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Introduction

Like many developing societies, the Philippines continues to experience various problems and challenges in its political, economic and social affairs. While the political system has maintained strong adherence to democracy even with a passing episode of authoritarianism during the Marcos era, conflict and tension in the political and economic life persist.

A long-festering communist rebel movement continues to infest pocket areas in the countryside, while secessionist movements, chiefly in the South, remain active. As such, there is a significant number of communities that are not reached by government services, and remain to be habitually neglected.

Poverty persists as unemployment and declining livelihood opportunities remain formidable challenges. The government has also been hard put in addressing an unbridled population growth reaching as much as 2.5 percent per annum and where population control programs have encountered stiff resistance in this dominantly Catholic society where the Church exercises much influence.

The unemployment rate has registered to two digit levels, although inflation has been somehow contained.

Peace and order problems continue to challenge government authorities, as incidents of ambushes and killings, robbery, kidnapping and similar criminal acts persist with growing impunity. Scandal and accounts of graft and corruption in government continue to be pervasive issues. In the face of all these, the government has maintained some semblance of order and stability, but the crisis remains.

---
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Sporadic incidents of protests rallies and citizens assemblies have surfaced continuously but have been roundly dispersed, sometimes violently, by the police.

There continue to be intermittent and continuing initiatives to amend the present Philippine Constitution ratified in 1987 from a presidential, unitary system to a parliamentary, federal form. While there is a growing movement towards revising the existing Charter backed by the Government, an equally strong opposition to charter change has also emerged.

While there are indications of growth and economic activities, the country continues to suffer from a huge foreign and domestic public debt, aggravated by a widening public deficit brought about, among others, by a weak and corrupt tax collection system.

In 2005, additional taxes were legislated, authorizing the government to impose new taxes in the form of expanded and reformed value-added taxes (E-Vat and R-Vat), as well as the so-called “sin” taxes which brought about the indexation of excise taxes on liquor and cigarettes.

Like many developing countries therefore, the Philippines has encountered numerous difficulties and challenges in the political, economic and social and administrative dimensions that make good governance a compelling agenda. This is particularly so in the continuing and enduring efforts towards instituting far-ranging and relevant reforms.

In a fairly current World Bank study on governance indicators involving 175 countries released in 2002, the Philippines scored relatively low ratings in the indicators used, namely accountability, political stability, rule of law, regulatory quality, voice and accountability, and control of corruption (World Bank, 2002, as cited in ADB, 2005: 12-13).

In a mission report on Governance Indicators for national reform policies made by the Oslo Governance Center out of a series of round table meetings in the Philippines in 2005, the issue of numerous indicator systems in use and disuse in the country, among others, were observed.
The Oslo Mission met with “a cross section of national stakeholders [in the country] to discuss how a project focused on the development of indicators could be useful to national and sub-national policy makers.” The Mission also “discussed processes for the generation and use of government indicators, specifically designed to inform policy reforms from the perspective of poverty reduction and gender equality” (OGC, 2005:1).

The remaining findings of the Mission are equally significant: the importance of getting national ownership for governance indicators and establishing a set of indicators that is acceptable to all and will be used by policy makers to inform their decisions; the need to strengthen capacities of policy makers to use indicators for policy reform; the sharing of best practices at the sub-national level; the emphasis on the rights based approach in governance principles and indicators, particularly in pro-poor and gender-sensitive considerations; and a better appreciation of the relationship between country programme governance indicators and national governance indicators (OGC, 2005).

This Mission laid the groundwork for exploring the indicator framework in the Philippines, and hence, this preliminary initiative to track down key indicator sources in the Philippines.

Likewise, in support of this, and as part of the data-gathering activities in the preparation of this Guide, a seminar-workshop was undertaken in May, 2006 for selected mid-level Philippine government officials on the issue of problems, issues and concerns they generally encountered or believe to often encounter in ensuring good governance in the performance of their functions. Fig. 3 shows the listing of these responses. The responses were varied and revealing, although candid and straight-forward bereft, of any political color.

The responses ranged from problems of dissemination of information and awareness, budget concerns, not-rights based, inconsistency, reliability and accuracy, and transparency, timeliness and validity, among others.

While couched in general terms with no specific reference alluded to any person or institution, these responses provide insight on the issues that need to be overcome.

An important response that must be cited here is the acknowledgement of the participants of the non-convergence of indicator system and lack of harmonization, possibly of
indicator measures or determinants. Some participants also cited the absence of government benchmarks.

Essentially, this exercise reflects on the need to better develop an indicator system in the Philippines considering the numerous interpretations, issues and problems attending to the entire gamut of the governance framework.

Figure 3. Problems, Issues and Concerns in the Philippine Indicators System
Drawn from a workshop with governance experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the issues, problems, concerns or challenges of Governance Indicators Systems in the country and its possible solutions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Dissemination of information and awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Budget concerns as regard to monitoring of impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Imputing weights on different aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not rights-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inconsistency in practical application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of familiarity with methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reliability and accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Credibility, impartiality and objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Acceptability and accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transparency, timeliness and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multiplicity of indicators systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-convergence of indicator system/lack of harmonization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Absence of governance benchmarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance Concepts

Governance and governance practices have become among the more compelling agenda of societies in both developed and developing nations in the new millennium. The conduct of governance and its processes during the past two decades have become significant and important denominators of efficiency in the dynamics of nation states and in the management of public and international affairs.

Overnight, governance principles have evolved as defining standards by which relationships between governments and their citizens, between rulers and ruled, between the governors and the governed, are measured and understood. For the most part, governance practices have emerged today as determinants of a country’s adherence to established democratic principles and ideals and, consequently, its respect for basic freedoms and human rights.

But what is governance and how is it distinguished from the more familiar term of “government?”

In recent years, there has been a proliferation of definitions and literature as to what governance is and how it is supposed to work or be observed (UNDP, 1997a; UNDP, 1997b; Pierre, 2000a; Pierre, 2000b; Hirst, 2000; Rhodes, 2000; Hubbard, 2001; Bevir, Rhodes and Weller, 2003; UNDP, 2004).

The literature can be somewhat confusing, as governance, on the one hand may mean “the empirical manifestations of state adaptation to its external environment as it emerges in the late twentieth century.”

On the other hand, it is also denoted as “a conceptual or theoretical representation of co-ordination of social systems and, for the most part, the role of the state in that process” (Pierre, 2000b: 3). The label “governance,” while widely used, can also be “elastic” (Bevir, Rhodes and Weller, 2003:14).

Conceivably, there may be variations and varying interpretations by which governance is to be understood in different societies and cultures. Historical backgrounds and experiences,
traditions, patterns of norms, conduct and behavior, as well as varying political and social practices may result in differing appreciation of the term. As some scholars on the subject would point out, ‘governance’ as applied to British government may mean something different to ‘governance’ in France (Bevir, Rhodes and Weller, 2003:14).

The word has been used, in many instances, as “a blanket term to signify a change in the meaning of government,” which alternatively, focus on the degree and extent of public intervention and the use of markets, quasi-markets and non-government institutions and resources to deliver public services (March and Olsen, 1989 and Jorgensen, 1993, as cited in Rhodes, 2000: 55)

Governance has also been offered as a “preferred shorthand phrase for encapsulating the changing form and role of the state in advanced industrial societies and a key facet of these changes is public sector reform” (Bevir, Rhodes and Weller, 2003:13).

The Evolving Notion of Governance

Governance is regarded as having shaped as a “locution” of “enlightened members of [the] international technocracy who recognize, after a decade of economic liberalism in the 1980s, that market forces and private interests require regulation and restraint, but...are reluctant to accept a new and major extension of the powers of the state” (Hirst, 2000: 13, ital. supplied).

In the same token, governance has also been used as a new variant of the policy-making and the management processes of public affairs which engender the active participation and involvement of “civil society” which has grown to distrust the state.

The perception that the state, captured by commercial interests, and/or corrupt politicians and supported by unaccountable bureaucracies, has increasingly persisted so as to demand new contours and frameworks to reform government processes and practices (Hirst, 2000: 13).
While governance has been alternately used to signify a variety of meanings even in the corporate sector, the term has been associated with reforms in government, particularly in public administration.

Traditional public administration and contemporary governments have been rooted in the practice and observance of the compelling values of efficiency, effectiveness and economy in the management of public affairs. These have been generally regarded and accepted as the “3 E’s” of government and of public administration.

In recent years, however, the management of public affairs and the structure and processes of governments and their bureaucracies have increasingly highlighted the significance of the overarching values of responsibility, responsiveness and representativeness. These are now encased in what has been termed as the 3 R’s of public administration and governance practice and are considered as compelling values that must be maximized to support and complement the traditional, but institution focused ideals of the 3 E’s.

In fact, governance may as well be a “catch-all” term to cover various activities in the relationships of citizens with each other, and with their governments, as well as the accountability of leaders in the management of societies.

**Governance Defined**

Governance has thus been defined and interpreted in various ways even if the spirit or substance of various interpretations of the term remains the same.

The UNDP defines governance as “the system of values, policies and institutions by which a society manages its economic, political and social affairs through interactions within and among the state, civil society and private sector” (UNDP, 2004 as cited in UNDP-Eurostat,2004:3).

Governance is thus viewed as the means by which “society organizes itself to make and implement decisions” within a climate of “mutual understanding, agreement and action.” In this sense, governance comprises the mechanisms and processes by which citizens express their

On the other hand, the European Commission maintains that “governance concerns the state’s ability to serve its citizens” and encompasses those “rules, processes, and behaviours by which interests are articulated, resources are managed and power is exercised in society.” (Communication on Governance and Development, 2003, as cited in UNDP-Eurostat, 2004:3).

Similarly, the World Bank has defined governance as “the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised for the common good,” which “includes, (i) the process by which those in authority are selected, monitored and replaced, (ii) the capacity of the government to effectively manage its resources and implement sound policies, and (iii) the respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them.” (World Bank Institute website, 2004, as cited in UNDP-Eurostat, 2004:3).

Bereft of its nuances and ramifications, an earlier UNDP discussion paper defines governance “as the exercise of political, economic and administrative authority to manage a nation’s affairs. It refers to the “complex mechanisms, processes, relationships and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their rights and obligations and mediate their differences. The UNDP also describes governance as transcending the state but to include civil society organizations and the private sector “because all three are involved in most activities promoting sustainable human development” (UNDP, 1997a: 9).

Governance has also been described as “the process of policy making through active and cohesive discussion among policy makers who are interconnected through a broad range of networks” (Kooiman, 2003 and World Bank, 1994, as cited in Kim, et.al., 2005:647).

It is however emphasized that the aspiration is not just governance but the requisites for good governance. The process must anchor on the ideals and principles of multiple stakeholdership where government is only one of the actors involved because it is marked by dialogues and consensus in the management of common and societal affairs (Kim, et. Al. 2005).

From this description, therefore, is carved the prescription for good and sound governance where, again, as the UNDP suggests, would bring an environment where public
resources are managed effectively, problems resolved efficiently, and issues are threshed out within a climate of public participation, accountability and transparency (UNDP, 1997a: 9).

“Good Governance”

Good governance can be seen as occurring when there exists an effective political framework that is conducive to private economic action, the efficiency of stable regimes, the triumph of the rule of law, the presence of an efficient state administration adapted to the roles that government can actually perform, and a vigorous and dynamic civil society independent of the state (Hirst, 2000:14).

This issue becomes remarkable in third world setting such as the Philippines where problems of poverty, resource mobilization, conflict, graft and corruption, and other attendant political, economic and social instabilities and discontinuities, appear to stifle or stymie the practice of good and sound governance.

In such an environment, good governance, as a compelling agenda, has been increasingly advocated, but the problem remains, as in other societies: when is there good governance and when is there none? How is good governance measured and determined?

Dimension of Governance

There has been a generous amount of materials that seeks to identify the characteristics of good governance, when good governance is present in a society, and when it is not (UNDP, 1997a; UNDP, 1997b; Brillantes, 2000; Bevir, Rhodes and Weller, 2003; Kooiman, 2003; Pierre, 2000a; Kim, 2005).

A steady stream of efforts during the past two decades has been initiated to identify what constitutes good governance, what characteristics accompany it, how it is derived and promoted. Some of these initiatives have broken down a working typology that would help classify governance characteristics and criteria by breaking governance into “domains.”

In the typology devised by the UNDP (1997a:9-10), four types have been suggested, namely,
**Economic governance**, which covers processes of policy-making and decision-making that directly or indirectly affect a country’s economic activities or its relationships with other economies;

**Political governance**, which refers to decision and policy processes and implementation of a legitimate and authoritative state representing, among others, the “the interests of a pluralist polity” that allow citizens to freely elect their representatives;

**Administrative governance**, which reflects a system of policy implementation undertaken through “an efficient, independent, accountable and open public sector; and,

**Systemic governance** which encompasses the processes and structures of society that guide political and socio-economic relationships to protect cultural and religious beliefs and values, and to create and maintain an environment of health, freedom, security and with the opportunity to exercise personal capabilities that lead to a better life for all people”

The Philippines has roughly adopted this framework as shown in Figure 4, Framework for the Development of Governance Indicators, although it has not incorporated the systemic governance classification. A brief description of advocacies is reflected in each of the domains of political, economic and administrative governance.

Figure 4. Framework for the Development of Governance Indicators
Accordingly, in support of this classification, a listing of governance performance criteria are also listed and accompanied by an indicative checklist intended to describe how each criterion can be fulfilled or determined.

Figure 5, Governance Performance Criterion and Indicative Checklist below lists ten criteria of governance, namely, Transparency; participation; accountability; general organization.
and management; intergovernmental relations; rule of law; continuity in the implementation of programs, predictability and sustainability, preference for the poor; and effective responsive provision of basic services.

Accompanying this set of criteria is an indicative checklist which suggests how these criteria are to be applied and operationalized.

Figure 5. Governance Performance Criterion and Indicative Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Performance Criterion</th>
<th>Indicative Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Transparency**              | ▪ Presence of a management information system.  
                                 | ▪ Accomplishment reports are clearly posted and measured against stated targets.  
                                 | ▪ Reports of cashflows published.  
                                 | ▪ Use of computer technology in preparation of socio-economic profile.  
                                 | ▪ Creation of a municipal information office.  
                                 | ▪ Openness to participation of media.  
                                 | ▪ Presence of community data board and spot map (e.g., MBN survey) and updated regularly.  
                                 | ▪ Publication of a municipal news magazine/newsletter.  
                                 | ▪ Accessibility of officials to media through regularly press conferences.  
                                 | ▪ Conduct of regular citizens assemblies, especially at the barangay level. |
| **2. Participation**             | ▪ Public consultations conducted.  
                                 | ▪ Functioning local development council.  
                                 | ▪ Performance monitoring and evaluation committee institutionalized with technical NGO members.  
                                 | ▪ Presence of programs and activities with clear private sector / NGO / civil society participation.  
                                 | ▪ Beneficiaries are always involved and consulted in programs, processes. |
3. Accountability
- Presence of performance measurement and appraisal system.
- Public accountability operationalized through Ethics and Accountability Law and Anti-Graft and Corrupt Practices Act
- Presence of local ombudsman, grievance and other committees
- Use of Performance Audit.
- Audit report of the COA posted in conspicuous places.
- Assets and liabilities well accounted for.
- Extent of COA disallowance and suspensions.
- Complete and available financial reports.

4. Leadership
- Presence of Clear and Consistent Vision clearly articulated by the LCE
- Participation in activities of the Leagues of LGUs
- Ability to network with NGAs and LGUs and donor institutions
- Attainment of planned targets in spite of constraints.
- Ability of LCE to harness civil society and business sector for support.

5. General Organization and Management
- Presence of a Clear Organizational Structure
- Performance evaluation periodically conducted.
- Staff meetings / department meetings conducted regularly.
- Presence of Local Government Profile
- Presence of a Master Development Plan with quantifiable and measurable targets.
- Devolved employees absorbed properly.
- Delegated tasks clearly stated.
- Clear delineation of responsibilities between executive and legislative.
- Visibility of SB members and other heads of offices in municipal and barangay activities.
- Organization of committees to address intercultural conflicts.

6. Inter-governmental Relations
- Functioning coordinative mechanisms such as local development councils, local special bodies.
- Presence of inter-LGU programs and projects.
- Memoranda of Agreement with other LGUs.
- Local NGA functionaries tapped by the LGU for technical assistance.
- Presence of inter-LGU undertakings for economic and commonly beneficial purposes with responsibilities of each level clearly defined.
- Networking among officers and among personnel officers.
- Adoption of convergence approach.
7. Rule of Law
- Ordinances periodically reviewed and updated.
- Existence of legislative tracking mechanism.
- Establishment of work flow prominently posted for guidance of all.
- Legal and cultural laws effectively implemented.
- Customary and ancestral laws, e.g., Shariah Law, respected.
- Functioning People’s Law Enforcement Board (PLEB).
- Availability of information and statistics re: crime arrests and convictions, no of cases filed in court for traffic violation, etc.)

8. Continuity in the implementation of programs, predictability and sustainability
- Continuing efforts to augment resources through short term and long terms grants and loans.
- Continuous consultation with local constituents.
- Programs and projects subject to regular evaluation and continuous enrichment.
- Development plan updated on a regular basis.

9. Preference for the Poor
- Use of Poverty Mapping conducted and updated regularly.
- Use of MBN Surveys in designing local programs and projects.
- Provision of livelihood programs.
- Funds set aside for poverty alleviation projects.
- Presence of poverty alleviation programs such as Lingap para sa mahirap, health insurance of indigents, senior citizens, etc.

10. Effective, responsive, provision of basic services
- Services identified for devolution under the Code actually devolved.
- Devolved services adequately funded.
- Equitable and rational distribution of basic services among beneficiaries as evidence in the budget.

Source: Brillantes, 2005.

Obviously, there may be other criteria that can be added to this extended list, depending of course on the priorities and needs of a given society. These provide a set of general and descriptive standards supported by specific indicative performance targets that can be used or are being used in the Philippines to determine the application and operationalization of governance practices.

But, given these set of criteria and their indicative checklist, the challenge remains as to how these can be measured objectively. It is for this reason that indicators would be necessary to provide an objective means of measuring governance activities based on some methodology and undertaken by independent producers.
The Need for Governance Indicators

While good governance can be described subjectively in detail as to its components, peculiarities and characteristics, problems arise, however, as to how its can be determined and measured objectively.

When, for instance, is government transparency present, or practiced and upheld in a society? When is people’s participation in policy-making and in the management of public affairs observed? When is a public policy a product of good governance and when is it not?

It is for this reason that governance indicators to test patterns and practices of governance have become necessary to objectively identify governance performance. Essentially, an indicator is “a device for providing specific information on the state or condition of something.” It could be a measure, a gauge, guide, index, marker or benchmark, among others. (UNDP-Eurostat: 2004:3)

A governance indicator, then, is “a measure that points out something about the state of governance in a country.” It serves as a yardstick that suggest, reflect or gauge the condition of governance in a society or a country, and may be narrowed down to measure specific areas or concerns of governance, such as “electoral systems, corruption, human rights, public service delivery, civil society and gender equality” among others (UNDP-Eurostat: 2004:3).

As such, these can be used as guides or benchmarks for policy-makers, political parties, program implementors, business groups, civil society organizations, as well as researchers and international institutions to help determine sensitive policy decisions, investment potentials or people’s sentiments in terms of approval or disapproval over government actions.

What are these benchmarks? Obviously, these may differ from country to country, depending on the demands of society. An economically underdeveloped society but under a democratic system of government may, for instance, look and give emphasis at economic benchmarks such as high employment and livelihood opportunities, rising per capita income, purchasing power and similar parameters as determinants of good governance.
On the other hand, societies that have experience political repression and suppression of human rights, while economically growing, may consider untrammeled freedom of assembly, press freedom, freedom of religion, free elections, greater respect for human rights, among others, as the more important parameters that must indicate good governance.

Likewise, societies that suffer from both political repression and economic underdevelopment would require more extensive measures of governance.

In the same token, mature democracies would have their own interpretations of how good governance is to be achieved and, measured.

Different societies therefore may have varying and differing interpretations of how good governance occurs and how it is to be determined and measured.

How then are these to be measured and in reference to what? The task of unraveling the governance phenomenon therefore remains wide and needs to be explored. And in this respect, the preliminary agenda is to seek out sources from where governance indicators are generated.

Towards a Governance Indicators Guides

Among the major output of the Governance Indicators Project is the production of a Governance Indicators Users’ Guide. The preparation of a Guide is part of an overall effort to initiate the establishment of preliminary data on governance indicators employed by different institutions in the Philippines. This is an important step in understanding how governance – good governance in particular – is to be gauged.

As in the UNDP-Eurostat Guide, the focus of the Guide is on governance indicators in the Philippines and not on statistical data. Although the terms are almost used interchangeably, the Guide does not apply or adopt strict statistical tools in measuring governance indicators (UNDP-EC: 2004:3).

Instead, the Guide provides a listing or inventory of institutions in the public, private and non-government sector in the Philippines where governance indicators are being produced regularly or periodically. It does not however provide a detailed discussion of the methodology
employed by an indicator producer as to how it had generated and measured a given governance indicator report it has released or are releasing.

Guide Methodology

In producing the Guide, information was generated from various institutions producing and generating governance indicators in the Philippines. These institutions include those from the public, private and non-government sectors. This Guide has deemed it practicable to distinguish the sectors to allow the Guide user to identify and determine which institution would suit his requirements.

The information was generated from websites and interviews, and admittedly remains limited to those that operate largely at the national level. The sources vary in the frequency of their releases but have gained nationwide recognition because they have consistently released information on various aspects of governance.

There are also institutions such as universities and colleges based at the regional and provincial levels that have been known to have devised and released governance indicators at the community level but these have been largely sporadic, owing perhaps to the limitations of funds and available resources. Some of these, however, are included in this Guide.

The Guide provides the information of the indicators sources and follows the UNDP-Eurostat format. The Guide is shown below in Figure 6 as follows:

Figure 6. Source Guide

Name: Name of the data source
Producer: The individual or organization that produced the data source
Stated purpose: The purpose for which the information source was intended
Funding source: The organization that funded the project
Current usage: Where and how the data is currently being used
Where to find it: The web address the dataset or database is located
Type of data used: Describes the type of data that was used in the data source (expert assessments, surveys, stories from news agencies, etc.)
**Coverage:** Number of provinces, municipalities or barangays covered

**Time coverage:** The years when the first and most recent data were collected and the frequency with which data is collected.

**Contact details:** The address at which the producer can be contacted

**Methodology:** Explains how the data was collected and compiled, and includes relevant information such as sources of data, data-gathering techniques, questionnaire design and coding

**Example results:** An example of the results or the probable results of the indicator source


The listing of indicators sources in the Philippines in the Guide does not, in some instances, provide the complete standard information indicated in the source guide. This is because some of the indicators sources have chosen not to provide some data for reasons of their own.

Likewise, the Guide does not explain the methodology used by the indicator source in generating data or information. Sample reports of some of the indicators sources are however included in this Guide to help the user assess the value of the information released by a given institution or organization.

Apparently, there would be other indicators sources, as had been said earlier, that may not have been included in this listing, particularly at the regional and community levels in the Philippines. This is because, these have not been either reached at the time of research or because they have not released indicator reports regularly or continuously.

A total of 40 governance indicators and indicator sources that are generated and released by public, business and non-profit organizations in the Philippines have been compiled in this Guide.

Those in the public sector have been further classified as to whether they belong to the Executive, Legislative or Judiciary branches. A fourth classification was also included and this refers to indicators generated and released by independent constitutional bodies.

The listing represents indicator-generating sources that measure varying indicators of governance such as environmental protection, human rights violations, people’s participation in
public affairs, citizens’ access to basic services, poverty, and corruption, among others. Some of these tend to overlap and cut across various sectors.

The important point that needs to be emphasized is that these represent data and information independently obtained out of systematic research or statistical surveys based on some accepted or acceptable methodology. They also present what can be considered as credible sources, mainly because data and information were secured by professionals.

Figure 7 below, Philippine Governance Indicators Survey Tools, classifies these organizations and lists these indicators sources and the indicators they use. A summary of these indicator sources is also included reflecting institutions of origin.

Figure 7. Philippine Governance Indicators Survey Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Legislative</th>
<th>Judiciary</th>
<th>Constitutional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Philippine Environmental Governance Program (EcoGov) – DENR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ombudsman Watch – OMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Human Development Index (HDI) – NSCB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Integrated Rural Accessibility Planning (IRAP) Procedure – DILG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Labor Cost Survey - DOLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Local Governance Performance Management System (LGPMS) – DILG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Local Productivity and Performance Measurement System (LPPMS) – DILG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Minimum Basic Needs Survey (MBN) – DSWD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Medium Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP) – NEDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Occupational Wages Survey – DOLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Philippine Labor Index – DOLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Philippine Statistical Yearbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Profit</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Academe</th>
<th>Development Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Watch Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Philippine Cities Competitiveness Ranking (PCCR) – AIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tatak Synergeia – Synergeia Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. System on Competency Assessment for Local Governments (SCALOG) – LGA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transparent Accountable Governance - TAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
- Executive – 13
- House – 1
- Senate – 1
- Judiciary – Constitutional – 3
- Non-Profit – 8
- Business – 3
- Academe – 7
- Development Agencies – 4

**Total = 40**

The following is a listing of the indicators sources included in the guide. These are classified according to those found and developed by government, non-profit organizations, business, academe and development agencies.

**Executive**
- Coastal Resource Management Project
- Philippine Environmental Governance Program
- Family Income and Expenditure Survey
- Human Development Index
- Integrated Rural Accessibility Planning Procedure
- Labor Cost Survey
- Local Governance Performance Management System
Some concluding notes

Indeed the use of governance indicators in the Philippines is still evolving. As the Users’ Guide has shown, there IS an interest in measuring various dimension of governance in the Philippines. What has to be addressed in the need to come up with some minimum acceptable standards in the use of governance indicators, and the need to incorporate them into the practice of the concerned agency or institution, be they government, business, civil society, or development agencies. To a certain extent, they need to be able to speak the same language, so to speak, using common points of references and definitions, if necessary. For instance, it is
imperative to come up with a common understanding and standard definition of governance, good governance and the fundamental principles of good governance. Experience has shown that local and international agencies are still working on these.

Then, there is the need to designate, if any, some kind of “lead agency” that would be responsible for the standardization of governance indicators. This may be in government or the private sector, or one with appropriate representation of all sectors. A logical downstream activity would be the application of such indicators of good governance with the ultimate objective of measuring the extent of good governance practice of certain agencies and institutions.

Experience has shown that Philippines has made progress in the design, development and operationalization of indicators of governance. But as our Project and the users guide has shown, there is still much work ahead. But with the cooperation of various institutions and stakeholders – government, civil society, international development agencies – it can be done as we move towards our collective vision of attaining good governance.
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