

THE GROWTH AND CHANGING ROLES OF NGOS AND THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR

*Virginia A. Miralao
Ma. Cynthia B. Bautista*

The Growth and Changing Roles of NGOs

Available data from the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) provide ample evidence of the growth of Philippine nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) since the 1980s. Consistent with earlier observations that the number of Philippine NGOs surged in 1983 following the Aquino assassination, the number of groups registering with the SEC as non-stock, non-profit organizations doubled from 2260 in 1982 to 4636 in 1983. Prior to 1982, non-profit entities registering with the SEC annually consisted of a fewer 1383 in 1980, and 1330 in 1981.

Table 1 shows that from 1984 to 1988, the number of NGO SEC registrants per year ranged from 2174 to 3434. A new surge in NGO registrations is noted in 1989 when these rose to a new high of 5200. Since then NGO registrations have risen

Table 1. Number of Non-Stock, Non-profit Entities Registering with the SEC Per Year: 1980-1993

Year	Number
1980	1383
1981	1330
1982	2313
1983	4636
1984	2260
1985	2174
1986	2311
1987	3279
1988	3434
1989	5200
1990	7956
1991	8788
1992	6756
1993	7107

Source: Securities and Exchange Commission.

consistently, averaging 7651 per year between 1990 and 1993. Table 2 presents data on the voluntary organizations that registered with the SEC for the years 1980, 1983, 1989 and 1993 following the SEC's system of classifying groups in the voluntary sector into some seven categories. These categories are as follows: research and scientific institutes; social welfare services; business associations; professional associations; labor associations; civic organizations and religious organizations.

Following the SEC's system of classification, Table 2 reveals that the surge in the number of Philippine NGOs in 1983 owes mainly to the large increase in the number of non-profit business associations that registered during the year, and which rose dramatically from only 62 in 1980 to over 3000 in 1983. One notes that this trend accords well with the known active involvement of the business sector in the protest actions spurred by the Aquino

assassination, and with the observation that the assassination mobilized the urban middle class to join and provide the leadership for the popular movement against the Marcos dictatorship (see Rocamora 1994 in this volume).

By 1989 and three years after the ouster of President Marcos, the SEC data show that business associations lost their dominance of the NGO community to civic organizations and religious organizations. The number of civic organizations registering with the SEC more than quadrupled to 2592 in 1989 from only 584 in 1983. Similarly, the number of religious organizations more than doubled from 249 in 1983 to 523 in 1989. The latest 1993 figures indicate that civic groups and religious organizations have sustained their leads in the NGO community. With the exception of business associations whose numbers have been declining since 1983, the numbers of new professional asso-

Table 2. Number of Other Social and Community Services - Entities Registering with the SEC Per Year by Type of Entity: 1980, 1983, 1989 and 1993

Type of Entity	1980	1983	1989	1993
Research and Scientific Institutes	7	14	38	23
Social Welfare Services	3	4	3	8
Business Associations	61	3004	420	718
Professional Associations	15	52	42	89
Labor Associations	4	72	111	306
Civic Organizations	201	584	2592	4743
Religious Organizations	56	249	523	647
Total*	347	3979	3729	6534

*Totals shown here do not tally with those shown in Table 1. The distribution and totals of entities in Table 2 are based on entities appearing on the SEC's computerized lists for the above selected years which are not yet complete

ciations and labor organizations have also been rising, although not as dramatically as those of civic and religious organizations.

The SEC data which reveals a total of 58927 non-stock and non-profit organizational registrants from 1980 to 1993 suggest that the number of NGOs at present is well over the 20000 estimate often quoted in NGO reports and studies (Aldaba 1992 and Constantino-David 1993). Determining the number of NGOs remains problematic however, owing largely to the various definitions and changing notions of what NGOs are, and which do not readily correspond to the SEC's system of classifying NGOs.

Briefly, the SEC system of classification is based on the 1977 Philippine Standard Industrial Classification (PSIC) that is used by NEDA and other government agencies for noting the major economic activity of enterprises and establishments. Based on internationally-set criteria to facilitate inter-country comparisons, the PSIC is geared primarily for monitoring changes in the structure of national economies rather than the growth of voluntary associations and NGOs. Non-profit entities and NGOs fall under the PSIC's major industry classification of "Other Social and Community Services", which in turn consists of the seven categories of NGOs mentioned above.

Because of the limited computerization of the SEC data and other limitations in the SEC's classification system, data from the Commission do not allow for a further analysis of the changing nature of the voluntary sector or of NGOs. Nonetheless, because NGOs continue to register with the SEC to formalize their organizations and

operations, the SEC remains the major source of data on the relative magnitude of NGOs. Further improvements in the SEC's system of classifying NGOs will depend on a clearer delineation of NGO activities and of the roles and services that they render to society and communities.

Changing Nature and Notions of NGOs

Prior to the 1970s or before the term 'non-governmental organization' became popularly used to refer to voluntary groups and organizations, there was little interest in studying the voluntary sector and much less in classifying voluntary associations into various typologies.

In earlier periods, many of the country's voluntary groups revolved around the three major institutions of the Church, business and government. The Church had its own local parish associations and other religious organizations such as the Catholic Women's League, the Knights of Columbus and others. Business had its own chambers of commerce or of trade and industry, in addition to other business or corporate foundations. Government too, sponsored the formation of local associations at various times to promote its programs. In the 1930s for instance, it organized rural women into "Rural Improvement Clubs" to support agricultural production. In the 1950s, government similarly organized farmers' and credit cooperatives and other community organizations to promote its economic and community development programs.

As the country's educational system produced more graduates in the 1950s, several professional organizations corresponding to different fields of studies and expertise also emerged during the period.

In addition, there were several socio-civic organizations set up by the educated classes and the elite. Many of these functioned as social clubs, although it was not also unusual for these groups to engage in social welfare activities such as sponsoring scholarships and health and community improvement projects.

The country too, had its share of voluntary organizations engaged in activist causes. These include the women's groups formed in the early 1900s which spearheaded the campaign for women's suffrage, and the labor and farmer's formations which fought for improvements in the living conditions of workers and the peasantry and for changes and reforms in national politics and the economy. Activist organizations however, did not dominate the country's voluntary groups and associations.

It is now well known that the drift towards activism occurred in the late 1960s, and further reinforced by the declaration of Martial Law in the early 1970s and by the growth of the popular struggle against the Marcos dictatorship in the 1980s. As a result, voluntary groups came to be increasingly classified as either progressive or traditional. Progressive NGOs consisted of those associated with the anti-Marcos struggle and with the broader movement for social change. Traditional groups on the other hand, consisted of those socio-civic, religious and other organizations formed in earlier periods which were thought to have remained apolitical.

By the 1980s and after Marcos' downfall, progressive NGOs had gained dominance over the country's voluntary sector. While the national struggle against the Marcos regime "politicized" the

country's NGOs, other international developments contributed as well to the changing character and nature of voluntary organizations in the Philippines. Among these has been the changing notion or vision of development itself. The new vision has veered away from a purely economic conceptualization of development and stresses the importance of democratizing economic and political institutions through broad-based people's participation in development. This new concept was more in keeping with the activist and political orientation of the country's progressive NGOs which had been advocating and fighting for fundamental societal changes and reforms.

The national struggle against Marcos' authoritarian rule and the new vision of development also affected many of the country's traditional NGOs. Several business, civic, and professional organizations began to strive for greater social relevance and to align their work with ongoing reform efforts and programs. Hence, whether associated with the church, business, government, professional or socio-civic groups, many Philippine NGOs today would claim that they are engaged in 'development work' and are working for fundamental changes and reforms.

Following new development concepts and paradigms, governments, donor agencies and international bodies have also accorded NGOs an expanded role in development activities. Relative to government and other groups, NGOs are seen as the more effective instruments for mobilizing people's action and participation in development efforts and activities. In particular, NGOs are seen as being more effective in a) surfacing social issues; b) advocating for the interests of disadvan-

taged groups; and c) organizing local communities for development work. These are in addition to the community/welfare services provision performed by the voluntary sector.

Since the 1980s therefore, government and donor agencies have increasingly involved NGOs in the formulation and implementation of development programs. The increased demand for the services of NGOs is reflected in the growth of the country's voluntary sector since 1989. In turn, the growth of the sector has led to a bewildering array of NGOs that some assessment is needed to clarify the roles and relationships of NGOs vis-a-vis government, external funding agencies, and other groups and actors in the development field.

Classifying NGOs

For reasons mentioned earlier, the distinctions commonly made of Philippine NGOs have tended to emphasize differences in their political stance and social orientations. Other than the distinction made between progressive and traditional NGOs, those in the progressive block are further distinguished in terms of their affiliation with the various groups and factions of the country's political Left which played a crucial role in the struggle against the Marcos dictatorship. Followers or adherents of the radical left are referred to as the natdem (national democrat) NGOs, while those espousing left-of-center positions consist of several other groups including the social democrats and popular democrats.

This system of classifying NGOs by their political orientations is heavily influenced by the emerging factions and shifting alliances of the political left. In the last two to three years for example, the

natdem NGOs have split into two camps following the split in the country's underground left movement. It should also be noted that the classification of NGOs by their political orientations is done largely from the standpoint of progressive groups. Consequently, this tends to leave out the many other groups in the country's voluntary sector which do not espouse strong ideological positions on the development process but are nonetheless engaged in development-related work and activities.

In a recent paper, Constantino-David (1993) attempts another classification of Philippine NGOs which distinguishes between what she calls "genuine development NGOs" and other types of NGOs. Development NGOs are those committed to bringing about genuine social transformation and which generally grew out of the mass movement that flourished in the country in the 1970s and 1980s. The non-development NGOs on the other hand, include among others, the '*Gringos*' or those initiated by government to lend support to a particular administration or to state-led programs and projects. They also include the '*Bingos*' or those set up by business firms or corporations for tax-shelter purposes or for expounding their own interests and values. Still comprising another type of non-development NGO are the '*Fly-by-Night*' NGOs that are put up by local politicians and the elite to absorb some of the development funds that are being channeled to NGOs.

Though not directly referring to their political orientations, Constantino-David's typologies reflect the generally anti-establishment stance of progressive NGOs. They suggest that non-development NGOs have goals that fall short of structural political

and economic change (government- or business-initiated NGOs) or motives that are opportunistic (fly-by-night NGOs). For instance, while business NGOs utilize community organizing strategies similar to those used by 'genuine development NGOs', some of those who consider them-selves members of progressive NGOs remain critical of the BINGO's efforts to organize communities around their business interests.

Systems of NGO classification proposed by writers outside of the Philippines do not emphasize as much the political affiliation of NGOs, assuming instead that most groups in the voluntary sector today consist of political/social activists or of organizations committed to protecting and working for the advancement of disadvantaged groups. Writing about the NGOs in India for example, Kothari (1992) simply makes a distinction between social development-like agencies consisting of bigger groups that have developed their own programs and bureaucracies, and the relatively small groups and organizations working directly with the grassroots. The latter are led by "young men and women who have given up their professional careers to work with the people". Small voluntary organizations in India have flourished in different sectors, taking up new issues and problems that affect ethnic, regional and religious minorities, child and women's labor, and the unorganized economic sector. They are also active in resisting the displacement of villages and the environmental damage caused by development and industrial projects. Though involved in the same causes, 'agency' NGOs do not work directly with villages and the affected masses.

Not unlike Kothari, Korten in another paper on the voluntary sector and NGOs (1989) begins with the premise that following changes in the development paradigm, today's voluntary organizations and NGOs are value-driven formations committed to bringing about social change. Specifically, current-day voluntary groups are working to help democratize political and economic institutions which have tended to concentrate power and resources on a few and marginalized the larger masses in society. Consequently, Korten's classification of NGOs focuses more on the specific functions and roles that they play in catalyzing social changes at local and national levels and in the international development community. Korten also presents his analysis and classification of NGOs within the context of the world-wide growth of NGOs, and the increased demand for their services by governments and international-donor agencies.

In Korten's classification, NGOs that serve as contractors to government and private donors in the delivery of social services function as non-profit businesses or as 'public service contractors' (PSCs). PSCs tend to possess a high level of technical competence and a well-developed management system, in addition to exhibiting a concern for cost-efficiency in their operations. Compared to other types of NGOs, PSCs are driven by market donor demand rather than by their social mission *per se*. A factor that has contributed to their growth is their perceived institutional ability to manage the implementation of development programs which government and other conventional contractors are not capable of providing.

Korten classifies NGOs that attempt to combine their social mission with a market

orientation as 'hybrid NGO-PSCs'. Compared to PSCs, hybrid NGOs tend to emphasize their social mission agenda (e.g., as their commitment to the goals of community self-reliance), and their choices and activities are less conditioned by the availability of funds or the priorities of donor agencies.

Finally, there are those NGOs that are more purely or predominantly driven by their social missions purely as voluntary signs with a social mission, and still others that began as relief or welfare agencies and which continue to provide humanitarian assistance to the victims of 'system failure' without necessarily taking action to correct systemic societal problems or inequalities. As with PSCs and hybrid NGOs, Korten writes that the line separating welfare/humanitarian NGOs from so called 'development NGOs' that aim to contribute to basic social changes is not always clear, since there are no hard and fast criteria that divide one from the other.

Based on the distinctions that have been made of Philippine NGOs and of NGOs in general, one notes that part of the confusion in assessing the institutional roles and relationships of Philippine NGOs has to do with the intermingling of their social missions with the ideological orientations of various groups in the political spectrum. Often, there are no major differences in the written social philosophies or mission statements of Philippine NGOs, although they continue to be identified as belonging to either one of the groups within the progressive block, or to the business, religious, socio-civic, or some other group of NGOs. In recent years, Philippine NGOs have moved to unify themselves and to minimize their political differences by building alliances, networks and coalitions

to advance a common development agenda. They have gone as far as laying the groundwork for self-regulation. For instance, a proposed Code of Ethics governing the NGOs' relationship to the community, other NGOs, government, donor agencies, and the NGO staff has been developed by the Caucus of Development NGO Networks' (CODE-NGO) Commission on Ethics to police its ranks. Notwithstanding the thriving coalitions, like the CODE-NGO, those interviewed from the NGO community acknowledged that the country's NGOs will require time to overcome their historical political differences.

But since Philippine NGOs are generally committed to effecting social changes, there may in fact be value in bracketing their political differences and in viewing them as Korten does, in terms of the functions that they perform vis-a-vis government, donor agencies, the populations that they serve, and the larger development community. Korten's classification of NGOs into PSCs, hybrid NGOs, purely voluntary organizations, and welfare/humanitarian agencies has not gained ground among Philippine NGOs partly because this says little of their distinctive political perspectives which are of importance to the development NGO community. Further, the terms 'PSCs', 'hybrid NGOs' and 'agencies' connote some kind of bureaucratization, ongoing relations with government and donor agencies, and a market orientation that is averse to the 'politicized' culture of Philippine NGOs. Similarly, the terms 'welfare' or 'humanitarian' do not convey enough of the developmental dimension sought by progressive NGOs. Nonetheless, some Philippine NGOs do in fact function as PSCs, or as humanitarian and welfare

groups, or as social development agencies. Moreover, most relate with government, donor agencies and other groups, so that a system of mapping their institutional relations and arrangements with other entities appear relevant and appropriate.

A system of classifying NGOs in terms of their program areas or fields of expertise is also useful, considering the increasing differentiation of functions that has accompanied the growth of NGOs. Knowledge of which NGOs are working in the fields of health, gender, early childhood development, environment, shelter and housing, peasant concerns, labor, tribal communities and the urban poor for example, can facilitate the exchange and complementation of services among NGOs and between them and government and other groups. This classification of NGOs can be enhanced further with additional information on the major type of activity undertaken by NGOs. Some NGOs for example engage primarily in policy advocacy, while others are into education and training, organizing communities and cooperatives, managing credit schemes and livelihood projects, and delivering special services from relief to health and housing.

Finally, from the standpoint of government, donor agencies, affected groups and NGOs themselves, there is also value in classifying NGOs by their geographic location or coverage. At present, some Philippine NGOs are known as national NGOs, while others are referred to as regional, provincial or local NGOs. Local and provincial NGOs are more likely to be working directly with communities, people's organizations or the grassroots. Regional and national NGOs operate from the regional centers or the national capital,

although their membership often consists of a scattering of NGOs and POs from different areas of the country. With the exception of a few peasant and labor associations and cooperatives which have a system of federating themselves at local, provincial, regional and national levels, national NGOs in the Philippines have yet to develop mechanisms of effectively linking themselves to local communities and to most of the country's provinces (Rocamora 1994). A directory of NGOs at the level of provinces can help identify the availability of NGO resources and expertise in given localities, in addition to indicating the magnitude of NGO operations throughout the country. But while there are several ways of classifying NGOs that would be useful in planning and programming development activities, the roles of NGOs will also continue to depend on how they perceive their work and how they are perceived by others. These perceptions help shape the way NGOs organize their activities and relationships with other groups and entities.

Government and NGOs

Consistent with the expanded role that NGOs now play in development activities, interviews with a few government departments and agencies indicate that they regularly consult and have established working relationships with NGOs. These agencies include the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG); the Department of Health (DOH); the Department of Social Work and Development (DSWD); the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR); and the National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women (NCRFW). Each of these five agencies have several ongoing projects

funded from their own budgets or with donor assistance that are being implemented with NGOs.

The interviews further reveal that government agencies relate with a wide variety of NGOs and voluntary groups of differing political orientations, and ranging from those considered as traditional to those considered progressive or development NGOs. These groups include grassroots or people's organizations as community-based associations, local cooperatives, and other organized groups of program beneficiaries; specialized groups variously consisting of social development workers, technical and professional workers, community workers and training specialists; center-based organizations and consultancy groups; socio-civic clubs; business and religious organizations; and private hospitals, schools and colleges.

Government agencies seek the participation or employ the services of NGOs for various purposes. Following participatory processes, the NCRFW extensively uses NGOs in consultations and dialogues to help formulate or improve their gender policies and programs. The DSWD relies on NGOs to help monitor their projects and provide them with program feedback and involves them as well in the evaluation and documentation of their projects. The DOH enlists the assistance of NGOs in their health information and advocacy campaigns and community-based health programs while the DENR utilizes NGOs primarily for organizing program communities and assessing community needs and resources. The DILG on the other hand, draws its training specialists and consultants (particularly for its local government management and training program) from NGOs. Except for the NCRFW which

does not implement programs, all the other departments also involve NGOs in various aspects of service delivery or program implementation.

Government officials further report that for consultations, dialogues and networking, they simply invite NGOs known to have an interest in the programs or activities that they are doing. But much like Korten's PSCs, NGOs engaged in program/project implementation are contracted by the departments to provide certain services or to undertake specific project activities. These NGOs are asked to submit project proposals that are sometimes subjected to open bidding processes. Since all the departments with the exception of the NCRFW have their own NGO accreditation systems, NGOs involved in program implementation are usually selected from the departments' lists of accredited NGOs. Often, the selection process entails a review of the profiles, capabilities and 'track records' of NGOs, as well as the recommendations that have reached the departments regarding these NGOs.

Officials from the five government agencies acknowledge that NGOs have certain strengths, skills and capabilities that are needed to improve their development programs and services. In particular, they cite the knowledge and familiarity of NGOs with local conditions, their commitment to serve disadvantaged groups and sectors, their flexibility, their skills at community organizing, and their innovative approaches in advocacy and service delivery. Government officials also admit however, that they have encountered certain difficulties in their working relationships with NGOs. Some officials mention that NGOs generally lack an appreciation of

government procedures and of the limitations imposed on government by its bureaucratic structure. While respondents from the NGO sector agree with this observation, they make the counter claim that apart from lack of previous exposure to government procedures, the fact that delayed fund releases have hampered field operations has sometimes undermined the credibility of the NGOs in the communities where they work. This has contributed to the NGOs' lack of appreciation for the bureaucratic limitations which bog down government agencies collaborating with NGOs. (Tan 1994. in this volume).

Reflecting perhaps the anti-state orientation of NGOs from their earlier struggle with the Marcos regime, another official mentions that NGOs tend to be 'judgmental and to look down on government and government officials'. This 'condescending attitude' of NGOs is seen to limit their efficacy in working with government. Other officials further note that some NGOs are suspicious of government and that they need to evolve a clearer framework for dealing with government to advance ongoing efforts at collaboration between government and NGOs.

Suspicion of government's motives and the fear of possible cooptation are manifested in the NGOs' continuing ambivalence towards collaboration with the state. This ambivalence is rooted in the progressive NGOs' struggle against authoritarianism in the 1980s and their agenda to help build the foundation of a genuinely democratized society with strong peoples' organizations. From the viewpoint of NGO respondents, this agenda requires vigilance against the obstacles to much needed structural changes posed by groups including some government agencies and

personnel. Because of its basic commitment to social transformation and people empowerment which may be compromised by uncritical involvement with government, the development NGO community has jealously guarded its autonomy even while it sees possible openings for NGO intervention in existing government structures. An effect of this ambivalence is the failure to discern opportunities where they exist.

The judgmental and condescending outlook of NGOs towards government also partly emanates from differences in the working styles of the more flexible NGO members on one hand, and their government counterparts, on the other. NGO respondents adopting to the work schedule of farmer clients in rural areas for instance, have complained of what they call the 8:00 to 5:00 mentality of some government agents who are reluctant to leave the comforts of their offices to engage in fieldwork.

Other problems mentioned by government officials with regard their working relationships with NGOs have to do with the latter's lack of technical skills, their limited area coverage; and their lack of funds which limit their impact and performance. One official mentions that the still low level of skills among NGOs in project/program formulation, planning and implementation often results in the shuttling back and forth of proposals and reports before their approval and acceptance by his department. Another says that the limited area coverage of NGOs limits the participation of NGOs in their programs. At present, her department continues to deal mostly with Manila- or city-based NGOs whose reach do not extend to many provinces and to local municipalities and *barangays*. Lacking funds and

financial sustainability, one other official mentions that some NGOs are unable to absorb the costs entailed by exigencies and delayed payments for their services. This in turn affects the quality and continuity of their services.

Briefly summarizing government's relations with NGOs, one notes a demand for NGO participation in development initiatives and in an increasing variety of program services. There may in fact be an insufficient number of NGOs in the provinces and of technically skilled ones to fill the requirements of existing projects and programs. Indicating a move towards specialization and contractual arrangements, several government departments have set up their own systems of NGO accreditation. It is from their lists of accredited NGOs that government selects those that are involved in the management and implementation of development programs. The screening and selection procedures followed by government and which sometimes entail open bidding procedures also point to the need of NGOs to become competitive and to further develop their technical skills and capabilities.

Finally, although some NGOs may continue to be suspicious of government, there is little indication among the officials interviewed that they are averse to NGOs and private voluntary organizations. In general, the changes in government administrations since the Marcos regime have ushered in the appointment of officials from the NGO community and of other individuals who share the social commitment of voluntary groups and organizations.

External Funding Agencies and NGOs

An increasingly participatory and bottom-up approach to development emerged out of the failure of programs built on top-down and economic perspectives to solve problems plaguing developing countries. Whether organizations funding development activities adopted the approach early on as in the case of UN agencies or much later as in the case of the World Bank, the paradigm shift had profound effects on the thrusts and strategies of major external donor organizations. Coinciding with the historical conjuncture which saw the emergence and growth of NGOs in the Philippines, the financial resources channeled into the country by external funding sources contributed significantly to the expanded NGO role in development efforts and legitimized GO-NGO collaboration.

Interviews with representatives of a few, albeit major multilateral, bilateral and private donor organizations revealed diverse externally-funded NGO programs and projects, ranging from small scale livelihood activities (e.g. the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) livelihood projects for a Palawan tribal group) to large-scale programs with NGO participation such as the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)-sponsored Natural Resource Management Program (NRMP) based at the Department of Environment and Natural Resources.

The substantive content of funded NGO activities vary even within the same funding agency. Despite the existence of different portfolios in and across donor organizations, however, common thrusts among

NGOs in the 1990s are easy to identify. Many have programs on the environment, gender, peace and human rights, and economic and political empowerment.

Depending on the agency and the nature of the program, the involvement of donor organizations with local NGOs has either been direct or indirect. In the latter case, funds are coursed to contracting consultancy firms through an implementing government agency. While the donor organization monitors the contracting firm, it does not have a direct hand in the choice of partner NGOs in areas where components of the program are implemented. The NGOs are selected solely by the contracting firm or in consultation with the relevant government agency. The USAID-funded NRMP and the World Bank Health Project in Central Visayas are good illustrations of the indirect links of the funding agency to local NGOs. For the NRMP, the foreign contracting foreign firms—the Louis Berger Consultancy Inc., the Development Alternatives Inc., and Winrock International — have taken the lead (under the supervision of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources) in mobilizing NGOs for the relevant tasks of the Program.

The ongoing World Bank NGO Integrated Area Protection (NIPA) Program in ten sites was originally designed along the same model as the NRMP. However, the strong pressure exerted by Philippine NGOs on the Bank to course its funds to a local consortium of NGOs which include the Foundation for Philippine Environment (FPE), the Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM) and the Haribon Foundation for the Conservation of Natural Resources under the supervision of the DENR makes the Program a variant of the

indirect mode of involvement by the funding agency. The absence of foreign contractors in the management of the program makes it different from NRMP and other World Bank programs.

The consortium mechanism in the World Bank project was utilized earlier by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) in three of its major programs in the country: the Philippine-Canada Human Resources Development (PCHRD), the Philippine Development Assistance Programme (PDAP) and the Development Initiatives for Women's Alternatives and Transformative Action (DIWATA). Although there are partner NGOs in Canada, program management in the Philippines is in the hands of the Philippine partners who deal directly with CIDA, unlike the NRMP or World Bank Program discussed above.

The CIDA model of direct funding to NGO networks is a unique experiment in NGO management of bilateral program funds. Like the World Bank-funded NIPA Program, CIDA facilitated the formation of a network of NGO partners whose collective impact on the country's development promises to be greater because despite the problems confronting the coalitions formed, significant NGO groupings are able 'to dialogue with each other, lobby for policy changes, appraise the options presented by political parties and movements, experiment with alternative production relations, make concrete the vision of an alternative political order, and create democratic structures that would no longer allow elite factions to speak in the name of the people' (CODE-NGO, n.d. p. 3).

It is noteworthy that the NGOs involved in the CIDA and World Bank

Programs mentioned earlier fall neatly under the category of 'development or progressive NGOs'. Multilateral organizations like the UNDP or private funding agencies like NOVIB and the Ford Foundation are also inclined to deal with this group. However, the World Bank and agencies like the USAID have not been confined to funding similarly classified NGOs. Neither have they made clear-cut distinctions among nongovernment organizations.

A review of the private volunteer organizations accredited with USAID reveals a wide range of aggrupations from religious organizations like the El Shadai Inc., to business associations like the Ayala Foundation and the Pilipinas Shell Foundation, to research and scientific institutions like Aquinas University, Silliman University and Xavier University. What matters to USAID is that these accredited NGOs are non-profit organizations with a certificate of eligibility issued on the basis of their track record in producing the required output and in managing funds.

Although CIDA seeded and nurtured CODE-NGO as a consortium of development NGO networks through its Philippine Canadian Human Resource Development Program, it would seem that the agency currently applies a much broader definition of NGOs in the Philippines to include academic institutions and other voluntary organizations outside the purview of development NGOs. This is also true of the Ford Foundation which otherwise has very close ties to existing networks of development NGOs. In the case of the Ford Foundation, the choice of NGO to fund is a function of the needs of its program thrusts,

a situation which may very well hold for similar donor organizations.

1. Donor Agencies' Perception of NGOs

The representatives of several donor agencies interviewed for this paper recognize the invaluable contribution of NGOs to development activities in the country. NGOs are perceived to be catalysts of change as sectoral or community organizers, mobilizing citizens to rally around issues of local and national concern. In the process of building people's organizations, NGOs are also seen to provide mechanisms for strengthening democratic institutions. Apart from their organizing role, NGOs have obtained logistical support from donor agencies for their efforts to assist government in delivering much needed services to people at the grassroots. Thus, multilateral and bilateral agencies that provide funds to the Philippine government have been explicit in their support for collaboration between government and NGOs.

From the interviews, the funding agencies are impressed by the achievements in networking of the NGO community over the last four years. They are particularly struck by the capacity of coalitions of NGOs to overcome initial organizational and turfing problems. However, some of those interviewed were concerned about the institutional capability of coalitions that have not sufficiently jelled to implement substantive programs along agreed upon guidelines. One of the respondents used an analogy in chemistry to illustrate what he perceives to be the status of a particular NGO network he is in touch with. He likened the coalition to a mixture of diverse elements which have yet to congeal into a compound. He asserted that the program

can be sustained only if the coalition ceases to be a fledging organization. In their assessment of the CIDA-funded PCHRD project, Miralao and Associates (Universalia, 1994 volume II) went beyond this optimistic remark to say that 'coalitions appear better suited for specific mobilizations but it is difficult to strengthen the "institutional capability" of coalitions even with a continuous flow of funds and projects since coalitions are vulnerable to internal and external pressures and changes and may rise or ebb at given periods of time' (See CPAR paper on this volume.)

Apart from concerns regarding consortium arrangements, donor agencies funding collaborative GO-NGO programmes are equally apprehensive about the sustainability of the collaboration when funding is no longer available. Furthermore, agencies subjected to strict auditing procedures in their respective home offices are hoping NGOs will have the patience to learn and understand the implementation guidelines and accounting procedures and abide by them to avoid future misunderstanding.

It is important to note that while strict implementation and accounting procedures are expected of donor agencies like the World Bank and USAID, there has been a tendency in the last three years for more liberal funding organizations to also require a stricter monitoring of project activities and funds. The fact that project funds were allegedly diverted by politically motivated NGOs from their intended uses accounts in part for this trend as donors have become more conscious of hidden agendas. Cutbacks in the available funds have also resulted in much stricter allocation and monitoring of limited resources.

The stricter monitoring of NGO-managed programs and projects coincides with the increasing tendency of donor agencies to focus on the measurable impact of the programs or projects they are funding. The same funding organization which has liberally supported the education-related activities of a women's NGO has begun to require the NGO to evaluate and if possible quantify concrete effects of the program, much to the consternation of process-oriented NGO members.

The ongoing and at times unarticulated debate between those who espouse a more process and people-oriented monitoring scheme and those who tend toward a detailed operationalization of project targets has not only been waged between NGOs and funding agencies but within funding agencies as well. Agency-based officers who are sympathetic to the constraints and realities in the field have tended to take a position closer to the NGOs and POs they support compared to their foreign counterparts or superiors. The reason for the latter's strict stance lies in the dependence of the agency on taxpayers who demand a justification in concrete terms of the use of their hard earned money. It should be noted that the trend towards stricter monitoring schemes does not necessarily hold for private donors like the Ford Foundation and the Asia Foundation.

The need for adherence to implementation guidelines and accounting procedures have impelled funding agencies to suggest the hiring of professional accountants and the institution of training programs to make up for the NGO personnel's lack of skills in specific areas of work. These efforts have come to constitute the so-called professionalization

of NGO work, a trend those interviewed considered inevitable.

One of the respondents, however, raised the issue of balancing the bureaucratization of NGOs with the flexibility which is their strength. This is reminiscent of Korten's view as expressed in the 1989 issue of *Partnership*.

'When donors offer capacity building assistance to VOs and POs to help them professionalize, the unstated intent is often to make them more like the conventional kinds of government or contractual organizations which the donor is more comfortable with...the call for greater professionalization must not be a disguised demand for bureaucracy' (Korten, 1989 p. 3).

2. NGOs' Perception of Donor Agencies

From the eyes of representatives of development NGOs who were interviewed, funding agencies may be classified as traditional or progressive on the basis of the frameworks used, the types of programs supported, and the level of control exerted over the NGO, among others. The more progressive donor agency usually espoused people empowerment with the end in view of effecting fundamental societal changes, is sympathetic to the implications of NGO work for the socio-economic and political order and is committed to forging a partnership with the NGO and PO.

Three points are worth noting with respect to the efforts of those interviewed to classify some of the agencies. First, while the above are considered to be important considerations, other factors figure in the way specific agencies are

classified. Most respondents, for instance, classified USAID immediately as traditional despite its expressed support for building strong organizations at the grassroots. This owes largely to the Agency's perceived role in US foreign policy. The same is true of the World Bank. Respondents automatically considered the Bank a traditional funding agency without any prior knowledge of its programs in the Philippines. Second, among members of progressive NGOs, there is the impression that European funding agencies are more liberal and supportive of genuine development concerns compared to American agencies, like the USAID. Finally, this impression seems to correlate highly with the flexibility of accounting and monitoring procedures and the amount of paper work required.

It is important to qualify the last two impressions. The observed differences between American and European funding agencies are not based on the geographic origin of the funding agency but on the distinction between smaller private donor organizations and government supported agencies that are subject to pressures of auditors in their respective countries. Among American funding agencies for instance, the Ford Foundation tends to be liberal and supportive of processes operating in the NGOs while USAID is more strict. The individual commitment of some representatives of agencies like USAID to more flexible and iterative development processes involving NGOs are easily subsumed under the bureaucratic procedures of a government agency.

The issue of a hierarchical relationship between funding agencies and NGOs characterized by the control of the latter by the former versus partnership in develop-

ment efforts is a sensitive one for some of those interviewed. Although an NGO leader was quick to point out that the conservative funding agencies seem to be veering away from avowed 'relations of patronage', there have been instances in the past when representatives even of agencies known to fund projects in the spirit of partnership lapsed into what was perceived to be a superior stance vis-a-vis the NGO personnel. This observation highlights the role of personality as a variable in negotiating the everyday relationship of the NGO and the funding agency.

The interviews raised other issues. One of those interviewed complained that the demand for strict adherence to procedures has forced key NGO personnel to spend more time writing reports than doing substantive fieldwork. Other concerns include the predilection of funding agencies to continuously support known personalities for their track record rather than allowing weaker NGOs with younger members to develop. It is significant to note that some NGOs have been supported by the same funding agency for almost a quarter of a century. Although these NGOs have performed very well, an NGO leader has criticized the dependence because it has prevented the agency from opening new areas of work and building the next generation of potential NGO leaders and members.

But the most significant issue judging from the problems raised by those interviewed revolves around program evaluation. Some NGOs and funding agencies have had difficulty arising from differences in expectations that were not threshed out in the Terms of Reference. As a respondent put it, many of the agreements regarding the expected output

and evaluation process are verbal. She claims to have been shocked when external evaluators began asking for output the NGO did not consider important to prepare. On the other hand, even if the expected output was written, some of the NGOs, particularly those working in the realm of organizing and training paid more attention to the processes they underwent rather than meeting particular success indicators, if these were spelled out at all.

Apart from the need to make the expected output explicit in the Terms of Reference (TOR), it is suggested that the criteria against which the project or program will be assessed be made a part of the TOR. In addition, those interviewed recommended a more participatory process of evaluation. They deem this to be a reasonable request because some NGOs and funding agencies have succeeded in forming evaluation teams where the NGO is represented.

Ultimately, however, some of the evaluation problems confronted by funding agencies and NGOs can be addressed if NGOs are open to being evaluated regularly. On the part of the donor agency, on the other hand, efforts must be expended to triangulate quantitative measurements of achievement with qualitative assessments of the processes NGOs undergo in the course of implementing a program. This presupposes the iterative but conscious development of quantitative measures and qualitative indicators that incorporate the process.

Summary

The previous discussion traced the growth and development of NGOs as gleaned from SEC data and key informant interviews with selected government

officials, members of the development NGO community and funding agencies. The following are the highlights of the paper:

- Since 1989, the number of NGO SEC registrants has been rising consistently averaging 7651 per year between the 1990-1993 period. SEC data reveals a total of 58927 non-stock and non-profit organizational registrants since 1980 suggesting that the number of NGOs is higher than the 20000 estimated in the literature.
- By the 1980s and after the downfall of the Marcos administration, progressive NGOs committed to democratizing economic and political institutions through a broad-based people-centered development dominated the scene. Although they are a very significant force, having successfully organized coalitions and networks, other voluntary organizations have increased dramatically. The SEC data reveal that the significant increase in the early 1990s owes mainly to the rise in the number of civic and religious organizations. Although some of these organizations may be outside the ambit of development NGOs which are committed to bringing about genuine social transformation and which grew out of the mass movement in the 1970s and 1980s, they are nevertheless engaged in development-related work and activities.
- The practice of classifying NGOs in forms of their political orientations is losing relevance given local, national and international developments which encourage the participation of the private and voluntary sectors in development activities. Other systems of classifying NGOs may be more useful for development planning and programming. One such system is Korten's suggestion of classifying NGOs in terms of the roles or functions that they play in society. There are thus NGOs who serve as public service contractors to government and donor agencies in the delivery of social services; NGOs that combine their social mission with a market orientation; NGOs that are driven solely by their social mission for change; and NGOs which serve as welfare or humanitarian agencies. Other useful classifications include the classification of NGOs in terms of their program areas or major fields of activities (i.e., environment, health, human rights, shelter and housing, relief and disaster management, etc.), and in terms of their geographic coverage and location.
- The role of NGOs in development activities has expanded. Although development NGOs have remained ambivalent towards working with the state, there are many opportunities for GO-NGO collaboration. Government agencies have increasingly sought the participation of NGOs for various purposes, among others: to help monitor projects and provide program feedback; to assist in information campaigns and advocacy; to organize, prepare and assist communities in development activities; and to be involved in various aspects of service delivery or program implementation.
- Some of the difficulties in the working relationships of GOs and NGOs from the point of view of government include a general lack of appreciation of government procedures and of the limitations imposed on government by its bureaucratic structure; the condescending attitude of NGOs towards government officials; and their lack of

technical skills, limited area of coverage and lack of funds. From the perspective of NGOs, delayed releases of government funds have hampered field operations sometimes undermining the credibility of NGOs in the communities where they work; the working styles of government workers are not attuned to the demands of field-based development work.

- The wide acceptance of a participatory and people-centered development by funding agencies has facilitated the flow of multilateral, bilateral and private funds to NGOs. Multilateral and bilateral funding agencies have established indirect links to local NGOs through contracting organizations or direct relations through a consortium of NGOs.
- The concerns of funding agencies include the long run institutional capability of coalitions to implement programs and projects; the sustainability of GO-NGO links when funding has dried up; adherence to monitoring guidelines and problems of accountability, lack of technical skills on the part of the NGOs and the need to support their professionalization. NGOs, on the other hand, are concerned with problems in evaluating processes for areas of work that are hard to assess quantitatively; and the need to fund young people and new areas of concern even as funding agencies support known personalities with a track record.

References

- Aldaba, Fernando T. 'CODE-NGO: Unifying the Development NGO Community'. *Development NGO Journal* (CODE-NGO, Quezon City, Philippines) 1 Third Quarter: 1-14.
- _____. The Role of NGOs in Philippine Social Transformation. In *Philippine Politics and Society*, Ateneo Center for Social Policy and Public Affairs, Quezon City, January 1993.
- CODE-NGO. *Scaling-up the Impact of Development NGOs in the Philippines. A Profile*. n.d.
- Constantino-David, Karina. *NGOs and Influencing National Policy In Clayton A (ed) Governance, Democracy and Conditionality: What Role for NGOs?*. Oxford: Intrac. 1994.
- Gonzales, Maribel. *Learning from DIWATA, PCHRD and PDAP: CIDA's NGO Support Programmes in the Philippines*. Discussion Paper prepared for the Philippine-Canadian NGO Consultation. October 20-23, 1994, Samal Island, Davao.
- Korten, David C. 'Voluntary organizations in Development: Issues for Donors' *Partnership 2* (3) January 1989.
- _____. *The US Voluntary Sector and Global Realities: Issues for the 1990s. An Issues Paper prepared for the US Agency for International Development. Institute for Development Research, Boston, April 1989.*
- Rajni, Kathari. *Voluntary Organizations in a Plural Society*. In *Solidarity* 133-134. Manila. January-June 1992.
- Tan, Victor. *NGO-GO Relations-Prospects and Experiences*. Background Paper submitted to the Canadian International Development Agency. November 1994.
- USAID. *PVO Financing. List of Registered Private Voluntary Organizations*. August 15, 1994.
- USAID. *USAID/Philippines Development Program 1993-1998*. June 1994.
- UNIVERSALIA. *PCJC-HRD Inc. Mid-Project Evaluation. Volume I. Synthesis Report. September 1994; volume II Annex I and II.*