

A Preliminary Assessment of Coordinative Bodies for Human Development

VICTORIA A. BAUTISTA*

Utilizing secondary materials and primary data, this article deciphers broad patterns of the operations and interrelationships of eighteen coordinative bodies. In general, coordinative bodies have been created in order to ensure effective management of programs/projects through the involvement of various institutions in the formulation of consolidated plans, the advocacy of relevant policies, and the conduct of monitoring and evaluation. They vary in population served, programs fostered, and composition. Recommendations clustered into issues of management and reorganization serve as one of the article's highlights.

Background and Methodology

Introduction

One of the areas of concern in pursuing development activities is development administration. In Chapter V of the *Medium Term Philippine Development Plan 1993-1998*, one of the goals is to "make the bureaucracy an effective, efficient and more productive machinery for translating into reality the government's vision of human development" (NEDA 1993: 5-1). A strategy cited in the same chapter to rationalize improvement of the capabilities of government is to limit its size and to concentrate intervention on the most basic functions with the bulk of development efforts being left to communities, organizations and firms empowered to implement them.

*Professor, College of Public Administration, University of the Philippines.

The research team which conducted this study was composed of the following: Victoria A. Bautista, project leader; Wilhelmina L. Cabo, Juvy Lizette M. Gervacio, Gabrielle R. Iglesias, Eleanor E. Nicolas, Dan A. Saguil, Ma. Clarisa R. Sia, and Emalyn L. Sodusta, researchers; and Corazon J. del Rosario, administrative staff.

Sincere gratitude is extended to the key informants of coordinative bodies which served as the subject matter of this study. This research undertaking has also drawn a lot of insight and assistance in data gathering from the Social Development Staff of the National Economic and Development Authority (SDS-NEDA). In particular, we would like to convey our appreciation to Ms. Erlinda M. Capones, Director of SDS-NEDA and her staff, namely: Florencio R. Carandang Jr., Reina Elena C. Gotian, Marites B. Lagarto, and Aleli A. Rosario. The editorial assistance of Dr. Oscar M. Alfonso is also hereby acknowledged. We likewise thank the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) for the financial assistance in the conduct of this study.

At present, many structural arrangements exist to orchestrate the activities of various sectors in relation to social and/or human development. These bodies include: (1) Social Development Committee (SDC) with two levels, namely, the Cabinet level and the Technical Board and two subcommittees, the Subcommittee on Livelihood and the Multisectoral Committee for the World Summit for Social Development; (2) Cabinet Cluster C (CCC) or the Human Resource and Development Cluster; (3) Social Reform Council (SRC); (4) Presidential Commission to Fight Poverty (PCFP); (5) Presidential Council for Countryside Development (PCCD); (6) Philippine Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD); (7) Presidential Commission for the Urban Poor (PCUP); (8) National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women (NCRFW); (9) National Commission on the Welfare of Disabled Persons (NCWDP); (10) Council for the Welfare of Children (CWC); (11) Population Commission (POPCOM); (12) National Nutrition Council (NNC); (13) National Youth Commission (NYC); (14) National Disaster Coordinating Council (NDCC); (15) Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council (HUDCC); (16) Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA); (17) Philippine National AIDs Council (PNAC); and (18) Literacy Coordinating Council (LCC). There is also a move to establish a High Commission on Poverty Alleviation to interrelate the Executive and Legislative Branches of government to ensure that quality of life of the poor can be fully addressed.

For our purposes, social development refers to the United Nations Center for Regional Development's (UNCRD) context of the term social as "non-material" factors which contribute to the overall quality of life, and in particular those aspects which are more concerned with people rather than material things (UNCRD 1988: 8). Separating social from economic development dominated the Philippine perspective prior to the nineties, except for some interrelated strategies like primary health care (PHC) and integrated area development (IAD).

Prior to the nineties, regimes in postwar Philippines viewed social development as significant but varied in their emphases. The first period considered social development as supplementary to economic development. This was the dominant idea until President Magsaysay's term. The second period, from President Garcia until President Aquino's term, began to view social development as an important component in overall development effort, although social development was treated more as a single sector apart from economic development (Bautista 1994). Each regime after President Magsaysay actually demonstrated parity in allocating resources between economic and social development, with the exception of President Marcos who allocated a smaller chunk of the budget for social development in relation to economic development (Bautista 1994). However, it was President Marcos who was the most avid in professing commitment to values for social development in the development plan for 1978 until the year 2000. He said his

design was for "the poorest of our society, planning to meet their basic nutritional needs, reducing if not entirely eliminating illiteracy, expanding employment opportunities, improving access to basic services, equalizing opportunities, sharing the fruits of development equitably, and introducing the requisite institutional changes" (Marcos 1977: xx).

On the other hand, coordinative bodies which interrelated social with economic-political components in their agenda were subsumed under the nomenclature of "human development." The latter term gained prominence in the nineties as the basic needs paradigm found a place in the strategy for development. Human beings occupied the center or thrust of development in this perspective. All other components, both economic or social, were also interrelated towards the uplift of the human condition. Thus, each sector was not viewed in a separate, disjointed manner, but was considered strongly linked to each other to attain quality of life.

The Social Reform Agenda (SRA) embodies the perspective of the Ramos administration. The SRA sees the need to integrate social and economic departments and offices at the national and local levels in order to attain basic needs. These include survival needs like health, nutrition, potable water and sanitary toilet facility; safeguarding against physical harm through housing that will provide protection from natural and man-made intrusions into the safety of the individual and the provision of general security and safety; and, enabling needs such as basic education, livelihood and community participation which can facilitate attainment of survival and protection needs (Bautista 1994: 15). Meeting these needs will redound to the attainment of quality of life measured by such factors as reduced morbidity and mortality; increased participation in governance; and reduction in poverty.

Research Agenda

With the foregoing as the context, this article hopes:

- (1) To understand the basic features and characteristics of each coordinative body such as: goals/missions; major activities/functions; program framework; structural arrangements for coordination (i.e., composition, secretariat support) and where it is organizationally lodged; mechanisms adopted to coordinate its tasks; target clientele and area of coverage; funding sources for coordination, including major Official Development Assistance; general assessment of performance to ascertain what objectives have been addressed and which ones have not been met; and difficulties in/facilitative factors for coordination.

- (2) To determine what mechanisms/options rationalize the management of the program commitments for human development by indicating what substantive activities can be stopped or started; and what institutional mechanisms can be simplified through indications of areas of convergence or even a determination of what can be delimited.

Review of Literature

Coordination is one of the key responsibilities of top and middle-level managers of an organization. Leaders are expected to orchestrate various entities in an organization to ensure that every one leads towards the attainment of a common purpose. An even more significant responsibility in coordination is the need to reach out to external entities which have a role to play in attaining and enhancing the goals of an organization.

The second type of coordination occupied the interest of scholars even as far back as the sixties when the attainment of organizational goals could not be fully addressed if they proceeded in a sectoral way. It has dominated the thinking of exponents of integrated rural development since reaching the masses of the people in rural areas could not be effectively achieved if there was no concerted effort among implementors in catering to their multiple needs at the local level. Aminuzzaman's account (1982) traces the first study of coordination to that of Remigia Laus in 1960 on the role of the Presidential Assistant for Community Development (PACD) in a report entitled *Coordination Agencies in Community Development Programs*. Aminuzzaman noted the ineffectiveness of this body especially in orchestrating rural development activities at the provincial level (Aminuzzaman 1982: 182). Other studies were cited by Aminuzzaman to have pointed to the failure of coordination at the local level because of the inactive role of local governments in program coordination and "an overactive and self-concerned role of line agencies, on the other hand." Aminuzzaman further added that this was also the observation of Luz A. Einsiedel in the *Success and Failure of Some Community Development Projects in Batangas (1968)* and Ma. Aurora C. Catilo in the *Problems of Coordination: The Case of Skills Training Implemented by National Line Agencies in Batangas (1981)*.

Alex Brillantes, Jr. (1979: 5) likewise made an account of the dynamics of coordination experienced by regional development councils as one of the administrative bodies charged with orchestrating multisectoral efforts in planning. The difficulties of coordination were attributed to confused authority structure, poor leadership traits, obscure interagency relationship, diffused goals, lack of technical competence, and a potent tendency for centralization.

At the national level, attempts to orchestrate multisectoral efforts both in planning and implementation were witnessed in rice and corn production through the setting up of the Rice and Corn Production Coordinating Council under the leadership of then Executive Secretary Rafael M. Salas. The success in attaining rice self-sufficiency during his term was not only attributed to his commitment to attain the objectives of the rice program. His political clout as Executive Secretary facilitated orchestration of efforts of various representatives from government and the private sector to work together as a team (Arcega 1969). While a coordinative body was already existent in the past, this was not as effective as in this case because a co-equal served as the Coordinator of the Council.

One of the most comprehensive beginnings of coordination started with the conceptualization of integrated area development (IAD) programs. This has created national and local coordinative structures to ensure that the various phases of the management cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation are fulfilled. The key structural arrangement evolved was the lead-agency model with the agency considered to be a priority consideration serving as the Cabinet Coordinator at the national level. The representative at the local level orchestrated implementation efforts. For example, the Mindoro Integrated Rural Development Project which focused on the national and provincial roads, the rehabilitation and upgrading of the Calapan port, the improvement of the Pula and Baco-Bucayao National Irrigation System, the provision of the Mindoro Integrated Watershed Management and Erosion Control Project and the certification and distribution of certified seed series were headed by the Minister of Public Works and Highways. This infrastructure support was considered critical in this area. The same Minister also served as the Cabinet Coordinator for the Bicol River Basin Development Program and the Zamboanga del Sur Development Project with slant on irrigation and road network, respectively.

A perennial problem encountered with the lead agency structure was that the personnel from the different line ministries assigned to the coordinative body gave priority attention to the mother agency rather than the IAD project (Castillo 1983: 439). To carry out the functions expected of other agencies, the lead agency sometimes resorted to hiring its own staff, thus duplicating rather than integrating efforts of multisectoral representatives.

In one of the documented experiences on coordination in IAD programs such as the Libmanan-Cabusao Integrated Area Development Project (Ocampo and Tancango 1984), decisionmaking at the local level had to be centralized because the regional and project offices lacked the legal authority, technical capability and/or material resources to handle implementation problems.

Thus, difficulties of coordination were not only management in nature (i.e., lack of leadership traits or commitment, lack of competence, etc.) but also structural (i.e., lack of clout on the part of leadership because of the organizational arrangements). It is, therefore, of interest to note if such problems plaguing coordinative bodies enable them to draw practical suggestions on how to respond to them.

A recent experience in coordination was the Area-Based Child Survival and Development Program (ABCSDP) implemented in the seven most depressed provinces in the country (Bautista 1994a). This program was a joint undertaking between the Philippine Government and the United Nations Children's Fund from 1988 to 1993. This experimented with devolution by granting financial autonomy to local executives to undertake socioeconomic development projects for women and children. A basic feature of ABCSDP was the application of convergence since local executives were expected to marshal the efforts of various implementors from the national and local governments, nongovernmental organizations and people's organizations in the conduct of situation analysis, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The political will of local executives in marshalling the efforts of these different sectors depicted the improvement of the condition in infant mortality and malnutrition rates since services were maximized in areas which were successful in convergence at provincial, municipal and barangay levels. Facilitating factors for the success of selected ABCSDP areas were the application of participatory strategies for the implementation of selected projects.

Methodology

This research entailed a review of secondary materials such as agency documents, minutes of meetings, executive orders/directives and annual reports. These sources were utilized to gain insights on the mission, goals, activities, partner institutions, sources of support and accomplishments of coordinative bodies.

Interviews of key informants were also conducted to find out the problems and difficulties encountered in coordination and what options they are likely to consider in simplifying their coordinative functions. A total of 23 key informants knowledgeable about the operation of the coordinative bodies served as the key resource persons. They were mostly Executive Directors (fifteen) of the current Secretariats. Some were the Deputy Directors (two). Five others were heads of units of the Secretariat. Previous Executive Directors (two) were also interviewed specially if the current ones were quite new in their posts.

An interview guide was formulated to draw standardized information from key informants.

The design of this research is basically qualitative as it hopes to draw patterns in undertaking coordinative functions and solving problems encountered in forging these.

Limitations

This study focuses on the broad patterns regarding the operations and interrelationships of coordinative bodies. It does not look into the internal dynamics, processes and structures of partner institutions intensively. Neither does it match administrative capability and impacts of coordinative bodies. This is, at best, exploratory to describe the nature, function, and broad structural features of these coordinative bodies. This then raises general issues to derive some measures which can be pursued by decisionmakers, including some research agenda on focal areas where coordination can be further enhanced.

Findings and Analysis

Mission of Coordination

The Rationale of Coordination. Why is coordination important? What is the basis for orchestrating the efforts of various institutions under one single body? Reviewing the basic directives creating the 18 coordinative bodies for human development reveals that the objective is to effectively address management of common concerns. The essence of coordination is to rationalize processes and mechanisms to attain common goals and thrusts. This could be captured in various policy statements. For instance, Executive Order No. 203 on 20 December 1994 creating the Social Reform Council (SRC) charged this body to "facilitate and ensure the implementation" of the Social Reform Agenda (SRA) by interrelating government organizations (GOs) and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Another such statement is Executive Order No. 12 of 15 August 1992 creating the Presidential Commission to Fight Poverty (PCFP) with the intention to "prod and facilitate the implementation of poverty alleviation activities."

Providing the venue for discussion of various individuals and groups at various levels, both national and local, is thus seen as the underlying reason for the creation of these different bodies and permeates the different policy directives. This can be gleaned from such statements as the need to "foster dialogue" (PCCD), to "establish and maintain contact with public and private

organizations" (POPCOM), and "to recognize and encourage the complementary roles of public and private institutions" (TESDA).

Population Served. The coordinative bodies may also be distinguished according to the population they focus on and the nature of the program thrusts they pursue.

A total of eight bodies aim their focus on the general population. These are the Social Development Committee (SDC), Cabinet Cluster C (CCC), Presidential Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD), Population Commission (POPCOM), Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council (HUDCC), National Nutrition Council (NNC), Philippine National AIDS Council (PNAC) and Literacy Coordinating Council (LCC). The rest (ten in all) currently gear their efforts to special groups in the population. See Table 1.

Four of the ten focus on the poor and the marginalized sectors, namely, the SRC, PCFP, Presidential Commission for the Urban Poor (PCUP) and Presidential Council for Countryside Development (PCCD). Among the four, however, one has specialized sectors of the poor in its agenda. PCUP, as the name implies, centers on the urban poor. The other three (PCCD, PCFP and SRC) aim to address the broad population of poor and marginalized people, currently targeted in 20 priority provinces, and soon to expand to the other areas. Of the four, SRC maintains an oversight role as it includes the key executives of the Secretariat of the three other coordinative bodies.

Five of the ten with specialized groups of people as their target beneficiaries have varying foci of interest. For instance, the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA) gears its efforts toward middle-level manpower. The National Youth Commission (NYC), in turn, aims to improve the plight of the youth; the National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women (NCRFW) focuses on women; the Council for the Welfare of Children (CWC), on children; and the National Council for the Welfare of Disabled Persons (NCWDP), on persons with disabilities.

The last one, the National Disaster Coordinating Council (NDCC) targets not only groups of people but also areas affected by disasters or calamities and those potentially victimized by these.

Program Thrusts. The coordinative bodies may be grouped into five: those performing general oversight functions (two), those engaged in poverty alleviation (four), those involved in fostering multisectoral activities (five), those engaged in a particular sector as an entry point in integration of various institutions (three), and those emphasizing manpower development (two).

Table 1. Summary of Population Served and Program Thrusts of Coordinative Bodies

<i>Coordinative Bodies</i>	<i>Population Served</i>	<i>Program Thrusts</i>
SDC	General	General
CCC	General	General
SRC	Poor and marginalized	Social and economic dimensions of human development
PCFP	Poor and marginalized	Social and economic dimensions
PCUP	Urban poor, women and children	General services both social and economic (i.e., housing, infrastructures, livelihood, employment and social services)
PCCD	Poor and marginalized	Social and economic
PCSD	General	Social and economic (i.e., human health, battling poverty, sustainable human settlements, demographic dynamics) and conservation and management of resources
POPCOM	General	Population and its relationship to resources and environment, women, sexuality
NNC	General	Nutrition
HUDCC	General	Housing
TESDA	Middle-level manpower	Technical education and skills development
NDCC	Actual/potential disaster areas/victims	Intersectoral (social, economic, etc.)
NCRFW	Women	Social, economic, political and cultural uplift
NCWDP	Disabled	General health, education, labor and social services requirements; including disability prevention and rehabilitation
NYC	Youth	Harnessing of full potential of the youth for development; development of capability of the youth for active participation in development
CWC	Children	General physical, intellectual, emotional, moral, spiritual and social development
LCC	General	Policy formulation and management of literacy programs
PNAC	General	AIDS prevention and control

(1) *General Oversight Function*

Two coordinative bodies do not have special program thrusts as their major role is to oversee the overall social development efforts. These are the SDC and CCC.

The SDC is one of the committees which assist the NEDA Board in formulating continuing, coordinated and fully integrated social and economic policies, plans and programs. It is under the direct control of the NEDA. On the other hand, Cabinet Cluster C or the Human Resource and Development Cluster is one of the seven clusters organized under the Cabinet to enhance inter-agency coordination and expedite the implementation of major inter-agency programs and projects. Both SDC and CCC provide policy advice to the President concerning social development. Because of the similarities of their functions, they currently conduct joint meetings, although there is a greater tendency to discuss operational and management issues in the joint meetings. These concerted meetings also provide an opportunity for reflection and brainstorming on government direction. However, policy issues requiring further deliberation are tossed back to the SDC. For instance, CCC was able to brainstorm on government directions which were ultimately referred to the SDC Technical Board for technical discussion/deliberation. The "hot issues" deliberated on included: oil levy, double digit inflation rate, negative effects of VAT, red tide, traffic, garbage and Mindoro earthquake.

(2) *Poverty Alleviation*

The coordinative bodies for poverty alleviation are synchronized under the umbrella of the SRC. SRC has embodied economic, political and social development considerations to address human development, specially those of the poor under the SRA. SRA, as the flagship program of SRC, interrelates many institutions in the economic, political and social sectors although a total of nine department secretaries called the Flagship Champions head their respective flagship programs which interrelate various offices. The nine flagship programs are agricultural development for farmers and landless rural workers; fishery development for fisherfolk; socialized housing for the urban poor; ancestral domain claims for indigenous peoples; workers' welfare and protection for the informal sector; comprehensive and integrated delivery of social services for disadvantaged children and youth, women in especially difficult circumstances, persons with disabilities and senior citizens; livelihood; institution-building; and credit.

An important development in the SRA is the adoption of a management technology called the Minimum Basic Needs (MBN) approach. This evolved from the initiative of the PCFP together with the Department of the Interior

and Local Government (DILG), the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) and the UP College of Public Administration, among others. This management intervention now permeates the perspective of PCCD and PCUP. A key feature of this approach is the formulation of a common set of indicators to demonstrate the attainment of the basic requirements of survival of the family. It harnesses the community as the key partner in gathering data and also as an instrument for empowerment. The program thrusts of the four bodies are therefore multisectoral, as they not only focus on social considerations, but also hope to address poverty by considering economic and physical requirements.

PCUP's mission is to facilitate the urban poor's access to basic services and programs such as land, housing and infrastructure services, livelihood and employment; and social services. Its basic thrust is to foster dialogue with the urban poor to hasten the institutionalization of their participation to redress their condition. PCUP, though, has tended to engage more in addressing the housing requirements of the poor.

PCCD has also adopted an intersectoral perspective by encouraging local government units (LGUs) to develop their respective master plans for countryside development. PCCD also mobilizes LGUs to generate resources and actively implement the programs in partnership with national government agencies (NGAs), government corporations (GOCCs) and the private sector. It also performs close monitoring and evaluation. It thus provides technical assistance to LGUs. It has also actively participated in the formulation and propagation of SRA's management technology.

PCFP for its part has not yet zeroed in on the propagation of a program package. Its major effort has focused on to the propagation and installation of the management technology of MBN. The rationale is that localities can focus on programs where their MBNs are found to be the most substandard.

(3) *Multisectoral Thrusts*

Five coordinative bodies can be subsumed under this typology. These are PCSD, NCRFW, NCWDP, NDCC and CWC.

PCSD is the latest to be created among the five. Its program zeroes in on sustainable development as a result of the commitment of the country at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. When it was created on 1 September 1992, one of the mandated tasks of PCSD was "to ensure the implementation of the Philippine commitments to sustainable development principles."

Its program commitments are multisectoral in nature as it aims to cover two broad program perspectives. One is social and economic dimensions, as activities are centered on the promotion of health, battling poverty, creating sustainable human settlements, and understanding demographic dynamics. The second is conservation and management of resources, as the main concern is the promotion of clean and healthy atmosphere, protection and preservation of biological resources, management of land resources and conservation/rehabilitation of water resources.

Other coordinative bodies like NDCC, NCRFW, NCWDP, and CWC have a multisectoral program perspective in addressing requirements of their respective target groups. The earliest to be established among the five is CWC (1974) through the Child and Youth Welfare Code. The Code aims to promote child and youth welfare through a package of programs addressing the physical, intellectual, emotional, moral, spiritual and social requirements of this group.

NCRFW was constituted a year after (1975) to ensure the full integration of women for social, economic, political and cultural development at national, regional and international levels to ensure equality with men.

NDCC was created in 1978 with the hope of coordinating efforts on disaster preparedness, rescue and relief operations, and recovery and rehabilitation activities.

NCWDP was established in 1987. The Council's thrusts are in three major areas, namely: prevention of the causes of disabilities, rehabilitation, and equalization of opportunities. Equalization of opportunities means the process through which the general system of society, i.e., physical, environment, health education services, work opportunities and facilities for social life, is made accessible to all including the sector with disability. With these thrusts, NCWDP hopes to promote the integration of the disabled in the mainstream of society through the formulation of policies on health, education, labor and social welfare for the disabled. It is evident that it is proactive in stance by ensuring the formulation of policies on disability prevention, and not only rehabilitation.

(4) *Sectoral Thrust*

Five coordinative bodies may be subsumed under this typology because they focus on a particular sector as the entry point in interrelating the requirements of their respective target beneficiaries. These are HUDCC, POPCOM, NNC, LCC and PNAC.

HUDCC was created by virtue of EO 90 on 17 December 1986. Its main function is to coordinate the activities of the government housing agencies to ensure the accomplishment of the National Shelter Program.

POPCOM, on the other hand, focuses on the issue of population, as its title implies. It was created under Republic Act (RA) 6365 dated 16 August 1971 with the latest amendment under EO 476, subsuming it under the NEDA. POPCOM's basic mission is to ensure that policies, laws, plans, programs and projects are population, resources and environment (PRE) balance-sensitive. It is hoped that individuals, families and communities internalize and institutionalize such perspective. It takes the lead in proposing policies and programs on family planning, population size, and population movement, among others.

NNC, for its part, focuses on nutrition. Created in 1974 by virtue of Presidential Decree (PD 491), it is mandated to be the highest policymaking and coordinating body on nutrition. Like POPCOM, it was originally established as an implementing body for nutrition under the regime of President Marcos, until the Local Government Code of 1991 divested it of its implementing functions in favor of local government executives. NNC's basic mission is to improve the desirable nutritional levels of the Filipino population.

PNAC was created through EO 39 on 3 December 1992 in recognition of the "increasing number of Filipinos infected with HIV and succumbing to AIDS" (RP 1992e). The Council is empowered to foster multisectoral effort towards the formulation of policies on the implementation of the National AIDS Prevention and Control Program and to overcome discriminatory attitudes towards those with AIDS.

The LCC was established through RA 7165 on 25 November 1991 to undertake, among others, "the identification of successful management schemes of literacy programs and adopt measures to boost research to be able to eradicate illiteracy" (RP 1991b).

(5) *Manpower Development*

The two remaining coordinative bodies have one thing in common. They share the vision of empowering their target clientele with skills to enable them to participate in their respective areas of work. TESDA aims to provide technical education and skills development for small and middle entrepreneurs. NYC hopes to harness the full potential of the youth to make them active participants in national development efforts. Both TESDA and NYC are very recent creations of the Ramos administration.

TESDA was established on 25 August 1994 and has replaced and absorbed the National Manpower and Youth Council (NMYC), the Bureau of Technical and Vocational Education (BTVE) of the Department of Education, Culture and Sports (DECS), and the apprenticeship program of the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE). TESDA hopes to strengthen the quality of technical education and skills development in order to attain international competitiveness. Among others, it also aims to inculcate desirable values through the development of moral character with emphasis on work ethic, self-discipline, self-reliance and nationalism.

NYC is the youngest among the coordinative bodies. It was established on 7 June 1995. Like TESDA, it is expected to help the youth through its capability-building programs.

Mandate

The coordinative bodies under study were created either as institutional bodies through law or as transitional/*ad hoc* bodies established by Executive Orders (EOs) or Administrative Orders (AOs). A total of seven were established by Republic Acts (RAs) or Presidential Decrees (PDs). These are POPCOM (RA 6365 on 16 August 1971), NNC (PD 491 on 25 June 1974), TESDA (RA 7796 on 25 August 1994), NDCC (PD 1566 on 11 June 1978), NCRFW (PD 633 on 6 January 1975), NYC (RA 8044 on 7 June 1995), CWC (PD 603 on 10 December 1974) and LCC (RA 7165 on 25 November 1991).

All the rest were established through executive directives. SDC was created by Letter of Instruction No. 601 on 20 September 1977 to ensure "quick and effective inter-agency coordination in the formulation and implementation of government policies in social services." NEDA was established, though, as far back as 1973 when PD 107 of 25 January was issued for this purpose. CCC was created through Memorandum Order 271 on 22 December 1989 and Memorandum Order 20 on 14 September 1992. SRC was set up under EO 203 on 20 December 1994. PCFP was organized on 15 August 1992 by EO 12. PCUP was created by virtue of EO 82 on 8 December 1986; PCCD on 14 July 1992 per EO 6; PCSD on 1 September 1992 pursuant to EO 15; HUDCC on 17 December 1986 per EO 90; NCWDP on 30 January 1987 under EO 123; and PNAC through EO 39 on 3 December 1992.

Seven of the current bodies were set up during the time of President Marcos. These are NEDA-SDC, NCWDP, POPCOM, NNC, NDCC, NCRFW and CWC. Four were established during President Aquino's term, namely: PCUP, HUDCC, CCC and LCC. Five were conceived under the current dispensation. These are SRC, PCFP, PCCD, PCSD and PNAC. Two others were revitalized under President Ramos. These are TESDA and NYC.

Functions of Coordinative Bodies

Common Functions. The coordinative bodies perform some common activities. These are the formulation of policies, the formulation of a coordinated development plan, and the conduct of monitoring and evaluation.

Policy formulation is undertaken in the form of preparing proposals for legislation on a specific area of concern. This is also pursued through agreements on implementing rules and regulations or guidelines in the execution of development plans. For instance, NDCC is mandated to establish priorities in the allocation of funds for relief operations on the basis of the criteria formulated in determining calamity areas. In the case of PCSD, guidelines and mechanisms are established to operationalize sustainable development principles adopted in the Rio de Janeiro Summit.

One of the policy directives which has gained major support and attention across coordinative bodies is the approval of the Convergence Strategy as a methodology in implementing the Social Reform Agenda. This was the rallying point for such coordinative bodies as SDC, SRC, PCFP, PCUP, and PCCD. Apart from this, other policy frameworks and program plans were formulated by most coordinative bodies as their major accomplishment.

The formulation of a coordinated development plan is also another feature of coordinative bodies. For example, PCCD coordinates the drafting of a master plan for countryside development drawn from subnational consultations. POPCOM also coordinates the preparation of the Population Program Plan; NNC, the National Nutrition Plan; CWC, the Philippine Plan of Action for Children; and NCRFW, the Long-Term Plan for Gender Responsive Development. The exception is CCC which basically responds to current issues having both operational and policy implications. In the case of SDC, its oversight role is undertaken through a review of the social development plans formulated by the different coordinative bodies.

Another common activity is the conduct of monitoring and evaluation. A popular mechanism is to determine the progress or accomplishment of various institutions on a particular scope of interest through the submission of reports by partner institutions. Another regular mechanism is the conduct of meetings, although this does not guarantee a systematic review of each agency's performance.

Some have attempted to evolve common indicators in order to review the accomplishments of partner institutions like NCRFW, NNC and HUDCC and those engaged in poverty alleviation. This is an improvement over the usual expectation for various sectors to submit their reports applying their respective criteria or indicators. However, much can still be done to

RECEIVED BY: _____
 DATE: _____
 ACC. NO.: _____
 CALL NO.: _____
 OBN: _____ MFM

understand and assess the mechanisms adopted by various coordinative bodies to undertake this activity.

Specific Functions. Apart from the previous functions, other commitments are also to be undertaken by some coordinative bodies based on their mandates. These include the following:

(1) *Mobilization/Advocacy Activities: Networking/Alliance-Building*

The most popular expression of mobilization is the requirement to establish alliances or networks outside the fold of the coordinative group itself. This is to be realized by networks or alliances between government and NGOs/business sector/peoples's organizations (POs) at the national and LGUs levels.

Thirteen coordinative bodies have been explicitly instructed to undertake this. These are SRC, PCUP, PCCD, PCSD, POPCOM, TESDA, NYC, NCWDP, NDCC, NCRFW, LCC, CWC and PNAC.

PCSD even has a broader instruction as its network is to encompass the international arena. One of the functions given to it is "to act as a coordinating mechanism, in cooperation with the Department of Foreign Affairs Office of the United Nations and other International Organizations, the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development and other international organizations, on the provision of assistance and cooperation towards the fulfillment of Philippine commitments" to sustainable development (PCSD n.d.).

(2) *Mobilization Activities: Public Information*

Another mechanism to impart the perspective of each coordinative body is through the conduct of public information. This is explicitly stated in the mandate of eight coordinative bodies (PCFP, PCUP, POPCOM, TESDA, NCWDP, NYC, NCRFW and LCC).

(3) *Mobilization: Capability-Building*

One promotive or mobilization activity is the conduct of capability-building programs to inculcate the perspective and the approaches to propagate the mission of the coordinative body. This is witnessed in the mandate of PCFP, TESDA, and NYC.

(4) *Conduct of Research*

Five coordinative bodies have been instructed to conduct research. These are POPCOM, NCWDP, TESDA, PCSD and NYC.

(5) *Resource Generation/Allocation*

Other mandates also explicitly underscore the importance of coordinative bodies in generating resources to sustain programs and projects pertaining to a given group or population. This is indicated for PCUP, PCCD, NNC, NYC CWC, and LCC.

(6) *Regulation*

Based on their respective mandates, five coordinative bodies are to carry out regulatory functions as they are directed to formulate guidelines to legitimize the operation of concerned groups of people. These are PCUP, NDCC, TESDA, CWC, and HUDCC.

(7) *Implementation of Pilot Projects*

Four bodies are also authorized to implement innovative projects which can become the basis for the formulation of policy directives for wide-scale application. These are CWC, NCRFW, PCFP and PCCD.

(8) *Service Delivery*

Two coordinative bodies, TESDA and NYC, are directly tasked to implement programs and projects on capability-building. This is the major role and function of these bodies; they are not only a mechanism to pursue other functions.

General Observations and Key Issues. In general, the conduct of monitoring and evaluation appears to be an area that has not been fully addressed by the coordinative bodies. This has admittedly stemmed from the need to firm up indicators as well as the limited number of technical and other resources for this activity.

One difficulty may also arise from the lack of clarity about the role of the coordinative body's national secretariat regarding its relationship with local people, who are the primary sources of information. Should the national

secretariat deal with local people directly, as some have done? Or rather, should the national secretariat and their representatives interface with DILG to mobilize LGUs for better synchronization? Thus, much needs to be ascertained about the posture of national personnel, both coordinative and departmental, in interfacing with LGUs.

Furthermore, while some coordinative bodies have a role to play in the enforcement of certain rules and regulations in their respective sectors, this has not been fully addressed by them.

Composition of Coordinative Bodies

A review of the composition of the different governmental institutions constituting the coordinative bodies reveals that the most involvement is demonstrated by NEDA and the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) with a total of 16. It is understandable why NEDA tops the list since it performs oversight functions. On the part of DILG, the high visibility in these committees signifies the importance given to devolution, being the agency able to interface with LGUs.

The second and the third in rank are mostly the social development departments like DECS (14), DSWD (13) and DOLE (13). The only economic department included in the third rank is DA (13) as agriculture is still the most dominant livelihood today.

NGOs are represented in twelve coordinative bodies: PCSD, PCFP, SRC, NCRFW, TESDA, NNC, NDCC, HUDCC, LCC, PNAC, CWC, and NCWDP. People's organizations are also represented in six: PCSD, SRC, NCRFW, TESDA, HUDCC, and NCWDP. The business sector as a group is also given opportunity to sit in these bodies. This is witnessed in such bodies as NCRFW, TESDA and HUDCC. In the case of CWC, three private individuals constitute the Board with at least one being an active member of a legitimate youth organization.

The total number of members in these committees ranges from eight (PCFP) to 32 (SRC). The latter's composition is understandable considering that it interrelates a broad range of developmental concerns with a direct impact on human development. Considering the number of inter-agency bodies each department head is involved in inevitably raises the issue of the capability of the top leadership of each institution to be present in all these bodies.

*Mechanisms Adopted by Coordinative Bodies
in Undertaking Their Tasks*

Most of the coordinative bodies have created multisectoral structures at the cabinet and technical levels to carry out their coordinative functions. Examples of cabinet level organizations are the Council Proper of PCSD, Governing Board of NNC, SDC Cabinet level, Council Board of CWC and POPCOM Board. More often, these bodies meet quarterly. On the other hand, the technical level body composed of Undersecretaries, Assistant Secretaries and/or Directors, works on the technical clarity of policies, programs and other inter-agency concerns prior to endorsement for approval by the cabinet level. Examples of these are the Executive Committee of the PCSD, Technical Committee of NNC, Technical Board of SDC, Technical Management Committee of CWC and Technical Committee of POPCOM. Compared to the cabinet level, the technical committee meets more often, usually on a monthly basis. Some inter-agency committees have Technical Working Groups or Task Forces composed of technical staff to assist the inter-agency body. NNC, PCFP and CWC have Technical Working Groups or Task Forces which convene as the need arises.

The most common mechanism for coordination employed by the coordinative bodies is the conduct of regular inter-agency meetings and workshops. Emergency meetings or special meetings to address pressing concerns are also conducted.

The SDC-Technical Board, for example, which meets monthly convened a special meeting in July 1995 to discuss a bill proposing the creation of a new body to deal with poverty alleviation. The NDCC also called emergency meetings immediately after the occurrence of a disaster such as flooding in Central Luzon or typhoon in Samar to be able to strengthen emergency and relief operations and organize rehabilitation activities.

Consultative workshops between the national and regional inter-agency counterparts are also held by some coordinative bodies. An example of these is the SDC National-Regional consultative meeting where the Regional SDC Chairmen and representatives from the NEDA Regional Offices meet with the SDC-TB to discuss regional issues which have implications at the national level such as for example, the operationalization of the Local Government Code. Others, such as PCUP, POPCOM, NNC and CWC, likewise conduct consultation with their regional counterparts. Moreover, planning workshops are commonly held during the last month of the year to formulate inter-agency work and financial programs for the succeeding year. For newly created bodies such as TESDA and NYC, their early years are spent in mission-visioning workshops at various geopolitical levels.

CWC has even created local councils for the protection of children. These councils are replications of the national CWC in terms of functions, objectives and composition. This has been approved by the Board and the DILG through Memorandum Circular 94-14.

Quarterly and annual reports and pertinent documents are shared with member agencies on a regular basis. This is to apprise members on what the inter-agency body has accomplished and what still has to be done.

There is also complementation of functions among inter-agency bodies such that sectoral institutions like POPCOM, TESDA and NNC, among others, elevate some policy and programmatic issues at the SDC-TB level for the purpose of generating broader socioeconomic perspectives and at times, to fast-track approval by the President of a certain policy, plan or program.

The establishment of another macro-level body on social development like SRC has created another layer reviewing the thrust for social development, apart from SDC. The SRC Secretariat is also requested by the SDC to report on the status of SRA. With the present administration focused on SRA, the President as Chairman of the SRC gives preference to this body as the forum to tackle emergent social development policy issues.

Some bodies have adopted innovative strategies like maximization of utilization of human resources to perform their coordinating roles. For instance, the NCRFW established focal points using personnel within each government and non-government entity, and even in inter-agency council for purposes of direction setting, advocacy, monitoring and coordination on gender and development concerns.

Cognizant of the vital role of NGOs and POs as partners of government in development, the PCSD has created a relatively unique set-up by creating two parallel Secretariats. The lead Secretariat coordinates activities with GO agencies while the NGO Secretariat relates with the NGO/PO members.

One coordinative body, by virtue of its mandate to formulate and implement policies and programs for the urban poor, makes use of regular dialogues involving NGOs and urban poor organizations themselves. The use of this mechanism manifests the recognition of the government, through PCUP, of the need to plan and work with the people to come up with realistic and doable programs.

Organizational Forms and Supervision

Viewing the coordinative bodies mentioned above, it can be seen that there are different forms adopted to constitute them. A total of four forms have

been demonstrated, namely: council, commission, committee, and authority. The dominant form is the council (i.e., SRC, PCCD, PCSD, NNC, HUDCC, NDCC, CWC, NCWDP, LCC and PNAC) with a total of ten. The second is the commission model with a total of five, namely: PCFP, PCUP, POPCOM, NCRFW, and NYC. Two are of the committee type, the SDC and CCC. One is an authority (TESDA). See Table 2.

Based on the *Framework for Governance on Streamlining the Bureaucracy* prepared by the Presidential Committee on Streamlining the Bureaucracy (DBM 1993: 38-42), a council is the highest policymaking body of the Executive Branch. It provides advice to the President on socioeconomic, political, security and policy issues of vital nationwide or international importance. It does not have public goods provision, production or delivery function. It is a collegial body headed by the President and composed of cabinet level members. Private sector members may be tapped, where necessary. It is a primary subdivision of the Executive Branch and reports directly to the President. It normally does not maintain attached units. Policy and technical support is provided by Offices and various departments.

In the same *Framework*, the commission is categorized into two types. One type is the constitutional commission whose existence, powers and functions are specifically mandated by the Constitution, such as for example the Civil Service Commission and the Commission on Audit. The second type, which subsumes most coordinative bodies mentioned previously, are specially created to be responsible for a transitory, multisectoral or multi-jurisdictional concern requiring government attention. Functions could include policy formulation, regulation, or administration of specific service delivery systems. It is usually a collegial body headed by a Chairman and attached to a lead Department or Office for policy supervision. Organic units consist of divisions. As a body, it does not have attached agencies.

In the *Framework*, an authority is referred to as a type of government entity involved in the development of specific geographic area having socioeconomic significance for the development of the country. Such involvement may include the provision and production of multisectoral public goods. It does not perform regulatory functions. This is often created under the following conditions: (1) goods and services are not provided by the private sector; (2) the development of a geographic area is to be hastened; and (3) national security and welfare are of primordial interest. Stock ownership of an authority consists of at least 60 percent national government shares. It is often governed by a board of directors with day-to-day operations managed by a Chief Executive Officer. It is usually attached to a department for policy supervision. It does not normally have subsidiaries.

Table 2. Organizational Forms and Supervision

<i>Coordinative Body</i>	<i>Organizational Form</i>	<i>Supervising Office</i>	<i>Chairperson of the Coordinative Body</i>	<i>Vice-Chairperson</i>	<i>Head of Secretariat</i>	<i>Institution Where Secretariat is Lodged</i>	<i>Regional Representation</i>
SDC	Committee	NEDA	DOLE Secretary	NEDA Director General	Director of Social Development Staff (SDS), NEDA	NEDA	Regional Social Development Committee
CCC	Committee	Office of the President (OP)	NEDA Director General	DSWD Secretary	Director of SDS, NEDA	NEDA	
SRC	Council	OP	President	DAR Secretary (Lead Convenor)	Secretary General of SRC	DAR	
PCFP	Commission	OP	Presidential Appointee	DSWD Secretary	Executive Director, PCFP	PCFP	
PCUP	Commission	OP	Presidential Appointee		Chief Executive Officer is the same as the Chairman	PCUP	Luzon, Visayas, & Mindanao Field
PCCD	Council	OP	Presidential Consultant for Rural Development		Executive Director	PCCD	
PCSD	Council	NEDA	NEDA Director General	DENR Secretary	Deputy Director General of NEDA	NEDA	
POPCOM	Commission	NEDA	NEDA Director General		Executive Director, POPCOM	POPCOM	With 14 regional offices

NNC	Council	DA	DA Secretary		Executive Director, NNC	NNC	With Regional Nutrition Office headed by the Regional Nutrition Program Coordinator
HUDCC	Council	OP	Presidential Appointee		Secretary General, HUDCC	HUDCC	Regional Offices
TESDA	Authority	DOLE	DOLE Secretary	DECS & DTI Secretaries	Director General, TESDA	TESDA	With Regional TESDA Committee, assisted by Regional TESDA Officers
NDCC	Council	OP	DND Secretary		Administrator, Office of Civil Defense, DND	Office of Civil Defense, DND	Local Disaster Coordinating Councils with the Local Chief Executive as Chair and Chief of PNP as Vice Chair
NCRFW	Commission	OP	Presidential Appointee		Executive Director, NCRFW	NCRFW	
NCWDP	Council	DSWD	DSWD Secretary		Executive Director	NCWDP	
NYC	Commission	OP	Presidential Appointee		Chief Executive Officer, NYC	NYC	To establish regional offices
CWC	Council	DSWD	DSWD Secretary		Executive Director, CWC	CWC	Regional subcommittee for the Welfare of Children
LCC	Council	DECS	DECS Secretary		Head Secretariat	DECS	
PNAC	Council	DOH	DOH Secretary		Head Secretariat	DOH	

No reference is made to committees as a special body in the *Framework for Governance*. Evidently, committees are treated not as distinct entities but as appendages of operating bodies.

Councils. Four (SRC, PCCD, NDCC and HUDCC) of the ten councils mentioned previously are all directly supervised by the Office of the President.

Six others are attached to other offices. CWC and NCWDP are under the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). Another one, NNC, is lodged under the DA. PCSD is under NEDA. LCC is under the DECS while PNAC is under the DOH.

Most of the coordinative bodies under the Office of the President have a designated person who chairs the council, although the President is technically considered the ex-officio Chairperson of the Council. This is the case with NDCC, SRC and HUDCC. For instance, the Lead Convenor of SRC is the DAR Secretary with the head of the Secretariat from the OPAPP. For NDCC, the Chairperson is the Secretary of the Department of National Defense (DND), with the Administrator of Office of Civil Defense (OCD) as the head of the Secretariat. In the case of PCCD, the Chairperson is the Presidential Consultant for Rural Development while the Secretariat Head is called the Executive Director who had been Presidential Assistant before being appointed to this position.

The remaining six bodies attached to other offices have different persons serving as Chairperson of the Council and as Chief Executive Officer/Executive Director of the Secretariat. NNC has the Secretary of the DA as the Chairperson of the Governing Board. The Executive Director is a different person. The case of the CWC and the NCWDP also shows the Secretary of DSWD heading the Governing Board with a different Executive Director heading the Secretariat. PCSD is headed by the NEDA Director-General while its Deputy Director heads the Secretariat. LCC is headed by the Secretary of DECS with an appointed person from the Bureau of Non-Formal Education serving as the Head of the Secretariat. This is also the experience of PNAC where the Chairperson is the Secretary of the DOH while the Head of the Secretariat is a designated person from the DOH.

NCWDP, while affiliated with the DSWD, operates autonomously and is not under its direct supervision. The Council proposes and defends its own budget in Congress.

Commissions. Supervision over the commissions is mainly lodged under the OP. Four of the six are under it, the PCFP, PCUP, NYC and NCRFW.

One is attached to the NEDA. This is the POPCOM. POPCOM has the head of the agency as the Chairperson and an appointed staff as the Executive Director of the Secretariat.

Those under the supervision of the OP have a presidential appointee designated as the chairperson of the commission. Only in one instance (PCUP) is the Chairperson serving as the head of the Secretariat. There is no active governing board at present.

Authority. The lone authority is the TESDA. Functionally, TESDA operates differently from the ideal perspective on authorities defined by the Committee on Streamlining the Bureaucracy. TESDA performs regulatory functions, like NDCC and HUDCC, by being tasked to "establish a system of accreditation of both public and private institutions" as defined in RA 7796. Based on the Committee's definition, authorities are not expected to perform this activity. TESDA also operates like NDCC and HUDCC as it undertakes the same functions as planning, monitoring/evaluation and social mobilization. It is like a commission such as NYC in undertaking manpower development service but for a different clientele. Thus, its functions do not make it different from some operating councils and commissions.

Committees. The two committees are constituted as entities attached to an office to perform coordinative functions. The SDC Cabinet level is under the supervision of the NEDA whereas the Cabinet Cluster C is under the Office of the President. However, the chairmanship of the SDC-Cabinet is lodged in the Secretary of DOLE. Because of the conduct of joint meetings between the two, chairmanship is assumed by the Director-General of the NEDA.

General Observations. On the whole, coordinative bodies do not have uniform modes of constitution and supervision. While most councils are under the Office of the President, other councils are supervised by other institutions. Furthermore, while councils are defined by the Presidential Committee for Streamlining the Bureaucracy as having functional leaning for policy advice, other activities are also undertaken by councils like policy advocacy, dissemination of information and resource assistance.

Based on the *Framework for Governance*, commissions are often attached to departments or offices for policy guidance. Most of the commissions for human development are attached to the Office of the President and often headed by a presidential appointee. This is the experience with coordinative bodies covering multisectoral interests like PCFP, PCUP and NYC. On the other hand, commissions with more specialized focus like POPCOM and CWC are attached to departments. The former is attached to NEDA while the latter, to DSWD. However, two other commissions have a specialized focus (i.e., NCRFW and NYC) but both are attached to the Office of the President.

Considering the kinds of activities performed by the commissions and the councils, it appears there is no clear distinction in their thrusts. Councils not only perform the role of policy advice but also undertake other activities

pursued by commissions such as advocacy, mobilization, capability-building, monitoring/evaluation, research, etc.

A critical issue is how the Office of the President will be able to cope with the numerous responsibilities extended to it as half of the 18 coordinative bodies are directly under its supervision. Thus, the coordinative bodies attached to the OP are often headed by another person.

Secretariat Support

Administrative and technical support is extended by the secretariat to the coordinative bodies. However, the secretariats vary in their degree of organization. Technical support is extended through the preparation of technical papers which serve as the basis for the decisionmaking process of the coordinative body as policies are formulated or advocacy activities are mounted at the national and local levels. Administrative support is provided by taking charge of the conduct of meetings and transmitting information to link various institutions as decisions are formulated.

Secretariats may be distinguished according to the degree of complexity of the structures built to support the coordinative body. Another mode of classifying them is the basic origin of their staff.

Degree of Complexity of the Structure. Some secretariats have a *complex structure* and staff complement undertaking numerous activities which even extend to the regions. These are SDC, NNC, HUDCC, PCUP, NDCC, TESDA, NYC, POPCOM, CWC, SRC and PCSD. See the previous Table.

The SDC Secretariat is made up mostly from the Social Development Staff (SDS) of the NEDA at the national level. The SDS at the national level, for example, is headed by a Director. The Director is supported by an Assistant Director, four Division Chiefs, and several Specialists and Analysts coming from various divisions of NEDA-SDS concerned with such sectors as health, nutrition, family planning, education, social welfare, and housing. At the regional level, Regional Social Development Committees also exist under the Regional Development Councils. Each of these committees is assisted by a Secretariat based at the NEDA Regional Offices.

In the case of the NNC, the Secretariat is headed by the Executive Director with the assistance of two Deputy Executive Directors, and three technical and two Administrative Division Chiefs. At the local level, the Regional Nutrition Office is manned by a Regional Nutrition Program Coordinator and assisted by one Nutrition Specialist.

At HUDCC, the Secretariat has a total of 200 technical and administrative personnel, with some of them located in regional offices. The Secretariat is headed by the Secretary General.

In the case of the CWC the Council Secretariat is the executive arm directly under the Executive Director. It is composed of four divisions namely: Planning and Programming; Legal and Technical Services; Information, Education and Communication; and Administration and Finance. The staff total about 18. They also serve as Regional Council in organizing Regional Subcommittees for the Welfare of Children. The latter is composed of concerned agencies from the government as well as the nongovernment sector in the region.

POPCOM also has its own regional offices.

TESDA has the most complex and huge bureaucratic apparatus as it consists of people originating from three offices namely: the National Manpower Youth Council (NMYC) with a total of 1,556 persons; Bureau of Training and Vocational Education formerly attached to the DECS with a total staff complement of 700 persons; and the DOLE with a total of eleven persons. Regional TESDA Committees are expected to be operational per RA 7796 to provide effective supervision, coordination and integration of technical education and skills development programs and projects. Each Regional Committee is to be assisted by the Regional TESDA Office headed by a Regional Director and shall serve as the Secretariat of the TESDA Committees.

PCUP, which has a total staff complement of 226, is headed by a Chief Executive Director and three regional directors assigned to each of the broad island groupings of Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao. There are also two offices in Metro Manila with one based in Malacañang.

NDCC as a coordinative body is assisted by the OCD-DND. Likewise, the Regional Field Officers of the OCD provide the different local disaster coordinating councils technical assistance and other support for coordinative activities.

It may be noted that the aforementioned structures had had a track record in delivering services before devolution was put in place and basic services became the LGUs' responsibility. The exception is NEDA which focused mainly on planning activities and in the past started to involve local executives. However, planning drew mainly from the participation of sectoral field representatives.

SRC can also be said to belong to this typology. Although it does not have any secretariat based at the regions or local levels, it is multi-layered even at

the national level. This is demonstrated by the fact that a secretariat is constituted to support the SRC and the Technical Working Group.

The SRC Secretariat was initially assigned to the Office of the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process (OPAPP) per EO 203. Recently, the SRC Secretariat was lodged under the Office of the Secretary of Agrarian Reform per EO 252. Such change was done to strengthen the functions of the Secretariat since it is now directly under the Vice Chairman and the Lead Convenor of the Social Reform Agenda. The Lead Convenor, who is the Secretary of Agrarian Reform, and the SRC Secretariat direct the activities of the Technical Working Group (TWG). The TWG, composed of Technical Action Officers (TAOs) from the nine Flagship Champions and other partner agencies, was created. The TAOs were nominated by their respective agencies, and their main responsibility is to represent and feed back to their agencies the commitments/agreements reached in the TWG.

Like SRC, PCSD does not have its own regional Secretariat. However, at the national level, it has four Committees headed by division chiefs from its member agencies. These Committees are on Social and Economic Dimensions; Conservation and Management of Resources for Development; Strengthening the Role of Major Groups; and Means of Implementation. Each Committee can also constitute Subcommittees composed of technical staff of partner institutions. For instance, the Committee on Conservation and Management has four Subcommittees on Biodiversity, Atmosphere, Water Resources and Land Resources. The Committee on Means of Implementation has four: Financing Arrangements; Science and Technology; Information and Education; and Legal and Institutional Arrangements. An important feature of these Committees is the representation it draws from NGOs to constitute the membership. A Secretariat is also constituted to assist the Executive Committee, which orchestrates the activities of the different Committees.

There are some secretariats with *simple structures* because their composition is lean and does not have staff members based at the regional offices compared with the structures mentioned earlier. These include the CCC, PCCD, PCFP, NCRFW, and NCWDP.

In the case of the CCC, secretariat support is provided by the Social Development Staff of NEDA. Cabinet Clusters usually meet every other Tuesday. Since most of the members of CCC are also members of SDC, joint meetings are held to tackle issues raised at the SDC Technical Board and "hot issues" requiring quick interventions, often operational in nature. Since the agenda of CCC are usually set by the President himself through the Office of the President-Project Management Staff (OP-PMS), special SDC-Cabinet level meetings are called to discuss policy issues emanating from the SDC-Technical Board.

PCFP and PCCD do not have complex institutional structures like NNC and TESDA. While interest has been expressed to perform advocacy activities in the regions and local government units, the limited staff complement curtails the capacity to undertake these activities.

At the NCRFW, the Executive Director administers the day-to-day operations with the assistance of the Division Chief of each of the three functional units such as Program Development and Evaluation; Research and Studies; and Administrative. It also has a Women's Information Center attached to the Research and Studies Division.

In the case of the NCWDP, the Secretariat is organized into five divisions: Office of the Executive Director with a Monitoring and Coordination Unit under it; Administrative; Program Management; Information, Education and Communication; and Technical Cooperation. There are 62 plantilla positions in the Secretariat with 56 being now occupied.

LCC only has three full-time members of the Secretariat. The Head is on full time detail from the Bureau of Non-Formal Education while two others are contractual employees. Of the last two, one serves as a project officer and the other as clerk. When there are many activities, Technical Working Groups are organized and the members are remunerated.

The AIDS/STD Unit of the DOH serves as the Secretariat of the PNAC with the Program Manager of this Unit also performing the role of Head of the Secretariat.

One issue pertinent to the structure of the secretariats is the extent to which regional or subnational counterparts will be reasonably constituted without trampling on the responsibilities of other institutions or local government units. For example, while the Secretariat of the PCFP has started to undertake advocacy role for the Minimum Basic Needs approach as the central management methodology of the Social Reform Agenda, capability-building activities are to be undertaken for this purpose by the DILG. Thus, it can be asked, to what extent should localization efforts be undertaken by PCFP? In the case of other coordinative bodies with existing regional secretariats, it can be questioned to what extent can they pursue their role without necessarily overlapping in activities with other coordinative bodies? For example, if NNC is overseeing the nutrition activities for the Country Program for Children, would not there be a duplication of the activities of the CWC?

Origin of the Secretariat. Another way of classifying secretariats could be in terms of how they are constituted.

Some secretariats are organized from *existing structures*. This is the experience of secretariats of the SDC, Cabinet Cluster C, NDCC and PNAC. SDC and CCC draw from the NEDA for their secretariat support through the Social Development Staff and OP-PMS. In the case of the NDCC, the Secretariat is constituted from the staff of the OCD.

Another mode in formulating secretariats is to set up or hire their own personnel to support the coordinative body. This is the case with the PCFP, PCUP, POPCOM, NNC, CWC, HUDCC, NCRFW, and NCWDP.

A third mode of constituting secretariats is to draw representation from various institutions. This is the case with SRC and PCSD. SRC has staff support from the OPAPP which is now lodged in the Office of the Secretary of Agrarian Reform as the Lead Convenor of the SRA. In the case of PCSD, support to the Executive Committee is extended by a composite Secretariat based at the NEDA and with staff complement from NEDA, Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and Department of Finance (DOF). Secretariat support for the various Committees is drawn from both government and NGO representatives.

LCC draws from the BNFE of DECS while two others are hired on a contractual basis.

Issues. Among the three modes of constituting secretariats, the least problem with respect to dislocating personnel is the second one since the staff members are hired purposely for this position. However, the expectation is that a budget is set aside to ensure that the remuneration of the staff is regularly provided. On the other hand, the first and third modes do not necessitate additional budget because remuneration is drawn from the regular budget of the agency where they are based or from other sources of support drawn by the institution. However, secondment leads to dislocation on the part of the staff and may require some adjustments in their new tasks.

Funding Support for Coordinative Activities

Government Support. In order to sustain the activities of the coordinative bodies, one important issue is the source of financial support to mobilize these activities. See Table 3 for a summary of the sources of support for coordinative activities.

The budget for each of the thirteen coordinative bodies is drawn from the national coffers principally from the General Appropriations Act. Others are sourced from offices where they are attached.

Table 3. Financial Sources of Coordinative Bodies for 1994-1995

<i>Coordinative Bodies</i>	<i>Financial Sources</i>		
	<i>National</i>	<i>Foreign</i>	<i>Others</i>
SDC	General appropriations (GAA) of NEDA		
CCC	GAA of OP-PMS & NEDA		Intergovernmental support
SRC	GAA		
PCFP	GAA	UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF	Intergovernmental support
PCUP	GAA, President's Social Fund	NOVIB, UNICEF	
PCCD	GAA, President's Social Fund, President's Contingency Fund	USAID	
PCSD	NEDA	UNDP, CIDA	Intergovernmental support
POPCOM	GAA	USAID, UNFPA	
NNC	GAA	UNICEF, USAID, JAPAN	
HUDCC	GAA	UNDP	
TESDA	GAA	World Bank, JICA, GTZ	
NDCC	DND- OCD		Intergovernmental support
NCRFW	GAA	CIDA	
NCWDP	GAA, congressional insertions		
NYC	GAA		
CWC	GAA, congressional insertions	UNICEF	
LCC	GAA		
PNAC	DOH savings from projects		Intergovernmental support

Like PCSD, NDCC does not receive any government appropriation for its coordinative activities. Expenses for meetings are shouldered by the DND-OCD which serves as the Secretariat of NDCC. Other agencies which take turns in hosting meetings shoulder the cost of conducting these. Funds intended for disaster management are directly released to agencies undertaking disaster relief operations. The calamity fund is released to the following implementing departments or agencies: (1) DSWD for emergency relief and rehabilitation assistance to victims; (2) DOH for medical assistance to disaster victims; (3) Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH) for immediate repair and restoration of damaged vital infrastructures which include schoolbuildings; (4) DECS for replacement of totally damaged instructional materials and prioritization and restoration/repair of schoolbuildings and other related facilities in coordination with DPWH; (5) Department of Transportation and Communication (DOTC) for repair/restoration of vital government transportation and communication facilities/infrastructures; (6) DND-Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) for relief, rescue, and evacuation activities and repair/rehabilitation of public utilities; and (7) other departments/agencies requiring immediate repair/restoration of vital infrastructures/facilities.

Calamity funds are not released directly to LGUs. Agencies involved in disaster operations are instructed to first use available resources in support of their emergency activities and not wait for the calamity fund release. Implementing agencies which need calamity fund for their activities are to submit their requests to the NDCC for evaluation and appropriate recommendation to the President. Calamity funds are not released to the NDCC. The release and the utilization of the calamity funds are monitored by the NDCC through reports of agencies which receive them.

Foreign Assistance. Ten of the 18 also generated support for the past year from foreign assistance like United Nations Development Program (UNDP), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Fund for Population Assistance (UNFPA), Netherlands Organization for International Development Cooperation (NOVIB), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), German Technical Assistance (GTZ), World Bank (WB), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and the Embassy of Japan.

Among the aforementioned institutions, UNDP and UNICEF have the most number of coordinative bodies assisted possibly because of their commitment to human development. For example, UNDP extends assistance to PCFP, PCSD, and HUDCC. UNICEF also assists PCFP together with such coordinative bodies as PCUP for its Urban Basic Services Program, NNC for its Nutrition Program of the Fourth Country Program for Children and the CWC.

The coordinative body where there was convergence of the most support among the foreign donor institutions (i.e., UNDP, UNFPA, and UNICEF) was the PCFP with a total of \$0.5 million poured on it for a period of three years. PCFP utilized these resources for the preparation of the National Strategy Paper to Fight Poverty, the advocacy of Minimum Basic Needs approach as the management methodology for the Social Reform Agenda at the national level; conduct of provincial workshops for the localization of MBN; and strengthening of PCFP organizationally and logistically. For the year 1994, PCFP got foreign support of about P3.9 million or about 37 percent of its budget of P10.67 million.

Observations. The fact that a number of coordinative bodies have been supported by donor institutions, it is possible that the latter's perspective could have shaped and influenced the thrusts of the former. Might the institutions supported by foreign funding become "donor driven?" What flexibility does the coordinative body exercise in designing thrusts and activities with an eye to the list of concerns of donor institutions?

Summary of Perceived Coordinative Problems

On the whole, the problem commonly expressed which has hampered effective coordination is the failure of partner institutions to extend full cooperation in coordinative meetings. A usual solution to this problem is by sending a representative as an alternate to the principal member of the coordinative body. This was expressed by nine key informants of the coordinative bodies studied. The difficulty though is that the agreements are often not achieved because the alternates are not given enough authority. At times, the alternates do not convey or feed back the discussions in the coordinative meetings. Thus, continuity of deliberations on issues and agreements has been difficult to foster.

Among the commissions, the expressed difficulty in generating involvement of partner institutions is the lack of clout to invite the participation of those with the position of Secretary. This is particularly encountered by commissioners who do not have an equivalent status.

Three key informants also expressed frustration over the failure of partner institutions to submit their reports on time. This has in a way affected the Secretariats' timely delivery of their consolidated reports. This has been attributed to the lack of commitment on the part of the representative or his being saddled with numerous responsibilities.

Four coordinative bodies openly expressed the lack of adequate funding to sustain their activities, particularly those which do not have regular

appropriations (i.e., PCSD). Some have plans to replicate and amplify their activities at local levels but are affected by this problem. This was expressed by PCUP, PCFP, PCSD, and HUDCC.

As a result of the meager financial resources extended to them, they have concomitantly experienced the lack of manpower resources to undertake their activities. Two (i.e., NNC and HUDCC) even expressed the need to upgrade their hardware (i.e., computers) to undertake their tasks of monitoring more efficiently.

Two key informants cited "turfism" as a stumbling block to coordinative effort. It was observed that some institutions still maintain the tendency to project their own mission and methods and become shortsighted when it comes to the potential contribution of partner institutions.

Other impeding factors include delay in the releases of funds from the DBM, overlapping meetings of coordinative bodies, and absence of sanctions for representatives who do not participate actively in coordinative bodies.

On the whole, therefore, the difficulty in ensuring participation in coordination stems from factors pertaining to individual/agency participants who may not have imbibed the attitude for convergence, and lack of institutional support (i.e., funding and human/material resources) for coordinative activities. Other factors are structural in nature and have implications on the necessity of improving organizational arrangements such as the leader of a coordinative body having a lower level position than representatives of partner institutions and being saddled with numerous responsibilities for coordinative tasks which overlap with one another.

Conclusions and Recommendations

General Observations/Conclusions

Mission. Coordinative bodies have been created with the end in view of ensuring effective management of programs/projects through the involvement of various institutions in the formulation of consolidated plans, the advocacy of relevant policies, and the conduct of monitoring and evaluation.

Coordinative bodies vary in population served and programs fostered. Eight have the general population as the focus of their convergence (i.e., SDC, CCC, PCSD, POPCOM, NNC, HUDCC, LCC and PNAC). Four have special concern for the poor: SRC, PCFP, PCUP and PCCD. However, SRC is an umbrella structure which intersects economic, social and political agenda. It subsumes the three coordinative bodies. The rest have varying sectoral groups in focus: small entrepreneurs (TESDA), the youth (NYC), women

(NCRFW), children (CWC), disabled (NCWDP), and areas/individuals prone to/affected by disaster (NDCC).

They also differ in terms of programs/projects propagated or supported, except for two (SDC and CCC) whose major function is giving policy advice to the top leadership. Furthermore, the CCC also functions to provide quick interventions for operational problems.

Nine have a multisectoral perspective as they cover various program areas. These are SRC, PCUP, PCCD, PCFP, PCSD, NCRFW, NCWDP, NDCC and CWC. The remaining ones (seven in all) have a sector each as the point of entry in interrelating other offices with their undertaking such as housing (HUDCC), population (POPCOM), nutrition (NNC), skills development of small entrepreneurs (TESDA) and skills development/value orientation of the youth (NYC). LCC focuses on education among the illiterates while PNAC highlights maintenance of health to prevent being afflicted with HIV/AIDS.

Functions. Apart from the usual policy advice, planning and monitoring/evaluation, coordinative bodies perform other functions. The most common activity is encouraging alliances with other groups at the national and local levels to propagate the basic program thrust of the coordinative body. Other functions include the dissemination of public information (in the case of eight bodies), performance of regulatory function (5), resource generation/allocation (6), capacity-building to impart the essence of the program (3), research (5), implementation of innovative projects (4) and manpower development (2).

Coordinative bodies vary in composition which ranges from eight to 32 in number. The largest is the SRC as it encompasses economic, social and political programs under its umbrella.

The two institutions with the most number of involvements in these coordinative bodies are the NEDA and the DILG (with 14 involvements). They are followed by the DA (with thirteen) and the four social development departments (DSWD, DOH, DOLE and DECS) with a total of twelve involvements each.

The Strengths of Coordination. Coordination is indeed an activity which has fared well insofar as fostering consolidated efforts in the determination of a common framework. This is the experience with the adoption of the Minimum Basic Needs Approach as a management framework in the Social Reform Agenda. Concern and interest in this management approach have spurred not just one coordinative body, but others too. Thus, various coordinative bodies (i.e., PCFP, PCUP, PCCD) are concerted in their methodology and thrust, though they focus on different population groups.

Coordination has also fostered a sense of "community" specially in instances when resources are limited and partner institutions assist by sharing their resources.

Management Issues in Coordination. Coordination is not an easy task to undertake. The most difficult part is how to sustain the involvement of designated participants. The fact that Secretaries are members of numerous coordinative bodies may overtax their energies and therefore engender inefficiencies. This could be the reason why representatives are sent to meetings instead. However, this creates the problem of hampering decisionmaking if the alternate is not authorized to vote in behalf of the regular member. Alternates do not convey what transpired to their respective institutions, thus making continuity a problem. Sustaining discussions in subsequent meetings becomes difficult because new representatives have to be oriented on what occurred previously. The sense of commitment and obligation is not urgent because of the lack of sanctions and even of authority of the coordinative body over member institutions. By its very nature, coordination hinges on the facilitative role and leadership of the Coordinator.

Other management issues like lack of regular support staff and limited financial and physical resources hamper the effectiveness of some coordinative bodies.

Structural Issues in Coordination. A structural issue in coordination, specially for commissions, is the difficulty in harnessing the participation of Department Secretaries because the Chairpersons are of lower level positions.

While there are different forms or structures to organize coordinative bodies, there is not much difference in terms of roles and supervising authority. Councils and commissions perform nearly the same functions like policy formulation, monitoring and evaluation, social mobilization (i.e., policy advocacy, networking, alliance building, capability building and IEC preparation/dissemination) and even regulation.

The line of control is not distinguishable. Some commissions and councils are attached to the Office of the President or to other departments/offices (i.e., DSWD and NEDA). Based on the formal definition of councils as suggested by the Presidential Committee on Streamlining the Bureaucracy, councils mainly perform policy advice and are directly linked to the Office of the President. However, many councils perform activities beyond this function (i.e., NNC, CWC, PCCD, and HUDCC) and are not necessarily under the Office of the President (i.e., CWC, NNC, NCWDP, LCC and PNAC).

On the other hand, while commissions are to perform transitory, multisectoral and multi-jurisdictional concerns based on the *Framework for*

Governance, the same features could also be witnessed in the councils as they are constituted at present. Furthermore, as commissions are expected to be attached to a lead Department or Office, most commissions are appendages of the Office of the President. Thus, in the human development sector alone, the President is to oversee a total of eight coordinative bodies.

Both councils and commissions also vary in terms of their degree of representation in the regions. Some councils (i.e., NNC, CWC, NDCC) and commissions (i.e., POPCOM, NYC and PCUP) have regional representations. They do carry out social mobilization activities to the regions and some local government units.

The lone authority, TESDA, does not differ from the commission and the council. As it performs policy formulation, regulatory function and capability-building of trainers, other coordinative bodies also pursue these functions like HUDCC and NDCC. The only difference lies in the extensive role in capability-building which TESDA is expected to undertake. This is the major role of TESDA. On the other hand, while most commissions and councils also pursue capability-building activities, this is not a regular service function.

Overlap of Functions. Some overlap does exist among the coordinative bodies. Overlaps spread resources too thinly and may result in inefficiencies and wastage. PCSD and POPCOM both foster sustainable development through the management of resources and environment, although there is a more conscious effort on the part of the latter to highlight the issue of population in its interrelationship with resources and environment.

Both PCUP and CWC foster child survival and development, with PCUP overseeing the implementation of the Urban Basic Services Program which addresses this concern.

PCSD, PCUP and CWC are all concerned with propagating health, although the target population for PCSD is much broader as it focuses its concern on "human health ... and integration in decisionmaking process" (RP 1992b). PCUP and CWC, on the other hand, are mainly focused on special groups in the population, the urban sector and children/women, respectively.

Poverty alleviation is a common concern among PCFP, PCCD, PCUP, and PCSD. While the population groups addressed by PCUP are specialized in focus as the marginalized from the urban sector are the ones targeted, the PCCD targets the marginalized in the 20 priority provinces. PCFP, on the other hand, has taken a lead role in the formulation and propagation of the Minimum Basic Needs Approach. In the case of PCSD, the general population of marginalized are also included in their agenda. Furthermore, both PCCD and PCFP have considered monitoring and evaluation of the condition of the poor as their primary roles.

The issue on women is primarily handled by NCRFW and this is also woven into the Urban Basic Services Program supervised by PCUP. This is also considered in the general platform of POPCOM on women's reproductive health. The CWC concerns itself with understanding their health and nutrition situation.

Oversight Function for Human Development. The task of overseeing all efforts in social development is currently lodged in three bodies, SDC, SRC and CCC. SDC reviews and approves plans and frameworks for social development and so does SRC. The difference between SDC and SRC is that the latter is more focused on a particular package of programs with a set of management technology (i.e., the Minimum Basic Needs Approach) with the end in view of attaining quality of life. Technically speaking, all offices and departments engaged in social development are subsumed under SRC. Included too are offices/departments in other sectors which are considered salient to human development such as agricultural development, fisheries and aquatic resources conservation, etc. Thus, the scope of control is broader for SRC as the other sectors are included in its coverage. The fear, though, is that the SRC may not be sustained as it is identified with the current dispensation. On the other hand, SDC is viewed as a more stable structure and with a long track record in performing the task of overseeing policy formulation in this sector.

The active involvement of CCC in raising social development issues has facilitated the usual role of the SDC. An advantage of CCC is that current and more pressing issues are tackled which could lead to a redirection of the thrust in social development. Like the SRC, CCC is under the direct supervision of the President, which may lead to immediate discussion and resolution of problems. On the other hand, the CCC also deals with a number of operational issues which could be handled by implementors. Because the agenda of CCC are known at most times only one or two days before the meeting, technical preparation is often not sufficient.

Strengthening Other Functions. One of the areas where coordinative bodies have definitely assumed a role is in policy formulation. However, the relative degree of effectiveness by which coordinative bodies have accomplished this role has not been the subject of the study and can serve as agenda for further research. However, it appears that there are still other functions where they have not assumed a full-fledged position. Based on the reports they have provided on major accomplishments, one such activity is monitoring and evaluation. This may stem from the current concern of coordinative bodies to firm up their indicators and to position themselves in relation to LGUs. Since most of the implementors of the basic services are now based at the local level, one pressing issue could be how local executives can have a commitment to transmit information to national departments or to coordinative bodies. This is a gray area which still has to be resolved.

One activity indicated in the functions of some institutions is the conduct of reasearch. However, it is not clear what type of research is to be tackled—policy, evaluation or development. As national departments now relinquish their roles in managing basic social services to local executives, one of the areas which can be tapped to hone the concerns and interests of national level personnel of departments and coordinative bodies is the conduct of various research activities. As policy issues are raised, a report on the process and basis in the formulation of these issues has not been made. Has the policy issue, agenda or stand evolved from policy research or from consensus among stakeholders who may happen to originate only from national government agency representatives? Who assists in the formulation of the policies? Does the secretariat or any special unit of the coordinative body assist in the formulation of these policies? Does the secretariat have the capability to conduct this?

Another function that appears to be generally pursued by coordinative bodies is the conduct of social mobilization activities. However, there is lack of clarity on the mechanisms and nomenclatures to signify the conduct of this activity, which has been reported in differing ways in the accomplishment reports of coordinative bodies: development of IEC materials, capability-building, conduct of training, information dissemination, development of networks, conduct of fora, etc. Also an issue is the extent to which social mobilization can be carried to the different subnational levels. It appears that some commissions and councils have also started to undertake their own mobilization at the LGU level.

The question can be asked whether or not there is overlap in what they are doing and to what extent they have convergence in the conduct of mobilization efforts to avoid duplication. Also, to what extent can this be undertaken at the local level without antagonizing local executives and local personnel and without fear of trampling on their initiatives? To what extent are national level personnel honed in skills for social mobilization? Social mobilization necessitates specialized skills to undertake each type such as policy advocacy; formulation and dissemination of IEC; capability-building; networking; alliance-building; and community organizing. Social mobilization is one of the major activities which can be carried out by national level implementors.

Donor-Driven. The fact that more than half of the coordinative bodies generate support from foreign sources indicates the potential influence of external entities in shaping the thrusts and approaches of coordinative bodies. While additional support can indeed go a long way in augmenting scarce resources for development, there should be more concerted effort on the part of participants of the coordinative bodies to define thrusts based on the perspective of the citizenry, both local and national. Thus, negotiations for

foreign assistance can spring from consultations with various sectors to generate the most representative perspective of the population.

Recommendations

(1) Management issues

- (a) Measures to improve the participation of the regular representatives of partner institutions can be fostered through a memorandum of agreement between the Chairman of the coordinative body and the head of the participating agency. Board Resolutions may also be passed designating someone as the regular representative to participate in the activities of the coordinative body. Responsibilities of participants can be defined to ensure that agreements in the coordinative body are upheld.
- (b) Budgetary and resource requirements to manage coordinative bodies can be studied more carefully to make sure that institutions are not created without any source of support unless they are envisioned to be a temporary body whose staff can be constituted through secondment and sharing of resources.
- (c) Much can still be done to ensure that different types of research be pursued by coordinative bodies. While evaluation is an activity which coordinative bodies are supposed to undertake, the extent to which this is fulfilled can further be ascertained, alongside the question of how the information drawn from this exercise is utilized to review policies and improve the management of programs, projects or activities being pursued. However, apart from evaluation studies, other alternatives in conducting policy research can be pursued to enrich the role of coordinative bodies in policy advocacy. The issue is: Do Secretariats have the capability to undertake this?
- (d) Innovative measures for coordination can be explored to ensure that participating members fulfill their roles effectively. The assignment of Focal Points by NCRFW is one such mechanism to ensure that a participating institution pursues its commitments to the coordinative body.

- (e) To what extent can capability-building activities be undertaken by each coordinative body for LGUs without taking much of their time from their own development activities? This effort can be synchronized by the different coordinative bodies to ensure that duplicating activities are avoided. Oversight bodies, such as SRC, can perhaps take the lead in orchestrating this.
- (f) It appears that some initiatives for coordination are inspired by international commitments and foreign donors' mobilization. However, the extent to which localization of efforts, especially for LGUs is fostered should be high in the agenda of these bodies. Local dialogues can be conducted to draw more responsive plans similar to the efforts of PCCD.

(2) Reorganization issues

- (a) There should be a clarification of the nomenclatures adopted to avoid confusion regarding the functions of and the line of control over the coordinative bodies. A more immediate issue to contend with is the distinction among councils, commissions and authorities.
- (b) The thrust and functional relationship of the coordinative bodies focusing on poverty can be clarified. While PCUP and PCCD differ in the population they serve, how they relate with and fit into the thrust and concerns of PCFP can be streamlined. It appears that PCUP and PCCD are more inclined towards the formulation of integrated plans for the population they hope to serve through a participatory perspective. Furthermore, PCUP also performs service function, specially in the aspect of urban housing, and overlaps with the sectoral concern of HUDCC.

On the other hand, PCFP focuses mainly on the propagation of the management technology of MBN. How this technology permeates the development planning of PCUP and PCCD is another matter that has to be dealt with. While PCCD has assisted in the propagation of MBN, the extent to which this has been imbibed is not yet apparent. What is the relationship of PCFP to DILG? As DILG is tasked to undertake institution-building and capability-functions for governance, propagating the technology of MBN could be lodged in this body. The issue is the capability or preparation of DILG to perform this function.

What is the fate of PCFP once this management technology is fully adopted? Will monitoring of MBN be a regular function?

Some options which may be considered to streamline the coordinative bodies on poverty include the following:

- (1) PCUP—Subsuming PCUP under the DSWD if the main thrust is to redress poverty of the urban poor. DSWD already has a long track record in responding to the plight of the poor. However, if the inclination is to stress housing, this may be encompassed as a unit of the HUDCC.
- (2) PCCD—Subsuming PCCD under the DSWD since the main thrust is to redress poverty of the countryside's poor sector. However, if the major role is to assist the countryside to prepare master plans, it can serve as an attached agency of the NEDA. Another possibility is to attach it to the DILG if the propagation of the participatory development planning process is a technique it has mastered and can effectively propagate.
- (3) PCFP—Subsuming PCFP under the DSWD since the monitoring system for MBN has already been formulated and installed by the latter. Its capability-building activities to propagate MBN can be delegated to DILG which has been mandated to implement institutionalization activities under the Social Reform Agenda. Another possibility is to attach PCFP under the NEDA, since it also has a long track record in the conduct of monitoring and evaluation, through its Regional Program Monitoring and Evaluation System.

As reorganization options are considered, caution should be exercised to prevent demoralization: by matching the capacities and commitment of the staff with the mission it is to fulfill and how it relates with those of the institution which will be absorbing it.

- (c) Once some coordinative bodies have been able to fulfill their obligation in permeating the different sectors with their perspective, is this the cue for phasing out? To what extent have coordinative bodies been able to fulfill their roles? When are they ready to phase out? To what extent has each coordinative body been able to impart its concerns to various

departments/offices and have these successfully filtered down to the LGUs?

- (d) To what extent do the thrusts and activities of coordinative bodies match the capability of the secretariats supporting them?
- (e) The joint effort of SDC-Cabinet and CCC appears to have obscured the performance of the usual role of SDC. More operational issues have been dealt with through the assistance of the SDS, leaving very little time for policy review.
- (f) With the creation of the SRC, some of the policy issues are now also discussed in this coordinative body pertinent to social development. However, the thrust of SRC has been expanded to encompass political and economic considerations to address the plight of the marginalized sectors. Thus, it has conveniently located multisectoral concerns under one umbrella. It has even been tasked to oversee the implementation of the Social Reform Agenda as the overarching program of the administration to attain quality of life. The political commitment of the top leadership is certainly a plus factor for the support and attention SRC is obtaining at present.

On the other hand, while SDC has subsumed mainly the social development sectors, it can also interrelate with other economic-political sectors because of the multisectoral thrusts of the NEDA. Among the key informants, there is a greater tendency to point to the SDC as the overarching body to orchestrate multisectoral efforts for human development. While this is currently being undertaken by the SRC, there is doubt about sustaining its commitments beyond the current dispensation.

Further clarification of the interrelationship of the oversight bodies can be made to avoid duplication of efforts.

It may also be asked, how does SRC relate with the Legislative Executive Development Advisory Council (LEDAC) as an oversight body for the Social Reform Agenda (SRA), the Social Pact for Empowered Economic Development (SPEED) and the National Unification Commission (NUC)? What can LEDAC accomplish apart from what SRC or the SDC can do?

References

- Aminuzzaman, Salahuddin Mhd.
 1982 Integrated Rural Development in the Philippines: The Coordination Problem. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*. 26(2) (April).
- Arcega, Victoria
 1969 Mobilizing the Bureaucracy: The Case of the Rice and Corn Production Coordinating Council. *Solidarity*. 4(9).
- Bautista, Victoria A.
 1994a Area-Based Child Survival and Development Program: An Experiment in Devolution. U.P. Assessments on the State of the Nation: A Multi-Disciplinary Research and Outreach Program. Occasional Papers Series 1994-004. University of the Philippines Center for Integrative and Development Studies.
 1994b Trends and Patterns in Social Development Efforts of the Philippine Government. *Public Administration Bulletin*, 3 (3 & 4) (September-December).
 1978 Philippine Administrative System. University of the Philippines, College of Public Administration (mimeo).
- Brillantes Jr., Alex B.
 1979 Development Councils as Coordinating Mechanisms for the Planning and Implementation of Development Programs and Projects: Focus on Region II. Masters Thesis, College of Public Administration, University of the Philippines.
- Council for the Welfare of Children
 1996 Briefing Folio for Fiscal Year 1996.
 1994 Annual Report to the Committee on Appropriations in Congress.
 1992 The Filipino Children: 2000 and Beyond. Philippine Plan of Action for Children.
 n.d. CWC Brochure.
- Castillo, Gelia T.
 1983 *How Participatory is Participatory Development? A Review of the Philippine Experience*. Manila: Philippine Institute of Development Studies.
- Damaso, Elpidio
 1992 National Shelter Program. *Building Houses for the Poor*. Small Enterprises and Development Foundation. Quezon City: U.P. Diliman.
- Domingo, Roquena R.
 1994 Challenges Confronting the Youth in NGOs in the Philippines: Towards the Resolution of Issues and Concerns. *Youth Journal*, Vol I, 1.
- Marcos, Ferdinand E.
 1977 Long-Term Philippine Development Plan Up to the Year 2000.
- National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women
 n. d.(a) National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women Brochure.
 n. d.(b) A Primer on the Gender and Development Focal Points.

National Commission on the Welfare of Disabled Persons

1995 NCWDP Information Document (26 May).

1994 NCWDP Work and Financial Plan.

1987-

1993 NCWDP Annual Reports

1982 1982-1992 Decade of Disabled Persons National Plan of Action.

n.d. NCWDP Primer

National Disaster Coordinating Council

1989a Memorandum No. 1. Providing for Community-Based Rescue, Evacuation and Relief Operations During Disasters or Emergencies and Encouraging Volunteerism from Among Concerned Citizenry for Such Purposes.

1989b Memorandum Order No. 2. Consolidation and Evaluation of All Reports on Damages by Typhoons and Other Calamities to Prioritize and Facilitate Release of Funds for Relief and Rehabilitation.

1989c Memorandum Order No. 9. Establishing Procedures and Criteria for Recommending the Declaration of a State of Calamity in Disaster-Stricken Areas.

1989d Memorandum Order No. 10. General Policies and Procedures on Foreign Assistance for Disasters.

1988 Calamities and Disaster Preparedness Plan.

National Nutrition Council

1993 1993-1998 Philippine Plan of Action for Nutrition. Metro Manila: NNC.

n.d. Brochure on the NNC Policy Statement and Strategies. Metro Manila: NNC.

National Youth Commission

n. d.(a) National Youth Commission (NYC): Vision, Mission and Goals.

n. d.(b) Primer: Presidential Council for Youth Affairs.

Office of Civil Defense

1994 Yearend Report.

Ocampo, Romeo B. and Luzviminda G. Tancangco

1984 *Bicol's LiCIAD: Inter-agency Relations and Farmer Participation in a Philippine IRD Project*. Malaysia: Asia - Pacific Development Center.

Periquet, Antonio O.

1982 *The Rehab Column*, NCWDP.

Philippines, Republic of the (RP)

1995a Republic Act No. 8044. An Act Creating the National Youth Commission, Establishing a National Comprehensive and Coordinated Program on Youth Development, Appropriating Funds Therefor and for Other Purposes. 7 June.

1995b Implementing Rules and Regulations of the Social Reform Agenda Convergence Policy.

- 1994a Administrative Order No. 194. Providing for the Adoption of the Social Reform Agenda Convergence Policy and Its Operationalization, and for Other Purposes. 30 May.
- 1994b Republic Act No. 7796. An Act Creating the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority Providing for its Powers, Structures and for Other Purposes. 25 July.
- 1994c Executive Order No. 203. Creating the Oversight and Executive Committees for the National Government's Social Reform Agenda. 20 December.
- 1994d Executive Order No. 217. Amending Section 1.2 (b) of Executive Order No. 203. 20 December.
- 1993 Administrative Order No. 86. Creating the National Credit Council. 8 October.
- 1992a Executive Order No. 6. Creating the Philippine Council for Countryside Development. 14 July.
- 1992b Executive Order No. 12. Providing for the Creation of the Presidential Commission to Fight Poverty. 15 August.
- 1992c Executive Order No. 15. Creating the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development. 1 September.
- 1992d Memorandum Order No. 20. Reorganizing the Cabinet Cluster C. 14 September.
- 1992e Executive Order No. 39. Creating the Philippine National AIDS Council (PNAC) as a National Policy and Advisory Body in the Prevention and Control of HIV (Human Immunodeficiency Virus) Infection and AIDS in the Philippines. 3 December.
- 1991a Republic Act No. 7160. Local Government Code. 10 October.
- 1991b Republic Act No. 7165. An Act Creating the Literacy Coordinating Council, Defining its Powers and Functions, Appropriating Funds Therefor and for Other Purposes. 25 November.
- 1989a Memorandum Order No. 142. Reconstituting the Cabinet Cluster System as Provided in MO No. 37 (14 September 1992). 7 July.
- 1989b Memorandum Order No. 271. Creating the Cabinet Cluster C. 2 December.
- 1988 Administrative Order No. 88. Transferring the National Nutrition Council from the Department of Social Welfare and Development to the Department of Agriculture. 26 August.
- 1987a Executive Order No. 123. Providing for the Structural and Functional Reorganization of the NCWDP and for Other Purposes. 30 January.
- 1987b Executive Order No. 230. Reorganizing the National Economic and Development Authority. 22 July.
- 1987c Executive Order No. 233. Redefining the Role and Organizational Structure of the Council for the Welfare of Children. 22 July.
- 1987d Executive Order No. 234. Reorganizing the National Nutrition Council. 22 July.
- 1986a Executive Order No. 82. Creating the Presidential Commission for the Urban Poor. 8 December.

- 1986b Executive Order No. 90. Identifying the Government Agencies for the National Shelter Program and Defining Their Mandates Creating the Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council, Rationalizing Fund Sources and Lending Mechanisms for Home Mortgages and for Other Purposes. 17 December.
- 1981 Amending Presidential Decree No. 1509. Creating the NCCDP and for Other Purposes. 4 January.
- 1978a Presidential Decree No. 1509. Creating the National Commission Concerning Disabled Persons and for Other Purposes. 11 June.
- 1978b Presidential Decree No. 1566. Strengthening the Philippine Disaster Control Capability and Establishing the National Program on Community Disaster Preparedness. 11 June.
- 1975 Presidential Decree No. 633. Creating the National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women. 6 January.
- 1974a Presidential Decree No. 603. Creating the Council for the Welfare of Children. 10 December.
- 1974b Presidential Decree No. 491. Creating the National Nutrition Council. 25 June.
- 1973 Presidential Decree No. 107. Creating the National Economic and Development Authority. 25 January.
- 1971 Republic Act No. 6365. An Act Establishing a National Policy on Population, Creating the Commission on Population and for Other Purposes. 16 August.

Philippine Council for Sustainable Development

n.d. A Primer

Population Commission

1993 The Philippine Population Management Program: 1993-1998.

n.d. Personnel Handbook.

Presidential Committee on Streamlining the Bureaucracy

1993 *A Framework for Governance.*

Saguil, Dan A.

1993 Crisis/Disaster Management in the Philippines: Targetting the Victims for Relief and Rehabilitation. *Public Administration Bulletin*. II, 2.

Social Reform Agenda

n.d. A Primer: Social Reform Agenda.

Torres, Amaryllis Tiglao *et al.*

1994 Gender and Development: Making the Bureaucracy Gender-Responsive. Quezon City: University of the Philippines, College of Social Work and Community Development.

United Nations Children's Fund

1992 Strategy Paper: Fourth Country Program for Children.

Venzon, Regina Emily

1994 National Youth Development Plan 1994-1998 (Primer).

*Appendix***Legend of Acronyms**

CWC	Council for the Welfare of Children
CCC	Cabinet Cluster C
DA	Department of Agriculture
DAR	Department of Agrarian Reform
DBM	Department of Budget and Management
DBP	Development Bank of the Philippines
DECS	Department of Education, Culture and Sports
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DFA	Department of Foreign Affairs
DILG	Department of the Interior and Local Government
DND	Department of National Defense
DOF	Department of Finance
DOE	Department of Energy
DOH	Department of Health
DOJ	Department of Justice
DOST	Department of Science and Technology
DOT	Department of Tourism
DOTC	Department of Transportation and Communication
DPWH	Department of Public Works and Highways
DSWD	Department of Social Welfare and Development
DTI	Department of Trade and Industry
GSIS	Government Service Insurance System
HDMF	Housing Development Mutual Fund
HUDCC	Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council
LBP	Land Bank of the Philippines
LCC	Literacy Coordinating Council
MMDA	Metro Manila Development Authority
NCRFW	National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women
NCWDP	National Council on the Welfare of Disabled Persons
NEDA	National Economic and Development Authority
NDCC	National Disaster Coordinating Council
NNC	National Nutrition Council
NYC	National Youth Commission
OP	Office of the President
OES	Office of the Executive Secretary
OPAPP	Office of the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process
PIA	Philippine Information Agency
PCCD	Philippine Council for Countryside Development
PCFP	Presidential Commission to Fight Poverty
PCSD	Presidential Council on Sustainable Development
PCSO	Philippine Charity Sweepstakes Office

PCUP	Presidential Commission for the Urban Poor
PNB	Philippine National Bank
PNAC	Philippine National AIDS Council
PNU	Philippine Normal University
POPCOM	Population Commission
PSC	Presidential Security Command
SDC	Social Development Committee
SRC	Social Reform Council
SSS	Social Security System
TESDA	Technical Education and Skills Development Authority
UPPI	University of the Philippines - Population Institute