## **ECONSTOR** Make Your Publications Visible.

A Service of

ZBW

Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Medina-Guce, Czarina; Velasco, Lawrence G.; Rey, Anne Marie T.

### Working Paper Baseline study on the state of participation in local government units: Participatory Governance Metrics for Local Development Councils

PIDS Discussion Paper Series, No. 2025-07

**Provided in Cooperation with:** Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS), Philippines

*Suggested Citation:* Medina-Guce, Czarina; Velasco, Lawrence G.; Rey, Anne Marie T. (2025) : Baseline study on the state of participation in local government units: Participatory Governance Metrics for Local Development Councils, PIDS Discussion Paper Series, No. 2025-07, Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS), Quezon City, https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2025.07

This Version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/10419/316214

#### Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

#### Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



## WWW.ECONSTOR.EU



# PÍDS

## Baseline Study on the State of Participation in Local Government Units: Participatory Governance Metrics for Local Development Councils

Czarina Medina-Guce, Lawrence G. Velasco, and Anne Marie T. Rey

The PIDS Discussion Paper Series constitutes studies that are preliminary and subject to further revisions. They are being circulated in a limited number of copies only for purposes of soliciting comments and suggestions for further refinements. The studies under the Series are unedited and unreviewed. The views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute. The Institute allows citation and quotation of the paper as long as proper attribution is made.

This study was carried out with support from the Department of the Interior and Local Government.

#### CONTACT US:

RESEARCH INFORMATION DEPARTMENT Philippine Institute for Development Studies

18th Floor, Three Cyberpod Centris - North Tower EDSA corner Quezon Avenue, Quezon City, Philippines https://www.pids.gov.ph

publications@pids.gov.ph



(+632) 8877-4000

Baseline Study on the State of Participation in Local Government Units: Participatory Governance Metrics for Local Development Councils

> Czarina Medina-Guce Lawrence G. Velasco Anne Marie T. Rey

## PHILIPPINE INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

April 2025

#### Abstract

The Local Development Councils (LDCs) feature a significant participatory governance function in local policy development, as local government units (LGUs) are mandated to constitute LDCs with members from civil society organizations (CSOs). While the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) monitors the status of LDC functionality following the Local Government Code's operational guidelines through the Seal of Good Local Governance, LDC effectiveness – particularly the quality and substantiveness of CSO participation – has not been reviewed. For this purpose, the DILG developed the Participatory Governance Metrics-LDC (PGM-LDC) tool to diagnose different dimensions and variables of participatory governance (PG).

This research provides a comprehensive assessment of the baseline participation status in LDCs using the PGM-LDC tool. Through a rigorous mixed-methods approach, the analysis unpacks LDC participation from the perspectives of LGUs and CSOs across LGU types and LDC functionality ratings (high/low) nationwide.

The baseline analysis consists of three parts. First, it establishes the context of PG in LDCs by analyzing different LDC mechanisms, practices, and adherence to national participation policies (e.g., perceptions of LDC composition and frequency of participation, status and level of participation in LDC functions and committees, mandated representation of women and indigenous peoples, et al.). Second, it analyzes the PGM-LDC variable statements corresponding to the three PG dimensions (space, engagement, results), including qualitative explanations and correlations of perceptions with LGU type, LDC functionality, and respondent group. Third, additional analytical explorations are provided to test for inter-variable interactions (among the PGM statements and dimensions) following PG logics of the PGM-LDC tool design. Recommendations are provided in each section to enhance existing/planned policies and capacity development initiatives of DILG to enhance participation in LDCs. Operational recommendations are also included for the future deployment of the PGM-LDC survey.

Finally, the report regroups with assessing the baseline status of participation in LGUs. The analysis highlights that when viewed through the lens of mandated mechanisms and practices, the state of participation in LDCs paints a picture of the active involvement of CSOs but is limited within 'invited' parameters. Furthermore, when viewed through the lens of the PGM-LDC framework, agreeable ratings throughout the variable statements characterize the state of participation in LDCs, but with the more substantive PG principles, such as CSO influence and autonomy, ranking lower among the 14 variables. Aside from granular recommendations in every variable-indicator discussion, the study also urges the elevation of national policy prescriptions and support for quality participation and the further appreciation of CSO satisfaction contributors, particularly those informing CSOs' underrating of their participation and referencing potential (not necessarily actual) benefits of participation for their satisfaction.

**Keywords**: participatory governance, local development council, civil society, local government units, participation quality

Abstract	1
1 Introduction	6
1.1 Context and objectives	6
1.2 Intended users of the study	6
2 Literature Review	7
2.1 Local Development Council (LDC) functions and functionality assessments	7
2.2 Participation of civil society organizations in LDCs	10
2.3 Participatory Governance Metrics (PGM)	12
3 Methodology	17
3.1 Overview of sites and respondents	17
3.2 Data processing and analysis	20
3.3 Scope and limitations	20
4 Findings	21
4A. LDC Mechanisms and Practices	21
4A.1 CSOs' awareness of the LDC CSO composition	21
4A.2 Compliance with LSB reconstitution process	23
4A.3 Adherence to representation policies	27
4A.4 CSO participation status and level in LDC activities	30
4A.5 Executive and Functional/Sectoral Committees	38
4A.6 Frequency of CSO participation in LDC-related activities	46
4A.7 Enablers, hindrances, and needed support	52
4B. PGM-LDC Variables	59
Space dimension variables	64
Statement 1. Rationalized inclusion criteria (Satisfaction of accreditation guidelines)	64
Statement 2. Engagement Strategy (Clear information on ways of participating)	66
Statement 3. Engagement strategy (Sufficient communication)	68
Statement 4. Transparency and access to information protocols	70
Statement 5. Organizational capacity (Sufficient resource support)	72
Statement 6. Clear mechanisms for feedback loops	73
Statement 7. Defined opportunities to raise feedback, petitions, grievances	75
Engagement dimension variables	77
Statement 8. Inclusion and representation	77
Statement 9. Autonomy and fairness	79
Statement 10. Transparency of engagement (Efficient Information Provision)	81
Results dimension variables	83
Statement 11. Influence on LDC Decisions	83
Statement 12. Enabling More Effective Policies	85
Statement 13. CSO satisfaction	86

#### **Table of Contents**

Statement 14. LGU satisfaction with participatory practices	90
4C. Additional Analytical Explorations	91
4C.1 Participation frequency x PGM-LDC results	91
4C.2 PGM-LDC S1 (Accreditation guidelines) x S8 (Inclusion)	94
4C.3 PGM-LDC S1 (Accreditation guidelines) x S14 (LGU satisfaction with participat practices)	ory 98
4C.4 Associations of information sharing-related statements	99
4C.5 PGM-LDC dimension interactions: Space x Engagement x Results	110
4C.6 Operational notes: Enumerators' feedback on survey deployment	113
5 The State of Participation in LDCs: Analysis and Recommendations	117
5.1 State of Participation in LDC Mechanisms and Practices	117
5.2 State of Participation assessed through the PGM-LDC variables	120
5.3 Implications for policymaking and continuing research	123
6 Concluding Notes	125
Bibliography	126
Annex A: Methodological Notes	1 3 1

#### List of Tables

Table 1. DILG's LDC Functionality Rating (Scaling Rubric)	9
Table 2. DILG's LDC Functionality Rating: Indicator Parameters	9
Table 3. LDC Functionality Rating National Results, 2022 and 2023 (in Percentages)	. 10
Table 4. PGM Framework: Assessment Dimensions	. 14
Table 5. PGM for LDCs: Summary of Customized Tool	. 15
Table 6. Summary of Respondents (CSO/LGU) by LGU Type	. 17
Table 7. CSO Respondents by Sector	. 18
Table 8. CSO Respondents by Year Start of LDC Engagement	. 19
Table 9. LGU Respondents by Office Represented	. 19
Table 10. LGU Respondents by No. of Years Engaged in LDCs	. 20
Table 11. CSO Composition by LDC Functionality Rating (CSO respondents)	. 22
Table 12. CSO Composition by Region (CSO Respondents)	. 22
Table 13. Highlights: Compliance with LSB Reconstitution Process	. 24
Table 14. Highlights: Creation of CSO Desk and Peoples' Council	. 27
Table 15. Highlights: IP and Womens' Representation	. 29
Table 16. CSO Participation Status and Level in LDC Activities (CSO Responses)	. 30
Table 17. CSO Participation Status and Level in LDC Activities (LGU Responses)	. 31
Table 18. Comparative Summary: CSO Participation Status and Level in LDC Activities by	,
Respondent Group	. 33
Table 19. LGUs with Constituted Executive and Functional/Sectoral Committees - SGLG	. 38
Table 20. CSO Participation Status and Level in Committees (CSO Responses)	. 39
Table 21. CSO Participation Status and Level in Committees (LGU Responses)	. 40
Table 22. CSO Participation Status and Level in Committees by Respondent Group	
Qualitative Response - Highlights	. 41
Table 23. CSO Participation in Committees, with Statistical Correlation Tests	. 43
Table 24. LGU Participation in Committees, with Statistical Correlation Tests	. 45
Table 25. LGU Adherence to LDC (Full Council) Meetings Requirement - SGLG	. 46
Table 26. Frequency of CSO Participation in LDC-related Activities	. 47
Table 27. Frequency of CSO Participation by LDC Functionality Rating	. 47
Table 28. Frequency of CSO Participation by Region	. 48
Table 29. Enablers of Participation by Respondent Group	. 54
Table 30. Hindrances to Participation, by Respondent Group	. 55
Table 31. LGU-identified Enablers to Deepen LDC-related Participatory Work	. 57
Table 32. PGM-LDC Statements: Ranked by Net Ratings	. 60
Table 33. Summary of PGM-LDC Variables Results	. 60
Table 34. Statement 1 (Accreditation Guidelines Satisfaction) Overall Results	. 64
Table 35. Statement 1 (Accreditation Guidelines Satisfaction) by LGU type	. 65
Table 36. Statement 2 (Clear Information on Ways of Participating) Overall Results	. 66
Table 37. Statement 2 (Clear Information on Ways of Participating) by LDC Functionality	
Rating	. 67
Table 38. Statement 2 (Clear Information on Ways of Participating) by LDC Functionality	
Rating by Respondent Type (CSOs)	. 67
Table 39. Statement 3 (Sufficient Communication) Overall Results	. 68
Table 40. Statement 3 (Sufficient Communication) by LGU Type	. 69
Table 41. Statement 4 (Transparency and Access to Information Protocols) Overall Results	s
	. 70
Table 42. Statement 4 (Transparency and Access to Information Protocols) by Responder	nt
Group	.71
Table 43. Statement 4 (Transparency and Access to Information Protocols) by LGU Type	. 71

Table 47. Statement 6 (Clear Mechanisms for Feedback Loops) by Respondent Group ..... 74 Table 48. Statement 6 (Clear Mechanisms for Feedback Loops) by LDC Functionality Rating Table 50. Statement 7 (Defined Opportunities to Raise Feedback, Petitions, Grievances) Table 51. Statement 7 (Defined Opportunities to Raise Feedback, Petitions, Grievances) by Table 52. Statement 7 (Defined Opportunities to Raise Feedback, Petitions, Grievances) by Table 69. Statement 13 (CSO Satisfaction) by LDC Functionality Rating - LGU Responses 89 Table 71. Statement 14 (LGU Satisfaction with Participatory Practices) – LGU Responses 90 Table 72. Statement 14 (LGU Satisfaction on Participatory Practices) by LDC Functionality Table 73. Summary of Enumerators' Feedback ...... 115

#### **List of Figures**

Figure 1. Local Development Council Functionality Passing Rates, 2017 to 2023	8
Figure 2. Participatory Governance Metrics Framework	13
Figure 3. PGM-LDC Statements: Summary of Overall Responses	59

#### Baseline Study on the State of Participation in Local Government Units: Participatory Governance Metrics for Local Development Councils

Czarina Medina-Guce, Lawrence G. Velasco, and Anne Marie T. Rey<sup>1</sup>

#### **1** Introduction

#### 1.1 Context and objectives

The Local Government Code of 1991, also known as Republic Act (RA) 7160 (henceforth the Code or LGC), mandates local government units (LGUs) to organize their respective Local Development Councils (LDCs) to formulate comprehensive multi-sectoral development plans, establish visions, set sectoral goals, define objectives, and craft development strategies and policies specific to their respective localities. The pivotal role of the LDCs is emphasized in actively engaging civil society organizations (CSOs) in the decision-making processes. These councils are expected to provide policy development and monitoring roles crucial for the LDCs enables their influence in local government decisions. However, the implementation and oversight of the LDCs for many years since the Code's implementation have not sufficiently addressed the variables of role clarity and citizen capacity to make the LDC-as-platform reach the outcomes desired (Medina-Guce and Galindes 2017).

Recognizing the need for accountability, the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) initiated monitoring LDC functionality through the Seal of Good Local Governance (SGLG) in 2017. The SGLG's assessment follows the Code's provisions for convening the LDCs, with indicators regarding composition, meetings, plan and investment programs, sectoral/functional committees, secretariat support, and an executive committee. However, the question persists regarding the quality and substantive practice of participation in the LDCs. To address this, the DILG developed the Participatory Governance Metrics (PGM) and its customized tool for the LDCs. The PGM, as a diagnostic tool, reflects three dimensions of participatory governance (PG): (a) space (the environment of participation), (b) engagement (the process of participation), and (c) outcomes (the results of participation) (Medina-Guce 2020a, 2023a).

Using the PGM-LDC tool, *this study provides a baseline assessment of the state of participation in local governments*. The project aims to comprehensively analyze the quality of participation exhibited by CSOs in LDCs, with feedback from the LDC's LGU functionaries and CSO members. The study seeks to contribute to policy formulation to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of CSO participation in LDCs.

#### **1.2 Intended users of the study**

The study is relevant to policymakers and implementing agencies through the following:

• The study helps advance the Philippine Development Plan (PDP) 2023-2028 goal to "Practice Good Governance and Improve Bureaucratic Efficiency (Chapter 14)". The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Czarina Medina-Guce, PhD, Department of Development Studies, Ateneo de Manila University; Project Technical Expert, Philippine Institute of Development Studies (Email: <u>mmedina@ateneo.edu</u>); Lawrence G. Velasco, CPA, PhD Cand., Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore; Anne Marie T. Rey, MA Cand., Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore.

The study team is grateful to Ricxie Maddawin and Jake Calubayan of the Philippine Institute of Development Studies for their assistance, as well as PrimaVisio for undertaking the survey deployment.

PDP identifies the mainstreamed implementation of the PGM for assessing and deepening the quality of participation in Local Special Bodies (including the LDC) and national programs (PDP 2023:341).

- Results of the study contribute to the fulfillment of the Philippine Government's commitments to the global Open Government Partnership (OGP). Under the PH-OGP National Action Plan 2023-2027, DILG's program, "Driving Responsive and Innovative Participation of Vulnerable Sectors towards Empowerment in Local Governance" identified the scaled implementation of the PGM to assess the quality of participation in LDCs and facilitate the closing of feedback loops. The DILG's program is the Philippines' commitment to safeguarding civic space and strengthening social accountability (Commitment 6).
- The assessment of the LDCs contributes to policy development of the Council of Good Local Governance (created by the SGLG Law) for its continuing review of the SGLG's technical indicators. LDC functionality is an indicator under the "Social Protection" governance area of the SGLG.
- The study's results also provide insight to the DILG's operationalization of its Strategic Plan 2023-2028, which includes upholding excellence in local governance by sustaining accountable, transparent, and people-centric local governments (DILG 2023:9).

#### 2 Literature Review

This literature review focuses on the policy issues that shaped the development of the PGM-LDC tool and the goals to which it intends to contribute. The review is organized in three parts: the LDCs' functions and current assessment, the CSO participation issues in the LDCs, and the PGM framework and LDC tool.

#### 2.1 Local Development Council (LDC) functions and functionality assessments

The LDC is one of the Local Special Bodies (LSBs) mandated by the Code (Title Six Sections 106 to 115) to be organized in every LGU. The LDC assumes the most significant role among the special bodies as it is tasked to initiate (and assist the Sanggunian on) economic and social development direction-setting and coordinate development efforts within its territorial jurisdiction (Section 106). It formulates, monitors, and evaluates all long-term, medium-term, and annual development plans and policies (Section 109). The importance of the LDC is further emphasized in its representative composition (Section 107), with the Local Chief Executive (LCE) as chairperson and seats for representatives of the LGU's component units, Sanggunian, and nongovernment organizations. The CSO members must constitute at least 25% of the full council. (Note that in this report, "CSO" is used to encompass the various nongovernmental organizations that are defined by policies as possible LDC and LSB members, e.g., nongovernment organizations, people's organizations, cooperatives, private sector associations, et al.)

The LGC's provisions on organizing the LDCs sets the parameters of the current functionality framework, which is codified in the SGLG assessment in six indicators: (a) composition, (b) frequency of meetings, (c) formulation of plan and investment programs, (d) creation of sectoral/functional committees, (e) secretariat support, and (f) creation of an executive committee. While the six indicators have been constant through the years in the SGLG's design,

some changes were introduced at the sub-indicator level across iterations.<sup>2</sup> Meanwhile, since the SGLG 2022 design, the LDC functionality indicators included the constitution of the Local Project Monitoring Committee and the satisfactory participation of the CSOs. The increases in the number and scope of indicators reflect the "progressive nature" of the SGLG (DILG MC 2023-086) and the performance challenge driving its recognition and incentive system (Medina-Guce and Sanders 2024). Acknowledging such increases in the indicators, the SGLG results show a downward trend in the LDC functionality overall passing rate from 2017 to 2023 but remained above 50% of all LGUs throughout the years (**Figure 1**).



Figure 1. Local Development Council Functionality Passing Rates, 2017 to 2023

In addition to the SGLG's LDC Functionality assessment, DILG also profiles the LGUs into subcategories (or ratings) of high, medium, and low functionality based solely on the Code's provisions in organizing the LDCs (without the performance challenge 'progressive' indicators). **Table 1** summarizes the description of the levels (scaling rubric), while **Table 2** elaborates on the scaling rubric for each indicator. With this rating scale, results for high functionality showed improvement across LGUs (overall, per LGU type, per indicator) from 2022 to 2023 (**Table 3**).

References: Medina-Guce 2023b, DILG-BLGS 2024a Note: SGLG assessment was not conducted in 2020 and 2021 due to the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For example, the SGLG 2017 assessment required the approval of either the Local Development Investment Program (LDIP) or the Annual Investment Program (AIP), while the 2018 assessment and the years thereafter required both.

Rating	Indicator Description			
High	High rating for (a) composition, (b) meetings, (c) plan and investment programs, (d)			
	Sectoral/Functional Committees; and passed the parameter for (e) secretariat			
	support, and (f) executive committee.			
Medium	At least one medium rating for (a) composition, (b) meetings, (c) plan and investme			
	programs, (d) Sectoral/Functional Committees; and passed the parameter for (e)			
	secretariat support, and (f) executive committee.			
Low	Has a low rating in any of items (a) to (d); and/or failed in items (e) or (f).			

#### Table 1. DILG's LDC Functionality Rating (Scaling Rubric)

Reference: DILG-BLGS 2024b (highlights added)

Parameters*	High	Medium	Low
(a) Composition	Meets minimum	Meets minimum criteria for all	Meets minimum
**	criteria for all other	other members except NGO	criteria for all
	members, except	representatives constitute exactly	other members
	NGO representatives	¼ of the council members	except NGO
	constitute more than	(Section 107)	representation
	¼ of the council		which is less than
	members		¼ of the council
			membership
(b) Meetings	LDC met at least once	Met in only one (1) semester	No meeting
	every six months		
	(Section 110)		
(c) Plan and	Formulated the CDP,	Formulated the Long-term,	No plan/
Investment	LDIP, and AIP	medium-term, and annual socio-	investment
Programs		economic development plans and	program
		policies, and Medium-term and	formulated
		annual public investment	
		programs; Minimum of at least	
		one socio-economic plan or	
		investment program (CDP, LDIP,	
		or AIP) (Section 109)	
(d) Sectoral/	Created more than	Created more than one sectoral	No sectoral or
Functional	one sectoral or	or functional committee	functional
Committees***	functional committee		committee
	(including the PMC)		
	Pass		Fail
(e) Secretariat	LDC is supported by a S	Secretariat that provides technical	Did not meet the
Support	assistance, documenta	LGC minimum	
	preparation of reports.	(Section 113)	
(f) Executive	Created an Executive C	ommittee to represent and act on	Did not meet the
Committee	behalf of the council w	hen it is not in session (Section	LGC minimum
	111)		

#### Table 2. DILG's LDC Functionality Rating: Indicator Parameters

Reference: DILG-BLGS 2024b (annotated). CDP = Comprehensive Development Plan, LDIP = Local Development Investment Program, AIP = Annual Investment Program, PMC = Project Monitoring Committee.

[\*] The blue-shaded cells indicate the standard indicated in the LGC. [\*\*] The minimum criteria for the LDC composition: All mayors of component cities and municipalities (for provinces) and all punong barangays (cities and municipalities); Chairman, Sanggunian's committee on appropriations; Congressman or his representative; and NGO representatives constituting at least 25% of the council members. [\*\*\*] LGC Section 112 indicates that LGUs "may form" committees.

Indicators/Parameters	2022 Assessment			2023 Assessment		
	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low
LDC Functionality (6 indicators)	38	12	50	51	27	22
Per LGU Type						
Provinces	42	28	30	44	21	35
Cities	46	8	47	62	25	12
<ul> <li>Municipalities</li> </ul>	37	11	52	50	27	23
Per Indicator						
(a) Composition	66	1	33	73	14	13
(b) Meetings	80	10	10	85	11	4
(c) Plans	72	20	8	74	20	7
(d) Sectoral/Functional Committees	86	2	13	89	1	10
(e) Secretariat Support	75		25	95		5
(f) Executive Committee	92		8	95		5

Table 3. LDC Functionality Rating National Results, 2022 and 2023 (	in Percentages)
---	-----------------

Reference: DILG-BLGS 2023, 2024b

The LDC functionality and ratings show that the current assessments are limited to operational indicators. As such, the LDC functionality assessments insufficiently account for the quality of participation in such activities and mechanisms. For example, a review of LDC functional effectiveness issues (Medina-Guce 2023b) shows that while LGUs may have high percentages in constituting the sectoral and functional committees (as shown in *Table 3*), these may only be for compliance with the SGLG assessment but not necessarily for broadening the planning and participatory mechanisms of the LDC. The review included feedback from CSO participants from some study sites about having been assigned to committees but never being called to meetings within the year of the committees' constitution. Moreover, while the current SGLG indicators include "satisfactory participation of CSOs," this is operationalized through the subindicators: (a) attendance to meetings held at least once in a semester for the assessment year, and (b) inputs from the CSO or actual representation of CSO representative as captured in the minutes of the meetings or any LGU official document, or at least one CSO Plan of Action submitted in the assessment year. The sub-indicators are consistent with the means of verification of the SGLG data-gathering and document submission protocols. However, they remain inadequate in capturing 'substantive' participation compared to stakeholders' expectations (Medina-Guce 2023b).

#### 2.2 Participation of civil society organizations in LDCs

The 'quality' and 'substantiveness' of participation in LDCs have been articulated gradually through the years, emerging from various contributory events and advocacy influences on DILG, concerned NGAs (such as DBM and the PH-OGP), and the CSO networks and reform constituencies. In the administrative and government-civil society engagement analyses during the earlier years of the Code's implementation, much attention has been given to issues of complying with the LDC composition requirement, the LDC's 'functionality' or inactiveness, and 'interventions' and inadequacies of government actors that prevent meaningful participation in the LDCs (CODE NGO 1999, 2016, 2017; Malay 2001; Brillantes 2003; Villarin 2004; Capuno 2005; Capuno and Garcia 2010; Nishimura 2018).

Since the SGLG began assessing LDC functionality in 2017, results showed that LGUs have consistently fared high in meeting (even surpassing) the 25% nongovernment composition requirement. Analysis of the SGLG data shows that the average CSO percentage in LDCs was

29% in 2017, 31% in 2018, and 33% in 2019 (Medina-Guce 2020b). Referring to *Table 3* and the parameters of the composition indicator, 67% of all LGUs met and surpassed the requirement in 2022, increasing to 87% of all LGUs in 2023. Therefore, the data suggests that participation issues in the LDC go beyond what the Code requires for the LDC's composition.

The Code, however, points to higher inclusion, representation, and citizen-influence policy goals for the LDCs in its other provisions. LGC Section 108 indicates that "the nongovernmental organizations *shall choose from among themselves* their representatives [to the LDCs; emphasis added]." While the Sanggunian accredits the organizations (also from LGC Section 108), the legitimacy of civil society representation is a mandate that the LGC assigns to the people themselves. Moreover, LGC Section 37 requires that the Local Prequalification, Bids, and Awards Committees (more commonly referred to as BACs) must be constituted with representatives of CSOs sitting in the LDC. These LGC provisions reinforce democratic principles and practices, intending LDCs to be local participatory governance policy instruments, as are the other special bodies (Medina-Guce 2023b).

In an earlier analysis of the policy goal accumulation of the LDCs, the participatory governance policy goal drifted from the implementation of the LGC as may be inferred from the absence of complementary issuances aside from DILG's order for LGUs to reconstitute their LSBs following every local election (Medina-Guce 2023b). Despite documented success stories such as Naga City and Marikina City (Ishii et al. 2007), studies pointed to the general failure of the LSBs to uphold their representative functions attributed to the clientelist local politics with politicians refusing to yield their discretionary powers to these participatory bodies (Manasan et al. 1999, Yilmaz and Venugopal 2013). The neglect of the participatory goals can also be inferred from the lack of LSB-related indicators in the first years of the SGLG design (2014 to 2016) as it laid out the technical articulation of local government performance, seemingly signaling that the functionality of the LSBs is outside of the core criterion in what makes an LGU well-performing (Medina-Guce and Galindes 2017). The LDC was passively dismantled by neglect when the Aquino administration reinforced participation through the Bottom-up Budgeting (BUB) program as the narrow focus on BUB and its ad hoc participatory planning mechanism (the Local Poverty Reduction Action Teams) took away potential attention from the Codal institutions (Saguin and Medina-Guce 2024). Nonetheless, BUB's political prioritization and successful enhancement of civil society social capital (Manasan 2016) created a significant reform constituency that, upon the Duterte administration's dismantling of the BUB in 2016, lacked the platforms to continue demanding local participation and accountability. This reform momentum rekindled the attention to the LSBs, particularly the LDCs, as the institutional 'home' of local participatory governance (Medina-Guce 2023b).

The policy goal of participatory governance became more pronounced when the LDC functionality indicator was moved to the "Social Protection" criteria (from the previous "Financial Administration" assignment) in the SGLG Act of 2019. As a performance criterion, social protection refers to "LGUs' sensitivity and responsiveness to the needs of its constituents" (SGLG Act Section 7-c), and the CSO representation and the functionality of the Codal local special bodies under this assessment criterion signal the instrumentality of the LDCs for inclusion and participation. Several participatory governance policies and initiatives complement these technical design shifts. Developed in 2020 through DILG's partnership with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the PGM is a diagnostic assessment framework of the quality of participation in the LDCs and is slated for scaled implementation to support the good governance goals of the PDP 2023-2028. In 2021, DILG directed LGUs to create CSO Desks and Peoples' Councils as continuing mechanisms to engage locally

accredited CSOs. In the same year, DILG started its capacity development support for the CSO members of the LDCs. Among these most recent efforts to improve participation, it is the PGM initiative that sought to articulate what 'quality' and 'substantive' participation means for the LDCs. (Medina-Guce 2023b)

The same strategic review found that functionality and participation issues recurring in the LDCs can be traced to the over-emphasis of assessments and practices at the 'full council' level. This means that the subcommittees (Sectoral and Functional Committees) and complementary mechanisms (CSO Desks and People's Councils) are underutilized for their potential contributions to meeting the LDC's goals. This heavy concentration at the full council level contributes to several interconnected issues: (a) limited time for effective discussions, (b) difficulties in convening and managing quorum and attendance, (c) overburdening of the full council's agenda and scope, extending to representative duties of the CSOs, (d) overloading of the secretariat's (usually the Local Planning and Development Office) technical, convening, and other support work for the LDC on top of its organic functions, and (e) insufficient participatory quality. The review recommended de-loading the functions and operations of the full council and activating the subcommittees and complementary mechanisms toward LDC functional effectiveness (Medina-Guce 2023b). The PGM-LDC tool reflects such attention to the subcommittees and complementary mechanisms.

#### 2.3 Participatory Governance Metrics (PGM)

The previous section located the PGM development within the emergence narrative of participatory quality in the LDC policy discourse. This section briefly overviews the PGM's specific purposes and development process.

#### 2.3.1 PGM Framework and Tool Development

The PGM framework was developed as part of the UNDP-DILG 2019-2020 partnership<sup>3</sup> supporting the Duterte administration's Participatory Governance Cabinet Cluster (PGC), which DILG and DBM then co-chaired. Among the cabinet cluster's target milestones were to ensure resources to support national and local participation and enforce compliance with existing laws related to participation (PGC Resolution No. 1, 2019). Following an issue stocktaking study (Medina-Guce 2020c), the need for a participatory governance framework became apparent to articulate the challenges and gaps that required policy and resource support (PGC Resolution No. 1, 2020). The PGM framework was developed and presented to the PGC in 2020, endorsed to the PH-OGP Steering Committee for initial implementation, and adopted by the PH-OGP Steering Committee for the Philippine National Action Plan in 2021 (PH-OGP Steering Committee Resolution No. 1, 2021).

The technical development of the PGM framework is documented in the reports following each milestone from 2020 (See Medina-Guce 2020a, 2022a, 2022b, 2022c, 2023a). This discussion provides the highlights of such reports for an overview of the PGM framework and its subsequent customization for the LDC tool used in this study.

There is no easily adaptable international framework that assesses the quality and substantiveness of participation, but multiple normative and operational assessments approximate various dimensions of PG. Participation discourses respond to gaps in interest

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> UNDP-DILG "Paving the Road to SDGs through Good Local Governance" project, March 2019 to March 2020

articulation, intermediation and representation, and decision-making in democratic political systems, and problematize the increase of substantive influence of citizens on governance decisions that they deem important (Alagappa 2004, Gaventa 2007, Schmalz-Bruns 2018):

Participatory governance "reflects a growing recognition that citizen participation needs to be based on more elaborate and diverse principles, institutions, and methods. Essential are a more equal distribution of political power, a fairer distribution of resources, the decentralization of decision-making processes, the development of a wide and transparent exchange of knowledge and information, the establishment of collaborative partnerships, an emphasis on inter-institutional dialogue, and greater accountability. All these measures seek to create relationships based as much or more on trust and reciprocity than advocacy, strategic behavior, and deceit. Participatory governance involves as well the provision of means to engage individuals and organizations outside government through political networks and institutional arrangements that facilitate supportive collaborative-based discursive relationships among public and private sectors." (Fischer 2012, p. 482-483, highlights added)

As PG presents a normative policy goal, the question becomes, how do we know if PG is being exercised beyond monitoring activities and outputs (i.e., absence/presence of representatives or prescribed consultative events)? To address this theory-based inquiry, the PGM was developed through mining insights from 18 theoretical and evaluative frameworks for assessing the extent to which the 'quality' or 'substantiveness,' considering both theoretical and practical concerns (**Figure 2**). The PGM frames the quality of PG in three dimensions: *space, engagement, and participation* (**Table 4**). These dimensions are further unpacked into 15 variables, each representing a spectrum of positive/preferred and negative/unpreferred scenarios (See Medina-Guce 2020a, 2020b for the framework-building process).



Figure 2. Participatory Governance Metrics Framework

Reference: Medina-Guce 2020a

Dimension	Description
Space: The	The space or environment of participation pertains to the policy and
participatory	institutional setting, which prescriptively should have sufficient mandate and
environment	capacity to conduct participatory governance with all principles of citizen
	participation and deepening democratic engagements. The setting, therefore,
	should encompass the inputs to launch processes of participation.
Engagement:	The engagement or the process itself of participation sets indicators for the
Participation	quality of interactions between government and citizens/citizen groups,
processes	regardless of the role or function of the citizens in the program in focus.
Results:	The outcomes or results of participation are the emergences changing the
The outcomes	relations between government and citizens and governance itself,
of participation	approximating the principles of participatory governance. Citizen participation
	and participatory governance ultimately target changes in institutions and
	power relations with improved trust and reciprocity between government and
	citizens.

#### Table 4. PGM Framework: Assessment Dimensions

Reference: Medina-Guce 2020a, 2020b

To develop the necessary research instruments, the PGM requires the *customization of the variables* into measurable indicators reflecting the assumptions and scenarios of participation. Learnings from the PGM tool development highlight that the customization process should be deliberative and participatory to ensure that the selection of relevant variables and identification of appropriate indicators reflect the nexus of realistic parameters (i.e., the scope of control or influence of the focus program/platform vis-à-vis higher-level outcomes of governance) and the enablers of PG's goals. In other words, variable customization balances the normative (what is preferred) and the pragmatic (what is within reasonable parameters of experience).

Furthermore, the PGM's 15 variables may *not be equally and simultaneously relevant or applicable to all* participatory settings due to variations in the programs' nature and the projected roles and functions of participating citizens or nongovernment organizations. For instance, diagnosing the participatory quality of platforms such as councils and town halls needs critical nuancing of assumptions when comparing quality participation in service delivery-oriented programs. The inclusion variable should be relevant to both types, but *operationalizing (measuring) inclusion* would entail different sets of indicators. Moreover, the PGM framework focuses on the *government side* of the participatory setting, i.e., elements that are directly actionable by government policy and processes. Hence, the resulting analysis intentionally targets government actors' sensemaking and action toward improving the quality of its participatory practices. These nuances are consistent with literature that differentiates PG from larger citizen participation discourses. The latter entails a broader view of the citizen side of participation, including capabilities and capacities to engage. Therefore, a clear, intentional implication is that the PGM is not designed to diagnose the PG capacity of citizens and CSOs.

From 2021 to 2022, the PGM framework was translated into four customized tools, for the Freedom of Information Strategic Partnerships at the national level, and three LSBs<sup>4</sup> for local implementation (Medina-Guce 2022a, 2022b). For the PGM-LDC tool, DILG, with continuing UNDP support, partnered with CODE-NGO as the primary technical working group counterpart to unpack the variables, identify appropriate statements to express the variable constructs (intended meanings), and design the survey instrument. The PGM tools for LSBs

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> LDCs, Local Health Boards (LHBs), and Local School Boards (LScBs)

underwent a series of reviews and vetting with local CSOs and DILG representatives in late 2021 and were piloted in Region 7 in 2022 (Medina-Guce 2022c). Feedback and lessons from the pilot implementation informed the updated tools for the LDCs, which were vetted in another rounds of consultations with local CSOs and LGU representatives from Regions 7, 8, and CARAGA from May to June 2023. These multiple rounds of vetting, pilots, and consultations were implemented to reach optimal construct validity in framing the PGM-LDC statements and the categorical options' expressed scenarios (i.e., what situations correspond to strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree). In other words, the years of vetting and tests were intended for the respondents to understand the statements and response options at level-best alignment.

The PGM evaluation process, therefore, follows a *theory-based evaluation approach*, wherein the resulting customized variables and indicators are stakeholders' articulations of theories of change or the shared understanding of the best possible set (not an idealized 'wish list') of enablers and scenarios of participating in the government program or platform. The approach echoes a futures analytical orientation while maintaining a practical, implementable method for the government agency and its non-government partners. Such an analytical approach implies that the PGM follows *integrative mixed-methods principles* for its tool customization design and data analysis. The 'qualitative' assumptions and scenarios are structured within a 'quantitative' tool which could be deployed and processed as a survey. As such, the PGM tools, in their current form, do not yield a singular 'index' that ranks the government programs/platforms it measures but delves deep into the question of whether or to what extent the program/platform delivers on its own assumptions and theorized results of participation.

#### 2.3.2 PGM-LDC Tool: Overview and Features

Through the customization and piloting process described in the previous section, the PGM-LDC tool was created with 11 of the 15 PGM framework variables prioritized and operationalized into statements (**Table 5**). There are two versions of the PGM-LDC tool, *one for the CSO members and another for the LGU functionaries* (offices directly engaged in the key functions and management of the LDC operations). Regarding the customized statements, the two PGM-LDC versions are alike in all but one (variable 3-4 on citizen satisfaction). As shown in *Table 5*, the PGM-LDC tool for LGU functionaries asks about satisfaction both on their view of the CSOs' satisfaction in participating in the LDC, and their own satisfaction with their LDC practices. CSOs and DILG regional and field offices consulted emphasized that *both sectors must respond in every LDC* to signal fairness and manage political relationships in the feedback gathering.

PGM Variables for LDCs		PGM-LDC Tool (Statement in research instruments)	
		Space	
1-2	Rationalized	Statement 1: The CSO accreditation and LDC membership selection	
	Inclusion Criteria	satisfy the requirements of the national guidelines.	
1-3	Clear Engagement	Statement 2: LDC-CSO members are clearly informed about the	
	Strategy	different ways of participating in the LDC, including its committees	
		and other consultative activities	
		Statement 3: The LGU sufficiently communicates the different ways	
		of participating in the LDC, including its committees and other	
		consultative activities, to all interested CSOs.	

Table 5. PGM for LDCs: Summar	y of Customized Tool
-------------------------------	----------------------

PGM Variables for LDCs		PGM-LDC Tool (Statement in research instruments)		
1-4	Transparency and Access to Information Protocols	<i>Statement 4:</i> The LDC has clear protocols for CSO members to access data and information relevant to their participation.		
1-5	Organizational Capacity	Statement 5: CSO participation in the LDC (including its committees and other consultative activities) is sufficiently supported by LGU resources, e.g., funding, facilities, technologies, and human resources.		
1-6	Functional Mechanisms for	<i>Statement 6:</i> The LDC has clear mechanisms to inform CSO members on the status of their issues raised and suggestions provided.		
	Communication, Feedback, Petition, and Redress of Grievances	<i>Statement 7:</i> There are defined opportunities for the LDC-CSO members to formally raise their own agenda, feedback, and grievances, e.g., in the Monitoring Reporting Committee meetings.		
		Engagement		
2-1	Inclusion and Representation	Statement 8: The LDC processes (in the council, committees, and other consultative activities) are effectively inclusive of different civil society sectors and agendas		
2-2	Autonomy and Fairness	<i>Statement 9:</i> LDC CSO members are enabled to exercise autonomy and fairness in the sharing of power vis-à-vis the government counterparts.		
2-3	Transparency of Engagement	<i>Statement 10:</i> The LDC processes efficiently provide information to its CSO members, including the CSO directory, meeting agenda and minutes, drafts of policies, plans, and reports, among other relevant documents.		
		Outcomes		
3-1	Influence on Program /Platform Decisions	<i>Statement 11:</i> CSO members clearly influence the LDC's agenda, plans, and policies.		
3-3	Program Results	<i>Statement 12:</i> CSO participation in the LDC, including its committees and other consultative activities, enable more effective local plans, policies, and services.		
3-4	Citizen Satisfaction	[CSO Tool] Statement 13: As CSO members, we are satisfied with our participation in the LDC.		
		[LGU Functionaries Tool] Statement 13: To the best of my knowledge, the LDC CSO members are satisfied with their participation in the LDC. Statement 14: In my capacity under my LGU office, I am satisfied with our LDC's participatory practices.		

Reference: Medina-Guce 2022, 2023a

The PGM-LDC tools (CSO and LGU versions) unpack each variable statement with an explanation, Filipino translation, rubrics, and the spiel/talking points provided in the enumerators' guide, which enumerators use for the *facilitated survey approach*. Respondents rank their level of agreement per indicator statement on a scale of 1 to 4 (corresponding to Strongly disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree). The neutral response is removed deliberately to remove the possibility of an overall neutral result for any of the indicators. In lieu of a neutral rating, options for Unsure/Not Know and Refuse to Answer are provided to clarify the intentions of the responses (Medina-Guce 2023a). This PIDS baselining study adopts the design and deployment principles of the PGM-LDC tool.

#### 3 Methodology

Following the PGM-LDC tool's intended mixed-methods design, this PIDS baselining study used PGM-LDC survey instruments for CSOs and LGU functionaries, which a third-party service provider deployed as facilitated survey sessions.

The following subsections present an overview of the sites and respondents, the mixed methods data processing and analysis, and the scope and limitations. For this main report's brevity, technical details on the stratified sampling for LGU sites, survey pre-deployment activities, and data cleaning are presented in **Annex A** (Methodological Notes). Also, some data tables are no longer included in the discussion for brevity but may be found in **Annex B** (Quantitative **Analysis**) sections as appropriately indicated.

#### 3.1 Overview of sites and respondents

The survey covered 168 LGUs. The sampling used the following strata for site selection: main island group (Luzon, Visayas, Mindanao), LGU type (province, city, municipality), and LDC functionality rating (high, low) (See **Annex A1**). For each LGU, the third-party survey firm conducted separate sessions for CSO members and LGU functionaries. The survey sessions intended to have three respondents per group, coordinated by DILG's Support for Local Governance Program (SLGP) Project Management Office (PMO) central and regional teams and the DILG field offices. CSO respondents were selected from the accredited members of the LDC, with preference for CSOs in the LDC Executive Committee or chairing/co-chairing any of the sectoral and functional committees. LGU respondents were designated representatives of the LGU functionaries directly involved in LDC activities. The third-party firm conducted the facilitated survey sessions from November to December 2024.

After respondent verification and additional data cleaning by the technical team (Annex A3), the survey dataset comprised responses answers from 992 respondents: 495 (49.9%) LGU functionaries and 497 (50.1%) CSOs. This nearly equal distribution ensures a balanced perspective between LGU and CSO stakeholders. The majority of respondents are from municipalities, comprising more than 60% of the total sample. Cities and provinces are also well-represented, providing a comprehensive overview of perspectives across different LGU levels (Table 6).

LGU Type	Respondent Type				
	CSO	LGU	Total		
City	105	104	209		
	50.2	49.8	100		
Municipality	305	304	609		
	50.1	49.9	100		
Province	87	87	174		
	50.0	50.0	100		
Total	497	495	992		
	50.1	49.9	100		

Table 6. Summary of Respondents (CSO/LGU) by LGU Type

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages. See Annex B1.1

Regarding the *LDC functionality rating stratum*, 423 (43%) respondents are from low-functionality LDCs, while 569 (58%) are from high-functionality LDCs as per DILG's 2023 rating<sup>5</sup> (Annex B1.3).

While regional location was not included in the stratified sampling, each of the 16 *regions* has approximately equal representation of LGU and CSO respondents, with the total respondents ranging from 12 in Region 4B (1.2%) to as high as 107 in Region 4A (10.8%). Most represented in the sample are Region 4A (107, 10.8%), Region 1 (96, 9.7%) and Region 6 (96, 9.7%). On the other hand, MIMAROPA (12, 1.2%), Region 13 CARAGA (24, 2.4%), and National Capital Region (NCR) (35, 3.5%) have the lowest representation in the sample overall. Despite the variation in respondent numbers across regions, the survey captures perspectives from all major areas of the country, ensuring geographic representativeness in the analysis (Annex B1.2).

The CSO respondents comprise a wide range of sectors, with the top three categories: farmers and landless rural workers (17.5%), NGOs (16.9%), and women (13.3%) (Table 7). In terms of time involved with LDCs, 240 CSOs (48.3%) began engaging in the 2010s, reflecting the resurgence of PG initiatives from BUB to the LSB pivots discussed in Section 2.2. Meanwhile, 183 CSOs (36.8%) began engaging from 2020 onwards. (Table 8). CSOs who are 'new' to the LDCs, accredited during the most recent LSB reconstitution in 2022, are 131 CSOs (26.4%).

Sectors	No.	Percent
Academe/Learning Resource Institutes	9	1.8
Artisanal Fisherfolk	18	3.6
Children	9	1.8
Cooperatives	57	11.5
Faith-based organizations	36	7.2
Farmers and Landless Rural Workers	87	17.5
Formal Labor and Migrant Workers	4	0.8
Indigenous People	9	1.8
LGBTQIA+	4	0.8
Non-Government Organizations	84	16.9
Others	37	7.4
Persons with Disabilities	15	3.0
Senior Citizens	21	4.2
Urban Poor	13	2.6
Victims of Disasters and Calamities	6	1.2
Women	66	13.3
Workers in the Informal Sector	11	2.2
Youth and Students	11	2.2
Total	497	100

	Table 7.	CSO	Respondents	by	y Sector
--	----------	-----	-------------	----	----------

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> As of data processing and writing, the LDC functionality rating based on SGLG 2024 results is not yet available.

Year Start	No.	Percent
Total	497	100
1992 to 1999	15	3.0
2000 to 2009	37	7.4
2010 to 2019	240	48.3
2020 to 2024	183	36.8
Invalid, Unsure	22	4.4
Since 2022 LSB Reconstitution	131	26.4

Table 8. CSO Respondents by Year Start of LDC Engagement

LGU respondents are from functionaries (offices) directly engaged in LDC functions and activities. Among the 495 LGU respondents, 195 (39.4%) are from Planning and Development Offices, 126 (25.5%) are from Sanggunian, and 83 (16.8%) are from CSO Desks (Table 9). The majority (76%) have been engaged in the LDCs for the last 10 years (Table 10).

Office	No.	Percent
Accounting	4	0.8
Administrative	4	0.8
Agriculture	7	1.4
Budget	13	2.6
Business Permit and Licensing	1	0.2
Civil Registrar	1	0.2
Cooperative Development	2	0.4
CSO Desk	83	16.8
DILG Field Office	3	0.6
Disaster Risk Reduction and Management	6	1.2
Economic Development and Investment Promotions	1	0.2
Engineering	9	1.8
Environment and Natural Resources	4	0.8
Human Resource and Management	2	0.4
Local Chief Executive (Governor/Mayor/Brgy Captain)	9	1.8
Local Leagues	1	0.2
Legal	3	0.6
Planning and Development	195	39.4
Population and GAD	1	0.2
Public Employment Service	1	0.2
Purok System	1	0.2
Sanggunian	126	25.5
Social Welfare and Development	12	2.4
Treasury	2	0.4
Youth Development	2	0.4
Unspecified	2	0.4
Total	495	100.0

Table 9. LGU Respondents by Office Represented

	No.	Percent
1 year or less	104	21.0
>1 to 10 years	272	54.9
>10 to 20 years	68	13.7
>20 to 30 years	40	8.1
>30 to 36 years	11	2.2
Total	495	100

 Table 10. LGU Respondents by No. of Years Engaged in LDCs

#### 3.2 Data processing and analysis

The study team used an integrative mixed-methods processing approach. The study design initially intended for a sequential explanatory approach. However, since the qualitative elaborations were *optional* for participants, the resulting dataset featured an uneven number of responses across data points. As such, the study team found it limiting to analyze only the qualitative explanations of modal results. Hence, the team processed the quantitative and qualitative data separately, of which findings are integrated in this report.

For the *quantitative analysis*, appropriate statistical analyses were conducted, e.g., tests of independence and exploratory regression (correlations) among profile data and PGM variables. The complete quantitative analysis is presented in **Annex B**.

The *qualitative analysis* followed a hybrid coding approach (deductive with a priori codes relevant to the variable, and inductive in adding new codes as emergent from the responses) for the thematic analysis. The complete qualitative analysis is presented in **Annex C**.

#### 3.3 Scope and limitations

Based on the final survey design, eighteen clusters were created based on island group, LGU type and LGU functionality. While the third-party survey firm adhered to the selection protocols provided by PIDS, extreme weather conditions in December 2024 and timeline considerations prevented deployment in two provinces to complete the intended sites.

Given these adjustments, the number of LDCs sampled per cluster ranged from 26 LDCs (Luzon-Municipalities-High) to 1 LDC (Mindanao-City-Low). Since one of the strata has only one sampling unit, it is not possible to calculate weighted test statistics (See **Annex A1**). Nonetheless, the quantitative analyses employed appropriate significance tests in variable interactions analysis to address the non-weighted tests. ..

Furthermore, upon further data cleaning, the study team found three qualitative responses directly indicating that the respondents were *not* members of the LDC (all from LGU respondents), which were removed from the dataset used for the analysis. (See Annex A3)

#### 4 Findings

This section is divided into three parts:

- Section 4A discusses the findings regarding *LDC mechanisms and practices*, which informs a context understanding of the LDC participation quality.
- Section 4B presents the *findings for each statement in the PGM LDC tool*. Each statement discussion briefly outlines the implications of the findings to DILG's ongoing policy and capacity development initiatives.
- Section 4C discusses *additional analytical explorations,* informed by the technical logics/theory-based design of the PGM-LDC tool variables.

The discussions feature *minimal data tables to manage the length* of this main report. Statistically significant findings are also elaborated, while non-significant results are alluded to at a lesser length. Readers are encouraged to refer to the relevant sections in **Annex B** (quantitative) and **Annex C** (qualitative)—with specific subsections annotated in the narratives—for a more detailed results presentation for the corresponding discussions.

#### 4A. LDC Mechanisms and Practices

Aside from the profile details earlier presented, the first section of the PGM-LDC tool includes questions to help understand the context of PG in LDCs. Identified during the customization process, the questions concern LDC mechanisms and practices of which logics have informed the policy logics of relevant DILG issuances through the years (see Medina-Guce 2023a for LDC functional effectiveness).

#### 4A.1 CSOs' awareness of the LDC CSO composition

CSO composition is widely considered in literature as the requisite indicator for the LDCs' PG quality (Section 2.2) whether there are *enough* CSOs accredited as LDC members, which the Code sets at a minimum 25%, with the DILG 2022 MC for reconstitution encouraging 50%. To note, DILG has official data on the CSO percentage in LDCs as part of the LDC functionality ratings. In 2023, 73% of total LGUs have LDCs with >25% CSOs (high rating), 14% meet exactly the 25% Codal requirement (medium rating), and 13% have less than 25% CSOs (low rating) (DILG-BLGS 2024b, see **Table 2** under Section 2.1).

Nonetheless, including the question on CSO composition is relevant for PGM since DILG's LSB reconstitution MC prescribes a series of activities to develop a local CSO network (discussed in the next section). These networking-related prescriptions are built on the assumption of *social capital* as an enabler of better-quality participation, learning from the lessons of the defunct BUB program (Manasan 2016). One way of sensing the local CSO network is to check if CSO members are at least aware of their LDC's CSO composition. (Other indicators are in the following sections).

While most CSO respondents reported that their LDCs meet and exceed the 25% CSO proportion threshold, *statistically significant findings show that 17% of CSOs were uninformed/unsure about the CSO composition of their LDCs* (Table 11, also Annex B2). Moreover, CSOs from low-functionality LDCs (19%) are more unsure/uninformed than the CSOs from high-functionality LDCs (15%).

LDC Functionality	Unsure/not	Less than	25-50%	51-75%	More	Total
Rating	informed	25%			than 75%	
Low	41	43	80	30	21	215
	19%	20%	37%	14%	10%	100%
High	43	36	142	43	18	282
	15%	13%	50%	15%	6%	100%
Total	84	79	222	73	39	497
	17%	16%	45%	15%	8%	100%

#### Table 11. CSO Composition by LDC Functionality Rating (CSO respondents)

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 11.71, Prob. = 0.0196. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Meanwhile, regional disaggregation reveals marginal significance (p = 0.0537, Table 12, also Annex B2.3), which suggests some statistically significant but marginal variation among the CSOs' perceptions across regions. *The results may give an initial sense of where (regions) the CSOs are more/less aware of their LDC's CSO composition and, by extension, the local CSO network represented by the accredited CSO pool.* 

- Regions with the highest proportion of CSOs reporting 25–50% representation in LDCs include CAR (59%), Region 7 (61%), Region 10 (53%), and Region 11 (71%) (the highest in the dataset). Regions with the lowest proportion of CSOs in the 25–50% category include Region 2 (23%), Region 4B (17%), and Region 9 (33%).
- On the other hand, the regions where CSOs were most uncertain about their participation (i.e., unsure/not informed category) were MIMAROPA (67%), Region 12 (28%), and Region 9 (29%).
- Lastly, the following regions had the highest proportion of CSOs reporting more than 75% involvement in LDCs: NCR (28%), Region 2 (13%), and Region 8 (14%).

				e neepen		
Regions	Unsure/ not	Less than	25-50%	51-75%	More than	Total
	informed	25%			75%	
CAR	5	5	17	2	0	29
	17%	17%	59%	7%	0%	100%
NCR	0	1	9	3	5	18
	0%	6%	50%	17%	28%	100%
Region 1	7	8	17	10	6	48
	15%	17%	35%	21%	13%	100%
Region 2	5	7	7	7	4	30
	17%	23%	23%	23%	13%	100%
Region 3	8	11	15	7	1	42
	19%	26%	36%	17%	2%	100%
Region 4A	9	4	26	11	4	54
	17%	7%	48%	20%	7%	100%
MIMAROPA	4	0	1	1	0	6
	67%	0%	17%	17%	0%	100%
Region 5	4	4	10	3	3	24
	17%	17%	42%	13%	13%	100%
Region 6	8	11	21	7	1	48
	17%	23%	44%	15%	2%	100%
Region 7	8	4	31	3	5	51
	16%	8%	61%	6%	10%	100%
Region 8	7	6	20	8	4	45

#### Table 12. CSO Composition by Region (CSO Respondents)

Regions	Unsure/ not	Less than	25-50%	51-75%	More than	Total
	informed	25%			75%	
	16%	13%	44%	18%	9%	100%
Region 9	6	4	7	2	2	21
	29%	19%	33%	10%	10%	100%
Region 10	3	8	16	3	0	30
	10%	27%	53%	10%	0%	100%
Region 11	2	3	10	3	3	21
	10%	14%	48%	14%	14%	100%
Region 12	5	2	10	1	0	18
	28%	11%	56%	6%	0%	100%
Region 13	3	1	5	2	1	12
	25%	8%	42%	17%	8%	100%
Total	84	79	222	73	39	497
	17%	16%	45%	15%	8%	100%

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 78.62, Prob. = 0.0537. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

The statistical analysis also explored results by LGU type, but the results were statistically insignificant (See Annex B2.2).

#### 4A.2 Compliance with LSB reconstitution process

Following the DILG MC's prescribed LSB reconstitution process, the PGM-LDC inquiry checks awareness of the members of their LGUs' adherence to the policy. Again, it should be noted that DILG consolidates monitoring data on the LGUs' process compliance.<sup>6</sup> As with the CSO composition data point, these items were included in the PGM-LDC tool primarily to sense if the CSO members and LGU functionaries are *at least aware of their LGUs' adherence* with the LSB's process requisites.

Table 13 provides the highlights of the survey results on compliance perception on the key activities for LSB reconstitution. For brevity, the individual data tables are no longer included in this main narrative, but may be referred in the Annex B sections referred to in each activity (row). Correlative tests were also conducted, of which statistically significant variable interactions are included in the table. Notable from the results are the following:

- Overall, compliance is high (above 75%) for all reconstitution activities, *except* for the CSO network emergent from the CSO conference (compliance is at 65% only).
- *Cities generally fare higher in compliance* with the LSB reconstitution activities.
- There is a statistically significant difference in the conduct of activities across regions.
- Testing for LDC functionality rating yielded no statistically significant results. This means that being rated high or low in LDC functionality does not affect compliance in the activities as reported by the respondents (both LGUs and CSOs).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Process notes: The revised (tighter) timeline for developing this report hindered further requests to DILG regarding its monitoring data on the activities covered in this section. Readers are to note that the results here are perceptions of compliance of the respondents.

Prescribed Activities	Overall Results	Statistically significant	Highlights of correlation explanation
[Annexed data tables]		correlations	
Updating the CSO	Complied: 92%	Better compliance	Cities report the highest compliance (97%) compared to
inventory and directory	Not complied: 2%	perception in cities	municipalities (91%) and provinces (90%). Municipalities and
(Annex B3.1)	Unsure/uninformed: 7%		provinces have slightly higher rates of respondents who are unsure or
			uninformed (8% for both) compared to cities (2%).
			(Pearson Chi2 = 10.08, Prob = 0.0391)
		Substantial regional	Respondents from Regions 1, MIMAROPA, and 12 report 100%
		differences in	compliance, suggesting strong adherence to LDC policies on the CSO
		perception of	directory. Regions 3, 5, and CAR report the lowest compliance rates
		compliance	(83%-86%), indicating potential gaps in updating the inventory. Some
			regions have a notable proportion of respondents who are
			unsure/uninformed about the directory (e.g., Region 3: 15%, Region
			5: 15%).
			(Pearson Chi2 = 62.32, Prob. = 0.0005)
Conduct of CSO	Complied: 83%	Better compliance	Respondents from cities indicate the highest compliance rate (90%),
Conference	Not complied: 7%	perception in cities	followed by provinces (85%), while municipalities report the lowest
(Annex B3.2)	Unsure/uninformed: 10%		(81%). Non-compliance is highest in municipalities (9%), followed by
			provinces (5%), and lowest in cities (4%). The proportion of
			respondents who are unsure/uninformed is highest in municipalities
			(11%).
			(Pearson Chi2 = 12.22, Prob. = 0.0158)
		Substantial regional	Regions 11, 10, and 1 report the highest compliance rates (above
		differences in	94%). Regions 9, 7, and 4A have the lowest compliance rates. Regions
		perception of	2, 4A, and 3 have the highest proportion of respondents who are
		compliance	unsure/uninformed.
			(Pearson Chi2 = 100.45, Prob. = 0.0000)
Timely release of	Complied: 83%	Substantial regional	Regions 1 and 10 report full compliance (100%). Regions 4B (83%), 2
invitations encouraging	Not complied: 2%	differences in	(85%), and 5 (88%) have the lowest compliance rates. Region 2
accreditation	Unsure/uninformed: 5%	perception of	exhibits the highest level of uncertainty (12%), followed by NCR (11%)
(Annex B3.3)		compliance	and Region 5 (10%).
			(Pearson Chi2 = 57.85, Prob. = 0.0017)

#### Table 13. Highlights: Compliance with LSB Reconstitution Process

Prescribed Activities	Overall Results	Statistically significant	Highlights of correlation explanation
[Annexed data tables]		correlations	
Timely release of certificates of accreditation	Complied: 88% Not complied: 2% Unsure/uninformed: 10%	Lower compliance in municipalities	Cities (94%) and provinces (93%) have the highest compliance, while municipalities (85%) lag behind. Municipalities also report the highest level of uncertainty (13%) and non-compliance (2%).
(Annex B3.4)		Near-significant regional disparities	(Pearson Chi2 = 14.80, Prob. = 0.0051) Region 1 (96%), Region 10 (97%), and NCR (94%) have the highest compliance rates. MIMAROPA (67%), Region 9 (79%), and Region 2 (80%) report the lowest compliance. Region 4B has the highest percentage of unsure/uninformed respondents (25%), followed by Region 5 (19%) and Region 2 (18%). (Pearson Chi2 = 43.32, Prob. = 0.0549)
		Higher compliance perception by CSO respondents	CSOs report higher compliance (91%) than LGUs (86%). LGUs have a significantly higher proportion of unsure/uninformed respondents (12%) than CSOs (7%). (Pearson Chi2 = 7.01, Prob. = 0.0301)
Receipt of updated CSO inventory and directory (Annex B3.5)	Complied: 79% Not complied: 12% Unsure/uninformed: 9%	Highest compliance in cities	Cities have the highest rate of receiving an updated inventory (82%), followed by municipalities (79%), and provinces (74%). Respondents from provinces were the most likely to report not receiving the inventory (15%) or being unsure/uninformed (12%), indicating weaker compliance in provincial LGUs. (Pearson Chi2 = 10.01, Prob. = 0.0402)
		Higher compliance (receipt of inventory and directory) for LGUs than CSOs Significant regional disparities	LGU respondents were far more likely to have received an updated inventory (93%) compared to CSO respondents (65%). CSOs were significantly more likely to be unsure/uninformed (15%) or not receive the inventory (21%). (Pearson Chi2 = 120.02, Prob. = 0.0000) Region 1 has the highest compliance (94%), while MIMAROPA has the lowest (67%). CAR and Region 4A have high levels of respondents unsure/uninformed. (Pearson Chi2 = 44.25, Prob. = 0.0453)

Prescribed Activities	Overall Results	Statistically significant	Highlights of correlation explanation
[Annexed data tables]		correlations	
CSO network emergent	Complied: 65%	Significant regional	Region 8, Region 1, and Region 10 report the highest compliance, with
from CSO conference	Not complied: 13%	disparities	over 80% of respondents confirming CSO network formation. CAR,
(Annex B3.6)	Unsure/uninformed: 23%		Region 9, and Region 3 show the lowest compliance.
			(Pearson Chi2 = 83.63, Prob. = 0.0000)
		Higher perception of	LGU respondents were significantly more likely to report CSO network
		compliance by LGUs	formation (69%) compared to CSO respondents (61%). CSOs were
		(than CSOs' perception)	more likely to be unsure/uninformed (22%) or report that no network
			was formed (17%), suggesting alignment concerns on network-
			formation.
			(Pearson Chi2 = 18.73, Prob. = 0.0001)

Notes: Overall results' percentages may not exactly equal 100% due to rounding off.

#### 4A.3 Adherence to representation policies

The PGM-LDC data gathering further includes the LDCs' adherence to national policies that ensure ways of representation or supportive mechanisms thereof. The PGM-LDC tool specifically looks at the CSO desks, Peoples' Councils, and the mandatory representation of Indigenous Peoples (IPs) and women.

#### 4A.3.1 CSO Desk and Peoples' Council

Since 2021, DILG mandated the institutionalization of CSO Desks and Peoples' Councils in LGUs to support local initiatives (DILG MC 2021-012), which it conducts annual status monitoring. The inclusion of the two mechanisms in the PGM-LDC tool is more concerned with the respondents' awareness (whether their LGU has the CSO Deck and Peoples' Council constituted). *The awareness of these mechanisms is an entry point (proxy intermediate indicator) for understanding their relevance and functionality*, i.e., the respondents cannot maximize their CSO Desk as a support platform/mechanism if they do not know it exists, and, similarly, cannot maximize the platform of the Peoples' Council for collective agenda formulation and social capital advancement if they are unaware of its constitution.

**Table 14** provides the highlights of the survey results for the two mechanisms (See corresponding Annex B3 sections for the complete data tables). Results show that compliance with CSO desk establishment is much higher (78%) than that of the Peoples' Council (58%). *Cities are also perceived to be better in compliance* than other LGU types. *Significant regional differences* are also apparent in the statistical test results. Notably, the tests for LDC functionality rating showed no statistically significant relationship for both CSO Desk and Peoples' Council establishment.

Overall Results	Statistically Significant	Highlights of Correlation Explanation
	Correlations	
CSO Desk (Annex B3.7)		
Compliance = 78%	Higher	Cities have the highest reported compliance rate (89%),
Non-compliance = 11%	compliance	followed by municipalities (76%), and provinces (71%).
Unsure/uninformed =	perception	Provinces have the highest proportion of uncertain
11%	in cities	responses (17%).
		(Pearson Chi2 = 27.25, Prob. = 0.000)
	Significant	Region 1, CARAGA, and Region 10 show the highest
	regional	compliance rates, with over 90% of respondents
	disparities	confirming CSO Desk establishment. Region 4A, Region 7,
		and Region 4B show the lowest compliance, suggesting
		regional disparities in policy enforcement.
		(Pearson Chi2 = 84.45, Prob. = 0.0000)
Peoples' Council (Annex	B3.8)	
Compliance = 58%	Higher	Cities have the highest reported compliance rate (66%),
Non-compliance = 23%	compliance	while provinces have the lowest (53%). Uncertainty rates
Unsure/uninformed =	perception	are highest in municipalities (21%) and provinces (21%).
19%	in cities	(Pearson Chi2 = 10.29, Prob. = 0.0358)

Table 14. Highlights: Creation of CSO Desk and Peoples' Council

Overall Results	Statistically Significant Correlations	Highlights of Correlation Explanation
	Significant regional disparities	Region 12 (86%) has the highest compliance, while Region 5 (35%) has the lowest. Regions with high uncertainty include Region 4B (42%) and Region 3 (30%). (Pearson Chi2 = 81.91, Prob. = 0.0000)
	Higher compliance perception by CSOs	CSOs report higher compliance (64%) than LGUs (52%), suggesting that LGUs may underreport the presence of People's Councils or perceive them differently. LGU respondents show higher uncertainty (23%), compared to CSOs (15%), indicating that some LGU officials may be less familiar with participatory structures. (Pearson Chi2 = 17.01, Prob. = 0.0002)

Notes: Overall results' percentages may not exactly equal 100% due to rounding off.

To reiterate, these results are perceptions of compliance with the establishment of the two platforms and may not necessarily reflect DILG's status monitoring data.<sup>7</sup> Instead, they provide *diagnostic insights on where information dissemination and CSO network outreach activities may be strengthened*.

#### 4A.3.2 Representation of Indigenous Peoples and women

The Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (RA 8371 Section 16) provides that IPs have the right to participate fully at all levels of decision-making, thus mandating representation in *all* policy-making bodies and other local legislative councils at an appropriate proportion as the local IP population. DILG assesses the law's local implementation through the SGLG assessments, which in the 2023 results showed 82% of LGUs passing the indicator (DILG-BLGS 2024a). However, the SGLG sub-indicators cover only IP representation in the Sanggunian and do not yet include the IP mandatory representation in LDCs. As such, the CSOs participating in the LDC tool customization highlighted the need to include IP representation in the LDCs to prompt the necessary data gathering and DILG's oversight of local implementation in LDCs.

Meanwhile, the Magna Carta of Women (RA 9710) requires women to comprise 40% of decision-making bodies. The mandatory representation of women has yet to be reflected in DILG's monitoring instruments since the SGLG indicators only cover the Gender and Development (GAD) mechanism, i.e., the GAD focal point system and database, the GAD Code, the GAD plan, budget, and accomplishment. As with the matter on IP representation, CSOs during the PGM-LDC customization process underscored the inclusion of the 40% women representation LDC compliance in the points of inquiry.

**Table 15** provides the highlights of the survey results and annotates the Annex B3 subsections where the complete data tables are provided. Notable among results are:

• There is a high perception of compliance among respondents in LGUs wherein IPRA implementation is deemed applicable. However, the 40% womens' representation only has 64% perceived compliance rate, with 25% of respondents unsure/uninformed of its implementation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Process notes: The research team does not have immediate access to DILG's status monitoring data. The limited timeline in report production hindered any further data requests and comparisons in this discussion.

- Statistical tests with the variables of LGU type and regions have significant results for both IP and women's representation perceptions.
- Neither IP nor women's participation has statistically significant results with the LDC functionality rating variable.

	of mg mg month							
Overall Results	Statistically	Highlights of Correlation Explanation						
	Significant							
	Correlations							
IP Representation (Annex B	3.10)							
Compliance = 44%	Highest	Provinces have the highest compliance rate (53%)						
Non-compliance = 8%	compliance in	compared to municipalities (45%) and cities (31%).						
Unsure/uninformed = 16%	provinces	Cities have the highest proportion of respondents						
N/A = 32%		who consider IPRA "Not Applicable" (43%), possibly						
		due to the lower presence of IP communities in						
		urban areas. Municipalities report lower uncertainty						
		(13%) compared to cities (18%) and provinces (25%).						
		(Pearson Chi2 = 49.42, Prob. = 0.0000)						
	Significant	Region 12, Region 10, and CAR report the highest						
	regional	compliance, likely due to IP populations in the areas.						
	disparities	Regions 7 and 8 report the lowest compliance, with						
		many respondents considering IPRA "Not						
		Applicable."						
		(Pearson Chi2 = 374.88, Prob. = 0.0000)						
	Higher	CSOs report higher compliance (48%) compared to						
	compliance	LGUs (40%). LGUs are more likely to consider IPRA						
	perceived by	"Not Applicable" (38.0%) compared to CSOs (26.6%).						
	CSOs	(Pearson Chi2 = 18.74, Prob. = 0.0003)						
Womens' Representation (	Annex B3.9)							
Compliance = 64%	Highest	Municipalities have the highest reported compliance						
Non-compliance = 11%	perceived	(65%), followed by cities (63%) and provinces (61%).						
Unsure/uninformed = 25%	compliance in	Provinces have the highest proportion of						
	municipalities	"Unsure/Uninformed" respondents (33%). Non-						
		compliance is lowest in provinces (6%) but higher in						
		cities (12%) and municipalities (12%).						
		(Pearson Chi2 = 9.50, Prob. 0.0497)						
	Significant	Regional compliance rates vary significantly, with						
	regional	Region 11 (81%) and Region 12 (78%) leading, while						
	disparities	Region 4A (51%) has the lowest compliance						
		perception. Regions with high uncertainty rates are						
		Region 3, Region 9, and Region 6).						
		(Pearson Chi2 = 58%, Prob. = 0.0016)						

#### Table 15. Highlights: IP and Womens' Representation

These results may inform DILG's future policy framework for the LDC's functional effectiveness, as LDCs must be able to observe coherence with and reinforce other national policies that ensure inclusive representation in local decision-making.

#### 4A.4 CSO participation status and level in LDC activities

The PGM-LDC tools reflect that participation in the LDC not only concerns the 'full council' meetings but also all the other activities relevant to the LDC's planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation functions. To reflect the expanded LDC mechanisms, the PGM-LDC tools unpack several LDC activities and extended platforms where CSO members ideally participate. CSO respondents were asked about *their (own)* status and level of participation in the activities. Meanwhile, LGU respondents were asked about *their CSO counterparts'* status and level of participation in the activities. The survey is deliberately designed for comparative sensing of *where CSOs/LGUs converge or differentiate* on their assessments.

This discussion is divided into two parts. The first presents the frequencies and descriptive results juxtaposing CSOs' self-rated participation and LGUs' perception of CSO participation. The second part compares the distribution between CSOs' and LGUs' responses with statistical tests concerning over-/under-reporting of participation as perceived by the respondent groups.

#### 4A.4.1 Frequencies and Descriptive Results

**CSOs' assessment of their participation in activities (Table 16).** Regarding participation status, most CSO respondents affirmed their participation in the LDC activities, except in the procurement processes (e.g., bids and awards), wherein the not-participating response is at 47%.<sup>8</sup> The summary table also shows that after budget preparation (from budget authorization to budget accountability), the 'not participating' and 'unsure/uninformed' responses generally increase in percentages. Meanwhile, the level of participation varies, with 'high levels' emerging as top-rated categories for data gathering, public consultations, budget execution, budget accountability, and in the Project Monitoring Committee (PMC).

LDC Activities	Do you participate in the activity?							If yes, at which level?						
	Y	Yes		No		Unsure/ Uninformed		High		Medium		Low		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Data gathering	435	89%	30	6%	26	5%	205	47%	197	45%	33	8%		
Data analysis	397	82%	53	11%	37	8%	178	45%	186	47%	33	8%		
Public consultations	444	90%	25	5%	26	5%	204	46%	201	45%	39	9%		
Budget preparation	362	74%	88	18%	36	7%	162	45%	170	47%	30	8%		
Budget authorization	290	61%	125	26%	62	13%	130	45%	136	47%	24	8%		
Budget review	342	71%	97	20%	46	9%	150	44%	158	46%	34	10%		
Budget execution	259	55%	147	31%	68	14%	113	44%	109	42%	37	14%		
Budget accountability	262	56%	139	30%	67	14%	115	44%	109	42%	38	15%		
Project Monitoring	326	68%	107	22%	48	10%	165	51%	135	41%	26	8%		
Committee														
Sanggunian consultative activities	312	65%	119	25%	52	11%	126	40%	145	46%	41	13%		

Table 16. CSO Participation Status and Level in LDC Activities (CSO Responses)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> The PGM-LDC tool technical notes acknowledge that the Bids and Awards Committee (BAC) is the most apparent indicator translation of CSOs' participation in procurement processes. The 'not participating' result may be explained by the fact that BAC participation requires additional appointment of the LCE of the CSOs that will serve as observers. However, CSOs involved in PGM-LDC tool development also noted that the BAC observer role is not the only way that CSOs may be involved in procurement processes, and that other LGUs have more open policies (e.g., open contracting) wherein interested CSOs may be engaged without needing formal appointments.

LDC Activities	Do you participate in the activity?						If yes, at which level?						
	Y	Yes No		0	Unsure/ Uninformed		High		Medium		Low		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Procurement processes (e.g. Bids and Awards)	194	42%	220	47%	51	11%	68	35%	100	52%	26	13%	

Notes: Frequences of N/A and blank responses are excluded in totals and percentages. Highlighted cells are top-rated categories per activity.

LGUs' assessment of CSOs' participation in activities (Table 17). When rating their CSO counterparts' participation, the LGU respondents affirmed CSO participation in all activities *except* the budget preparation, where the not-participating option was top-rated (44%). Also notable in the summary table are fewer activities wherein LGU respondents indicated 'high level' participation: only public consultations, PMC, and Sanggunian consultations. All other activities are most rated as 'medium-level' participation.

LDC Activities	Do CSOs participate in the activity?							If yes, at which level?						
	Yes		No		Unsure/ Uninformed		High		Medium		Low			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Data gathering	433	88%	25	5%	32	7%	200	46%	205	47%	27	6%		
Data analysis	394	81%	42	9%	52	11%	163	41%	194	49%	37	9%		
Public consultations	459	93%	8	2%	24	5%	228	50%	198	43%	32	7%		
Budget preparation	165	43%	171	44%	52	13%	165	43%	171	44%	52	13%		
Budget authorization	264	55%	135	28%	81	17%	99	38%	126	48%	39	15%		
Budget review	286	59%	127	26%	71	15%	94	33%	151	53%	41	14%		
Budget execution	304	62%	108	22%	76	16%	110	36%	146	48%	48	16%		
Budget accountability	259	54%	118	25%	101	21%	90	35%	122	47%	47	18%		
Project Monitoring Committee	407	83%	18	4%	65	13%	228	56%	144	35%	35	9%		
Sanggunian consultative activities	395	80%	29	6%	69	14%	179	46%	172	44%	40	10%		
Procurement processes (e.g. Bids and Awards)	303	63%	72	15%	108	22%	113	37%	138	46%	52	17%		

Table 17. CSO Participation Status and Level in LDC Activities (LGU Responses)

Notes: Frequences of N/A and blank responses are excluded in totals and percentages. Highlighted cells are top-rated categories per activity.

**Juxtaposed summary (Table 18).**<sup>9</sup> Comparing the CSO and LGU responses show that the toprated categories differ only in budget preparation (Yes for CSOs, No for LGUs) and procurement processes (No for CSOs, Yes for LGUs). In terms of perceived level of participation, the respondent groups differ in their assessments of CSO participation in data gathering (high for CSOs, medium for LGUs), budget execution and accountability (high for CSOs, medium for LGUs), and Sanggunian consultations (medium for CSOs, high for LGUs).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> *Process note:* Further statistical analysis of the status and level of participation in LDC activities is no longer provided since the research interest for the data points is a baseline sensemaking of participation in the expanded set of activities (not just the 'full council'), and comparing the assessments by respondent group. Correlations may be pursued if given more time vis-à-vis the project timetable.

The summary table also highlights the qualitative responses per activity for both respondent groups (See Annex C1's corresponding subsections for the qualitative processing tables). Even with the qualitative elaboration being optional in the PGM-LDC tool, the gathered responses still showed a notable similarity, which is the recurring recommendation to *enhance the skills and knowledge of CSOs specific to each activity*. It is also notable that CSOs and LGUs refer to CSOs *being "invited" or "consulted" for most activities*, giving insight into the level of participation as practiced. This notion will figure into the analysis and recommendations in Section 5 of this report.

LDC Activities			CSO Response	LGU Response				
	Status	If yes,	Highlights of qualitative responses	Status	lf yes,	Highlights of qualitative responses		
	(Тор	Level (Top		(Тор	Level (Top			
	Category)	category)		Category)	category)			
Data gathering	Yes (89%)	High (47%)	52% of 99 qualitative responses	Yes (88%)	Medium	70% of 87 qualitative responses		
			indicated that they (CSOs) are		(47%)	explained that CSOs are invited and		
			consulted for suggestions and insights			involved in activities (deliberations		
			concerning the data.			and meetings).		
			Recommendations included the need			Recommendations highlighted the		
			for more 'knowledge' ("still learning")			need for increased CSO involvement.		
Data analysis	Yes (82%)	Medium	No CSO respondent provided	Yes (81%)	Medium	82% of 62 qualitative responses		
		(47%)	qualitative elaboration		(49%)	indicated that CSOs are consulted for		
						their questions and		
						recommendations ("provide valuable		
						insights").		
						Recommendations include improving		
						CSOs' knowledge of budgetary and		
						administrative matters.		
Public	Yes (90%)	High (46%)	66% of 70 qualitative responses	Yes (93%)	High (50%)	96% of 67 qualitative responses		
consultations			indicated that CSOs are asked to			indicated that CSOs are widely		
			provide suggestions and feedback			consulted and provided opportunities		
			during public consultations.			to "share what they want to convey."		
			Concerns raised are about logistical					
			issues, delays in feedback, and limited					
			understanding of proceedings.					
Budget	Yes (74%)	Medium	66% of 71 qualitative responses	No (44%)	Medium	87% of 52 qualitative responses		
preparation		(47%)	affirmed participation in the budget		(44%)	affirmed CSO participation wherein		
			preparation wherein they provided			CSOs provide feedback and		
			suggestions. However, participation			recommendations.		
			status and level vary by program or					
			project.					

Table 18. Comparative Summary: CSO Participation Status and Level in LDC Activities by Respondent Group
LDC Activities	CSO Response				LGU Response				
	Status	us If yes, Highlights of qualitative responses		Status	If yes,	Highlights of qualitative responses			
	(Тор	Level (Top		(Тор	Level (Top				
	Category)	category)		Category)	category)				
Budget	Yes (61%)	Medium	54% of 35 qualitative responses	Yes (55%)	Medium	76% of 29 qualitative responses			
authorization		(47%)	affirmed active participation in		(48%)	indicated that CSOs are invited "to			
			deliberations and budget			observe" and participate in the			
			endorsement.			budget deliberation.			
			Concerns were raised about CSOs not						
			having enough information to make						
			informed decisions during the						
			meetings.						
Budget review	Yes (71%)	Medium	68% of 41 qualitative responses	Yes (59%)	Medium	82% of 28 qualitative responses			
		(46%)	affirmed participation in the budget		(53%)	affirmed CSOs' participation in the			
			review. Concerns were raised about			review and to "present their			
			CSOs' insufficient budget review skills			requested budget."			
			and operational funds (transportation			A recommendation was raised about			
			for attendance).			building CSOs' technical knowledge in			
						budget reviews.			
Budget execution	Yes (55%)	High (44%)	64% of 33 qualitative responses	Yes (62%)	Medium	50% of 36 qualitative responses			
			indicated that CSOs receive feedback		(48%)	noted that CSOs are invited during			
			on activities during budget execution,			budget execution. The other 42%			
			and are involved in monitoring and			noted that CSOs participate actively			
			reporting.			in submitting requests for the release			
			Recommendations included financial			of project budgets.			
			support to CSO activities and capacity						
			building for skills enhancement.						
Budget	Yes (56%)	High (44%)	36% of 36 qualitative responses	Yes (54%)	Medium	82% of 38 qualitative responses			
accountability			noted being recognized and given		(47%)	highlighted active CSO participation			
			opportunities to participate.			in budget monitoring and			
			A recommendation highlighted the			implementation.			
			need to inform CSOs about budget						
			accountability process flows.						

LDC Activities	CSO Response			LGU Response				
	Status	If yes,	Highlights of qualitative responses	Status	If yes,	Highlights of qualitative responses		
	(Тор	Level (Top		(Тор	Level (Top			
	Category)	category)		Category)	category)			
Project	Yes (68%)	High (51%)	88% of 43 qualitative responses	Yes (83%)	High (56%)	79% of 61 qualitative responses		
Monitoring			indicated CSO participation in project			noted CSO involvement in regular		
(Committee)			inspections and monitoring.			monitoring, including presenting		
			A recommendation pointed to further			findings and recommendations		
			training of CSOs for monitoring.			during LDC meetings.		
			Another noted that the LCE did not			Four responses noted that PMC		
			issue CSO appointments to the PMC.			participation is limited and by		
						invitation (if relevant to CSO sector).		
Sanggunian	Yes (65%)	Medium	75% of 40 qualitative responses	Yes (80%)	High (46%)	81% of 43 qualitative responses		
consultative		(46%)	affirmed participation, including			affirmed CSO participation, including		
activities			committee hearings and federation			serving as resource persons in		
			meetings.			relevant subject matters.		
			A recommendation raised the need			A recommendation was made		
			for closing feedback loops. Other			regarding financial support for CSOs'		
			concerns are about the inconsistency			participation, which, if provided, may		
			of invitations and conduct of			be misconstrued as "undue		
			activities.			influence."		
Procurement	No (47%)	Medium	84% of 25 qualitative responses	Yes (63%)	Medium	91% of 34 qualitative responses		
processes (e.g.,		(52%)	confirmed CSO participation through		(46%)	affirmed CSO participation as		
Bids and Awards)			proposal submissions, observing and			observers.		
			giving feedback.			Two responses pointed to scheduling		
						conflicts in ensuring CSO attendance.		

Notes: Annex C1 presents full tables of qualitative responses. Qualitative responses are optional in the survey. The highlighted cells show where the top-rated CSO and LGU responses differ.

### 4A.4.2 Comparing CSO participation perceptions of CSOs and LGUs

Further statistical analysis examined the difference between CSOs' self-reported participation status and LGUs' perception of CSO participation across different LDC functions and activities. The key variable, participation status, is measured separately for CSOs (self-reported participation) and LGUs (perceived CSO participation), of which frequencies and descriptives are discussed in the immediately preceding subsection. The analysis includes descriptive statistics, a Mann-Whitney U test (Wilcoxon rank-sum test), and quantile regression (median regression). The full data tables for these tests are presented in **Annex B7.** Highlights of the analysis are as follows:

**Overall trends (Annex B7.1).** The comparison of CSO and LGU responses on CSO participation in LDC functions and activities suggests that *LGUs consistently overestimate CSO participation while CSOs systematically underrate their self-reported participation.* 

- The median and interquartile range summarizes the overall differences in participation status responses between CSOs and LGUs. CSOs report a median participation status of 46 (IQR = 11). LGUs perceive CSO participation to be higher, with a median of 49 (IQR = 9). LGUs consistently rate CSO participation higher than CSOs rate themselves. The interquartile range for LGUs (IQR = 9) is narrower than for CSOs (IQR = 11), suggesting that LGU perceptions of CSO participation are more consistent, while CSOs report greater variability in their own experiences. *This discrepancy suggests that LGUs might be overestimating CSO engagement, while CSOs may feel their actual participation is lower than what LGUs perceive.*
- The Mann-Whitney U test (Wilcoxon rank-sum test) evaluates whether the distribution of participation status responses differ between CSOs and LGUs. The statistically significant p-value (p < 0.001) confirms that there is a systematic difference between CSOs' self-reported participation and LGUs' perception of CSO participation. *Since LGUs have a higher median and rank sum, this suggests that LGUs consistently perceive CSO participation as greater than what CSOs report themselves.* The negative z-score (-5.624) indicates that *CSOs systematically rate their participation lower than LGUs do,* reinforcing the perception gap.
- The quantile (median) regression model estimates the incremental difference of LGUs' perception on CSOs' participation status. LGUs rate CSO participation 3 points higher than CSOs do (coefficient = 3, p < 0.001). *LGUs still perceive CSO participation to be significantly higher than CSOs self-report* (by approximately 3 points). The statistical significance (p < 0.001) confirms that this difference is not random but represents a systematic discrepancy.

**Impact of LDC functionality in Perception Differences (Annex B7.2).** Accounting for LDC functionality ratings for the perception difference maintains the trend that LGUs rate CSO participation higher than CSOs' self-rating of their participation. *In other words, regardless of whether the LDCs are high- or low-functionality-rated, CSOs underrate their level of participation.* 

• Across both high- and low-functionality LDCs, *LGUs rate CSO participation as higher than what CSOs report themselves* (median of 49 for LGUs vs. 46 for CSOs). The gap between CSO and LGU medians is consistent across both LDC types (3-point difference). Variability (IQR) is slightly higher in low-functionality LDCs for both CSOs and LGUs, suggesting greater disagreement or inconsistency in perceptions in weaker LDCs. The slightly higher overall median in high-functionality LDCs (48 vs.

47 in low-functionality LDCs) suggests that participatory governance processes might be slightly better institutionalized in stronger (high functionality) LDCs.

- The Mann-Whitney U test show that in both high- and low-functionality LDCs, LGUs systematically perceive CSOs as being more engaged than CSOs report themselves. The difference is larger in high-functionality LDCs (z = -4.532, p=0.000) compared to low-functionality LDCs (z = -3.291, p=0010), suggesting that the discrepancy in participation perceptions is even more pronounced in better-functioning LDCs. *This could mean that even in LDCs that function well, CSOs do not feel as engaged as LGUs perceive them to be.* The smaller z-value in low-functionality LDCs suggests that the perception gap may be slightly less pronounced in weaker LDCs—possibly because CSO participation is lower overall, making discrepancies in perception smaller.
- Results of quantile regression indicate that in both high- and low-functionality LDCs, LGUs rate CSO participation 3 points higher than CSOs rate themselves, and this difference is statistically significant (p < 0.001). Despite differences in LDC functionality, the magnitude of the perception gap remains the same (3 points), *indicating that CSOs consistently feel less engaged than LGUs perceive them to be, regardless of institutional strength (functionality).*

**Differences across LGU types (Annex B7.3).** Accounting for LGU types, results suggest that the perception differences between LGUs and CSOs tend to be *most pronounced in provinces*. Perception differences are statistically significant in provinces and municipalities but not significant for cities – which means that *LGUs and CSOs in cities have more consistent perceptions of CSO participation*.

- In all LGU types, LGUs rate CSO participation median was higher than what CSOs report themselves. *The participation gap appears largest in provinces*, where LGUs rate participation 5 points higher than CSOs (median = 47 vs. 42). Cities and municipalities show smaller gaps (2-3 points), suggesting that *perception differences may be more pronounced in provinces*, where engagement structures may be weaker. Municipalities have the narrowest IQR for LGUs (7), indicating more consistent LGU perceptions, while CSOs report a wider range of experiences (IQR = 11).
- Mann-Whitney U test indicates that in cities, the difference between CSO and LGU perceptions is not statistically significant (p = 0.0769), suggesting a smaller gap in participation perceptions. In municipalities, the difference is highly significant (p < 0.001), confirming that LGUs systematically perceive CSO participation to be higher than what CSOs report. In provinces, the difference is also significant (p = 0.0030), with LGUs perceiving CSO participation as much higher than what CSOs report, similar to municipalities but slightly less pronounced. Overall, the perception gap is strongest in municipalities and provinces, but not statistically significant in cities.
- Lastly, quantile regression shows that in cities, the perception gap is not statistically significant (p = 0.121), meaning CSOs and LGUs have relatively aligned perceptions of participation. In municipalities, LGUs rate CSO participation 3 points higher than CSOs (p < 0.001), confirming a strong perception gap. In provinces, LGUs rate CSO participation 5 points higher than CSOs (p < 0.01), the largest gap among LGU types. The perception gap increases from cities (2 points, not significant) to municipalities (3 points, significant) to provinces (5 points, significant), suggesting that the discrepancy in perceptions is greater in less urbanized and less structured LGUs.

### 4A.5 Executive and Functional/Sectoral Committees

The Code's provisions require the constitution of an Executive Committee but only recommends ("may constitute") the creation of functional and sectoral committees as LGUs see fit (earlier shown in Section 2.1). Operationally, the functional and sectoral committees (or collectively, committees' henceforth for brevity) have been practiced as five committees corresponding to the components of LGUs' development plans: social development, economic development, physical land use/infrastructure development, environmental management, and institutional development. DILG monitors the LGUs' operationalization of these subcommittees in the annual SGLG assessment (**Table 19**). The monitoring data for 2023 shows high levels of LGUs' constitution of all committees across LGU types.

Committees	LGU Type	2023			
		No.	Percent		
Executive Committee	Provinces	75	93%		
	Cities	144	99%		
	Municipalities	1406	94%		
Functional/Sectoral Committees					
Social Development	Provinces	74	91%		
	Cities	136	93%		
	Municipalities	1315	88%		
Economic Development	Provinces	74	91%		
	Cities	136	93%		
	Municipalities	1315	88%		
Physical Land Use/Infrastructure	Provinces	74	91%		
Development	Cities	136	93%		
	Municipalities	1305	88%		
Environmental Management	Provinces	72	89%		
	Cities	134	92%		
	Municipalities	1303	88%		
Institutional Development	Provinces	71	88%		
	Cities	134	92%		
	Municipalities	1285	86%		

Source: SGLG 2023

The recent strategic assessment of LDC functionality issues (Medina-Guce 2023b) highlights the importance of the committees to *'unburden' the PG function load of the LDC full council*. The overwhelming feedback from local stakeholders is that, since the full council is large in attendance and limited in meeting time, the possibility for more genuine participation is also constrained (e.g. for 'real talk' conversations more than the Q&A or formalized agenda-based flow of approvals of motions). Local stakeholders see the *opportunity in the committees to facilitate more frequent, focused, and free-flowing conversations between LGU functionaries and CSO members*, of which pre-deliberated recommendations can be raised to the full council meeting. Moreover, DILG's guidelines indicate that CSO participation in committees need not be limited to the officially appointed CSO (accredited) members; CSOs of other accreditation

status may engage in the discussions (though may not have voting powers, unless the LGU provides as such). Hence, the subcommittees also present opportunities for *expanded spaces for participation and learning* for the larger pool of CSOs.

The same report, however, documented operational issues regarding the committees. The composition of the Executive Committee (ExeCom, for brevity) is not required to have CSO representation since the ExeCom is usually convened for urgent decisions and becomes more flexible if composed only of a subset of LGU functionaries. CSOs also gave feedback on the inconsistencies in convening the committees, with anecdotes suggesting that some LGUs may only be constituting the committees to comply with DILG's guidelines and annual monitoring. Moreover, in areas wherein CSOs consider themselves 'few,' attending multiple committees strains the distribution and resources of CSOs when trying to ensure that every committee has the appropriate CSO attendance. It is also not established to what extent CSOs can choose which committees they are to be members of, or the contrary scenario anecdotally described as LGUs pre-deciding which CSOs are assigned to certain committees based on the CSOs' background and portfolio of initiatives.

Given the landscape of opportunities and concerns regarding the LDC's committees, the analysis presents various levels of analysis on CSOs' and LGUs' participation.

### 4A.5.1 CSOs' participation status and level in the committees

The PGM-LDC tool unpacks CSO participation in the committees in terms of *status* (yes/no/unsure or uninformed) and, if participating, *level* of participation (high, medium, low). The question was asked for both CSO and LGU respondent groups.

**CSOs' perception of** *their* **committee participation (Table 20).** Most CSOs affirmed participation in all the committees, though the percentages of non-participation are still worth considering. The highest-rated committee with CSO participation is the Social Development Committee and the lowest is the Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Committee. CSOs also consider their participation mostly at 'medium' level, with close percentages between high and medium for the ExeCom, Social Development, and Environmental Management committees.

Committees	Do y	Do you participate in the Committee?						If yes, at which level?				
	Y	Yes		No		Unsure/ Uninformed		High		Medium		ow
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Executive	279	58%	135	28%	66	14%	122	44%	124	44%	33	12%
Committee												
Social Development	382	78%	65	13%	40	8%	167	44%	169	44%	46	12%
Economic	339	71%	89	19%	47	10%	145	43%	160	47%	34	10%
Development												
Physical Land	244	53%	149	32%	66	14%	97	40%	117	48%	30	12%
Use/Infrastructure												
Development												
Environmental	343	71%	95	20%	44	9%	156	45%	154	45%	33	10%
Management												
Institutional	252	53%	146	31%	75	16%	94	37%	124	49%	34	13%
Development												

Table 20. CSO Participation Status and Level in Committees (CSO Responses)

Notes: Frequences of N/A and blank responses are excluded in totals and percentages. Highlighted cells are top-rated categories per committee.

LGUs' assessment of *CSOs*' participation in committees (Table 21). The LGU respondents also affirmed CSO participation in all the committees, with notably low percentages of 'no' responses. As with the CSOs, the LGU responses also indicate the Social Development Committee as the highest-rated, while the lowest-rated is, similarly, the Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development Committee. LGUs consider CSO participation at high levels in three committees: ExeCom, Economic, and Environmental Management committees.

Committees		Do CSOs participate in the						If yes, at which level?				
			Committee?									
	Y	es	No		Unsure/		High		Medium		Low	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Executive	375	77%	57	12%	54	11%	175	47%	151	40%	49	13%
Committee												
Social Development	450	92%	7	1%	32	7%	203	45%	207	46%	40	9%
Economic	430	88%	19	4%	41	8%	196	46%	189	44%	45	10%
Development												
Physical Land	405	83%	24	5%	61	12%	175	43%	191	47%	39	10%
Use/Infrastructure												
Development												
Environmental	432	88%	14	3%	44	9%	198	46%	198	46%	36	8%
Management												
Institutional	407	83%	30	6%	51	10%	150	37%	211	52%	46	11%
Development												

Table 21. CSO Participation	Status and Level in Committees	(LGU Responses)
-----------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------

Notes: Frequences of N/A and blank responses are excluded in totals and percentages. Highlighted cells are top-rated categories per committee.

Qualitative elaboration. Respondents were provided the option to elaborate on their answers for the status and level of CSO participation in the committees. Table 22 summarizes the CSO and LGU responses, from which the following are notable observations:

- The majority of qualitative responses from each respondent group across committees confirm the CSOs' participation. Nonetheless, participation scenarios paint a picture wherein *CSOs attend and give feedback (engage in discussions) but rarely steer the committee agenda-setting*. There are very few anecdotes wherein CSOs exercise high-level decision-making powers, e.g., being an approving signatory, or chairing a committee.
- The issue of the rarity of committee meetings (frequency) is raised in some committees (Social Development, Economic Development).
- For both respondent groups, a recurring need identified is the *CSOs' skills and knowledge gap* in fulfilling higher participatory roles and contributing to steering the committees' directions.

Committees			CSO Response	LGU Response			
	Status	lf yes,	Highlights of qualitative responses	Status	If yes,	Highlights of qualitative responses	
	(Тор	Level (Top		(Тор	Level (Top		
	Category)	category)		Category)	category)		
Executive	Yes (58%)	Medium	76% of the 25 qualitative responses	Yes (77%)	High	78% of the 51 qualitative responses	
Committee		(44%)	confirmed participation in committee		(47%)	indicated that CSOs participated in the	
(Annex C1.9)			meetings. One respondent mentioned			committee meetings. A respondent	
			that their participation must follow the			noted that the CSOs hold a signatory	
			sector-specific rules that they			(approving) role. A recommendation	
			represent. A recommendation pointed			was raised to increase CSO members'	
			to further orientation of the CSOs on			awareness of the committee's	
			the committee functions.			activities.	
Social	Yes (78%)	Medium	78% of the 41 qualitative responses	Yes (92%)	Medium	87% of the 58 qualitative responses	
Development		(44%)	affirmed their participation in the		(46%)	confirmed CSO participation in the	
(Annex C1.10)			committee, providing feedback. A			committee. Three respondents cited	
			recommendation highlighted			that the chairperson is a CSO member.	
			addressing the CSOs' knowledge gap.				
			Another noted non-functionality of the				
			committee.				
Economic	Yes (71%)	Medium	97% of the 33 qualitative responses	Yes (88%)	High	84% of the 44 qualitative responses	
Development		(47%)	affirmed their participation in the		(46%)	confirmed CSO participation in the	
(Annex C1.11)			committee. Examples of activities cited			committee. Two respondents noted	
			included planning and implementation			that the committee seldom convened.	
			of livelihood projects.			Recommendations included addressing	
						CSOs' lack of knowledge and budget.	
Physical Land	Yes (53%)	Medium	88% of the 34 qualitative responses	Yes (83%)	Medium	89% of the 38 qualitative responses	
Use/		(48%)	affirmed their participation in the		(47%)	stated CSO participation in the	
Infrastructure			committee, including signing approved			committee, particularly in consultation	
Development			resolutions and addressing zoning			activities and crafting of the relevant	
(Annex C1.12)			violations. A recommendation			plans.	
			highlighted the need for the				
			committee to share technical				

Table 22. CSO Participation Status and Level in Committees by Respondent Group Qualitative Response - Highlights

Committees	CSO Response			LGU Response			
	Status	If yes,	Highlights of qualitative responses	Status	If yes,	Highlights of qualitative responses	
	(Тор	Level (Top		(Тор	Level (Top		
	Category)	category)		Category)	category)		
			knowledge with CSOs One respondent mentioned that the committee was not functional.				
Environmental	Yes (71%)	High	96% of the 45 qualitative responses	Yes (88%)	High &	89% of the 44 qualitative responses	
Management		(45%)	confirmed involvement in the		Medium	confirmed CSO participation in	
(Annex C1.13)			implementation, inspection, and		(46%)	committee meetings and planning	
			monitoring of environmental-related			sessions. Two respondents mentioned	
			activities. One respondent noted that			that CSO members submitted their	
			their participation was limited during			own proposals. A recommendation	
			approval, and not during deliberation			pointed to addressing the limited	
			or preparation of the initiatives.			knowledge of CSO on environmental	
						issues.	
Institutional	Yes (53%)	Medium	89% of the 19 qualitative responses	Yes (83%)	Medium	85% of the 33 qualitative responses	
Development		(49%)	indicated their participation in the		(52%)	confirmed the involvement of CSO in	
(Annex C1.14)			committee's consultations, meetings,			the meetings, crafting of development	
			and activities. Three respondents			plans, and discussion of	
			noted collaboration with LGU for			recommendations. One respondent	
			livelihood training.			mentioned that the meetings are	
						seldom conducted. A recommendation	
						included providing financial support for	
						CSO transportation.	

Notes: Annex C1 presents full tables of qualitative responses. Qualitative responses were optional in the survey. The highlighted cells show where the top-rated CSO and LGU responses differ.

Furthermore, the PDM-LDC tool included an additional question asking the respondents to identify other activities or avenues in which CSOs participate. Under "*Others*," 13% (66) of CSO respondents and 21% (106) of the LGU respondents provided qualitative responses. As with the previous questions, the responses were also categorized whether the respondent confirmed participation in other activities. Themes and recommendations were also identified and summarized in **Annex C1.18.** The notable responses are as follows:

- For CSOs, 94% of the 66 responses confirmed participation in other committees and activities organized by LGUs, including other LSBs. CSOs also participate in religious and municipal-level activities such as town fiestas and founding anniversary celebrations. The respondents recommended conducting consultation activities and CDC General Assemblies more regularly, increasing CSO involvement in policymaking, and enhancing their technical knowledge.
- For LGUs, 93% of the 106 responses affirmed CSO involvement in local committees, activities, and festivities, further acknowledging CSOs' role in "preserving sociocultural practices and disciplines." LGUs also described CSOs as sectoral partners in food security, health, and climate change. However, some LGUs noted that CSO participation remains conditional on whether the project or activity aligns with the concerns and interests of the CSOs. Recommendations included enhancing administrative processes (e.g., regular feedback with CSOs) and implementing capacity-building initiatives (e.g., orientation and meetings with CSOs during the accreditation processes, drafting MOAs with CSOs for training).

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B4).** This section expands the analysis with statistical tests for variable associations because of the high potential of the subcommittees to broaden the policy spaces and deepen the quality of LDC participation, as discussed earlier. **Table 23** below summarizes the statistically significant correlations found per committee.

Committee	Overall Results (CSO & LGU responses)	Statistically Significant Correlations
Executive Committee (Annex B4.7)	RecutiveCSO participationommittee(yes) = 68%Annex B4.7)Non-participation = 20%Unsure/uninformed = 12%	<i>By Respondent Group.</i> LGUs perceive CSO participation higher than CSOs' perception of their participation in the ExeCom. 77% of LGUs indicated participation by CSOs compared to 58% by CSOs. More CSOs (28%) reported non-participation than LGUs (12%) (Pearson Chi2 = 46.94, Prob. = 0.0000) <i>By LGU type.</i> CSO respondents from provinces indicated the lowest reported participation (44%) compared to municipalities (60%) and cities (64%). (CSO respondents only; Pearson Chi2 = 10.81, Prob. = 0.0288)
		<i>By Region.</i> Regional disparities are significant, with CSOs from Regions 10 (72%) and 11 (70%) reporting the highest CSO participation, while Region 8 had the lowest reported participation (41%), with 55% reporting non-participation. (CSO respondents only; Pearson Chi2 = 48.33, Prob. = 0.0184)

Table 23. CSO Participation in Committees, with Statistical Correlation Tests

Committee	Overall Results (CSO & LGU responses)	Statistically Significant Correlations
Social Development (Annex B4.2)	CSO participation (yes) = 60% Non-participation = 40%	No statistically significant correlation was found
Economic Development (Annex B4.1)	CSO participation (yes) = 54% Non-participation = 46%	By Respondent Group. LGUs reported higher levels of CSO participation (58%) in the Economic Development Committee, compared to CSOs on their participation (50%). (Pearson Chi2 = 6.03, Prob. 0.0141) By Region. Regionally, CSO participation was reported highest in Region 5 (67%) and Region 9 (67%), while Region 4B had no reported CSO participation in the committee. (CSO respondents only; Pearson Chi2 =28.02, Prob. = 0.0215)
Environmental Management (Annex B4.3)	CSO participation (yes) = 45% Non-participation = 55%	<i>By Region</i> . A regional breakdown revealed considerable variation, with the highest CSO participation reported in NCR (61%) and Region 1 (58%), while Regions 3 and 4A reported only 29% and 33%, respectively. (CSO respondents only; Pearson Chi2 = 25.49, Prob. = 0.0437)
Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development (Annex B4.4)	CSO participation (yes) = 36% Non-participation = 64%	By Respondent Group. LGUs indicated much higher CSO participation in the committee (52%), than CSOs' assessment of their participation (20%). (Pearson Chi2 = 107.61, Prob. = 0.0000) By LGU Type. Provincial CSO responses indicated
		highest CSO participation (31%) compared to 25% in cities and 15% in municipalities. (CSO respondents only; Pearson Chi2 = 12.07, Prob. = 0.0024)
		<i>By Region.</i> Regional disparities were pronounced, with Regions 3, 4A, and 11 reporting CSO participation rates below 10%, while Region 12 had the highest at 56%. (CSO respondents only; Pearson Chi2 = 45.57, Prob. = 0.0001)
Institutional Development (Annex B4.5)	CSO participation (yes) = 41% Non-participation = 59%	By Respondent Group. LGUs' reported CSO participation in the committee is much higher (61%) than CSOs' reported participation (21%). (Pearson Chi2 = 169.70, Prob. = 0.0000)
		By LDC Functionality Rating. CSOs from low functionality LDCs reported lower rates of participation (16%) than those from high functionality LDCs (24%). The discrepancy between yes and no responses is also notable, at only 21% participation and 79% non-participation.

Committee	Overall Results (CSO & LGU responses)	Statistically Significant Correlations
		(CSO responses only; Pearson Chi2 = 4.56, Prob. =
		0.0328)
		By Region. Regional disparities were evident, with
		CSOs in NCR reporting the highest participation rate
		(44%), while Regions 3, 7, and 11 had participation
		rates below 10%.
		(CSO responses only; Pearson Chi2 = 30.64, Prob. =
		0.0098)

### 4A.5.2 LGUs' participation in committees

The PGM-LDC tool for LGU functionaries inquired (amongst the 495 LGU respondents) about their participation in the committees as a baseline reference on LGUs' engagement conduct. This is included because no such information exists before this survey based on the data points collected via SGLG. Including this variable also gives preliminary insight into anecdotes of committees being essentially non-functional and convened only to satisfy DILG's status monitoring assessment for the annual SGLG.

Due to the extensive number of LGU functionaries (offices) represented in the survey (see LGU respondents' profile under Section 3.1 of this report), the analysis no longer endeavors to provide a per-office breakdown for data processing. This means that, in practice, it is impossible for any committee to have zero LGU involvement. The parameters being tested here concern inquiries such as in which committees LGU functionaries report higher/lower engagement and if there are statistically significant associations with the identifying variables (LGU type, LDC functionality rating, regions).

Results show that LGU respondents indicated highest participation in the ExeCom (77%), followed by Institutional Development (61%), while Environmental Management is the only committee wherein the responses for LGU non-participation (52%) is higher than participation. **Table 24** provides the summary of statistically significant correlations per committee association analysis (See **Annex B5** for complete data tables).

Committee	Results	Statistically Significant Correlations
Executive Committee	LGU participation	By Region. Regional disparities are observed,
(Annex B5.6)	(yes) = 77%	with Region 12 (94%) and Region 1 (89%)
	Non-participation =	reporting the highest reported LGU
	12%	participation, while NCR (47%) and MIMAROPA
	Unsure/uninformed	(50%) reporting the lowest.
	= 11%	(Pearson Chi2 = 58.28, Prob. = 0.0015)
Social Development	LGU participation	By LGU Type. Provincial respondents reported
(Annex B5.2)	(yes) = 59%	the highest participation at 72%, compared to
	Non-participation =	cities at 55% and municipalities at 56%.
	41%	(Pearson Chi2 = 8.16, Prob. = 0.0169)
Economic Development	LGU participation	No statistically significant correlation was found
(Annex B5.1)	(yes) = 58%	

Table 24. LGU Partici	pation in Committees,	with Statistical	<b>Correlation Tests</b>
	,		

Committee	Results	Statistically Significant Correlations
	Non-participation =	
	42%	
Environmental	LGU participation	By LGU type. Provincial respondents reported
Management	(yes) = 48%	the highest participation at 63%, compared to
(Annex B5.3)	Non-participation =	cities at 47% and municipalities at 44%.
	52%	Municipal respondents reported highest non-
		participation at 56%.
		(Pearson Chi2 = 10.30, Prob. = 0.0058)
Physical Land	LGU participation	By LGU type. Provincial respondents reported
Use/Infrastructure	(yes) = 52%	the highest participation at 64%, compared to
Development	Non-participation =	cities at 55% and municipalities at 47%.
(Annex B5.4)	48%	Municipal respondents reported highest non-
		participation at 53%.
		(Pearson Chi2 = 8.64, Prob. = 0.0133)
Institutional	LGU participation	By LGU Type. Provincial respondents reported
Development	(yes) = 61%	the highest participation at 78%, compared to
(Annex B5.5)	Non-participation =	cities at 57% and municipalities at 58%. City
	39%	respondents reported highest non-participation
		at 43%.
		(Pearson Chi2 = 12.56, Prob. = 0.0019)

## 4A.6 Frequency of CSO participation in LDC-related activities

The frequency of participation is a key variable that engages with many policy logics and theories of change regarding LDCs and local PGM discussions (Medina-Guce 2020b, 2023b). For example, CSOs aspire to have more frequent interactions in LDC activities since more interactions are linked to more opportunities to input into and influence decision-making. In previous studies, LGUs show no apparent opposition to the idea of more frequent participatory activities in and through the LDCs, but raise practical concerns about the organizational and financial resources that more activities (with varying attendance sizes) imply.

Moreover, in relation to SGLG's required bi-annual full council meeting for the LDCs, LGUs continue to raise issues about how the indicator-requirement fails to capture the dynamics of decision-making at the local level, e.g., most key decisions that the LDC full council needs to approve happen at the beginning of the year, and that follow-through meetings do not need to be in the second semester. Nonetheless, SGLG 2023 results show that 85% of all LGUs convene their LDC full council bi-annually, but only 75% of all LGUs have documented CSO participation in both meetings (**Table 25**).

		anenj	mee		equi	emen			
LDC meetings-related sub-indicators	Ove	Overall		Provinces		Cities		Municipalities	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
LDC full council bi-annual meeting (once every six months)	1459	85%	71	88%	134	92%	1254	85%	
Documented CSO participation in both meetings	1289	75%	65	80%	128	88%	1096	74%	

Table 25. LGU Adherence to LDC (Full Council) Meetings Requirement - SGLG

Reference: SGLG 2023

### 4A.6.1 Frequencies, Descriptives, and Correlation Tests

The PGM-LDC tool asked the CSO respondents how frequently they participate in LDC activities – not just in the full council but also encompassing the entire range of activities and mechanisms covered in the discussion. Results (**Table 26**) show that *while most CSO respondents participate in LDC-related activities quarterly (43%), the next highest answer is 'only when invited' at 23%*. Bi-annual participation (similar to the required full council meeting frequency) is only at 14%.

Frequency	n	%
Monthly	79	16%
Quarterly	215	43%
Bi-annually (every six months)	70	14%
Only when invited	115	23%
Others	18	4%
Total	497	100%

Table 26. Frequency of CSO Participation in LDC-related Activities

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B6).** Two variable interactions produced statistically significant results: *by LDC functionality rating* and *by region*. (The test for LGU type was not statistically significant.)

Results show that CSOs in highly functional LDCs attended more frequently on a quarterly basis (47%) than those in low-functioning LDCs (42%) (Table 27, Annex B6.1). CSOs in high-functionality LDCs were less likely to attend monthly (13%) than those in low-functionality councils (22%). However, if quarterly and monthly participation responses are totaled, CSOs from low-functionality LDCs report more frequent attendance (64%) than those from high-functionality LDCs (60%). This indicates that the functionality rating/level of the LDC influences how often CSOs participate. However, data also suggests that low functionality LDCs exhibit more frequent attendance from CSOs when quarterly and monthly attendance are analyzed together.

To the best of the information from recent LDC studies (Medina-Guce 2023b), the relationship between high-functionality LDCs and quarterly participation may initially be explained by the LDC subcommittees being convened quarterly, as per local stakeholders' accounts. Further studies and modeling efforts could explore the logics behind high-functionality LDCs featuring a quarterly frequency for CSO participation and the reasons for low-functionality LDCs seemingly featuring more frequent activities for CSOs.

LDC Functionality	Only when	Bi-annually	Quarterly	Monthly	Total
Rating	invited	(every six months)			
Low	51	24	87	45	207
	25%	12%	42%	22%	100%
High	63	46	128	34	271
	23%	17%	47%	13%	100%
Total	114	70	215	79	478
	24%	15%	45%	17%	100%

 Table 27. Frequency of CSO Participation by LDC Functionality Rating

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 9.12, Prob. = 0.0277. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages. Responses under "Others" have been removed from this analysis.

Meanwhile, regional participation frequency disparities were also statistically significant (**Table 28, Annex B6.3**). Results show that the most common participation frequency was quarterly (45%), with some regional variations.

- Regions with higher quarterly participation include Region 2 (70%), Region 12 (67%), and Region 11 (60%). Conversely, Regions 9 (45%) and 11 (30%) had the highest proportion of monthly participation, indicating more frequent engagement in these areas.
- Some regions showed lower engagement frequency, with CSOs indicating participating only when invited. For example, MIMAROPA (67%) and Region 6 (36%) had the highest proportion of CSOs that only attended when invited.

Region	Only when invited	Bi-annually	Quarterly	Monthly	Total
		(every six months)			
CAR	3	5	15	4	27
	11%	19%	56%	15%	100%
NCR	6	0	7	3	16
	38%	0%	44%	19%	100%
Region 1	8	15	20	5	48
	17%	31%	42%	10%	100%
Region 2	5	2	19	1	27
	19%	7%	70%	4%	100%
Region 3	6	6	24	6	42
	14%	14%	57%	14%	100%
Region 4A	19	0	18	14	51
	37%	0%	35%	27%	100%
MIMAROPA	4	0	2	0	6
	67%	0%	33%	0%	100%
Region 5	8	1	11	4	24
	33%	4%	46%	17%	100%
Region 6	17	6	17	7	47
	36%	13%	36%	15%	100%
Region 7	8	9	27	7	51
	16%	18%	53%	14%	100%
Region 8	14	7	15	7	43
	33%	16%	35%	16%	100%
Region 9	2	5	4	9	20
	10%	25%	20%	45%	100%
Region 10	7	11	10	1	29
	24%	38%	34%	3%	100%
Region 11	2	0	12	6	20
	10%	0%	60%	30%	100%
Region 12	1	2	12	3	18
	6%	11%	67%	7%	100%
Region 13	4	1	2	2	9
	44%	11%	22%	22%	100%
Total	114	70	215	79	478
	24%	15%	45%	17%	100%

### Table 28. Frequency of CSO Participation by Region

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 108.57, Prob. = 0.0000. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages. Responses under "Others" have been removed from this analysis.

### 4A.6.2 Participation frequency x Participation status in LDC activities

To recap the discussion of participation frequency so far, general results showed most CSOs indicated quarterly participation (43%). Additional statistical tests showed that CSOs in high-functionality LDCs attended more on a quarterly basis, although CSOs in low-functionality LDCs tend to participate more frequently (combined monthly and quarterly categories). The results also showed significant variations across regions.

To further make sense of participation frequency, additional analyses were conducted to examine its relationship with participation status in LDC activities (as discussed in Section 4A.4). To conduct the analysis, a *participation status index* was generated by aggregating the respondents' individual responses per activity. Principal component analysis (PCA) was employed, and the statistical significance of relationships was tested through the Kruskal-Wallis test, Dunn's test, and quartile regression. Highlights of the analysis are as follows. (Refer to Annex B6.4 introduction for methodological notes and its sections for corresponding data tables.)

**Overall trends (Annex B6.4.1).** The results confirm the logic that more frequent participation is associated with higher participation status. However, the tests suggest that *increasing attendance frequency beyond a bi-annual level does not lead to significant differences in participation status in the LDC functional activities.* This finding implies that while more frequent participation indeed increases participation status in LDC activities, attending beyond the required bi-annual (every six months) marginally contributes to increasing participation status (i.e., *bi-annual seems functionally sufficient to meet participation in the LDC encompassing the budget process, et.al*). Nonetheless, since these responses are perception-based, the Codal requirement of bi-annual meetings (although meant only for the full council) may have *some pre-framing effects* on what respondents perceive as sufficient in the overall council meetings).

- *Key findings indicate that more frequent attendance at LDC meetings is associated with higher LDC participation levels.* Specifically, attending meetings bi-annually or more frequently corresponds with significantly higher participation status than those who attend only when invited. However, differences between bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendance appear to be marginal. The median participation status varies across attendance groups. The results indicate that CSO respondents who attend meetings only when invited have the lowest median participation status index (40.5), while those attending bi-annually, quarterly, or monthly have higher median participation (ranging from 47-48). The Interquartile Range (IQR) is slightly lower (10) for those attending more frequently, suggesting less variability in participation among regular attendees.
- A Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test was conducted to determine whether participation status differs significantly across attendance groups. The results indicate a highly significant difference (p = 0.0001), confirming that *participation status varies based on meeting attendance frequency*.
- The Dunn's test indicates that individuals who attend only when invited have significantly lower participation levels compared to bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees, as evidenced by negative z-scores and statistically significant p-values (p < 0.001). However, no statistically significant differences were found between bi-annual,

quarterly, and monthly attendees, suggesting that *increasing attendance frequency beyond a bi-annual level does not lead to significant differences in participation*.

- The quantile regression indicates the following:
  - The baseline participation status for those who attend only when invited is 40.
  - Those who attend bi-annually or quarterly have a 7-point higher participation status, while those who attend monthly have an 8-point increase.
  - $\circ$  All coefficients are statistically significant (p < 0.001), confirming that more *frequent attendance is positively associated with higher participation levels.*
  - However, the marginal difference between bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendance (+7 vs. +8) suggests that attending *bi-annually already yields most of the benefits of engagement,* corroborating the results of the Dunn's test.

**Impact of LDC functionality ratings (Annex B6.4.2).** The findings suggest that LDC functionality significantly moderates the impact of attendance frequency on participation. *In high-functioning LDCs, participation is generally higher across all groups, and increasing attendance frequency beyond bi-annual meetings does not result in significant additional benefits. On the other hand, in low-functioning LDCs, participation is lower overall, and frequent attendance is essential to achieving higher levels of engagement. These results emphasize that low-functionality LDCs will benefit from increasing their CSOs' participation frequency to improve participation status across the LDC functions.* 

- The median and interquartile range analysis shows the overall median participation status is equal between high-functioning LDCs (p50 = 46) compared to low-functioning LDCs (p50 = 46). However, the median participation status of those CSOs attending only when invited is different between LDC functionality (High = 43, Low = 39). *This indicates that high-functioning LDCs inherently promote higher levels of participation, even for individuals who attend meetings infrequently.* 
  - In high-functioning LDCs, increasing CSO attendance frequency beyond biannual meetings does not lead to significant increases in participation. The median participation status for those attending bi-annually (p50 = 47), quarterly (p50 = 47), and monthly (p50 = 48.5) remains relatively stable, suggesting that once a certain level of participation is reached, more frequent attendance does not provide additional benefits. However, in low-functioning LDCs, participation levels show a similar trend (bi-annually, p(50) = 46.5, quarterly, p(50) = 47, and monthly, p(50) = 47).
- The Kruskal-Wallis test confirms that there is a statistically significant difference in participation across attendance categories for both high- and low-functioning LDCs (Low, p = 0.0009, high, p = 0.0185).
- Pairwise comparisons using Dunn's test further highlight these differences. In highfunctioning LDCs, individuals who attend only when invited have significantly lower participation than bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees (p < 0.05). However, there is no significant difference among bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees, suggesting that beyond a certain threshold, increasing attendance does not lead to a proportional increase in participation. In contrast, in low-functioning LDCs, the difference between "only when invited" and more frequent attendees is even more pronounced (p < 0.01). Additionally, bi-annual attendees show marginally lower participation than quarterly attendees, indicating that in weakly functioning LDCs, each incremental increase in attendance frequency contributes to higher participation levels.
- The quantile regression results provide further insights into the relationship between attendance frequency and participation levels under different LDC functionality conditions. In high-functioning LDCs, participation increases only slightly (+4 to +5

points) when individuals attend more frequently, with bi-annual attendance showing only marginal significance (p = 0.056). This suggests that in well-functioning LDCs, other factors—such as established institutional mechanisms and efficient governance—already contribute to high participation, making attendance frequency less influential. Conversely, in low-functioning LDCs, the impact of attendance frequency is much stronger (+7 to +8 points), and the effects are highly significant (p < 0.01). This indicates that when an LDC is less functional, attending meetings more frequently is a critical factor in boosting participation, as it helps individuals compensate for weaker institutional structures and engagement mechanisms.

**Differences across LGU types (Annex B6.4.3).** The tests show significant variations across LGU types, but more specifically for cities and municipalities.

- The median participation scores and interquartile ranges (IQRs) suggest that attendance frequency is positively associated with participation, but the strength of this relationship varies across LGU types.
  - $\circ$  For cities, individuals who attend only when invited have a median participation score of 44 (IQR = 16), whereas those attending bi-annually (47, IQR = 14), quarterly (46, IQR = 9), and monthly (50, IQR = 7) tend to show higher and more consistent participation. The decreasing IQRs suggest that more frequent attendees exhibit less variability in participation levels.
  - A similar trend is observed in municipalities, where only when invited attendees have the lowest median participation (40, IQR = 16), while bi-annual (48, IQR = 7), quarterly (47, IQR = 9), and monthly attendees (47.5, IQR = 8.5) demonstrate higher and more stable participation levels.
  - For provinces, differences are less pronounced, with median participation scores ranging narrowly from 40.5 (IQR = 6) for only when invited attendees to 45 (IQR = 9) for monthly attendees. The relatively small IQRs across attendance groups suggest minimal variation in participation based on meeting frequency.
- The Kruskal-Wallis test assesses whether there are statistically significant differences in participation levels across attendance groups. The results imply that in cities and municipalities, meeting frequency plays a role in participation, whereas in provinces, participation is relatively uniform across groups.
  - $\circ$  For cities, the test is statistically significant (p = 0.0377), indicating that participation levels differ across groups.
  - $\circ$  For municipalities, the test is highly significant p = 0.0013), confirming strong differences in participation across attendance categories.
  - $\circ$  For provinces, the test is not significant (p = 0.2484), suggesting no meaningful differences in participation based on attendance frequency.
- The Dunn's test is used to determine which specific attendance groups differ significantly in their participation levels. Since the Kruskal-Wallis test was not significant for provinces, Dunn's results for provinces should not be interpreted.
  - $\circ$  For cities, individuals who attend only when invited have significantly lower participation compared to bi-annual attendees (p = 0.0346) and monthly attendees (p = 0.0030). Additionally, there is a significant difference between quarterly and monthly attendees (p = 0.0318), suggesting that monthly attendees tend to have higher participation than quarterly attendees. However, no significant differences are found between bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees, indicating that beyond bi-annual attendance, increasing meeting frequency does not consistently raise participation levels.

- For municipalities, the "only when invited" group exhibits significantly lower participation than all other groups. Specifically, only when invited attendees differ from bi-annual (p = 0.0011), quarterly (p = 0.0001), and monthly attendees (p = 0.0033). However, there are no significant differences between bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly groups, reinforcing the pattern that attending at least bi-annually is associated with higher participation, but further increases in meeting frequency do not provide additional benefits.
- Overall, Dunn's test results align with the Kruskal-Wallis findings by confirming that meeting frequency significantly influences participation in cities and municipalities, particularly for those attending only when invited. In provinces, where Kruskal-Wallis was not significant, there is no justification for interpreting Dunn's test results.
- The quantile (median) regression analysis estimates the relationship between attendance frequency and participation while adjusting for other factors.
  - $\circ$  For cities, the results indicate no statistically significant differences between attendance groups. While monthly attendees show slightly higher participation than those attending only when invited (coefficient = 6, p = 0.099), this result does not reach conventional significance thresholds. Similarly, differences between bi-annual, quarterly, and only when invited attendees are not significant. This suggests that while descriptive statistics and Dunn's test suggest a pattern, the relationship between attendance and participation weakens when controlling for other factors.
  - For municipalities, the quantile regression results strongly support the earlier findings. Compared to those attending only when invited, bi-annual (coefficient = 8, p = 0.001), quarterly (coefficient = 7, p = 0.002), and monthly attendees (coefficient = 7, p = 0.003) all have significantly higher participation. These results confirm that attending meetings at least bi-annually is associated with higher participation in municipalities, even after adjusting for other influences.
  - For provinces, the regression results align with the Kruskal-Wallis findings, showing no statistically significant differences in participation across attendance groups. This reinforces the conclusion that meeting frequency does not meaningfully impact participation in provincial settings.

### 4A.7 Enablers, hindrances, and needed support

The PGM-LDC tool featured open-ended questions for respondents' identified enablers, hindrances, and needed support for participation. While the open-ended inquiry does not intend to generate a comprehensive needs assessment, the questions attempt to capture the respondents' most immediate thoughts after answering the items about the status and level of CSO participation in LDC-related activities.

This discussion has two parts. The first presents the responses by and between the respondent groups. The second zeroes in on LGUs' policy and capacity needs to enhance the quality of LDC participation.

### 4A.7.1 Responses by and between respondent groups

The question regarding enablers and hindrances generated a high percentage of qualitative responses -89% (444) from CSOs and 91% (449) from LGUs. Each response was analyzed to

determine whether it identified enablers, hindrances, or both, providing insights into factors influencing CSO participation in LDCs. The responses were categorized based on whether they referred to administrative, political, technical, policy, or abstract outcomes enabling or hindering CSO participation. The results are presented in the following tables, while the more detailed qualitative discussions are in **Annex C2**.

Results are summarized in Table 29 (enablers) and Table 30 (hindrances). Notable observations are the following:

- For *enablers*, CSOs and LGUs alike identified *administrative* matters the most, with 47% of CSO responses and also 47% of LGU responses falling under this category. Thematically, these enablers concern the *provision of implementation resources* (e.g., funding, staffing, office space, communication/dissemination, CSO allowances et.al.) to improve participation activities. These results are unsurprising as the resource requirement for participatory activities has always been a key concern for PG initiatives. It is also worth noting that dimensions of policy and technical capacity enablers still address resource allocation and communication efficiency needs.
- For *hindrances*, administrative matters also emerge as the top category for both CSO responses (90%) and LGU responses (79%). The explanations are, essentially, flipped statements of the resource allocation and communication efficiency enablers.
- Moreover, a cross-cutting theme among enabling and hindering categories is a *sense of social capital-building with (a) the LCE and (b) the local CSO network*. Respondents view the frequency and intensity of interactions with LCEs and inter-CSO (as peers) as enablers of participation quality (and the lack of interactions, as hindrances). Examples of descriptives used are "recognition," "listening," "mindset change," which are all *suggestive of a change in the quality of relationships among stakeholders through and beyond the LDC as a platform*. These are perfectly aligned with the normative goals of PG, and imply further attention that DILG and its partners may pour into social capital and network-building among local stakeholders in/through the LDCs.

Enablers	Enablers Description	CSO responses		LGU responses			
categories		n	%	Examples	n	%	Examples
Abstracted intermediate factors	Responses refer to broad, intermediate outcomes (e.g., voice/empowerment principles, societal values, governance norms) towards PG normative outcomes <i>rather than</i> specific policy changes or tangible outputs.	67	25%	Having "voice" in meetings; Being "[contributory] to nation-building"	59	26%	"Actively participating," "feeling heard," "sense of bayanihan"
Administrative	Responses refer to the provision of organizational and financial resources and support (e.g., funding, staffing, office space, CSO desk) and the implementation of communication and information dissemination to CSOs	127	47%	Early notice of meetings ("being informed" enhances quality of participation), funding for CSOs	107	47%	Availability/ provision of incentives and allowances to CSOs
Policy	Responses refer to the formulation and/or updating of national, regional, or local policies and guidelines, including the availability of legal framework, guidance, and basis to support LDC activities	8	3%	Being accredited; involvement in decision- making processes	25	8%	Institutionalization of CSO participation through local ordinance, executive orders, or accreditation, availability of national laws and guidelines
Political relationships/ dynamics	Responses refer to the availability and/or influence of relationships and dynamics between CSOs and LGUs. These may include role of political will, advocacy efforts, and engagement of political actors and local leaders in the conduct of LDC activities	28	10%	Strong partnership with LGU, "recognition" and support from LGU, LCE listening to CSO suggestions and comments	16	5%	Good LGU-CSO collaboration, support from LCE and other local leaders, "LGU sponsorship"
Technical capacity	Responses refer to the conduct of capacity development activities on improving the skills and knowledge of LGUs and CSOs (e.g. training, seminars, orientation)	42	16%	Additional knowledge (learning about the government programs, processes, and budget), sharing of successful practices	40	13%	Trainings and workshops conducted by LGUs help improve CSO participation, ability of CSOs to understand functions of the committee and nature of LGU

## Table 29. Enablers of Participation by Respondent Group

Enablers	Enablers Description	CSO responses				LGU responses	
categories		n	%	Examples	n	%	Examples
							activities and matters discussed
							during meetings

Notes: Specifically for *enablers*, total CSO qualitative responses = 271 (61% of the 444 qualitative responses); total LGU qualitative responses = 230 (51% of the 449 qualitative responses). Refer to Annex C2 for detailed qualitative processing tables. Highlighted cells are the highest coded category per respondent group.

Hindrances	Hindrances Description		C	SO responses			LGU responses
categories		n	%	Examples	n	%	Examples
Abstracted	Responses refer to the lack of broad,	2	1%	Lack of commitment,	4	1%	CSOs' lack of commitment and
intermediate	intermediate outcomes (e.g. lack of			transparency, and			accountability
factors	participation, weak governance, lack of			accountability			
	commitment) which hinder progress						
	toward PG normative outcomes						
Administrative	Responses refer to the lack of	166	90%	Scheduling conflicts,	244	79%	CSOs' schedule conflicts, lack of
	organizational and financial resources and			delays in meeting			benefits/incentives, ineffective
	support (e.g., insufficient funding,			notices, lack of budget			communication
	inadequate office space and mechanisms,						
	lack of information dissemination) that can						
	limit coordination and participation						
Policy	Responses refer to the lack or absence of	3	2%	Roles and	25	8%	"Rigid" requirements on CSO
	clear national, regional, and local policies			responsibilities are			accreditation, lack of accredited
	or guidelines (e.g., unclear guidance,			not clarified, limited			CSOs, need for legal basis for
	unavailability of legal framework, weak			allocated slots for			the provision of allowance and
	policy support)			CSOs			honoraria to CSOs
Political	Responses refer to weak or absence of	5	3%	Weak relationship	16	5%	Lack of trust in government,
relationships/	relationships or networks between LGU			with LGU, CSO			political interference and bias
dynamics	and CSOs (e.g., absence of political will or			involvement is			in CSO accreditation, lack of
	support, biased processes, resistance to			dependent on LGU			interest from elected officials to
	advocacy efforts			invitations, "mindset			engage CSOs
				change" in			
				relationship with CSO			

### Table 30. Hindrances to Participation, by Respondent Group

Hindrances	Hindrances Description	CSO responses			LGU responses		
categories		n	%	Examples	n	%	Examples
Technical	Responses refer to lack of skills and	9	5%	Limited or lack of	40	13%	Lack of CSO knowledge and
capacity	knowledge among LGU and CSO members			skills and knowledge,			skills hinder their participation
	or the lack of capacity development			"no confidence in			(CSOs are "shy" to participate,
	opportunities			topics", absence of			there is a need to build their
				training on roles as			confidence), insufficient
				members, knowledge			training (CSOs are not aware of
				on "how to approach			their roles, lack of "technical
				the right agencies"			know-how")

Notes: Specifically for *hindrances*, total CSO qualitative responses = 185 (42% of the 444 qualitative responses); total LGU qualitative responses = 307 (62% of the 449 qualitative responses). Refer to Annex C2 for detailed qualitative processing tables. Highlighted cells are the highest coded category per respondent group.

### 4A.7.2 LGUs' policy and capacity needs

The PGM-LDC tool provided LGU respondents with questions on their (the LGUs') perceived needs as inputs to DILG's policy and programmatic directions on PG advancement in LGUs. The prompt is, "What would enable your office to expand and deepen its participatory LDC-related work?" The inquiry proceeds with previous studies' findings that LGUs are willing to further the quality of their participatory practices given more conducive policy and capacity settings. The PGM-LDC tool pre-categorized the needs according to four categories – policy, technical, administrative, and political – which the LGU respondents checked (if perceived as needs). As with the other qualitative questions, elaboration of answers was optional.

Results (**Table 31**) show that LGU respondents view all four categories as relevant support areas to enable their participatory work, with technical needs as the highest-rated category and political as the lowest-rated. While enhancing CSO participation leaned heavily on administrative (implementation resources) needs, *enhancing LGUs' PG practices prioritizes technical (capacity development) needs* for both LGUs and CSOs. These concern LGUs' skills, technologies, and knowledge in performing the PG dimensions of their work. Notably, the top qualitative category of policy needs also concerns guidelines for the conduct of activities and mechanisms, which logically overlap with technical needs (as clarification interventions through national policy issuances). The response also thematically converges with the qualitative responses in Section 4A.4 (status and level of participation in activities) that also emphasize skills and knowledge development of CSOs in every step/activity component of the LDC functions.

Needs	LGU responses	Qualitative response highlights
Categories		
Policy	Needed (yes): 78% Not needed 7% Unsure/informed: 15%	36% of the 310 qualitative responses for this category emphasized the need for clear administrative guidance (from the national government) to support CSO participation. Examples included guidance on the preparation and institutionalization of support mechanisms (CSO Desks, Peoples' Council, and honorarium provision), legal bases for various CSO participation modalities, and conducting "proper consultations"
		need for a national policy enabling the allocation of
		dedicated resources for CSO participation (e.g., staffing, M&E infrastructure, MOOE for transportation and reimbursements)
Technical	Needed (yes): 84%	75% of the 364 qualitative responses for this category
	Not needed: 6%	raised the need for capacity development initiatives for
	Unsure/uninformed:	both LGU and CSO members. For CSOs, orientation on
	10%	issue identification, creating solutions, and prioritizing
		activities are necessary to know the "technical know-
		how" of projects. For LGUs, improvements in governance
		processes were recommended (data analysis,
		management, and adoption of technologies). Sharing of

Table 31. LGU-identified Enablers to Deepen LDC-related Participatory Work

Needs	LGU responses	Qualitative response highlights
Categories		
		technical expertise and successful projects among LGUs were also indicated.
		6% of the 364 qualitative responses stated the need for administrative guidance (benchmarking best practices on how to improve CSO involvement, issue identification, and preparation of resolutions and plans)
Administrative	Needed (yes): 79% Not needed: 9% Unsure/uninformed: 13%	70% of the 339 qualitative responses for this category indicated the need for sufficient human and financial resources to support LGU operations and implementation of CSO programs and activities. The LGUs cited the need for skilled staff to help with their increasing workload.
		12% of the 339 qualitative responses suggested capacity development activities, specifically knowledge on administrative and financial management "to improve office operations"
Political	Needed (yes): 58% Not needed: 18% Unsure/uninformed: 24%	41% of the 239 qualitative responses indicated that political relationships and networks are considered as organizational resource that can facilitate access to projects, funding, and other forms of support. These political relationships can help CSOs "meet other needs", "have more benefits", and "expand their sphere of influence".
		11% of the 239 qualitative responses called for improvements in communication and information dissemination channels (expanding public access to information, promotion of CSO accreditation) and conduct of feedback between LGUs and CSOs to align agenda

Notes: Refer to Annex C3 for data tables of qualitative responses. The total number of LGU responses is 495. The highlighted cells are the top-rated responses per needs category.

### 4B. PGM-LDC Variables

This second part of the findings presents the results of the PGM-LDC variable statements analysis. **Figure 3** summarizes the overall responses per variable statement of the PGM-LDC tool, while **Table 32** presents the statements ranked by net ratings.

Key results are as follows:

- Among the 14 variables, Statement 1 (Rationalized inclusion criteria by Satisfaction of accreditation guidelines) received the highest percentage of strongly agree responses (58%) and is the most agreeable for respondents (95%, combining agree and strongly agree responses). It also received the lowest disagreement level (1% combining disagree/strongly disagree responses). It ranks first among the statements by net rating.
- Statement 5 (Sufficient resource support) was rated least by respondents. Combined agree/strongly agree responses are only 82% (the lowest across the 14 variables), and the combined disagree/strongly disagree responses are 14% (the highest disagreement level across all 14 variables). It ranks last among the statements by net rating.
- Among the three Engagement dimension variables (Statements 8 to 10), Statement 8 (Inclusion) is the highest rated (47% strongly agree, 92% combined agree/strongly agree; only 3% combined disagree/strongly disagree). Statement 9 (Autonomy and fairness) is the least rated at 88% combined agree/strongly agree responses and 5% combined disagree/strongly disagree responses.
- Among the four Results dimension variables (Statements 11 to 14), the highest rated is Statement 14 (LGU satisfaction of its participatory practices) at 94% combined agree/strongly agree and 4% combined disagree/strongly disagree although the variable only reflects LGU responses. Next highly rated is Statement 12 (Participation enabling more effective policies) at 93% combined agree/strongly agree, and 4% combined disagree/strongly agree, and 4% combined disagree/strongly disagree. Statement 11 (Influence on LDC decisions) is the least rated at 84% combined agree/strongly disagree, and 9% combined disagree/strongly disagree.



### Figure 3. PGM-LDC Statements: Summary of Overall Responses

Pank	DCM	Statement	Total	Total	Not Pating
Nalik	POIVI	Statement			
	Dimension		Positive %	Negative %	%
1	Space	S1. Accreditation	95%	1%	94%
2-3	Space	S3. Sufficient communication	94%	4%	90%
		of participatory opportunities			
	Results	S14 (LGU only). LGU	94%	4%	90%
		satisfaction with participatory			
		practices			
4-7	Space	S2. Clear info on ways of	93%	4%	89%
		participating			
	Space	S4. Access to info protocols	91%	2%	89%
	Engagement	S8. Inclusion and	92%	3%	89%
		representation			
	Results	S12. Enabling Effective Policies	93%	4%	89%
8	Results	S13. CSO Satisfaction	91%	4%	87%
9	Engagement	S10. Transparency of	90%	5%	85%
		engagement (efficient			
		document release)			
10	Space	S7. Mechanisms for feedback,	89%	5%	84%
		petitions, grievances			
11-12	Space	S6. Feedback loop	88%	5%	83%
		mechanisms			
	Engagement	S9. Autonomy and fairness	88%	5%	83%
13	Results	S11. Influence on decisions	84%	9%	75%
14	Space	S5. Resource Support	82%	14%	68%

Table 32. PGM-LDC Statements: Ranked by Net Ratings

Furthermore, **Table 33** presents the highlights of the analysis components, including the qualitative analysis, statistically significant correlations, and key recommendations per variable statement, which are discussed per variable in the next subsections. For brevity, the discussions henceforth present the *data tables only for the statistically significant* correlations. Full statistical data tables for the quantitative analysis are in **Annex B**, while the qualitative analysis tables are in **Annex C**.

	Table 33. Summary of Form EDC Variables Results							
Mode (highest rated) & Net rating	Qualitative results highlights	Statistically significant correlations	Variable-specific recommendations					
Space: Participatory environment from policy and institutional settings								
Stat	ement 1. Rationalized inclusion crite	ria (Satisfaction of	accreditation guidelines)					
Mode:	Responses expressed	Least agreement	Improve documentation					
Strongly	overwhelming affirmation of	by municipalities	support for accreditation,					
Agree	adherence to accreditation		especially for municipal-level					
58%	guidelines. Concerns about		CSOs;					
Net	arbitrary appointments of local		Improve guidance and					
Rating:	leaders' preferred CSOs were		enforcement of the LDC					
94%	raised.		member selection, including					
			CSOs' 'self-selection' process					

### Table 33. Summary of PGM-LDC Variables Results

rated) & correlations	
Net	
rating	
Statement 2. Engagement Strategy (Clear information on ways of participating)	
Mode: The majority are confirmatory Less agreement Improve <i>clarity, relevance</i>	2,
Agreeexpressions of the statement.in lowand actionability of	
48% Qualified agreements from both functionality information distributed;	
Net         CSOs and LGUs underscored the         LDCs;         Improve functionality rat	ing
rating: need for the information to make Less agreement of LDCs	
89% sense and be actionable for the by CSOs in low	
CSOs. functionality	
LDCs	
Statement 3. Engagement strategy (Sufficient communication)	
Mode: Most responses are confirmatory Highest Pivot communication as a confirmation of the statement in a second s	9
Strongly expressions of the statement. agreement by <i>frontine service</i> for its	: <b>.</b>
Agree Sumclent communication is cities / lowest by accessibility and informa	ity,
S0% described as exhaustively multi- provinces which may inform future	LDC
rating: regular accessible for informal	
90% follow-ups generously open (not	
nre-determined recipients)	
Statement 4. Transnarency and access to information protocols	
Mode: While most responses affirm the Less agreement Explore what types of	
Agree statement other comments by CSOs: information are requested	d by
46% express the need to establish Least agreement CSOs and further study	,
Net <i>more defined information and</i> by provinces / interactions with other	
rating: data access protocols. highest by transparency policies (e.	Ţ.,
89% municipalities FDP, FOI) for the eventua	ĺ
development of firmer a	cess
protocols	
Statement 5. Organizational capacity (Sufficient Resource support)	
Mode:Responses generally affirm theLeast agreementDevelop national policy	
Agree statement. Otherwise, they by municipalities guidance for the allocation	on,
48% highlight the <i>lack of policy</i> / highest by distribution, and access of	of
Net guidance on allocation, cities funds for participation	
rating: distribution, and access of funds	
68% for participation.	
Statement 6. Clear mechanisms for feedback loops	
Mode: Responses generally confirm that Less agreement Include <i>feedback loop</i>	
Agree mechanisms for feedback loops by CSOs; mechanisms in future	~
46% exist. Qualified agreements note Less agreement interventions, e.g., for L	C
Net that the mechanisms are not in low- Manuals' development.	
rating: sumciently clear in terms of tunctionality	
83% protocols and timeliness of LDCS;	
Least agreement	
by provinces /	
Statement 7 Defined on portunities to raise feedback notitions grievances	

Mode (highest	Qualitative results highlights	Statistically significant	Variable-specific recommendations
rated) &		correlations	
Net			
rating			
Mode:	Responses affirm the existence of	Less agreement	Address the vagueness of
Strongly	mechanisms to raise feedback and	by CSOs;	opportunities and processes
Agree	grievances, but the examples	Highest	for feedback and grievances,
46%	given are diverse, including non-	agreement by	e.g., through LDC Manuals
Net	formal practices, and do not	municipalities /	and CSO Desks
rating:	necessarily enable	least by	
84%	documentation, tracking, and	provinces	
	follow-through		
	Engagement: Participatio	in processes and ini	tion
Madai	Bechanses are mostly		Align expectations on
Strongly	confirmatory Emorgant	nighest	inclusion (terms and
Agroo	parameters for inclusion are:	agreement by	ngramatars) through LDC
Agree	commanyurate representation of	cities	manuals and local resolutions
47% Not	local sectors breadth/reach of		
rating:	invited sectors, and gaenda-		
20%	setting roles for CSOs		
0570	Statement 9, Aut	tonomy and fairnes	s
Mode <sup>.</sup>	Besponses are mostly affirming of	Less agreement	Alian expectations on
Strongly	the statement CSOs however	hy I GUS	autonomy and fairness (terms
Agree	attribute gaps to tokenistic (for	Least agreement	and parameters) through LDC
45%	compliance) participation and the	hy provinces /	manuals and local resolutions
Net	lack of agenda influence and	highest by cities	
rating:	feedback loops. IGUs underscore	ingrest by onles	
83%	capacity gaps of CSOs. Both		
	groups underscore the disposition		
	of LCEs/LGUs on participation to		
	influence autonomy and fairness		
	practices.		
	Statement 10. Transparency of eng	agement (Efficient o	document releases)
Mode:	Most responses affirm the	Less agreement	Streamline timelines for
Strongly	statement. Qualified agreements	by CSOs;	document releases to CSOs,
Agree	and disagreements concern the	Highest net	as part of LDC protocols and
47%	timeliness of document releases	agreement by	manual of operations
Net	to CSOs	municipalities	
rating:			
85%			
	Results: Partic	ipation outcomes	
	Statement 11. Influ	ence on LDC Decisi	ons
Mode:	While ~60% of CSO and LGU	Less agreement	Pursue conversations on the
Agree	responses allude to 'strong	by LGUs;	constitution of 'strong
46%	partnerships' affirming influence,	Highest	partnerships' and the
Net	other responses point to limited	agreement by	capabilities of CSOs in cities
rating:	CSO influence. Scenarios include	cities / least by	that may be expanded to
75%	LGUs 'cherry-picking' CSO	province	other LGU types
	proposals, CSOs having limited	1	

Mode	Qualitative results highlights	Statistically	Variable-specific
(highest		significant	recommendations
rated) &		correlations	
Net			
rating			
	capacity and expertise to assert		
	influence, and other		
	conditionalities about when CSOs		
	are deemed relevant to influence		
	LDC decisions.		
	Statement 12. Enablir	ng More Effective Po	
Mode:	Most responses affirm the value	Least agreement	Further analysis and tailored
Strongly	of CSO perspectives in developing	by provinces	action on uptake dynamics of
Agree	plans and programs. Qualified		CSOs' voice in plans and
52%	agreements and disagreements		programs, especially for
Net	highlight scenarios limiting the		provincial LDCs
rating:	uptake of CSO inputs, e.g., CSO		
89%	technical and advocacy		
	capabilities and LGUS		
	conditionality (gatekeeping) of the		
	scope and depth of CSO inputs.		
N A a al a c	Statement 13		
Node:	~70% of CSO and LGU responses	Less agreement	Advance CSOs <sup>2</sup> understanding
Strongly	affirmed CSU satisfaction, citing	by LGUS;	of PG and its outcomes
Agree	CSUS <sup>®</sup> exercise of voice in sharing	Less agreement	(addressing the CSUs
52%	local policies and receipt of	IN IOW-	seeming baseline of lack, such
Net	resource support, and LGOS	Tunctionality	that LDC access and
rating:	Opening up of governance.	LDCS;	opportunities raise
8/%	dissetisfactions of CCOs loop on	Less agreement	satisfaction, insufficiently
	dissatisfactions of CSOS leaf of	functionality	accounting for LDC
	support and gatekooning		ellectivelless of limberchig
	dynamics with LGUs LGUs'	LDCS, Highost	outcomes)
	qualified agreements and	agreement in	
	dissatisfactions stem from their	cities	
	inability to 'completely respond to	cities	
	all CSO concerns'		
	Statement 14 (LGUs only), LGU sa	atisfaction on partic	cipatory practices
Mode:	LGUs' self-assessment is mostly	(Trend only. not	Advancing policy guidance
Strongly	positive (74% of qualitative	significant) Less	toward more PG-guality
Agree	responses), pegged against their	agreement in	practices and outcomes since
51%	fulfillment of policy-defined roles	low-functionality	LGUs seem to rationalize
Net	and administrative requirements	LDCs	satisfaction based on the
rating:	(LDC functionality, DILG MC).		national government's
90%	Partial agreements and		prescriptions
	disagreements are thematically		
	similar regarding administrative		
	compliance and addressing		
	resource constraints.		

### Space dimension variables

# Statement 1. Rationalized inclusion criteria (Satisfaction of accreditation guidelines)

The CSO accreditation and LDC membership selection satisfy the requirements of the national guidelines.

Aside from compressing the operationalization of the national guidelines into a single variable, the statement also accounts for the extent to which LGUs unarbitrary and non-politicized inclusion of CSO members in the LDC. The statement upholds the logic that if the LGU observes the prescribed CSO accreditation process, then the likelihood of politicized selection of CSOs is lessened (Medina-Guce 2020a, 2022a, 2023a). Rationalizing the inclusion (gatekeeping') parameters of 'who gets a seat' is considered a policy space (design) requisite of PG quality. While the political arbitrariness of selection is not explicit in the statement, it provides the inquiry space for such issues to be accounted for in the overall assessment.

**Overall result.** Among the total respondents, the majority (58%) strongly agree with the statement, followed by 37% who agree (**Table 34**). Note from **Figure 3** that this is the variable statement with the highest percentage of combined agree and strongly agree responses (95%) and the least combined disagree/strongly disagree percentage (1%) across all the 14 PGM-LDC statements.

Responses	No.	Percent
Strongly Agree	569	58%
Agree	367	37%
Disagree	14	1%
Strongly Disagree	4	0%
Not informed/Not know	28	3%
Refuse to Answer	10	1%
Total	992	100%

Table 34. Statement 1 (Accreditation Guidelines Satisfaction) Overall Results

**Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.1).** Only three CSOs (out of 497 respondents) provided qualitative elaborations, which only confirmed the satisfaction of the CSO requirements. More LGU responses were received (223, 45% of total LGU respondents). From the 223 responses, 80% affirmed the process adherence. Among the LGU respondents who partially or did not agree, the responses were still concerned that *political leaders' preferences influence the selection process* and that the Magna Carta of Women representation is not followed. Bottlenecks in the accreditation process are attributed to documentation issues and outdated records of CSOs.

The LGU respondents noted that complying with accreditation requirements takes time, highlighting that they are "too short" and that the "requirement that they have to be accredited prior to LDC membership is not usually satisfied". This suggests further review and streamlining of processes and requirements for LDC accreditation. Recommendations from LGU responses further highlighted the need to strengthen data gathering capabilities to create/update the CSO inventory and more extensive support from DILG for CSOs to understand' accreditation guidelines Other 'completely the and requirements. recommendations underscored better implementation and a 'proper process' for selecting LDC members.

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B8.1).** Among the profile variables, the only correlation with a statistically significant result is Statement 1 *by LGU type* (**Table 35**). The chi-squared test confirms significant differences in perceptions across LGU types, with general agreement (sum of agree and strongly agree) highest among provinces (95%, combining agree and strongly agree) and cities (94%, also combined agree categories), while municipalities show lower agreement (84%, combined categories). This suggests that accreditation and LDC membership selection guidelines are observed better in provinces and municipalities.

LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree	
City	1	0	0	11	55	142	209
	0%	0%	0%	5%	26%	68%	100%
Municipality	9	3	9	14	268	306	609
	1%	0%	1%	2%	44%	50%	100%
Province	0	1	5	3	44	121	174
	0%	1%	3%	2%	25%	70%	100%
Total	10	4	14	28	367	569	992
	1%	0%	1%	3%	37%	57%	100%

Table 35. Statement 1 (Accreditation Guidelines Satisfaction) by LGU type

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 51.05, Prob. = 0.0000. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** Two implications may be drawn from the results. First, PGM Statement 1 results show an interesting scenario when interpreted with the results of compliance with the LSB reconstitution process (Section 4A.2). When the survey inquired on the compliance with the set of activities for reconstitution, the results showed high (80%+) compliance rates (except for CSO network emergence), with cities identified as the most compliant in many of the activities. PGM Statement 1 reaffirms the finding (largely agreeable responses) and specifies the municipalities with the least percentage of agreeable responses (84% combined categories).

This suggests *the municipalities as the LGU type that most need attention for accreditation guidelines compliance interventions.* The earlier LDC strategic review (Medina-Guce 2023b) noted that provincial-level accreditation is often opened to CSOs operating in multiple locations (more than one municipality) to qualify with the logic of being a 'provincial-level' representative. This means that by capacity tiers, the more established, more institutionally mature CSOs are accredited at the provincial or multiple levels where they operate. The scenario paints a picture of the less organizationally mature CSOs (e.g., anecdotally, habal-habal drivers associations, marginalized groups' sectoral people's organizations) vying for accreditation at the municipal level. The bottlenecks in the accreditation (documentation gaps and outdated records) are not practices of stronger, more established CSOs. In other words, they can focus their efforts at the municipal level, specifically targeting the less established CSOs.

Second, it is notable that the political arbitrariness of selection and appointments of the LDCs was documented from the LGU responses, indicating good will that the LGU functionaries are seeking for structured approaches to rationalize the process and guard it against politically motivated selection. Here the earlier study's recommendation (Medina-Guce 2023b) from stakeholders may also apply, that DILG strengthens *the enforcement of the Code's provision for CSOs to select their LSB representatives themselves (LGC Section 108)*. Currently, the self-selection seems to be recommendatory in practice (endorsement only), instead of a binding

decision of the CSO representative body (from the CSO conference/network/Peoples' Council) that the LGU is meant to uphold.

**Statement 2. Engagement Strategy (Clear information on ways of participating)** LDC-CSO members are *clearly informed about the different ways of participating* in the LDC, including its committees and other consultative activities.

PGM Statement 2 assesses the presence of a *clear and substantiated approach to engaging CSOs* in LDC processes, i.e., development planning, budgeting, and monitoring and evaluation. The Code specifies the creation of subcommittees under the LDC that could expand the participation of CSOs. The LDCs are also tasked to develop and review the LGU plans that should also observe participatory processes. These ways of participation are beyond the conduct of the regular/official meetings of the 'full' LDC, of which *engagement modalities could vary across LGU practices*. The preferred scenario is that DILG will not over-prescribe an engagement process (activity-focused) that would strain the implementation options of LGUs with their CSO partners.

As such, the statement assesses the extent to which the *scope of participatory opportunities is clear and known to the CSO members, indicating awareness and 'grasp' of the information.* As one of two statements operationalizing the clear engagement strategy PGM variable, this follows the logic that if CSO members are well informed of the various ways of participating, they can better navigate the LDC participatory space and maximize the opportunities of their accredited representation status (Medina-Guce 2022a, 2023a).

**Overall result:** 48% of all respondents agreed with the statement that CSOs are clearly informed of participatory opportunities (**Table 36**). The combined strongly agree and agree categories comprised 93% of all responses.

Responses	No.	Percent
Strongly Agree	442	45%
Agree	480	48%
Disagree	29	3%
Strongly Disagree	9	1%
Not informed/Not know	25	3%
Refuse to Answer	7	1%
Total	992	100%

Table 36. Statement 2 (Clear Information on Ways of Participating) Overall Results

**Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.2).** Qualitative responses were, at large, confirmatory expressions of the statement (72% of the 162 CSO responses and 65% of 207 LGU responses). Qualified agreements from both CSOs and LGUs underscored *the need for the information to make sense and be actionable for the CSOs*. For example, "Sometimes there [is] information that needs detail[ed] knowledge, especially if it is highly technical," and "We were informed but needed to be more detailed, including specific processes or procedures." LGU responses (12%) were further concerned that CSOs do not fully understand the information due to "lack of capacity" and "limited or inconsistent participation."

The CSO respondents highlighted the need for the timely dissemination of information and feedback. Few respondents failed to attend the activities due to the "delay sending of invitation letters". They were also not "proactively" and "fully informed" of their roles and ways in

participation in the LDC. The LGU respondents also echoed that the CSOs were not "fully briefed" on their roles, tasks, and extent of participation. Recommendations from the LGU respondents included further training and orientation activities for CSO members.

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B8.2).** Two correlative tests yielded statistically significant results: *by LDC functionality rating* and *by functionality rating x respondent type (CSOs)*. On the first correlation, perceptions of being informed about LDC participation mechanisms differ based on LDC functionality (**Table 37**). Respondents from high-functionality LDCs report a higher overall agreement rate (95%, comprising agree and strongly agree responses) compared to those from low-functionality LDCs (91%, combined agree and strongly agree).

		.,					
LDC	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed	Agree	Strongly	Total
Functionality	Answer	Disagree		/ I do not		Agree	
Rating				know			
Low	6	7	10	17	197	186	423
	1%	2%	2%	4%	47%	44%	100%
High	1	2	19	8	283	256	569
	0%	0%	3%	1%	50%	45%	100%
Total	7	9	29	25	480	442	992
	1%	1%	3%	3%	48%	45%	100%

 Table 37. Statement 2 (Clear Information on Ways of Participating)

 by LDC Functionality Rating

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 17.77, Prob = 0.0032. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Adding respondent type into the correlation test showed a significant relationship with CSOs (but not for the LGUs). Among CSOs in high-functionality LDCs, 94% (combined agree and strongly agree) report being well-informed, compared to 91% (combined agree and strongly agree) in low-functionality LDCs (**Table 38**). The difference suggests that CSOs in high-functionality LDCs receive more effective communication about participation opportunities, while CSOs in low-functionality LDCs are less informed. As per the LGU responses, the LDC functionality level does not affect the high agreement rates of LGU respondents (data table in **Annex B8.2.4**, no longer included here for brevity).

by LDC Functionality Nating by Respondent Type (C505)							
LDC	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed	Agree	Strongly	Total
Functionality	Answer	Disagree		/ I do not		Agree	
Rating				know			
Low	2	3	4	11	86	109	215
	1%	1%	2%	5%	40%	51%	100%
High	0	1	11	5	133	132	282
	0%	0%	4%	2%	47%	47%	100%
Total	2	4	15	16	219	241	497
	0%	1%	3%	3%	44%	49%	100%

# Table 38. Statement 2 (Clear Information on Ways of Participating) by LDC Functionality Rating by Respondent Type (CSOs)

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 11.98, Prob. = 0.0350. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** The results suggest that *clear and effective communication of participation opportunities* is a significant contributor to LDC participation quality, particularly in high-functionality LDC settings. High functionality parameters mean more CSOs (also the local

network), more interactions (meetings and mechanisms/platforms like the subcommittees), and more documented CSO attendance (interactions with LGUs) – all increasing the possibilities for formal and informal information sharing. But more notably, the qualitative responses provide insightful context – that 'only' receiving information about participatory opportunities is insufficient; the communication's effectiveness is contingent on *whether the information is deemed relevant and actionable for the CSOs*.

There is no quick and easy model as to what constitutes clear and effective communication, only the guidance that LGU's communication mechanisms (e.g., LDC Secretariat, CSO Desks) and even inter-CSO (within the networks) see through that information on participation opportunities are well received and understood by receiving CSOs. The significant nuance of the low-functionality correlation also means that improving the functionality level of the LDC (passing and exceeding the minimum requirement) is imperative.

### Statement 3. Engagement strategy (Sufficient communication)

The LGU *sufficiently communicates* the different ways of participating in the LDC, including its committees and other consultative activities, to all interested CSOs.

The second engagement strategy-related statement concerns *sufficient communication* of the LGU regarding the ways of participating in the LDC and its related activities as broadly as possible. The PGM-LDC tools (including the enumerators' spiel) emphasize the dimension of *communication reach* that targets *interested* CSOs regardless of their accreditation status. The main consideration here is the CSOs' interest in being involved, such that if any CSO wants to participate, then the information on how-to should be available and accessible. In principle, the statement explores the *communication flows across the networks* presumably built through the layers of CSO orientations and pre-appointment activities that DILG prescribes in its LSB reconstitution guidelines (Medina-Guce 2022a, 2023a).

**Overall result.** Results show positive responses to the statement, with 94% strongly agreeing and agreeing. Half of the responses strongly agree (Table 39).

Responses	No.	Percent
Strongly Agree	497	50%
Agree	434	44%
Disagree	26	3%
Strongly Disagree	5	1%
Not informed/Not know	21	2%
Refuse to Answer	9	1%
Total	992	100%

Table 39. Statement 3 (Sufficient Communication) Overall Results

**Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.3).** This statement gathered a moderate number of qualitative responses from CSOs (31%) and LGUs (38%). While the majority of the responses are confirmatory of the statement, they also give insights as to *what 'sufficient' parameters mean*, e.g.:

- 'Exhaustively' multi-modal in dissemination (mix of email, social media/group chats, hard copies)
- Timely and predictably regular based on pipelined events and activities

- Accessible for informal follow-ups and clarifications through dedicated offices and persons that CSOs can reach
- Generously open, meaning the information given to one CSO is accessible to all and not pre-determined by the LGU what 'relevant' information is for whom.

For example, CSO and LGU respondents alike indicated that information communication is limited to qualified, accredited, and "relevant to the agenda." An LGU respondent noted that few CSOs choose not to participate in the subject for deliberation does not "concern them" or "align with their interests." Recommendations highlighted that the CSO orientation may not be sufficient, and there is a need to "sustain the information dissemination" through various mechanisms.

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B8.3).** Among the correlation tests, a significant relationship was found in the statement's results by LGU type (**Table 40**). Cities exhibit the highest agreement at 96% (combining the agree and strongly agree results), with minimal disagreement (1%). In municipalities, agreement is lower at 94% (combined agree-strongly agree). Provinces show the lowest agreement at 90% (combined categories), with 7% disagreeing. These findings suggest that *city-level LGUs are perceived as the most effective in sufficiently communicating* participation opportunities to interested CSOs.

LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree	
City	1	2	1	4	74	127	209
	0%	1%	0%	2%	35%	61%	100%
Municipality	7	2	13	14	295	278	609
	1%	0%	2%	2%	48%	46%	100%
Province	1	1	12	3	65	92	174
	1%	1%	7%	2%	37%	53%	100%
Total	9	5	26	21	434	497	992
	1%	1%	3%	2%	44%	50%	100%

Table 40. Statement 3 (Sufficient Communication) by LGU Type

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 34.31, Prob. = 0.0002. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** The results provide insights in establishing a qualitative baseline of expectations for sufficient communication from both CSOs and LGUs. The LDC strategic review (Medina-Guce 2023b) noted innovations in *multi-modal communication strategies* (combined email, social media, hard copies), with social media (group chats) cited as particularly helpful with its opportunity to be informal in raising questions and clarifications.

The element of the informality of the channels seems to be an emerging successful strategy, which is a matter not readily captured by the structure and protocols of LDC as per the DILG guidelines' scope. Instead, *sufficient communication is being packaged here as a frontline service*, like a hotline and info/help desk, in the manner frontline service delivery is commonly understood (e.g., emergency helplines, barangay women's desks). Delivering this communication service requires resources for staff and technologies, which may begin to explain why cities fare better (e.g., internet and mobile communication for all stakeholders). These findings may inform DILG's considerations of the scope of LDCs' Manuals of Operations, as pipelined in ongoing policy and capacity development interventions.
# Statement 4. Transparency and access to information protocols

The LDC has *clear protocols* for CSO members to access data and information relevant to their participation.

While Statements 2 and 3 concern strategies for 'info out' from LGUs, Statement 4 assesses the extent to which clear protocols are available to facilitate transparency access to data and information regardless of demand—but particularly *when there is demand* from CSOs. Its relevance is rooted in the CSOs' data needs to develop evidence-based proposals and an independent citizen agenda. The lack of access to information negatively affects their participation experience (Medina-Guce 2022a, 2023a).

**Overall result:** The majority of respondents agree with the statement (91%, combining agree and strongly agree categories, **Table 41**).

Responses	No.	Percent
Strongly Agree	445	45%
Agree	455	46%
Disagree	10	1%
Strongly Disagree	11	1%
Not informed/Not know	56	6%
Refuse to Answer	15	2%
Total	992	100%

Table 41. Statement 4 (Transparency and Access to Information Protocols) Overall Results

**Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.4).** The statement received a moderate number of responses from CSOs (27%) and LGUs (31%). The majority of such responses confirm that CSOs can access data relevant to their participation (73% of the CSO qualitative responses, 81% of the LGUs'). The respondents mentioned different mechanisms varying from the conduct of briefing and barangay assemblies, posting of documents on full disclosure boards, and assistance from the CSO Desk to the formal submission of requests for data access.

However, partial agreements and disagreements emphasize the need to establish *firmer protocols* (e.g., steps, timeliness guidelines, requirements) to clarify uniformity of access for CSOs and the roles and responsibilities on the part of the LGU functionaries. Both CSOs and LGUs indicated that access to data is subject to the discretion of the relevant offices and/or committees. The respondents also emphasized the need to understand and comply with data privacy guidelines and other procedural requirements before releasing the requested data by the CSOs. Recommendations included enhancing CSO knowledge on where to obtain relevant data and information.

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B8.4).** Two variable associations yielded statistically significant results: *respondent group* and *LGU type*. For the respondent group, LGUs indicated a higher level of agreement (91% agree, combining agree and strongly agree responses) compared to CSO respondents (90% agreement, combined categories). While both groups agree with the statement, CSOs expressed higher disagreement levels (4%, combined disagree and strongly disagree) compared to only 2 responses from LGUs (**Table 42**). *This means LGU respondents tend to view their LDC's information access protocols more positively ('clearer') than the CSOs*.

riotocoloj by hespondent Group								
Respondent	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total	
Group	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree		
CSO	8	10	10	20	216	233	497	
	2%	2%	2%	4%	43%	47%	100%	
LGU	7	1	0	36	239	212	495	
	1%	0%	0%	7%	48%	43%	100%	
Total	15	11	10	56	455	445	992	
	2%	1%	1%	6%	46%	45%	100%	

Table 42. Statement 4 (Transparency and Access to InformationProtocols) by Respondent Group

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 24.15, Prob. = 0.0002. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Meanwhile, results (**Table 43**) also suggest that *the LGU type is associated with how respondents perceive the clarity of information access protocols*. The highest level of agreement is observed among municipal respondents (92% agree, combined positive categories). Provinces report the lowest level of agreement (86% agreement, combined categories) and the highest level of disagreement (6%, combined disagree and strongly disagree). Cities report agreement between the two at 90.4% (combined).

LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
	Answer	Disagree		I do not know		Agree	
City	3	3	3	11	73	116	209
	1%	1%	1%	5%	35%	56%	100%
Municipality	11	2	2	33	299	262	609
	2%	0%	0%	5%	49%	43%	100%
Province	1	6	5	12	83	67	174
	6%	3%	3%	7%	47%	39%	100%
Total	15	11	10	56	455	445	992
	2%	1%	1%	6%	46%	45%	100%

Table 43. Statement 4 (Transparency and Access to Information Protocols) by LGU Type

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 37.54, Prob. 0.0000. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** The high levels of agreement with the statement suggest that LDC members are confident about the protocols for accessing data. However, the responses do not negate an aspiration for *more refined protocols*, especially for the CSOs and provincial respondents.

Moreover, the inquiry does not delve deeper into the types of data and information the respondents agree with having clear protocols for access. It may also be possible that the information scope is provided through other non-LDC-initiated policies, e.g., Full Disclosure Policy, transparency portals in websites, or, for some LGUs, local Freedom of Information ordinances. DILG's capacity development interventions with CSOs could feature more information access protocol-related discussions and further map out the types of information CSOs may be interested in requesting to aid their LDC policy engagements.

# Statement 5. Organizational capacity (Sufficient resource support)

CSO participation in the LDC (including its committees and other consultative activities) is *sufficiently supported by LGU resources*, e.g., funding, facilities, technologies, and human resources.

Reflecting the costs of participation issue, which is greatly resonant in policy discussions, Statement 5 assesses the extent to which LGUs' resources (e.g., human, financial, facilities, and technology) are sufficient to support CSO participation (Medina 2022a, 2023a).

**Overall result.** Responses show that most respondents affirm sufficient resources supporting the LDCs' participatory activities, with 48% agreeing and 38% strongly agreeing **(Table 44).** Referencing the summary of all 14 PGM-LDC statements in **Figure 3**, this is the variable with the least percentage of combined agree/strongly agree responses (82%) and the highest percentage of combined disagree/strongly disagree responses (14%) – as such the lowest rated among the 14 PGM-LDC statements.

Responses	No.	Percent
Strongly Agree	334	34%
Agree	478	48%
Disagree	119	12%
Strongly Disagree	15	2%
Not informed/Not know	34	3%
Refuse to Answer	12	1%
Total	992	100%

Table 44. Statement 5 (Sufficient Resource Support) Overall Results

**Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.5).** The statement gathered 174 qualitative responses from CSOs and 208 from LGUs. While most answers affirm the sufficiency of resources (55% from CSOs and 48% from LGUs), qualified agreements and disagreements highlight either lacking or inconsistent resource provision. A few CSO respondents mentioned that while financial support is limited, they receive other support types, such as logistical and administrative support (e.g., facilities, technology, and human resources). According to the CSOs, the lack of financial support "depletes their organizational funds." 11% of CSOs said no LGU funds are specifically dedicated to participation, while 8% of LGUs indicated tight budgets and COA regulations as constraints. One LGU noted that while they provided enough budget for CSOs, it could not be disbursed to fund their travel expenses.

CSO recommendations include establishing clear protocols for CSOs' access to funds and dedicating funds for honorarium and operational costs. LGUs cited the need for national policies from which bases for CSO fund allocations and other participatory activities could easily and seamlessly be sourced.

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B8.5).** For the correlation tests, statistically significant results were found with the statement's association with LGU type (**Table 45**). Municipalities agree least with the statement (80% combined agree/strongly agree, 16% combined disagree/strongly disagree). City respondents agree most with the statement (89% combined agree, 7% combined disagree). The results suggest that the resource sufficiency issue is most pronounced in supporting municipal LDC activities.

					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
	Answer	Disagree		I do not know		Agree	
City	2	3	12	6	94	92	209
	1%	1%	6%	3%	45%	44%	100%
Municipality	7	6	89	18	307	182	609
	1%	1%	15%	3%	50%	30%	100%
Province	3	6	18	10	77	60	174
	2%	3%	10%	6%	44%	35%	100%
Total	12	15	119	34	478	334	992
	1%	2%	12%	3%	48%	34%	100%

Table 45. Statement 5 (Sufficient Resource Support) by LGU Type

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 30.86, Prob. 0.0006. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** The survey results provide nuances on the extent of the resource insufficiency issue that persists in policy conversations. Respondents generally affirm the sufficient allocation of resources but less so at the municipal level. DILG may seriously consider *developing a national policy that sets parameters for fund sources and disbursement protocols* for participation so that, even in areas (e.g., low resource-level municipalities), LGUs and CSOs could still have a concrete reference to carve out fiscal spaces for participatory activities.

# Statement 6. Clear mechanisms for feedback loops

The LDC has *clear mechanisms* to inform CSO members on the status of their issues raised and suggestions provided.

The statement responds to documented CSO concerns during the PGM-LDC customization regarding closing feedback loops on the agenda they raise. Otherwise stated, CSOs do not necessarily receive follow-through information and updates if the LDC/LGU acts upon their concerns and suggestions. The variable assesses the extent to which such feedback loop mechanisms are in place.

**Overall result.** The survey's responses show high levels of agreement, with 46% agreeing and 42% strongly agreeing with the statement **(Table 46).** 

Responses	No.	Percent
Strongly Agree	421	42%
Agree	454	46%
Disagree	42	4%
Strongly Disagree	11	1%
Not informed/Not know	49	5%
Refuse to Answer	15	2%
Total	992	100%

Table 46. Statement 6 (Clear Mechanisms for Feedback Loops) Overall Results

**Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.6).** The statement gathered 146 responses from CSOs and 170 from LGUs. The qualitative responses are mostly affirmative of the statement (66% of CSOs and 79% of LGUs). LGU respondents noted feedback mechanisms include providing updates on issues raised, complaint and suggestion boxes, and even the option for CSOs to submit letters to the LGU.

However, the partial agreements and disagreements emphasize that while mechanisms exist, they are limited and often unclear (e.g., concerning timeliness and lack of detailed guidance). Some LGU respondents noted that specific concerns are often forwarded to the offices in charge but are no longer followed up on for return feedback to the concerned CSO. Some CSO respondents echoed that "follow-ups are needed to get an answer" and further cited being in a "back and forth" mechanism with the LGUs to resolve issues. Recommendations emphasized the need for consistent reporting/updating, more structured discussions, and clear feedback mechanisms.

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B8.6).** Statistical association tests found significant results for the variables *respondent group, LDC functionality rating, and LGU type.* For the respondent group (**Table 47**), LGUs report slightly higher agreement (90% combined agree/strongly agree) than CSOs (87%, combined categories). Disagreement is also higher among CSOs (8%, combined) than LGUs (3%). This means that LGUs tend to perceive their feedback loop mechanisms better than how CSOs do.

Respondent	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
Group	Answer	Disagree		I do not know		Agree	
CSO	5	8	30	21	223	210	497
	1%	2%	6%	4%	45%	42%	100%
LGU	10	3	12	28	231	211	495
	2%	1%	2%	6%	47%	43%	100%
Total	15	11	42	49	454	421	992
	2%	1%	4%	5%	46%	42%	100%

Table 47. Statement o (clear mechanisms for recaback coops) by hespondent oroa
--

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 12.79, Prob. = 0.0254. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

The LDC functionality rating also affects the perception results (**Table 48**). High-functionality LDCs agree more (90% combined agree/strongly agree) than low-functionality LDCs (85%). Conversely, low functionality LDCs' disagreement is higher (7% combined disagree/strongly disagree) than high functionality LDCs (4% combined). These suggest that high-functionality LDCs are perceived to have more established feedback loop mechanisms in place than low-functionality LDCs.

Table 48. Statement 6	(Clear Mechanisms for	Feedback Loops)	b'	y LDC Functionality	Rating
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------	----	---------------------	--------

LDC	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed	Agree	Strongly	Total
Functionality	Answer	Disagree		/ I do not		Agree	
Rating				know			
Low	6	9	20	27	191	170	423
	1%	2%	5%	6%	45%	40%	100%
High	9	2	22	22	263	251	569
	2%	0%	4%	4%	46%	44%	100%
Total	15	11	42	49	454	421	992
	2%	1%	4%	5%	46%	42%	100%

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 11.42, Prob. = 0.0436. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Lastly, LGU type significantly correlates with the perception of feedback loop mechanisms (**Table X**). City respondents indicate the highest agreement level (89%, combined agree/strongly agree), closely followed by municipalities (89% combined, with less strongly agree than cities). Provincial respondents indicated the lowest level of agreement (83%

combined) and the highest percentage of disagreement (8%, combined disagree/strongly disagree).

LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree	
City	0	4	7	11	76	111	209
	0%	2%	3%	5%	36%	53%	100
Municipality	12	5	22	27	298	245	609
	2%	1%	4%	4%	49%	40%	100%
Province	3	2	13	11	80	65	174
	2%	1%	7%	6%	46%	37%	100%
Total	15	11	42	49	454	421	992
	2%	1%	4%	5%	46%	42%	100%

Table 49. Statement 6 (Clear Mechanisms for Feedback Loops) by LGU Type

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 24.76, Prob. = 0.0058. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** These results suggest the presence of feedback opportunities but can be significantly improved to rationalize steps and response protocols, especially for low-functionality LDCs and provinces. It is interesting to note that CSOs agree less with the statement, suggesting that LGUs may be clearer about how they receive and respond to concerns but do not sufficiently communicate and align processes with their CSO counterparts. Improving feedback loops may be included in future interventions in developing LDC Manuals of Operations and may learn from emergent lessons in the local FOI implementation of the LGUs with such ordinances.

# Statement 7. Defined opportunities to raise feedback, petitions, grievances There are *defined opportunities* for the LDC-CSO members to formally raise their own agenda, feedback, and grievances, e.g., in the Monitoring Reporting Committee meetings.

The variable accounts for scenarios raised by CSOs regarding insufficient opportunities for them to shape the LDC agenda, including feedback and grievances. This refers to practices wherein CSOs are passive recipients of pre-defined agendas and are unsure about how to formally raise their concerns in the LDC discussions (except for 'as other matters' toward the end of meetings). TWG discussions during the PGM-LDC customization indicated that the formal space for raising agenda, feedback, and grievances should be observed in, but not limited to, the quarterly Monitoring Reporting Committee meetings. Also, during the customization process, LGUs highlighted the relevance of such mechanisms so that legitimate 'actionable' grievances could be filtered from what may be perceived as politically motivated feedback (Medina-Guce 2022a, 2023a).

**Overall result.** Results show high levels of agreement with the statement, with 46% of respondents strongly agreeing and 43% agreeing (Table 50).

Responses	No.	Percent					
Strongly Agree	461	46%					
Agree	424	43%					
Disagree	36	4%					
Strongly Disagree	10	1%					
Not informed/Not know	42	4%					
Refuse to Answer	19	2%					
Total	992	100%					

Table 50. Statement 7 (Defined Opportunities to Raise Feedback, Petitions. Grievances) Overall Results

**Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.7).** The statement received 139 qualitative responses from CSOs and 178 from LGUs. 76% of CSO responses and 85% of LGU responses confirm the statement. Such indicate that CSO concerns are included in the agenda of the council meetings and their members can also directly communicate with the LGU personnel or the CSO desk.

However, the *diversity of mechanisms* that the respondents cite is notable from the full set of responses (including the confirmatory ones). Some point to the CSO desk as the formal mechanism, while others refer to *non-formalized practices* such as approaching the concerned offices after LDC meetings. The qualitative responses suggest that there are mechanisms to raise concerns, but they do not necessarily translate to a formalized agenda point that LDC discussions can document, track progress, and follow through with for various reasons (e.g., lack of funds).

Moreover, Both CSO and LGU respondents cited CSOs' lack of willingness to use the existing mechanisms and to raise concerns. Few LGU respondents described CSO members as "shy," "not confident, or "passive." Recommendations underscored improvements in feedback mechanisms and enhancements in CSO capacity to enable them to become more informed and proactive.

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B8.7).** Correlation tests yielded statistically significant results for *respondent group* and *LGU type*. For the respondent group (**Table 51**), LGUs report a higher level of agreement (92%, combined agree/strongly agree) than CSOs (87%, combined). Conversely, CSOs reported a higher level of disagreement (6%, combined disagree/strongly disagree) than LGUs (3%). These suggest that *LGUs perceive the current mechanisms as sufficient but less so for CSOs*.

relitions, drievances, by Respondent droup									
Respondent	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total		
Group	Answer	Disagree		I do not know		Agree			
CSO	10	7	27	22	212	219	497		
	2%	1%	5%	4%	43%	44%	100%		
LGU	9	3	9	20	212	242	495		
	2%	1%	2%	4%	43%	49%	100%		
Total	19	10	36	42	424	461	992		
	2%	1%	4%	4%	43%	46%	100%		

 Table 51. Statement 7 (Defined Opportunities to Raise Feedback,

 Petitions, Grievances) by Respondent Group

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 11.89, Prob. = 0.0363. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

The type of LGU also relates to the perception levels of the formal opportunities for feedback and grievances. The correlation test (**Table 52**) shows that municipality respondents agree with the statement the most (91% combined agree/strongly agree) compared to cities (89%) and provinces (87%). Provincial respondents reported the highest level of disagreement at 7% (combined categories). The results suggest that *municipalities are better perceived at establishing and practicing formal spaces wherein CSOs can raise their feedback and grievances*.

LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
	Answer	Disagree		I do not know		Agree	
City	0	3	9	12	64	121	209
	0%	1%	4%	6%	31%	58%	100%
Municipality	17	3	19	20	284	266	609
	3%	1%	3%	3%	47%	44%	100%
Province	2	4	8	10	76	74	174
	1%	2%	5%	6%	44%	43%	100%
Total	19	10	36	42	424	461	992
	2%	1%	4%	4%	43%	46%	100%

Table 52. Statement 7 (Defined Opportunities to Raise Feedback,
Petitions, Grievances) by LGU Type

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 33.20, Prob. = 0.0003. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** The results suggest *that respondents make sense of 'defined opportunities' to raise feedback and grievances vaguely.* Some consider informal chats with LGU functionaries *after* LDC meetings as such mechanisms, but they consider them 'LDC mechanisms' just because the opportunity for the conversations is happenstance with the conduct of LDC meetings. The more mature practices others have cited pertain to *structured, formal ways to document, track, and resolve CSO agenda/grievances.* As with Statement 6, LGUs tend to agree with the statement more, which suggests that LGU functionaries may be clearer about how they receive and resolve feedback and grievances but less so from the CSOs' perspective. There is significant room for improvement in developing these mechanisms in the future, e.g., in developing LDC Manuals and elaborating on the roles of CSO desks.

#### Engagement dimension variables

#### Statement 8. Inclusion and representation

The LDC processes (in the council, committees, and other consultative activities) are *effectively inclusive* of different civil society sectors and agendas.

As a variable under the PGM dimension of *engagement (as participatory interactions)*, the statement assesses the extent to which the LDC processes enable sectoral and advocacy representation of a broad range of CSOs (regardless of accreditation). The emphasis here is on the *processual* element in the LDC since its scope is not limited to the full and formal council meetings. The statement further explores if the LDC mechanisms and processes are being maximized to multiply the ways that CSOs could participate. (Medina-Guce 2022a, 2023a)

**Overall result.** Most respondents agree with the statement, with 47% strongly agreeing and 45% agreeing **(Table 53)**. This statement is the highest rated among the three Engagement dimension variables (as per **Figure 3** earlier presented).

Responses	No.	Percent
Strongly Agree	467	47%
Agree	444	45%
Disagree	24	2%
Strongly Disagree	8	1%
Not informed/Not know	33	3%
Refuse to Answer	16	2%
Total	992	100%

Table 53. Statement 8 (Inclusion and Representation) Overall Results

**Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.8).** The statement gathered 142 responses from CSOs and 160 from LGUs. Most qualitative responses were confirmatory statements (76% CSOs and 82% LGUs). CSO responses included varying levels of inclusive participation, from involvement in meetings and discussions and submission of proposals to decision-making processes. Notable from the overall responses are the emergent diverse parameters of what constitute effectively inclusive' practices, e.g.:

- *Commensurate representation of sectors.* Some answers gauge inclusivity by the correspondence of the LDC CSO members with the sectors in the locality.
- *Breadth of invitations*. Some responses operationalize inclusivity by the broadness and reach of the LGU's call for participation among the CSOs, especially when the invitations are extended beyond the officially accredited CSOs.
- *Agenda-setting roles*. Others still (particularly from the CSO responses partially agreeing and disagreeing) view inclusion as the degree to which CSOs can shape/set the LDC's agenda. Few CSO respondents indicated that the "LGU sets the agenda," and thus, the processes are not inclusive at all.

Meanwhile, costs of participation, CSO technical skills and capabilities, and accreditation issues continue thematically as hindrances and areas of recommendation in the responses. Some CSOs' participation was contingent on the relevance of the activity (i.e., only CSOs directly involved in a specific sector or activity were included) or the committee's decision in charge. One LGU noted that they provide CSOs the opportunity to be part of the "most appropriate committee that they should belong [to]."

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B8.8).** A statistically significant correlation was found between the statement and LGU type (**Table 54**). City respondents indicated the highest agreement level (94%, combining agree/strongly agree) and least disagreement level (2%, combined disagree/strongly disagree). Meanwhile, provincial respondents indicated the lowest agreement level (89%, combined categories).

LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total		
	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree			
City	1	2	2	6	74	124	209		
	0%	1%	1%	3%	35%	59%	100%		
Municipality	13	4	18	17	300	257	609		
	2%	1%	3%	3%	49%	42%	100%		
Province	2	2	4	10	70	86	174		

Table 54. Statement 8 (Inclusion and Representation) by LGU Type

LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree	
	1%	1%	2%	6%	40%	49%	100%
Total	16	8	24	33	444	467	992
	2%	1%	2%	3%	45%	47%	100%

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 27.30, Prob. = 0.0023. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** Considering all the elements of the results, Statement 8 may be the highest rated among the engagement dimension variables due to the broad parameters through which LDC stakeholders gauge the inclusivity and representativeness of their LDC engagements. Subscribing to any of such definitions merits a high agreement without necessarily having to level expectations among stakeholders. The PGM framework is not one to recommend what ought to be the 'best' definition of inclusion, but as a diagnostic tool, it would instead highlight *the importance of LDCs explicitly laying out the terms of their respective inclusion definitions*. Defining terms and measures of targeted inclusion parameters may be included in the LDCs' preparations of their manuals or LDC resolutions that align the expectations among local stakeholders.

# Statement 9. Autonomy and fairness

LDC-CSO members are enabled to exercise *autonomy and fairness* in the sharing of power vis-à-vis the government counterparts.

The variable assesses the extent to which the CSO members' participatory experience (vis-àvis their government counterparts) is fair and autonomous, i.e., if devoid of unwanted pressure or threats. The variable also encompasses tokenistic or co-opted participation issues, which recur in anecdotal feedback from CSOs (Medina-Guce 2022a, 2023b).

**Overall result.** Respondents indicated high levels of agreement with the statement (88%, combining strongly agree/agree responses) (Table 55). However, compared to the other Engagement dimension variables, this statement is the least rated (from Figure 3 earlier presented).

•		•
Responses	No.	Percent
Strongly Agree	446	45%
Agree	425	43%
Disagree	41	4%
Strongly Disagree	11	1%
Not informed/Not know	39	4%
Refuse to Answer	30	3%
Total	992	100%

Table 55. Statement 9 (Autonomy and Fairness) Overall Results

**Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.9).** The statement received 143 responses from CSOs and 171 from LGUs. 74% of CSO responses and 77% of LGUs' affirmed autonomy and fairness in LDC practices. From the CSOs' responses, partial agreement and disagreement with the statement are attributed to insufficient/lack of influence on the LDC agenda, tokenistic participation (for compliance with LDC requirements only), and lack of feedback loops. CSO respondents indicated that they are "not strong enough to give a fair [equal] voice to the LDC. The number of participation [CSO members] is still insufficient." 5% of responses pointed to

more relational issues of CSOs being dependent on LGUs for approvals (pre-existing imbalances of who needs whom) and insufficient appreciation of LGUs of the roles of CSOs in local governance.

Meanwhile, LGUs' partial agreement and disagreements with the statement point to issues of the CSOs' technical knowledge gaps, limited CSO assertiveness, and inconsistent participation of CSOs as hindrances for them to exercise more autonomy and equal positioning. 3% of responses noted that autonomy and fairness emerge from the LCE's disposition/attitude toward CSOs, and no such fairness exists when "government overpowers CSOs." Recommendations included an allusion to broader outcomes, citing that there is still a need for "CSOs to feel empowered" and a shift in how CSOs are perceived at the local level from "secondary stakeholders" to "equal partners" in governance.

The respondents reiterated *the conditional aspect of CSO participation* in the LDC. In terms of autonomy and fairness in the sharing of power, it relies on the alignment of the CSO's vision and mission with the LGU's priorities, approval of the LCE, and the urgency of the issue being discussed.

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B8.9).** Statistically significant relationships with the variable statement are found with *respondent group* and *LGU type*. For the respondent group (**Table 56**), CSO respondents exhibit slightly greater confidence than their LGU counterparts, with 89% (combined agree/strongly agree) expressing positive views compared to 86% (also combined categories) among LGU respondents. (The combined disagree/strongly disagree responses are the same at 5% for both respondent groups.) In other words, CSOs feel slightly more autonomous and equal in their participation than how LGUs perceive the practices to be.

Respondent	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
Group	Answer	Disagree		I do not know		Agree	
CSO	18	7	19	10	221	222	497
	4%	1%	4%	2%	45%	45%	100%
LGU	12	4	22	29	204	224	495
	2%	1%	4%	6%	41%	45%	100%
Total	30	11	41	39	425	446	992
	3%	1%	4%	4%	43%	45%	100%

Table 56. Statement 9 (Autonomy and Fairness) by Respondent Group

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 12.18, Prob. = 0.0324. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Meanwhile, for the LGU type correlation (**Table 57**), cities emerge as highest rated for autonomy and fairness practices (90% combined positive responses, only 3% combined negative responses). Provinces are the least rated, with 82% combined positive category responses and 5% combined negative response results.

Table 571 Statement 5 (Autonomy and Famess) by EGO Type										
LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total			
	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree				
City	6	2	4	9	80	108	209			
	3%	1%	2%	4%	38%	52%	100%			
Municipality	16	5	31	18	280	259	609			
	3%	1%	5%	3%	46%	43%	100%			

#### Table 57. Statement 9 (Autonomy and Fairness) by LGU Type

LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree	
Province	8	4	6	12	65	79	174
	5%	2%	3%	7%	37%	45%	100%
Total	30	11	41	39	425	446	992
	3%	1%	4%	4%	43%	45%	100%

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 20.50, Prob. = 0.0249. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** Statement 9 on autonomy and fairness may be considered the most contentious among all the PGM-LDC variables, such that since the customization process, the TWG had expected variations of how local stakeholders will try to make sense of the statement. The difference in perspectives between CSOs and LGUs is affirmed in the qualitative responses and the correlation test. Nonetheless, as with the previous statement, the PGM-LDC's diagnostic approach is to highlight *the importance of LDCs laying out the terms by which local stakeholders could gauge if their practices are sufficiently and effectively upholding autonomy and fairness.* The qualitative explanations provide insights for alignment conversations, ideally as LDCs develop manuals and/or supporting resolutions.

Meanwhile, the highest rating in cities may be initially attributed to more established CSOs and CSO networks in city centers, from which social capitals emerge with capacities enabling CSOs' autonomy and positioning. As such, the implication for future action concerns strengthening CSO networks that can reach municipalities and support provincial-level representation.

# Statement 10. Transparency of engagement (Efficient Information Provision) The LDC processes efficiently provide information to its CSO members, including the CSO directory, meeting agenda and minutes, drafts of policies, plans, and reports, among other relevant documents.

The variable assesses the extent to which the LDC discloses the CSO directory, agenda, minutes, and other relevant information. The disclosure means that accessing information is not difficult, or at best, already disclosed without the prompt of a request (Medina-Guce 2022a, 2023a).

**Overall result.** Most respondents agree with the statement, with 90% positive responses (combining strongly agreeing and agreeing) (Table 58).

Responses	No.	Percent
Strongly Agree	462	47%
Agree	424	43%
Disagree	42	4%
Strongly Disagree	7	1%
Not informed/Not know	45	5%
Refuse to Answer	12	1%
Total	992	100%

#### Table 58. Statement 10 (Efficient Information Provision) Overall Results

Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.10). The statement received 154 qualitative responses from CSOs and 175 from LGUs. 70% of the CSO responses and 84% of the LGUs

affirmed quick and regular distribution of relevant documents. Some CSO respondents pointed out that the timely release of information enabled them to take action effectively. The rest of the partial agreements and disagreements with the statements cited *gaps in the timeliness of document releases*. Some of the information provided to CSOs was deemed "insufficient" and lacked essential details. On the part of the LGUs, some explanations were provided about human resource gaps (overloaded functions and tasks) that contribute to the delays.

Concern was also raised about the content of the disseminated information and the capacity of CSOs to comprehend it, as members "struggle with the terminologies." While CSO recommendations emphasize more details and documents to be released, LGU recommendations highlight the need for human resource support. Meanwhile, 5 CSO responses and 7 LGU responses cited that the documents released are conditional, i.e., if documents must be shared or explicitly requested by the CSOs.

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B8.10).** Two variable associations are statistically significant with Statement 10: *respondent group* and *LGU type*. For the respondent group (**Table 59**), CSOs show lower agreement levels (88% combined positive categories) compared to LGUs (91% combined), with CSOs also reporting higher disagreement (7% versus 2%). The result suggests that LGUs perceive their document provision practices more efficiently than the CSOs' expectations.

Respondent	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
Group	Answer	Disagree		I do not know		Agree	
CSO	6	6	30	20	184	251	497
	1%	1%	6%	4%	37%	51%	100%
LGU	6	1	12	25	240	211	495
	1%	0%	2%	5%	48%	43%	100%
Total	12	7	42	45	424	462	992
	1%	1%	4%	5%	43%	47%	100%

Table 59. Statement 10 (Efficient Information Provision) by Respondent Group

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 22.70, Prob. = 0.0004. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

As per the LGU type correlation (**Table 60**), the differences in the positive responses are close, with the municipalities being rated highest (90%), followed by cities (89%), then provinces (88%). Disagreement rates in cities, however, are highest (9%), followed by provinces (7%), then municipalities (5%). If taken as a net rating, municipalities emerge with the highest net positive rating (85%), followed by provinces (81%), and then very closely by cities (80%).

10									
LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total		
	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree			
City	1	1	8	12	73	114	209		
	5%	5%	4%	6%	35%	54%	100%		
Municipality	10	5	23	25	287	259	609		
	2%	1%	4%	4%	47%	43%	100%		
Province	1	1	11	8	64	89	174		
	1%	1%	6%	5%	37%	51%	100%		
Total	12	7	42	45	424	462	992		
	1%	1%	4%	5%	43%	47%	100%		

Table 60. Statement 10 (Efficient Information Provision) by LGU Type

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 18.79, Prob. = 0.0430. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** The results generally parallel Statement 4 regarding the clarity of information access protocols, including the statistically significant correlations. This indicates the consistency of the extent to which protocols translate to practices for both well-rated and less-rated categories. For Statement 10, the most pronounced issue is the timeliness of document releases, which could form part of the general terms of the conduct of the LDCs. While LGU respondents raise practical issues in human resource gaps (workload and lack of staff) that hinder timely document releases to CSOs, it is also worth considering that streamlining timeframes could help LGU staff strategize their workload and efficiently follow through with the information.

# **Results dimension variables**

# Statement 11. Influence on LDC Decisions

CSO members *clearly influence* the LDC's agenda, plans, and policies.

Influence on governance decisions is arguably the most cited result (immediate/intermediate outcome) of participatory governance initiatives in literature. For instance, IAP2's spectrum of public participation describes its highest level of participation as the government implementing what the participating publics demand (2018). In the LDC's context, the influencing outcome is assessed as the extent to which the CSO agenda is incorporated and pursued in the functions and outputs (plans and policies) of the LDCs. (Medina 2022a, 2023a)

**Overall result.** The survey shows that 46% of respondents agree with the statement, and 38% strongly agree (Table 61). This statement is the least rated among the results dimension variables, and the second least rated of all the PGM-LDC variables (from Figure 3).

Responses	No.	Percent
Strongly Agree	377	38%
Agree	460	46%
Disagree	76	8%
Strongly Disagree	11	1%
Not informed/Not know	45	5%
Refuse to Answer	23	2%
Total	992	100%

 Table 61. Statement 11 (Influence on LDC Decisions) Overall Results

**Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.11).** The statement gathered 154 qualitative responses from CSOs and 174 from LGUs. 68% of CSO statements and 63% of the LGU statements affirmed CSO influence on LDC decisions, citing "strong partnerships" and scenarios of being "co-proponents" of projects and programs. CSOs are also allowed to "voice out their opinions" and "clarify their doubts."

Meanwhile, the rest of the CSOs' partial agreements and disagreements highlighted limited to no influence on LDC decisions, with examples of LDC "cherry-picking" CSO proposals or CSOs only "following the good intentions of the LGU" rather than influencing the agenda themselves. Partial agreements and disagreements from LGUs refer to the limited capacity and expertise of CSOs to influence decisions and the limited numbers (being a minority of the LDC) hindering CSOs from steering LDC votes. A CSO respondent recommended expanding CSO participation to include agenda-setting and policy formulation. This aligns with concerns raised by other respondents, who noted that CSO members are "not consulted regarding the agenda" or the "agenda has already been prepared by the LGU or the committee." Other recommendations include capacity-building interventions on CSO roles, organizational processes, and local governance structures to address the lack of familiarity with their roles in the council.

Furthermore, five CSOs and 12 LGUs shared about the conditionality of influence, whereby CSOs' voices are contingent on their sector/demographic views being relevant to the decision points. Three other LGU respondents indicated that insufficient CSO influence is due to CSOs being "not proactive" in agenda preparations and acting merely as observers.

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B8.11).** The statement's interactions with two variables are statistically significant: *respondent group* and *LGU type*. For respondent group, *CSOs are significantly more likely to perceive themselves as influential* (87% combined agree categories) compared to LGUs' perception of CSO influence (81% combined). The same skepticism about CSO influence is seen in the disagreement rates, with LGUs' negative responses at 9% compared to CSOs' 8%. Additionally, more LGUs (6%) expressed uncertainty about CSO influence compared to CSOs (3%).

Respondent	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
Group	Answer	Disagree		I do not know		Agree	
CSO	9	9	29	14	236	200	497
	2%	2%	6%	3%	47%	40%	100%
LGU	14	2	47	31	224	177	495
	3%	0%	9%	6%	45%	36%	100%
Total	23	11	76	45	460	377	992
	2%	1%	8%	5%	46%	38%	100%

Table 62. Statement 11 (Influence on LDC Decisions) by Respondent Group

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 17.94, Prob. = 0.0030. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

The association with LGU type (**Table 63**) shows that respondents from cities agree with the statement the most (88%) and indicated the least percentage of disagreement (6%). Municipalities are rated next at 85% agreement and 9% disagreement, while provinces are rated least at 78% agreement and 12% disagreement.

LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total		
	Answer	Disagree		I do not know		Agree			
City	2	2	11	11	77	106	209		
	1%	1%	5%	5%	37%	51%	100%		
Municipality	16	6	48	21	304	214	609		
	3%	1%	8%	3%	50%	35%	100%		
Province	5	3	17	13	79	57	174		
	3%	2%	10%	7%	45%	33%	100%		
Total	23	11	76	45	460	377	992		
	2%	1%	8%	5%	46%	38%	100%		

#### Table 63. Statement 11 (Influence on LDC Decisions) by LGU Type

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 27.87, Prob. = 0.0019. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** CSO influence as the least rated results variable and second least rated variable among all the PGM-LDC variables suggests that LDC participation has much room for substantive improvement. The nuance of CSOs rating their influence more than LGUs also demands further discussions about what "strong partnerships" (as per the qualitative results) constitute to address the power relationship gaps that stakeholders pointed out.

Meanwhile, the stronger influence of CSOs in cities coincides with the results of Statement 9, wherein cities were also rated highest in autonomy and fairness in the CSOs' conduct of their LDC participation. The parallel results merit continuing conversations on the capabilities of CSOs in cities that enable them to be both autonomous and influential and endeavoring to build such capabilities throughout CSO networks in municipalities and provinces.

# Statement 12. Enabling More Effective Policies

CSO participation in the LDC, including its committees and other consultative activities, *enables more effective* local plans, policies, and services.

The variable expresses the principle in participation theories that public/civil society involvement in governance improves the effectiveness of policies (programs, services) through accounting for the voice of the rightsholders and the intended benefiting publics. In the LDC context, the principle translates to assessing if CSO participation enables more effective local plans, policies, and services.

**Overall result.** Most respondents responded positively to the statement, with 52% strongly agreeing and 41% agreeing (Table 64).

Responses	No.	Percent
Strongly Agree	511	52%
Agree	408	41%
Disagree	27	3%
Strongly Disagree	6	1%
Not informed/Not know	23	2%
Refuse to Answer	17	2%
Total	992	100%

#### Table 64. Statement 12 (Enabling More Effective Policies) Overall Results

**Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.12).** The statement gathered 144 qualitative responses from CSOs and 163 from LGUs. 67% of CSO responses and 75% of LGUs' confirmed the statement, with repeating references to CSOs perspectives enhancing the problem definitions and solutions' effectiveness vis-à-vis the experiences of communities.

Meanwhile, CSOs' qualified agreements and disagreements cite issues regarding LGUs limiting the scope and depth of inputs that CSOs could give, and the conditionality of participation (gatekeeping which CSOs can participate in what discussions). One respondent noted that while they participate in planning discussions, they are excluded from committee-level deliberations and final decision-making, suggesting the dominant role of LGUs. LGU responses highlight technical and capability gaps of CSOs to effectively craft and advocate for their inputs to the plans and policies, suggesting less of a gatekeeping dynamic and more of an inability of CSOs to maximize the participatory opportunities in the LDCs.

While CSO participation is valued for its role in "scrutinizing programs that can refine its implementation", the LGU respondents noted that plans remain largely top-down, limiting CSO participation. One respondent also noted that CSO members sometimes "cannot present their ideas", as technical individuals tend to "defeat" their suggestions. Recommendations include stronger collaboration with CSO members and improvements in their technical knowledge.

Statistically significant correlations (Annex B8.12). A significant association was found between the statement and the LGU type. Results show that cities and municipalities are positively rated both at 93%, while provinces are rated at 91% (Table 65). However, considering the negative responses (disagree and strongly disagree), the net ratings show municipalities at 90%, cities at 89%, and provinces at 88%. In both interpretations, provinces are rated as least agreeable regarding the variable.

10										
LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total			
	Answer	Disagree		I do not know		Agree				
City	0	2	6	7	59	135	209			
	0%	1%	3%	3%	28%	65%	100%			
Municipality	13	3	17	10	272	294	609			
	2%	0%	3%	2%	45%	48%	100%			
Province	4	1	4	6	77	82	174			
	2%	1%	2%	3%	44%	47%	100%			
Total	17	6	27	23	408	511	992			
	2%	1%	3%	2%	41%	52%	100%			

Table 65. Statement 12 (Enabling More Effective Policies) by LGU Type

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 27.93, Prob. = 0.0019. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** If not accounting for the LGU-only rated Statement 14, this variable statement has the *highest net rating among the results variables*, suggesting that, at large, stakeholders view CSO participation in LDCs as improving the effectiveness of plans and policies. The results affirm the value of CSO perspectives but also expound on the scenarios that limit the uptake of CSOs' inputs into LDC policies.LDC stakeholders could benefit from further reflections and learning as to what their uptake dynamics (assumptions and expectations) are, for tailored action for specific scenarios. Furthermore, the result regarding provinces being the least rated LGU type suggests the need to further understand the types of CSO technical capabilities and LGU motivators that would accord more agreeable uptake dynamics in provincial LDCs.

# Statement 13. CSO satisfaction

[CSO tool version] As CSO members, we are satisfied with our participation in the LDC. / [LGU tool version] To the best of my knowledge, the LDC CSO members are satisfied with their participation in the LDC.

Governance and service literature shows that satisfaction is an effective but complex assessment indicator with objective and subjective dimensions based on the assessor's expectations and sensemaking of experiences. In participation principles, satisfaction draws from notions of political efficacy or the extent to which citizen (as individual or group) participation is able to shape positive results, thereby increasing trust and confidence in the governance platform and processes (LDC, in this context) because they have delivered *for* the citizens' agenda (Medina-Guce 2020a).

These principles are operationalized in the PGM-LDC CSO tool as the CSOs' overall satisfaction with their participation experience in the LDCs. The LGU tool version asks the LGU functionaries to assess the satisfaction of their CSO counterparts in the LDCs.

**Overall result.** Among all respondents, 52% strongly agree, while 39% agree with the statement. Accounting for positive and negative response percentages gives an 87% net rating **(Table 66).** 

Responses	No.	Percent
Strongly Agree	519	52%
Agree	390	39%
Disagree	25	3%
Strongly Disagree	7	1%
Not informed/Not know	36	4%
Refuse to Answer	15	2%
Total	992	100%

Table 66. Statement 13 (CSO Satisfaction) Overall Results

**Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.13).** The statement gathered 168 qualitative responses from CSOs and 173 from LGUs. 74% of CSO responses and 72% of LGUs' affirmed CSO satisfaction with LDC participation. CSO responses highlight how LDC participation enables them to exercise voice and become essential stakeholders in local planning and service delivery, while some pegged their satisfaction on concrete terms such as receiving projects and honorarium. Nine CSO respondents noted that they are "given importance in decision making" and held accountable for government projects. Part of their satisfaction is the learning and insights obtained from participating, which can be shared with other organizations. LGU responses highlighted the opening up of governance as the basis for their CSO satisfaction as references.

Meanwhile, partial agreements and disagreements of CSOs leans on gaps in providing them funding support for participation and the gatekeeping dynamics experienced with LGU counterparts. LGUs' partial agreement and disagreements lean on the inability of LGUs to 'completely respond to all' CSO concerns, and gaps in information and communication and resource support. The LGUs pointed that there is a lack of feedback mechanisms to assess CSO satisfaction, with one respondent suggesting that CSOs can "anonymously respond to a survey to ascertain their level of satisfaction in dealing with the LGU."

Recommendations documented are thematically summative of others discussed, particularly under the PGM space dimension variables.

**Statistically significant correlations (Annex B8.13).** The correlation tests with the statement yielded four statistically significant relationships: *by respondent group, LDC functionality rating, respondent group x LDC functionality rating, and LGU type.* 

*Respondent group.* CSOs rated their satisfaction much higher (93%) than how LGUs perceive CSO satisfaction to be (89%) (Table 67). Accounting for the disagreement ratings, CSO net agreement is at 92%, while LGUs' perception of CSO satisfaction is at net 87%. The result suggests that LGUs are more cognizant of the gaps that CSOs experience in LDC participation,

while CSOs are more appreciative of the spaces and opportunities that LDC participation accords them.

Respondent	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
Group	Answer	Disagree		I do not know		Agree	
CSO	6	4	18	3	176	290	497
	1%	1%	4%	1%	35%	58%	100%
LGU	9	3	7	33	214	229	495
	2%	1%	1%	7%	43%	46%	100%
Total	15	7	25	36	390	519	992
	2%	1%	3%	4%	39%	52%	100%

Table 67. Statement 13 (CSO Satisfaction) by Respondent Group

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 41.45, Prob. = 0.0000. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

*LDC functionality rating*. Respondents from high-functionality LDCs reported higher levels of CSO satisfaction (93%) than those from low-functionality LDCs (91%) (**Table 68**). The result suggests that exceeding the LDC minimum administrative requirements (functionality parameters) affects CSOs' positive experiences in LDC participation.

LDC	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed	Agree	Strongly	Total
Functionality	Answer	Disagree		/ I do not		Agree	
Rating				know			
Low	11	5	7	17	181	202	423
	3%	1%	2%	4%	43%	48%	100%
High	4	2	18	19	209	317	569
	1%	0%	3%	3%	37%	56%	100%
Total	15	7	25	36	390	519	992
	2%	1%	3%	4%	39%	52%	100%

Table 68. Statement 13 (CSO Satisfaction) by LDC Functionality Rating

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 15.85, Prob. = 0.0073. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

LDC functionality rating x Respondent group. Testing for CSO responses and LGU responses separately showed a statistically significant relationship only for the LGUs. **Table 69** presents the results for the LGU responses, while the CSO table is no longer included for brevity. LDC functionality rating x CSO response correlation is not statistically significant (prob. = 0.1268), which suggests that CSOs' satisfaction of their LDC participation is not affected by whether their LDCs are high or low functionality-rated. The result further nuances the qualitative results suggesting that what constitutes CSOs' own satisfaction leans on the opportunities and spaces they access, but not necessarily on how functional (in functionality rating definitions) their LDCs are.

Meanwhile, LGU responses are statistically correlated with their LDC functionality type, with LGUs in high-functionality LDCs providing higher ratings of CSOs' satisfaction (91%) than the LGUs from low-functionality LDCs (87%). *This result enhances the earlier discussion that LGUs are more cognizant of the challenges that CSOs are experiencing and that LGUs in low-functionality LDCs are even more aware that these gaps need to be addressed.* 

LDC	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed	Agree	Strongly	Total
Functionality	Answer	Disagree		/ I do not		Agree	
Rating				know			
Low	7	3	3	15	95	85	208
	3%	1%	1%	7%	46%	41%	100%
High	2	0	4	18	119	144	287
	1%	0%	1%	6%	41%	50%	100%
Total	9	3	7	33	214	229	495
	2%	1%	1%	7%	43%	46%	100%

Table 69. Statement 13	(CSO Satisfaction) by	/ LDC Functionality Rating	- LGU Responses
------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 11.78, Prob. = 0.0380. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

*LGU type*. The interaction of the variable statement with LGU type is also statistically significant. Cities received higher ratings for CSO satisfaction (93%) than municipalities and provinces (both 91%) (**Table 70**). However, accounting for the negative responses yields a net rating of cities at 91%, municipalities at 88%, and provinces at 85%. From both processing perspectives, *CSO satisfaction is rated highest in cities*.

LGU Type	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree	
City	4	1	5	5	58	136	209
	2%	0%	2%	2%	28%	65%	100%
Municipality	10	4	12	25	263	295	609
	2%	1%	2%	4%	43%	48%	100%
Province	1	2	8	6	69	88	174
	1%	1%	5%	3%	40%	51%	100%
Total	15	7	25	36	390	519	992
	2%	1%	3%	4%	39%	52%	100%

Table 70. Statement 13 (CSO Satisfaction) by LGU Type

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 24.75, Prob. = 0.0058. First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** Integrating all results components for CSO satisfaction, the most notable insight is the reference point of differentiating CSOs' satisfaction with the LGUs' perception of CSO satisfaction. CSOs rate their satisfaction higher, which *CSOs associate with their appreciation of the benefits and meanings of being able to participate in governance decisions* – and are not affected by their LDC's functionality rating. Meanwhile, *LGU responses on CSO satisfaction suggest a more grounded accounting of participation gaps*, especially with the sentiment that LGUs are not able to respond to all CSO concerns completely. This point, in particular, signals a desire to provide and respond to CSO concerns in more substantive terms than current practices.

These results merit continuing conversations on *advancing CSOs' understanding of participatory governance to elevate their appreciation of the powers and responsibilities* that the LDC opens for them. In plainer terms, CSOs seem to be coming from a *baseline of lack*—such that access to LDCs and being given an opportunity for voice raise their satisfaction levels without necessarily accounting for more process-based (LDC functionality parameters) or participatory outcomes (e.g., influence levels).

# Statement 14. LGU satisfaction with participatory practices

[LGU tool only] In my capacity under my LGU office, I am satisfied with our LDC's participatory practices.

The PGM-LDC tool includes LGUs' satisfaction with *their own* participatory practices as an additional layer of the satisfaction variable analysis—but separate from the earlier statement, which only concerns CSOs' satisfaction. To note, this statement *appears only in the LGU tool*, meaning that CSOs were not asked to rate their LGUs' satisfaction. Including this statement is cognizant of *possible respondent biases* since the variable essentially serves as *a self-assessment question for the LGUs*.

**Overall result.** Among the LGU respondents, 51% strongly agree, while 43% agree with the statement (**Table 71**). Referring to **Figure 3** and the net ratings summary (**Table 32**), this variable is the highest-rated statement under the results dimension (90% net rating), though it accounts only the LGUs' responses.

Responses	No.	Percent
Strongly Agree	250	51%
Agree	215	43%
Disagree	17	3%
Strongly Disagree	4	1%
Not informed/Not know	3	1%
Refuse to Answer	6	1%
Total	495	100%

#### Table 71. Statement 14 (LGU Satisfaction with Participatory Practices) – LGU Responses

**Qualitative response highlights (Annex C4.14).** The statement gathered 181 qualitative responses from LGUs. 74% expressed satisfaction with their LDC practices, recurringly referring to how their offices are fulfilling their policy-defined roles and functions or how they provide CSOs with opportunities to participate. With CSO participation, LGU respondents affirmed that there are improvements in implementing programs and activities and delivery of services.

Meanwhile, partial agreements and disagreements emphasize gaps in implementing administrative requirements (LDC functionality parameters, DILG MC) and the need for greater effort for CSO communication and inclusion. Some LGU respondents also noted that LDC meetings are not conducted regularly. Recommendations mainly concern compliance with the administrative requirements and addressing resource challenges. One respondent mentioned that CSOs should notify the LGUs about organizational leadership changes, indicating the need for better communication. Six respondents also called for more capacity-building activities to address knowledge gaps and enable CSOs "to be more efficient in their task."

Statistically significant correlations. In strict terms, no significant correlations were found, although the statement's association with LDC functionality rating approaches statistical significance (prob. = 0.0898) (Table 72). For this association, there is a trend of LGUs from low-functionality LDCs agreeing less (90%) than LGUs from high-functionality LDCs (97%).

LDC	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed	Agree	Strongly	Total		
Functionality	Answer	Disagree		/ I do not		Agree			
Rating				know					
Low	5	3	10	2	90	98	208		
	2%	1%	5%	1%	43%	47%	100%		
High	1	1	7	1	125	152	287		
	0%	0%	2%	0%	44%	53%	100%		
Total	6	4	17	3	215	250	495		
	1%	1%	3%	1%	43%	51%	100%		

# Table 72. Statement 14 (LGU Satisfaction on Participatory Practices) by LDC Functionality Rating

Notes: Pearson Chi2 = 9.53, Prob. = 0.0898 (not statistically significant). First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

**Discussion.** The most notable insight from the results is the LGUs' reference to policy-defined administrative requirements compliance as their primary basis for satisfaction with their participatory practices. This result merits consideration of the implications of advancing policy guidance toward more PG-quality practices and outcomes since the LGUs seem to rationalize the sufficiency of their participatory practices based on what the national government prescribes.

# 4C. Additional Analytical Explorations

To enhance insights and layer the PG baseline analysis, additional analytical explorations were conducted following certain logics embedded in the PGM-LDC tool design. This section presents the findings in a thematic organization of focus variables.

# 4C.1 Participation frequency x PGM-LDC results

**Section 4A.6** presented the results regarding the frequency of CSO participation (categorical: monthly, quarterly, bi-annually, only when invited), wherein the general results showed most CSOs indicating quarterly participation (43%). CSOs in high-functionality LDCs attended more on a quarterly basis, although CSOs in low-functionality LDCs tend to participate more frequently (combined monthly and quarterly categories). The results also showed significant variations across regions. It is worth emphasizing that any discussion of increasing participation frequency has *direct implications to financial and administrative resources* to support participation both for LGUs' provisions (which is overall perceived as lacking, Statement 5) and CSOs' demands. *Therefore, the logically sound analysis to make is if increasing the frequency of participation yields better PG results, so as to gauge the efficiency (best use) of resources.* 

These additional analytical explorations examine such relationship directly–*does participation frequency affect LDC participation results/outcomes?* Similar to the analysis for participation frequency with participation status (Section 4A.6.2), this analysis also creates a *results index* from PGM-LDC Statements 11-13 by aggregating the respondents' individual responses per statement. The results are structured into descriptive statistics, the Kruskal-Wallis test, Dunn's pairwise comparisons, and quantile regression analysis. (Refer to **Annex B6.4** introduction for the methodological notes, and **Annex B6.5** for data tables for this section's discussion points.)

In sum, the results show (as the following discussions elaborate), that more frequent participation is associated with higher perceptions of achieving PG outcomes. However, participation beyond bi-annual frequency yields marginal benefits in results, particularly for high-functionality LDCs and cities. Low-functionality LDCs, provinces, and municipalities are more likely to gain PG results if participation frequency is increased.

**Overall trends (Annex B6.5.1).** The test results confirm that more frequent attendance is associated with higher perceptions of achieving PG outcomes, especially against the "only when invited" category. However, participation beyond bi-annual frequency does not substantially improve impressions of PG results. While the results highlighted here have statistical significance, the respondents' perceptions may be pre-framed by the Codal minimum requirement of bi-annual meetings (although this frequency is intended only for the full council).

- The median and interquartile range (IQR) values provide an initial view of how the perceived achievement of participatory governance varies across different attendance groups: CSOs that attend "only when invited" have the lowest median perceived results score (15, IQR = 4). CSOs that attend bi-annually, quarterly, or monthly all have a higher median results score of 17 (IQR = 3). The overall median across all groups is 16, with an IQR of 3, indicating that most values are clustered around 16-17. *These results suggest that more frequent attendance is associated with a higher perception of achieving participatory governance outcomes*, with occasional attendees (only when invited) having the lowest perceived success. However, bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees have similar median values, indicating that *further increases in attendance frequency beyond bi-annual meetings may not strongly affect perceived governance success*.
- The Kruskal-Wallis test examines whether the distribution of perceived results scores differs significantly across attendance groups. The test statistic is  $\chi^2(3) = 20.570$ , with a p-value of 0.0001, indicating that there are statistically significant differences in perceived governance results across attendance groups. Since the Kruskal-Wallis test is significant, we can conclude that *attendance frequency plays a role in shaping perceptions of participatory governance results*.
- The Dunn's test compares participation results between each pair of attendance groups. CSOs that attend "only when invited" perceive significantly lower participatory governance results compared to all other groups. There are no statistically significant differences in perceived results between bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees. Based on the analysis, *CSOs that attend "only when invited" report significantly lower perceived achievement of participatory governance outcomes compared to more frequent attendees.* However, there is no significant difference among those attending bi-annually, quarterly, or monthly, suggesting that *attending at least bi-annually is sufficient to achieve higher perceived results, and additional frequency does not substantially improve perceptions.*
- To further analyze the relationship between attendance frequency and perceived governance results, quantile (median) regression is used to estimate the differences. Compared to CSOs that attend "only when invited": (a) Bi-annual attendees perceive participatory governance results to be 2 points higher on average (coefficient = 2, p < 0.001). (b) Quarterly attendees also perceive results to be 2 points higher (coefficient = 2, p < 0.001). (c) Monthly attendees have a similar increase of 2 points (coefficient = 2, p < 0.001). The regression confirms that all three groups attending at least biannually report significantly higher perceived results compared to those attending only when invited. The regression results align with the Dunn's test findings: (1) Only when</li>

invited attendees perceive significantly lower results compared to all other groups; (2) Attending bi-annually, quarterly, or monthly is associated with a 2-point increase in perceived governance results and (3) there are no substantial differences in perceived results between bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees.

**Impact of LDC functionality ratings (Annex B6.5.2).** The results show that more frequent participation is associated with higher perceived PG results in both high- and low-functionality LDCs. In high-functionality LDCs, higher participation frequency is associated with higher PG results. However, high-functionality LDCs may already be exhibiting high PG results which makes further increasing participation frequency yielding marginal added effects. In contrast, in low-functionality LDCs, only frequent attendees (monthly) perceive significantly better governance outcomes, underscoring the value of consistent participation interactions in such settings.

- The median scores and interquartile ranges (IQRs) reveal differences in perceived governance outcomes across CSO attendance groups within high- and low-functionality LDCs. *More frequent attendance is associated with higher perceived PG results in both LDC types.* CSOs in high-functionality LDCs report slightly higher perceived results across all attendance categories, with the overall median score being 17, compared to 16 in low-functionality LDCs. The IQR is slightly narrower in high-functionality LDCs, particularly for monthly attendees (IQR = 2 vs. IQR = 3 in low-functionality LDCs), suggesting more consistency in perceived results where LDCs function effectively.
- The Kruskal-Wallis test assesses whether participation frequency significantly impacts perceived PG results within high- and low-functionality LDCs. For high-functionality LDCs, the test statistics are significant ( $\chi^2(3) = 13.422$ , p = 0.0038), indicating that participation frequency influences perceived PG results in well-functioning LDCs. For low-functionality LDCs the results are not statistically significant ay p 0.05 ( $\chi^2(3) = 7.496$ , p = 0.0577), but borderline significant, suggesting that participation frequency may still play a role but is less influential in low-functionality LDCs. Overall, the relationship between CSO attendance and perceived governance results is stronger in high-functionality LDCs (statistically significant), while it is weaker in low-functionality LDCs (only marginal significance). *This suggests that in high-functionality LDCs, attending meetings more frequently is more strongly associated with higher perceived PG outcomes.*
- The Dunn's test identifies which specific CSO attendance groups significantly differ in their perceived PG results. In both cases of high and low LDC functionality, CSOs attending only when invited report significantly lower perceived governance results compared to more frequent attendees. However, the gap between only-when-invited and other groups is more pronounced in high-functionality LDCs (p-values are smaller, indicating stronger significance). In low-functionality LDCs, the impact of attendance on perceptions is weaker, with bi-annual attendance showing only marginal significance compared to only when invited (p = 0.0632).
- The quantile regression model estimates the relationship between CSO attendance frequency and perceived PG results while adjusting for other influences. In high-functionality LDCs, while Dunn's test finds differences between only-when-invited and more frequent attendees, the quantile regression does not detect significant differences after controlling for other factors. In low-functionality LDCs, the regression finds a significant increase (+2 points) in perceived results for monthly attendees compared to only-when-invited (p < 0.001). *These findings indicate that in high-functionality LDCs, PG quality may already be high across attendance groups, weakening the effect of*

attendance on perceived results. Conversely, in low-functionality LDCs, only frequent attendees (monthly) perceive significantly better governance outcomes, suggesting that engagement is necessary to overcome weak institutional performance (low functionality).

**Differences across LGU types (Annex B6.5.3).** Cities exhibit the highest perceived results scores across frequency categories in the association. Increasing participation frequency in cities has marginal effect compared to the perceived increases in PG results when participation frequencies in provinces and municipalities are increased. Particularly in municipalities, biannual and quarterly attendance is significantly associated with better-perceived PG outcomes.

- The median scores and interquartile ranges (IQRs) provide an initial comparison of how CSO attendance frequency correlates with perceived governance success across different LGUs. *Cities have the highest perceived results scores across all attendance groups* (Median = 18), suggesting stronger participatory governance mechanisms. Municipalities and provinces show lower perceived results (Median = 16), with wider IQRs, indicating greater variability in governance outcomes. The effect of meeting frequency appears weaker in provinces, where the increase in perceived results is smaller across attendance groups.
- The Kruskal-Wallis test evaluates whether CSO attendance frequency significantly affects perceived governance results within each LGU type. The relationship between attendance and perceived governance success is strongest in municipalities and provinces (both significant), while it is not significant in cities. *This suggests that in cities, governance mechanisms may already be strong, reducing the impact of attendance frequency on perceptions. In contrast, municipalities and provinces exhibit more variation, where attendance frequency influences perceived effectiveness.*
- The Dunn's test identifies which specific CSO attendance groups have significantly different perceived governance results. The effect of attendance frequency is weakest in cities (only one significant pairwise difference). In municipalities and provinces, "only when invited" attendees report significantly lower governance results compared to more frequent attendees. Beyond bi-annual attendance, increasing meeting frequency does not further improve perceived results.
- The quantile regression estimates the relationship between CSO attendance frequency and perceived governance results while controlling for additional influences. In municipalities, bi-annual and quarterly attendance is significantly associated with better perceived governance outcomes. In cities and provinces, once other factors are controlled for, attendance frequency does not significantly affect perceived governance success.

# 4C.2 PGM-LDC S1 (Accreditation guidelines) x S8 (Inclusion)

This association examines the logic that *adherence to the national government's accreditation and membership guidelines improves LDC inclusion* since the guidelines clarify the requisites and processes guarding the LDC membership appointments from arbitrary (political) interventions. As such, Statement 1 on accreditation is tested against the results of Statement 8 – the extent of the exercise of inclusion and representation in LDCs (under the Engagement dimension). To recap the relevant analysis so far from Section 4B:

• The analysis of Statement 1 shows that it is top-ranked in net ratings (94%) across the 14 statements, indicating high perceptions of LGUs' adherence to the national guidelines. While the statement is positively rated overall, least agreement is perceived

among municipalities (correlation by LGU type). Concerns with preferential political appointments are documented in the qualitative responses.

• Statement 8 analysis shows a net rating of 89%, with inclusion parameters expressed in terms of commensurate representation of local sectors, breadth/reach of invited sectors, and agenda-setting roles for CSOs. Correlation with LGU type is significant, with the highest agreement level by city respondents.

For this analysis, cross tabulations and Chi2 tests were employed, as well as ordered logistic regression to evaluate the strength and direction of the relationship while controlling for subgroup effects (Respondent Group, LDC functionality, LGU type). Interaction terms were included to test whether the strength of the relationship varied across different subgroups. (See **Annex B9.2** for methodological notes and its subsections for the corresponding data tables.)

In sum (as elaborated by the succeeding discussions), higher perceptions of adherence to national accreditation and membership guidelines increase perceptions of LDC inclusion. In the perception relationship, LGUs tend to rate the inclusivity effect slightly higher than the CSOs. The positive relationship of S1 to S8 is also more stable and stronger in high-functionality LDCs than in low-functionality-rated ones. Among LGU types, cities have the strongest agreement between accreditation adherence and inclusivity perceptions, while municipalities show the highest response variability.

**Overall results (Annex B9.2.1).** The cross-tabulation of S1 and S8 shows that a majority of respondents who agree that accreditation follows national guidelines (Agree or Strongly Agree in S1) also report higher inclusivity ratings (Agree or Strongly Agree in S8). The Pearson chisquare test (p = 0.000) confirms that this relationship is statistically significant, meaning that variations in accreditation compliance are systematically associated with differences in inclusivity perceptions. The Cramér's V value (0.3671) suggests a moderate to strong association.

The ordered logistic regression model provides additional confirmation of this relationship. The regression coefficients further highlight *the increasing probability of higher inclusivity ratings as accreditation compliance strengthen*. Respondents who strongly agreed with accreditation compliance (S1 = Strongly Agree) were significantly more likely to perceive LDCs as inclusive (S8), with a coefficient of 6.08 (p = 0.000). Agreement with S1 also had a strong effect (4.40, p = 0.000), confirming a statistically significant and positive association.

By respondent group (Annex B9.2.2). Accounting for the respondent group, there is a positive relationship between accreditation adherence and perceived inclusivity, with slightly higher inclusivity perceptions among LGU respondents.

- Among CSO respondents (n = 497), a strong association exists between accreditation compliance and perceived inclusivity. A majority (190 respondents, or 38%) strongly agreed with accreditation compliance and also rated LDCs as strongly inclusive. 127 respondents (26%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also agreed that LDC processes are inclusive. However, those who disagreed with accreditation compliance were more likely to report low inclusivity, with 6 out of 13 respondents (46%) selecting "Disagree" or "Not Informed" for inclusivity. Notably, CSOs had a higher proportion of "Not Informed" responses (17 respondents), suggesting that some CSOs may lack awareness or engagement in accreditation and LDC processes.
- Among LGU respondents (n = 495), the trend remains consistent but with slightly higher inclusivity perceptions compared to CSOs. 184 LGU respondents (37%) who

strongly agreed with accreditation compliance also strongly agreed that LDCs are inclusive. 122 LGU respondents (25%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also rated LDCs as inclusive. Notably, disagreement with accreditation compliance was much lower among LGUs, with only 11 respondents selecting "Disagree" and just 2 respondents choosing "Strongly Disagree". LGU respondents had fewer "Not Informed" responses (11 respondents), indicating greater familiarity with accreditation policies compared to CSOs.

• The Pearson chi-square test for CSOs (p = 0.000) and LGUs (p = 0.000) confirms that the relationship between accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions is statistically significant in both groups. However, Cramér's V is slightly higher for CSOs (0.4044) than for LGUs (0.3627), indicating that *the strength of association between accreditation compliance and inclusivity is slightly stronger among CSOs*.

Furthermore, the regression results confirm that *stronger agreement with accreditation compliance significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving LDCs as inclusive.* The coefficient for Strongly Agree (7.19, p = 0.000) suggests that respondents who strongly agree with accreditation compliance are significantly more likely to perceive LDC processes as inclusive. However, the interaction terms between accreditation compliance and Respondent Group were not statistically significant, indicating that the effect of accreditation compliance on inclusivity perceptions does not significantly differ between CSO and LGU respondents.

**By LDC functionality (Annex B9.2.3).** The cross-tabulation of S1 and S8 by LDC functionality reveals key differences in how respondents perceive accreditation compliance and inclusivity, with a *stronger and more stable relationship in high-functionality LDCs* confirmed in the correlation test.

- Among low-functionality LDCs (n = 423), the association between accreditation compliance and inclusivity is moderate but more varied than in high-functionality LDCs. 155 respondents (36.6%) strongly agreed with accreditation compliance and also strongly agreed that LDCs are inclusive. 60 respondents (14.2%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also agreed that LDCs are inclusive. A substantial number of respondents (12 out of 423, or 2.8%) reported "Not Informed" responses, indicating some lack of awareness regarding accreditation processes. Respondents who disagreed or strongly disagreed with accreditation compliance tended to have lower inclusivity ratings, with 46% of those disagreeing also reporting low inclusivity perceptions.
- Among high-functionality LDCs (n = 569), the relationship between accreditation compliance and inclusivity is stronger and more stable than in low-functionality LDCs. 219 respondents (38.5%) strongly agreed with accreditation compliance and also strongly agreed that LDCs are inclusive. 112 respondents (19.7%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also agreed that LDCs are inclusive. There were fewer "Not Informed" responses (16 out of 569, or 2.8%), indicating higher awareness of accreditation compliance compared to low-functionality LDCs. A lower proportion of respondents disagreed with accreditation compliance, and among those who did, their inclusivity perceptions were less negative than in low-functionality LDCs.
- The Pearson chi-square test (Low,  $\chi^2 = 289.43$ , p = 0.000; High,  $\chi^2 = 517.39$ , p = 0.000) confirms that accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions are statistically significantly regardless of functionality of LDCs. The Cramér's V value is higher for high LDC functionality, which suggests a stronger association compared to low-functionality LDCs (Low = 0.3699, High = 0.4264).

The regression results confirm that higher accreditation compliance significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving LDCs as inclusive. The coefficient for Strongly Agree (6.05, p = 0.000) suggests that respondents who strongly agree with accreditation compliance are much more likely to perceive LDCs as inclusive. However, the interaction terms between accreditation compliance and LDC functionality (s1#LDC Functionality) were not statistically significant, indicating that the effect of accreditation compliance on inclusivity perceptions does not significantly differ between low- and high-functionality LDCs.

By LGU type (Annex B9.2.4). The cross-tabulation of S1 and S8 by LGU type reveals key differences in how respondents perceive accreditation compliance and inclusivity across different LGU types.

- Among city respondents (n = 209), the association between accreditation compliance and inclusivity is strong and relatively consistent. 124 respondents (59.3%) strongly agreed with accreditation compliance and also strongly agreed that LDCs are inclusive. 33 respondents (15.8%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also agreed that LDCs are inclusive. A small percentage of respondents (11 out of 209, or 5.3%) were "Not Informed", indicating that most city respondents have a clear understanding of accreditation compliance and its implications. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 60.87$ , p = 0.000) confirms that accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions are statistically significant among cities. The Cramér's V value (0.3116) suggests a moderate association, and the gamma value (0.7409, ASE = 0.064) indicates that *the relationship is strongly positive, meaning that increased accreditation compliance leads to increased inclusivity perceptions.*
- Among municipality respondents (n = 609), the relationship between accreditation compliance and inclusivity is strong but more variable than in cities. 257 respondents (42.2%) strongly agreed with accreditation compliance and also strongly agreed that LDCs are inclusive. 188 respondents (30.9%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also agreed that LDCs are inclusive. A larger proportion of respondents (14 out of 609, or 2.3%) reported being "Not Informed", suggesting that there may be greater disparities in governance and accreditation awareness across different municipalities. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 503.01$ , p = 0.000) confirms that accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions are statistically significant among municipalities. The Cramér's V value (0.4064) suggests a stronger association than in cities, while the gamma value (0.6724, ASE = 0.044) indicates a moderately strong positive correlation.
- Among province respondents (n = 174), the relationship between accreditation compliance and inclusivity is weaker compared to cities and municipalities. 86 respondents (49.4%) strongly agreed with accreditation compliance and also strongly agreed that LDCs are inclusive. 38 respondents (21.8%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also agreed that LDCs are inclusive. A small proportion of respondents (3 out of 174, or 1.7%) reported being "Not Informed", indicating relatively higher awareness compared to municipalities but slightly lower than in cities.
- The Pearson chi-square test are significant across three LGU types which confirms that accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions are statistically significant among provinces. *Cities have the strongest agreement with both accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions*. Respondents from cities reported the highest agreement levels for both accreditation compliance and inclusivity. On the other hand, *municipalities show the highest variability in responses*. Compared to cities, municipality respondents exhibited greater variation in perceptions, with more respondents selecting "Not Informed." The Cramér's V value (0.4064) was higher than for cities, indicating a

stronger but more variable relationship between accreditation compliance and inclusivity.

The regression results confirm that higher accreditation compliance significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving LDCs as inclusive. The coefficient for Strongly Agree (2.60, p = 0.000) suggests that respondents who strongly agree with accreditation compliance are much more likely to perceive LDCs as inclusive. However, the interaction terms between accreditation compliance and LGU type (s1#intlgu\_type) were not statistically significant, indicating that the effect of accreditation compliance on inclusivity perceptions does not significantly differ across cities, municipalities, and provinces.

# 4C.3 PGM-LDC S1 (Accreditation guidelines) x S14 (LGU satisfaction with participatory practices)

The association intends to layer understanding regarding LGUs' satisfaction with participatory practices (Statement 14), which from Section 4B's analysis suggested that the LGUs' high level of satisfaction (94% agreement, 90% net rating) is rationalized with the LGUs' compliance with the national accreditation and membership guidelines, which concerns Statement 1. Cross tabulation, correlation test, and ordered logistic regression are employed for this analysis. (Refer to **Annex B9.6** for methodological notes and its sections for the data tables)

In sum (as elaborated in the succeeding discussions), there is a moderate association between perceptions of accreditation compliance and LGU satisfaction with their participatory practices. Results also show a strong but more varied association between LDC functionality rating (high vs low). The moderate and varied results nuances may be explained with S1 reflecting responses from both CSO and LGU respondents, while S14 is only answered by LGUs for their self-assessment. Nonetheless, there is statistical support for Section 4B's Statement 14 results that LGUs make sense of their participatory practices satisfaction through the lens of the national guidelines' requirements.

**Overall results**. The cross-tabulation of Statement 1 and Statement 14 indicates a moderate association between perceptions of compliance with national accreditation guidelines and LGU satisfaction with participatory practices in the LDC. The Pearson chi-square test confirms a statistically significant relationship between S1 and S14 ( $\chi^2(25) = 281.44$ , p = 0.000), indicating a strong and systematic association between accreditation compliance and participatory satisfaction. The Cramér's V = 0.3372 suggests a moderate association, reinforcing that perceptions of national accreditation compliance influence how participatory practices are perceived within the LDC.

The ordered logistic regression confirms that stronger agreement with S1 (national accreditation compliance) increases the likelihood of being satisfied with LDC participatory practices (S14). However, the effect sizes are not statistically significant.

- Respondents who strongly agreed with S1 were more likely to express satisfaction with LDC participatory practices, with a coefficient of 2.60 (p = 0.398).
- Agreement with S1 had a positive but weak effect (1.14, p = 0.710), indicating that while a positive relationship exists, its statistical significance is limited.
- The Not Informed category had a coefficient of 2.25 (p = 0.469), suggesting that even among those uncertain about accreditation compliance, there is some positive association with participatory satisfaction.

• Disagree (-1.90, p = 0.551) and Strongly Disagree (-1.79, p = 0.563) responses were negative but not statistically significant, suggesting that negative perceptions of accreditation compliance do not necessarily result in outright dissatisfaction with participatory practices but may weaken confidence in governance structures.

Overall, while there is a positive association between perceived compliance with national accreditation standards and satisfaction with LDC participatory practices, *the statistical significance of the regression model is weak. This suggests that other contextual factors, such as actual implementation of participatory mechanisms and internal governance quality, may play a more direct role in shaping satisfaction levels.* it must also be noted that Statement 1 ratings account for the CSO respondents, which may further explain the additional contextual factors suggested in the weak regression results.

By LDC functionality rating. The analysis further adds *LDC functionality* into the association between Statement 1 and Statement 14. Results show a strong but more varied association between low-functionality LDCs and high-functionality LDCs. The ordered logistic regression confirms that stronger agreement with S1 (perceived accreditation compliance) significantly increases the likelihood of being satisfied with LDC participatory practices (S14), but with varying effects across LDC functionality levels. Among respondents from high-functionality LDCs, the overall satisfaction level is higher (coefficient = 5.37, p = 0.072), but the effect is not statistically significant at p < 0.05. The interaction effects between LDC functionality and accreditation compliance were negative, but none of the interactions are statistically significant as well. For this set of analyses, readers are urged to refer to the data tables and detailed explanations in **Annex B9.6**.

# 4C.4 Associations of information sharing-related statements

An instinctively noticeable feature of the PGM-LDC variables is the number of informationsharing-related statements across the PGM dimensions, which CSOs purposively identified as logically linked during the customization process.

- Space dimension: Statement 4, concerning transparency and access to information protocols (i.e., the terms of access should be clear)
- Engagement dimension: Statement 10, concerning transparency through efficient document releases (i.e., the protocols should be observed/experienced in the actuality of interactions)
- Results dimension: Statement 11 concerns CSO's influence on LDC's agenda, plans, and policies, and Statement 12 concerns enabling more effective policies (plans and programs). Both statements broadly connect with the logic of for what purpose CSOs use the accessed information and received documents, i.e., influencing decision-making and improving LDC policies.

This section explores the relationships of statements across dimensions for further insightmining.

#### 4C.4.1 S4 (Access to info protocols) x S10 (Efficient document releases)

This interaction explores the perceptions of whether better access to information protocols affect more efficient document releases. Full methodological notes and data tables are presented in **Annex B9.3** and its subsections.

In sum (as elaborated in succeeding discussions), perceptions of better access to information protocols translate to more efficient document releases. Including the LDC functionality ratings in the relationship shows statistically significant results, with a stronger and more stable correlation in high-functionality LDCs. Both respondent groups affirm the S4 x S10 relationship, with a strong and more consistent association among CSO respondents. The S4 x S10 relationship is maintained across LGU types, with strong and stable association in cities, a strong but more variable association in municipalities, and the strongest association in provinces.

**Overall results (Annex B9.3.2).** The cross-tabulation of S4 and S10 indicates *a strong* association between perceptions of clear data access protocols and the efficiency of LDC information-sharing processes. The Pearson chi-square test confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 ( $\chi^2(25) = 668.52$ , p = 0.000), indicating a strong and systematic association between accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions. The Cramér's V = 0.3671, suggesting a moderate to strong association, reinforcing that clarity in data access protocols is linked to improved perceptions of information efficiency.

The ordered logistic regression confirms that stronger agreement with S4 (clear protocols for CSO data access) significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving LDC information processes as efficient (S10). Respondents who strongly agreed with S4 were significantly more likely to perceive LDCs as efficient in providing information, with a coefficient of 6.34 (p = 0.000). Agreement with S4 also had a strong effect (4.35, p = 0.002), confirming a statistically significant and positive association. Not Informed respondents had a coefficient of 2.98 (p = 0.031), indicating that even among those uncertain about data access protocols, inclusivity perceptions were positively influenced. Disagree and Strongly Disagree responses were positive but had higher p-values (0.367 and 0.195, respectively), meaning their statistical significance is weaker compared to stronger agreement levels.

By LDC functionality rating (Annex B9.3.3). The tests accounting for LDC functionality rating showed statistically significant relationships between S4 and S10, with a stronger and more stable correlation in high-functionality LDCs.

- Among respondents in low-functionality LDCs, the association between clear data access protocols and perceptions of efficient information sharing is moderate but more varied compared to high-functionality LDCs: 111 respondents (64.5%) who agreed with S4 also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10), while 48 (25.9%) strongly agreed. Among 194 respondents who strongly agreed with S4, 138 (71.1%) strongly agreed with S10, confirming a positive relationship. Respondents who disagreed with S4 tended to have lower inclusivity ratings: Among the 20 respondents who disagreed with S4, only 2 strongly agreed with S10. The "Not Informed" category for S4 (33 respondents) had a mixed distribution in S10, indicating possible gaps in awareness regarding information-sharing efficiency. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 513.46$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 for low-functionality LDCs.
- Among respondents in high-functionality LDCs, the association between clear data access protocols and perceived information efficiency is stronger and more stable compared to low-functionality LDCs: 182 respondents (72.2%) who agreed with S4 also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10), while 71 (28.2%) strongly agreed. Among 268 respondents who strongly agreed with S4, 193 (72.0%) strongly agreed with S10, showing a strong positive relationship. Disagreement with S4 is much lower in high-functionality LDCs, but where present, it correlates with low inclusivity

ratings. Fewer "Not Informed" responses were recorded, indicating greater awareness of accreditation policies compared to low-functionality LDCs. The Pearson chi-square test is statistically significant for both cuts. The Cramer's V is slightly higher among low functionality LDCs (Low = 0.4927, High = 0.4547), both indicating a strong association.

The ordered logistic regression confirms that higher accreditation compliance significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving LDCs as efficient in providing information. Respondents who strongly agreed with S4 were significantly more likely to perceive LDCs as efficient, with a coefficient of 6.97 (p = 0.000) Agreement with S4 had a strong effect (4.83, p = 0.002), confirming a statistically significant and positive association. However, LDC functionality is not statistically significant, implying that there is no systematic difference between LDCs with low and high functionality. The interaction terms between S4 and LDC functionality were not statistically significant, indicating that the effect of data access clarity on information efficiency perceptions does not differ significantly between low- and high-functionality LDCs.

**By respondent group (Annex B9.3.4).** Both respondent groups affirm the S4 x S10 relationship, with a strong and more consistent association among CSO respondents.

- Among CSO respondents, the association between clear data access protocols and perceived information efficiency is strong and consistent: 130 respondents (70.7%) who agreed with S4 also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10), while 59 (32.1%) strongly agreed. Among 251 respondents who strongly agreed with S4, 188 (74.9%) strongly agreed with S10, reinforcing a strong positive relationship. Disagreement with S4 correlates with lower inclusivity ratings. Among 30 respondents who disagreed with S4, only 2 strongly agreed with S10. A higher proportion of CSOs reported "Not Informed" responses (20 respondents), suggesting that some CSOs lack awareness or engagement in data access and LDC information-sharing processes. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 535.15$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 for CSO respondents. Cramér's V = 0.4641, indicating a strong association.
- Among LGU respondents, the association between clear data access protocols and perceived information efficiency is also strong but slightly more variable than in CSOs: 163 respondents (67.9%) who agreed with S4 also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10), while 59 (24.6%) strongly agreed. Among 211 respondents who strongly agreed with S4, 143 (67.8%) strongly agreed with S10, reinforcing a strong positive relationship. Disagreement with S4 is much lower among LGUs, but where present, it correlates with lower inclusivity ratings. Fewer LGU respondents selected "Not Informed", indicating greater familiarity with data access protocols compared to CSOs. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 448.08$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 for LGU respondents. Cramér's V = 0.4757, indicating a strong association.

The ordered logistic regression confirms that higher accreditation compliance significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving LDCs as efficient in providing information. Respondents who strongly agreed with S4 were significantly more likely to perceive LDCs as efficient, with a coefficient of 5.72 (p = 0.008). Agreement with S4 had a positive but less statistically significant effect (3.31, p = 0.127). Respondent Group (LGU) is not statistically significant, showing that there is no systematic difference between LGUs and CSOs. The interaction terms between S4 and Respondent Group were not statistically significant, indicating that the effect

of data access clarity on information efficiency perceptions does not significantly differ between CSOs and LGUs.

**By LGU type (Annex B9.3.5).** This set examines whether the perceived efficiency of LDC information-sharing processes (S10) is associated with the perceived clarity of CSO data access protocols (S4) across different LGU types. The findings suggest that respondents who perceive LDCs as having clearer access protocols for CSOs are significantly more likely to view LDC information-sharing as efficient. However, the strength of this association varies across LGU types.

- Among city respondents, the association between perceived clarity of access protocols (S4) and efficiency of LDC information provision (S10) is strong and consistent: Among respondents who agreed that the LDC has clear access protocols (S4 = Agree), 42 (57.5%) also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10 = Agree), while 26 (35.6%) strongly agreed. Among those who strongly agreed with S4, a majority (86 respondents, 74.1%) strongly agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information. Respondents who disagreed with S4 were less likely to view LDCs as efficient, with only 1 respondent strongly agreeing with S10. The "Not Informed" category was relatively small (11 respondents), but their perceptions were mixed, with some leaning toward agreement with S10 and others expressing uncertainty. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 308.68$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 within city respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.5435 suggests a moderate to strong association.
- Among municipality respondents, the association between S4 (clarity of access protocols) and S10 (perceived efficiency of LDC information provision) remains strong but slightly more variable: Among respondents who agreed that the LDC has clear access protocols (S4 = Agree), 204 (68.2%) also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10 = Agree), while 62 (20.7%) strongly agreed. Among those who strongly agreed with S4, the majority (192 respondents, 73.3%) strongly agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information. Disagreement with S4 is more pronounced in municipalities, with 6 respondents strongly disagreeing and 48 respondents disagreeing with S10, indicating a higher level of skepticism toward LDC information efficiency compared to cities. The "Not Informed" category had 33 respondents, showing some level of uncertainty about LDC information-sharing processes. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 576.21$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 within municipality respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.4350 suggests a moderate to strong association, though slightly weaker than in cities.
- Among province respondents, the association between perceived clarity of access protocols (S4) and perceived efficiency of LDC information-sharing (S10) is the strongest of the three LGU types: Among respondents who agreed that the LDC has clear access protocols (S4 = Agree), 47 (56.6%) also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10 = Agree), while 31 (37.3%) strongly agreed. Among those who strongly agreed with S4, 53 respondents (79.1%) strongly agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information. Disagreement with S4 was relatively low, with only 3 respondents disagreeing with S10. The "Not Informed" category was higher compared to cities and municipalities, with 12 respondents expressing uncertainty about both access protocols and LDC information-sharing efficiency. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 325.83$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 within province respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.6120 suggests the strongest association among the three LGU types.

The ordered logistic regression confirms that perceived clarity of CSO access protocols (S4) significantly increases the likelihood of respondents viewing LDC information-sharing as efficient (S10). However, the strength and direction of this effect vary across LGU types (Cities, Municipalities, and Provinces).

- Respondents in cities who strongly agreed with S4 had a statistically significant effect, with a coefficient of 4.01 (p = 0.027), confirming that stronger agreement with S4 is significantly associated with higher perceptions of LDC information efficiency (S10).
- Municipalities had a negative but non-significant effect (coefficient = -2.81, p = 0.245), suggesting that, compared to city respondents, municipality respondents were slightly less likely to perceive clear access protocols as a strong driver of LDC efficiency.
- Provinces had an extremely large negative coefficient (-80.81, p = 0.000), indicating that province respondents were far less likely than city respondents to perceive CSOs as having clear access to LDC information. However, this coefficient is highly extreme and may be influenced by convergence issues in the model, suggesting potential problems with data separation or limited variation in responses.

The interaction terms between S4 and LGU type were statistically significant, indicating that the effect of perceived access clarity on perceptions of LDC information efficiency varies significantly between cities, municipalities, and provinces.

# 4C.4.2 S10 (Efficient document releases) x S11 (CSO influence)

This discussion examines whether perceptions of efficient LDC processes in providing information to CSOs (S10) are associated with perceptions of CSO influence over LDC agenda, plans, and policies (S11). Methodological notes and data tables are presented in **Annex B9.4** and its subsections.

In sum (as elaborated in succeeding discussions), there is a strong association between perceptions of efficient document releases and CSO influence in decision-making. The association is confirmed when accounting for LDC functionality ratings, with a stronger and more stable result in high-functionality LDCs. Accounting for the respondent group, the correlation between information efficiency and CSO influence is significant, with a stronger and more consistent result observed among CSO respondents. The association varies across LGU types, with the strongest and most consistent results in cities.

**Overall results (Annex B9.4.1).** The cross-tabulation of S10 and S11 indicates *a strong* association between perceptions of efficient LDC information-sharing processes and the perceived influence of CSOs in decision-making. The Pearson chi-square test confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 ( $\chi^2(25) = 994.15$ , p = 0.000), indicating a strong association. The Cramér's V of 0.4477 suggests a moderate to strong relationship.

The ordered logistic regression further confirms the positive relationship between information efficiency (S10) and CSO influence (S11). Respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10) were significantly more likely to believe that CSOs influence the LDC's agenda, with a coefficient of 3.39 (p = 0.000). Those who strongly agreed with S10 had an even stronger effect, with a coefficient of 5.85 (p = 0.000), confirming a highly significant relationship. The "Disagree" category was marginally significant (p = 0.050), while the "Not Informed" category was slightly weaker in significance (p = 0.054). "Strongly Disagree" had no significant effect (p = 0.994), indicating that a lack of perception of information efficiency

does not necessarily correlate with perceptions of CSO influence. These results suggest that perceptions of efficient LDC information-sharing processes strongly enhance the likelihood that respondents view CSOs as influential in shaping LDC decisions. The statistical findings confirm a robust and systematic relationship between the two variables.

By LDC functionality ratings (Annex B9.4.2). The association between S10 and S11 is confirmed in both low- and high-functionality LDCs, with a stronger and more stable result in high-functionality LDCs.

- Among respondents from low-functionality LDCs, the association between perceived information efficiency and CSO influence is moderate but variable: Among respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10), 116 (62.4%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11), while 28 (15.1%) strongly agreed, reinforcing a positive relationship. Respondents who strongly agreed that LDC processes efficiently provide information also overwhelmingly agreed that CSOs have an influence: 133 (82.1%) strongly agreed with S11. Conversely, among respondents who disagreed with S10, only 4 respondents strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decisions, while the majority disagreed or were uninformed. The Not Informed category showed mixed perceptions, with most respondents lacking a strong stance on both information efficiency and CSO influence. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 443.27$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 within low-functionality LDCs. The Cramér's V of 0.4578 suggests a moderate to strong association.
- Among respondents from high-functionality LDCs, the association between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence is stronger and more consistent than in low-functionality LDCs: Among respondents who agreed that LDC processes efficiently provide information (S10), 189 (69.0%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11), while 27 (9.9%) strongly agreed. Among those who strongly agreed that LDC processes are efficient, an overwhelming majority (187 respondents, 87.0%) strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decision-making. Respondents who disagreed with S10 were much less likely to view CSOs as influential in high-functionality LDCs, mirroring trends observed in low-functionality LDCs. The Not Informed category was less prevalent in high-functionality LDCs than in low-functionality LDCs, suggesting greater awareness of LDC processes and CSO engagement. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 644.12$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 for high-functionality LDCs, with a Cramér's V of 0.4758, indicating a strong association.

The ordered logistic regression confirms that perceived LDC information efficiency significantly increases the likelihood of respondents viewing CSOs as influential in both high-and low-functionality LDCs:

- Respondents who agreed with S10 had a strong positive association with S11, with a coefficient of 4.53 (p = 0.000).
- Respondents who strongly agreed with S10 had an even larger effect, with a coefficient of 6.89 (p = 0.000), confirming a highly significant relationship.
- Those who disagreed with S10 also showed a positive but smaller effect (3.05, p = 0.009), while the Not Informed category had a similar effect (2.84, p = 0.014).
- However, LDC functionality (high vs. low) was not statistically significant (p = 0.196), indicating that there is no systematic difference in how LDC functionality moderates the effect of S10 on S11. The interaction terms between S10 and LDC functionality were also not statistically significant, implying that the relationship between LDC

information efficiency and CSO influence remains consistent regardless of whether the LDC has low or high functionality.

By respondent group (Annex B9.4.3). Accounting for respondent group, the correlation between information efficiency and CSO influence is significant, with a stronger and more consistent result observed among CSO respondents.

- Among CSO respondents, the association between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence is strong and consistent: Among respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10 = Agree), 145 (61.4%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11 = Agree), while 19 (8.1%) strongly agreed, reinforcing a positive relationship. Respondents who strongly agreed that LDC processes efficiently provide information overwhelmingly agreed that CSOs have an influence: 180 (90.0%) strongly agreed with S11. Conversely, among respondents who disagreed with S10, only 2 respondents strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decisions, while the majority disagreed or were uninformed. The Not Informed category showed mixed perceptions, with most respondents lacking a strong stance on both information efficiency and CSO influence. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 506.05$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 within CSO respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.4513 suggests a moderate to strong association.
- Among LGU respondents, the association between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence is also strong but slightly more variable compared to CSOs: Among respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10 = Agree), 160 (71.4%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11 = Agree), while 36 (16.1%) strongly agreed. Among those who strongly agreed that LDC processes are efficient, a large majority (140 respondents, 79.1%) strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decision-making. Respondents who disagreed with S10 were much less likely to view CSOs as influential in LGUs, mirroring trends observed in CSOs. The Not Informed category was slightly higher in LGUs compared to CSOs, suggesting some variance in awareness of LDC processes and CSO engagement. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 641.52$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 for LGU respondents, with a Cramér's V of 0.5091, indicating a strong association.

The ordered logistic regression confirms that perceived LDC information efficiency significantly increases the likelihood of respondents viewing CSOs as influential:

- Respondents who agreed with S10 had a moderate positive association with S11, with a coefficient of 1.65 (p = 0.250).
- Respondents who strongly agreed with S10 had a strong and statistically significant effect, with a coefficient of 4.21 (p = 0.004), confirming that stronger agreement with S10 is significantly associated with higher perceptions of CSO influence.

The effect of being an LGU respondent (Respondent Group = LGU) is negative and marginally significant (coefficient = -3.12, p = 0.066), suggesting that LGU respondents may perceive CSOs as slightly less influential in LDC decision-making compared to CSO respondents. However, interaction terms between S10 and Respondent Group (CSO vs. LGU) were not statistically significant, indicating that the relationship between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence does not significantly differ between CSOs and LGUs.

By LGU type (Annex B9.4.4). Accounting for LGU type, the findings suggest that respondents who perceive LDCs as having clearer access protocols for CSOs are significantly more likely
to view LDC information-sharing as efficient – but varying in association strength across LGU types, with strongest and most consistent results in cities.

- Among city respondents, the association between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence is strong and consistent: Among respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10 = Agree), 50 (64.9%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11 = Agree), while 15 (19.5%) strongly agreed. Among those who strongly agreed with S10, a majority (90 respondents, 84.9%) strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decisions. Respondents who disagreed with S10 were less likely to view CSOs as influential in cities, with only 1 respondent strongly agreeing with S11. The Not Informed category was relatively small but showed mixed perceptions, with 7 respondents unaware of LDC information-sharing processes. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 287.31$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 within city respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.5243 suggests a moderate to strong association.
- Among municipality respondents, the association between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence is also strong, though slightly more variable: Among respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10 = Agree), 209 (68.8%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11 = Agree), while 35 (11.5%) strongly agreed. Among those who strongly agreed with S10, the majority (178 respondents, 83.2%) strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decision-making. Disagreement with S10 is more pronounced in municipalities, with 6 respondents strongly disagreeing and 48 respondents disagreeing with S11, indicating greater skepticism toward CSO influence compared to cities. The Not Informed category had 21 respondents, showing some uncertainty about LDC information-sharing processes. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 546.59$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 within municipality respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.4237 suggests a moderate to strong association.
- Among province respondents, the association between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence is weaker than in cities and municipalities: Among respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10 = Agree), 46 (58.2%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11 = Agree), while 5 (6.3%) strongly agreed. Among those who strongly agreed with S10, 52 respondents (91.2%) strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decision-making. Disagreement with S10 was relatively low, with only 3 respondents disagreeing with S11. The Not Informed category was relatively higher compared to cities, with 13 respondents reporting uncertainty about LDC information-sharing efficiency. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 238.10$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 within province respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.5231 suggests a moderate to strong association.

The ordered logistic regression confirms that perceived LDC information efficiency significantly increases the likelihood of respondents viewing CSOs as influential:

- Respondents in cities who strongly agreed with S10 had a statistically significant effect, with a coefficient of 2.65 (p = 0.000), confirming that stronger agreement with S10 is significantly associated with higher perceptions of CSO influence.
- Municipalities had a negative and statistically significant effect (coefficient = -3.93, p = 0.000), suggesting that municipality respondents were significantly less likely than city respondents to perceive CSOs as influential in LDC decision-making.
- Provinces had an extremely large negative coefficient (-43.13, p = 0.000), indicating that province respondents were far less likely than city respondents to perceive CSOs

as influential. However, this coefficient may be influenced by convergence issues in the model.

The interaction terms between S10 and LGU type were statistically significant, indicating that the effect of perceived information efficiency on CSO influence perceptions varies significantly between cities, municipalities, and provinces.

4C.4.3 S10 (Efficient document releases) x S12 (Enabling more effective policies)

This discussion examines whether perceptions of efficient information-sharing processes in LDCs (Statement 10) are associated with the perception that CSO participation improves local plans, policies, and services (Statement 12). Methodological notes and data tables are presented in **Annex B9.5** and its subsections.

In sum (as elaborated in the succeeding discussions), there is a strong association between perceptions of information-sharing efficiency and the effectiveness of CSO participation in policymaking. The association between LDC efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness is stronger and more stable in high-functionality LDCs, CSO respondents, and cities.

**Overall results (Annex B9.4.5).** The cross-tabulation of S10 and S12 indicates *a strong* association between LDC information-sharing efficiency and the perceived effectiveness of CSO participation in local policymaking. The Pearson chi-square test confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 ( $\chi^2(25) = 809.80$ , p = 0.000), indicating a strong and systematic association between perceptions of LDC efficiency and CSO effectiveness. Cramér's V = 0.4041, suggesting a moderate-to-strong association.

The ordered logistic regression confirms that stronger agreement with S10 (LDC efficiency) significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving CSO participation as effective (S12).

- Respondents who strongly agreed with S10 were significantly more likely to perceive CSO participation as effective, with a coefficient of 5.97 (p = 0.000).
- Agreement with S10 also had a strong effect (3.49, p = 0.001), confirming a statistically significant and positive association.
- The Not Informed category had a coefficient of 1.89 (p = 0.086), indicating that even among those uncertain about LDC information efficiency, perceptions of CSO effectiveness were positively influenced.
- Disagree and Strongly Disagree responses were not statistically significant, suggesting that negative perceptions of LDC efficiency do not necessarily lead to outright rejection of CSO effectiveness, but they dampen confidence in participatory governance.

By LDC functionality rating (Annex B9.4.6). Testing with the LDC functionality rating, the association between LDC efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness is stronger and more stable in high-functionality LDCs.

• Among respondents in low-functionality LDCs, the association between information efficiency and CSO effectiveness is moderate but more varied compared to high-functionality LDCs. 113 respondents (63.8%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation enhances governance (S12), while 35 (19.8%) strongly agreed. Among 209 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 154 (73.7%) strongly agreed with S12, confirming a positive relationship. Respondents who disagreed with S10 tended to have lower perceptions of CSO effectiveness: Among 20 respondents who disagreed with S12. The Not

Informed category for S10 (33 respondents) had a mixed distribution in S12, indicating possible gaps in awareness regarding both information efficiency and CSO contributions. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 357.11$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 in low-functionality LDCs.

• Among respondents in high-functionality LDCs, the association between LDC efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness is stronger and more stable compared to low-functionality LDCs. 173 respondents (74.9%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation improves governance (S12), while 35 (15.2%) strongly agreed. Among 302 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 230 (76.2%) strongly agreed with S12, showing a strong positive relationship. Disagreement with S10 was much lower in high-functionality LDCs, but where present, it correlated with low perceptions of CSO effectiveness. Fewer "Not Informed" responses were recorded, indicating greater awareness of LDC efficiency and participatory mechanisms compared to low-functionality LDCs. The Pearson chi-square test is statistically significant for both low and high-functionality LDCs. However, Cramér's V is slightly higher for low-functionality LDCs (Low = 0.4109, High = 0.4090), indicating that perceptions of CSO participation effectiveness are more strongly influenced by LDC efficiency when LDC functionality is lower.

The regression results further validate the significant relationship between LDC information efficiency (S10) and perceptions of CSO participation impact (S12):

- Respondents who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) were significantly more likely to perceive CSO participation as beneficial, with a coefficient of 3.76 (p = 0.003).
- Strong agreement with S10 had an even larger effect, with a coefficient of 5.95 (p = 0.000), confirming that respondents who strongly believe in LDC information efficiency also strongly believe in the benefits of CSO participation.

The LDC functionality variable itself was not statistically significant (p = 0.818), implying that while high-functionality LDCs exhibit a stronger association, the general effect of information efficiency on CSO perceptions remains consistent across both types of LDCs. Interaction terms between S10 and LDC functionality were also not statistically significant, indicating that the impact of information efficiency on CSO participation perceptions does not vary significantly between low- and high-functionality LDCs.

**By respondent group (Annex B9.5.3).** Testing with the respondent group revealed a strong and more consistent association between perceptions of LDC information efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness among CSO respondents compared to more varied responses from LGUs.

• Among CSO respondents, there is a strong and consistent association between perceptions of LDC information efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness. 132 respondents (65.7%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation enhances governance (S12), while 37 (18.4%) strongly agreed. Among 261 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 211 (80.8%) strongly agreed with S12, reinforcing a strong positive relationship. Respondents who disagreed with S10 reported lower perceptions of CSO effectiveness: Among 15 respondents who disagreed with S10, only 1 strongly agreed that CSO participation improves local governance. A higher proportion of CSOs reported "Not Informed" responses (20 respondents), suggesting that some CSOs lack awareness of LDC efficiency and its impact on participatory governance. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 438.32$ , p =

0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 for CSO respondents. Cramér's V = 0.4200, indicating a strong association.

• Among LGU respondents, the association between LDC information efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness is also strong but slightly more variable than in CSOs. 154 respondents (74.4%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation enhances governance (S12), while 33 (13.5%) strongly agreed. Among 250 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 173 (69.2%) strongly agreed with S12, confirming a strong positive relationship. Disagreement with S10 was lower among LGU respondents, but where present, it correlated with lower perceptions of CSO effectiveness. Fewer LGU respondents selected "Not Informed" compared to CSOs, indicating greater familiarity with LDC information-sharing processes. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 588.13$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 for LGU respondents. Cramér's V = 0.4875, indicating a strong association.

The ordered logistic regression confirms that higher perceived efficiency of LDC informationsharing (S10) significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving CSO participation as effective (S12).

- Respondents who strongly agreed with S10 were significantly more likely to perceive CSO participation as effective, with a coefficient of 4.51 (p = 0.025).
- Agreement with S10 also had a positive effect (1.90, p = 0.345), although this was not statistically significant at conventional levels.
- Not Informed respondents had a negative coefficient (-0.10, p = 0.960), suggesting that a lack of awareness about LDC efficiency may dampen confidence in CSO effectiveness.

The interaction terms between S10 and Respondent Group (CSO vs. LGU) were not statistically significant, indicating that the effect of LDC efficiency on perceptions of CSO participation effectiveness is similar for both respondent groups.

By LGU type (Annex B9.5.4). Testing with the respondent group revealed the strongest and most consistent association among respondents from cities.

- Among respondents from cities, the association between LDC information efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness is strong and consistent. 41 respondents (69.5%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation enhances governance (S12), while 9 (15.3%) strongly agreed. Among 135 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 104 (77.0%) strongly agreed with S12, reinforcing a strong positive relationship. Respondents who disagreed with S10 were significantly less likely to view CSO participation as effective, with only 1 out of 6 respondents expressing strong agreement with S12. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 =$ 233.66, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 for city respondents. Cramér's V = 0.5287, indicating a strong association.
- Among respondents from municipalities, the association between LDC information efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness remains strong but is slightly more varied. 201 respondents (73.9%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation enhances governance (S12), while 39 (14.3%) strongly agreed. Among 294 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 215 (73.1%) strongly agreed with S12, reinforcing a positive relationship. Respondents who disagreed with S10 had much lower perceptions of CSO effectiveness, with only 1 of the 17 respondents in this category strongly agreeing that CSO participation enhances

governance. A higher proportion of respondents from municipalities reported "Not Informed" responses (25 respondents), suggesting greater disparities in governance and accreditation awareness across municipalities. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 574.30$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 for municipality respondents. Cramér's V = 0.4343, indicating a moderate-to-strong association.

• Among respondents from provinces, the association between LDC information efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness is still present but relatively weaker compared to cities and municipalities. 44 respondents (57.1%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation enhances governance (S12), while 22 (28.6%) strongly agreed. Among 82 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 65 (79.3%) strongly agreed with S12, reinforcing a strong positive relationship. Disagreement with S10 correlates with lower inclusivity ratings, with only 1 of the 4 respondents who disagreed with S10 strongly agreeing with S12. Fewer provincial respondents selected "Not Informed" (8 respondents), indicating relatively higher awareness compared to municipalities but slightly lower than in cities. The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 144.20$ , p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 for provincial respondents. Cramér's V = 0.4071, indicating a moderate-to-strong association.

The ordered logistic regression confirms that higher perceived efficiency of LDC informationsharing (S10) significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving CSO participation as effective (S12), though effects differ across LGU types.

- Strong agreement with S10 significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving CSO participation as effective, with a coefficient of 3.79 (p = 0.000).
- Agreement with S10 also had a positive effect (1.05, p = 0.002), confirming a significant and positive association.
- Respondents from municipalities (-3.05, p = 0.014) and provinces (-57.64, p = 0.000) were significantly less likely to perceive CSO participation as effective compared to city respondents, suggesting that LDC efficiency has a greater impact on CSO participation perceptions in city governments.

Interaction terms between S10 and LGU type were statistically significant for municipalities and provinces, indicating that the effect of LDC information efficiency on CSO participation perceptions varies across different LGU types.

### 4C.5 PGM-LDC dimension interactions: Space x Engagement x Results

The final analytical exploration concerns the relationship of the PGM-LDC framework dimensions. The logic is that the space and engagement dimensions lead to PG results. Paraphrasing the PGM framework technical descriptions of the dimensions<sup>10</sup> (Medina-Guce 2020a):

• Space is the PG dimension that can be designed by policy (e.g., accreditation, resource allocation, transparency protocols), that then shapes (not determines) the engagement

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> From the Medina-Guce 2020a technical notes: These dimensions are informed by theories of relational analysis, particularly on relational power concepts. The theories organize relational power analysis into the space of power interaction, the 'ties' or processes of interaction, and the 'emergences' from the relations (results). For more information on these theoretical foundations, refer to Selg (2018) for relational power, and Papilloud (2018) and Canto-Mila (2018) for Georg Simmel's analytical framework of relations.

at reasonable levels following normative behavioral changes introduced to institutions (as both formal and informal norms).

- The qualifier for the relationship between the space and engagement dimensions is 'shaping,' not determining, since the engagement dimensions are relational (i.e., concerning trust, reciprocity, and power relations), which are not necessarily a direct product of policy reforms particularly top-down prescriptions from the national government to local stakeholders.
- Meanwhile, the result dimensions are 'emergences' changing the relations between government and citizens and governance itself, approximating the principles of PG. Emergences, in this sense, are not defined outputs or outcomes but are evolving manifestations of the principles (e.g., political effectiveness, political efficacy) constitutive of contextually contingent and legitimized PG.

This analysis translates the logic design of PGM dimensions into a quantile regression analysis examining the relationship between policy space, engagement, and the outcomes of participatory governance. The analysis utilizes median regression (quantile regression at the 50th percentile) to estimate the effects of engagement processes and participatory space on participatory outcomes while accounting for potential non-normality and heteroskedasticity in the data.

A quantile regression model was estimated with an index of the Results statements (aggregated responses for statements 11-13) as the dependent variable and an index of Engagement statements (aggregated responses for Statements 8-10) and an index for Space statements (aggregated responses for statements 1-7) as the independent variables, including their interaction term. The methodology for index construction was consistent with earlier index discussions. The estimation accounts for robust standard errors to ensure statistical reliability. The model is specified as follows:

Results =  $\beta_0 + \beta_1 Engagement + \beta_2 Space + \beta_3 (Engagement \times Space) + \varepsilon$ 

**Overall results (Annex B9.1.1).** Engagement has a statistically significant positive effect on results (coefficient = 0.552, p < 0.01), indicating that higher perceived quality participation processes are associated with perceived improved participatory governance results. Space (Participatory Environment) also has a significant positive effect on results (coefficient = 0.206, p < 0.01), suggesting that a perception of more enabling policy and institutional environment enhances perceived participatory governance outcomes.

The interaction term between Engagement and Space is not statistically significant (p = 0.733), meaning that the combined effect of participation processes and the participatory environment does not appear to influence outcomes beyond their individual effects. *These findings suggest that both engagement processes and the participatory environment independently contribute to governance outcomes, but their interaction does not produce additional effects*.

By respondent group (Annex B9.1.2). The analysis mirrors the overall approach in the previous section but restricts the sample to only CSO or LGU respondents.

- Quantile regression results indicate that engagement (participation processes) significantly predicts governance outcomes for both CSOs and LGUs.
- The effect of engagement is slightly stronger for LGUs (0.611) than for CSOs (0.570).
- On the other hand, *space (participatory environment) has a stronger effect among CSOs* than among LGUs. The coefficient for CSOs (0.276, p = 0.001) is larger than that for

LGUs (0.167, p = 0.000). This implies that CSOs may be more reliant on an enabling environment (policies and institutional settings) to achieve better governance outcomes.

The interaction term (Engagement  $\times$  Space) is not significant for either group. This suggests that the combined effect of participation processes and participatory space does not provide additional benefits beyond their independent effects.

By LDC functionality rating (Annex B9.1.3). This set of analyses provides insights into whether stronger LDC functionality enhances participatory governance outcomes and whether engagement and institutional settings have different effects depending on LDCs' capacity and effectiveness.

Results show that engagement (Participation Processes) has a significant positive effect only for high-functionality LDCs:

- For high-functionality LDCs, the coefficient is 0.652 (p = 0.000), indicating that stronger participation processes are strongly associated with better participatory governance outcomes.
- For low-functionality LDCs, the coefficient is 0.417, but it is not statistically significant (p = 0.084), suggesting that engagement has a weaker or inconsistent effect in settings where LDC functionality is lower.

Space (Participatory Environment) is a significant predictor for both groups, but with a stronger effect for low-functionality LDCs. The coefficient for low-functionality LDCs is 0.250 (p = 0.019), while for high-functionality LDCs, it is 0.157 (p = 0.047). This suggests that when LDC functionality is weaker, improvements in institutional settings play a larger role in improving participatory governance outcomes.

The interaction term (Engagement  $\times$  Space) is not significant for either group. This implies that the benefits of participation processes and institutional settings are largely independent and do not necessarily reinforce each other.

By LGU type (Annex B9.1.4). Cities show the highest coefficient for Engagement (0.814, p = 0.000), suggesting that strong participation processes are associated with significantly better governance outcomes in cities. Municipalities (0.538, p = 0.000) and Provinces (0.650, p = 0.000) also benefit from better engagement, but to a lesser extent than cities.

Space (institutional setting) has a positive and significant effect across all LGU types –Cities: (0.239, p = 0.000), Municipalities: (0.212, p = 0.000) and Provinces: (0.242, p = 0.000) This suggests that a well-structured participatory environment (laws, policies, institutions) consistently supports better governance outcomes, regardless of LGU type.

The interaction term is insignificant across all LGU types, suggesting that the benefits of participation processes and institutional settings are largely independent rather than mutually reinforcing. This finding indicates that strong institutions alone do not necessarily amplify the effects of engagement—instead, both factors need to be improved separately to enhance participatory governance.

# 4C.6 Operational notes: Enumerators' feedback on survey deployment

While not necessarily a statistical analysis exploration like the earlier discussions, the research includes feedback on the operational component of the research project from field notes of the survey enumerators. Since the PGM-LDC survey is intended to be deployed again in the future, the PGM-LDC tools provided qualitative response options for field enumerators' notable observations and discussion points from the CSO and LGU sessions. Each response was analyzed and categorized based on whether it referred to giving feedback on survey administration, the behavior or actions of the respondents, or the sharing of learning outcomes and program and policy improvements raised during the sessions. These enumerators' insights may help DILG enhance the subsequent rounds of the national deployment of the PGM-LDC Tool.

There are 166 notes provided for the CSO sessions, and 165 for the LGU sessions. The highlights are summarized in **Table 73**, while more detailed discussion of the qualitative responses is in **Annex C6**. Highlights of the results are as follows:

- **Respondent conduct during sessions.** 50% of the CSO session observations and 46% of the LGU session concerned enumerators' notes on the conduct of survey sessions. The respondents were occupied with other activities (concurrent or upcoming meetings and fieldwork), which hindered a certain level of focus in completing the survey. The enumerators also indicated that the presence of high-ranking LGU officials (e.g., mayor and vice mayor) in some sessions may have caused unease among attending LGU functionaries. Few respondents raised concerns about anonymity and whether "responses would reach their superiors" despite the informed consent with anonymity and confidentiality protocols orientation.
- Survey administration. The enumerators identified challenges in coordination and technical issues, which caused delays in conducting the survey. According to the enumerators, some CSO and LGU respondents were invited at the last minute, suggesting the need for better scheduling and sending advance notices to the LGUs. However, it is worth noting that some LGUs were affected by severe weather conditions during the survey deployment timeframe, which may have affected coordination. Some respondents preferred face-to-face survey modalities since online sessions were prone to technical issues (e.g., internet connectivity and power interruptions).

The enumerators also raised concerns regarding the independence of each respondent's answer, as many respondents would first consult and discuss before answering. To note, the PGM-LDC deployment design anticipated such a 'consultation-first' tendency and does not explicitly hinder preliminary discussions. Furthermore, CSOs in selected regions were observed to be outright unaware of the accreditation and membership guidelines, e.g., not knowing that there ought to be a CSO directory. The PGM-LDC tool is also designed to reflect such scenarios, hence the 'unaware/uninformed' response option, of which enumerators were continuously instructed (in the prepared spiel) to assure respondents as an acceptable answer. While anticipated in design, future survey runs could further emphasize to enumerators that such scenarios are acceptable.

Overall, the enumerators' observations highlighted the need for better coordination with the LGUs to minimize delays and challenges in identifying respondents. These issues can be addressed by providing advance notices and conducting a proper orientation with the concerned DILG regional and local offices to ensure alignment of timelines and a clear understanding of the survey's objectives and use before deployment.

Additionally, *stricter adherence to the selection criteria* should be observed in future survey runs, since the research team found answers explicitly mentioning that the respondents are not members of the LDC (which were removed from the final dataset). Future survey firms should also ensure that field enumerators dedicate more than sufficient time for informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality protocol discussions with survey respondents.

Categories	Description			CSO Survey			LGU Survey
				(166 qualitative responses)			(165 qualitative responses)
		n	%	Highlights of qualitative responses	n	%	Highlights of qualitative responses
Survey	Refer to feedback on the	77	36%	Enumerators indicated challenges in	92	44%	Enumerators noted that some LGU
Administration	conduct and execution of the			coordination and scheduling (last minute			respondents preferred conducting
	survey (e.g. logistics,			invitations to respondents), technical			the survey face-to-face to better
	coordination with respondents,			aspects (slow internet access, multiple			explain their responses. Other
	scheduling)			form submissions) and influence of LGU			feedback includes issues in
				presence on CSO responses. CSOs			coordination and scheduling of the
				appeared "hesitant" or "anxious" due to			survey, availability of the
				the presence of LGUs during the survey			respondents, poor internet access
							and power interruptions, and lack of
							equipment (laptops or other devices)
Respondent-	Refer to feedback on the	106	50%	Enumerators noticed the tendency of	96	46%	Enumerators shared that the LGU
related factors	respondents' characteristics			CSOs to discuss their answers among			respondents consulted each other
	and/or actions that may affect			themselves prior to answering the survey,			before answering the survey,
	participation in the conduct of			while others were being coached by			including "echoing" answers of other
	the survey (e.g. difficulty in			other respondents. The enumerators also			respondents or seeking the guidance
	accomplishing the form,			observed that many respondents			of higher-ranking officials.
	interaction with other			struggled with the technology and			Respondents appeared "uneasy",
	respondents, availability)			required assistance with inputting their			"fidgety", or "confused". The
				answers. There were CSO members who			enumerators also mentioned that
				are busy with other responsibilities			there are respondents who
				(other meetings, conducting fieldwork,			accomplished the survey while
				participating in simultaneous events)			working (answering calls, juggling
							other tasks, or rushing to attend
							other meetings)
Program and	Refer to feedback on	25	12%	Enumerators reiterated the CSOs' need	12	6%	Enumerators noted that the LGUs
Policy	respondents'			for improvements in institutional and			acknowledged the need for
Improvements	recommendations and/or			administrative support (honoraria, travel			improvements to enhance CSO
	requests for improvements in			allowance, and CSO desk).			participation (financial support and
				Recommendations also included			conduct of capacity development

# Table 73. Summary of Enumerators' Feedback

Categories	Description			CSO Survey		LGU Survey		
				(166 qualitative responses)		(165 qualitative responses)		
		n	%	Highlights of qualitative responses	n	%	Highlights of qualitative responses	
	LDC policies, programs, and			improving coordination and			program). One respondent expressed	
	activities			communication with LGUs			concerns about the aging	
							membership of CSOs	
Learning	Refer to feedback on	6	3%	Enumerators acknowledged CSO learning	7	3%	Enumerators noted that the LGUs	
Outcomes	respondents' insights gained			from participating in the survey (more			appreciated the survey, recognizing	
	and/or the expected impact of			CSO involvement and need for			its importance and impact on their	
	the survey			accreditation) and mentioned that CSOs'			relationships with CSOs and their	
				"hope" that their concerns would be			overall involvement. A respondent	
				forwarded to national level for action			raised clarifications regarding the	
							purpose of the survey and how it	
							would "benefit" the LGU.	

# **5** The State of Participation in LDCs: Analysis and Recommendations

This research project aimed to comprehensively analyze the quality of participation in LDCs using the PGM-LDC tool and, as such, mined the data points that the tool provides as exhaustively as possible for a rich and 'thick' baseline informing future assessments. This section integrates key insights emerging from the findings (both as executive summary and further analysis) and lays out the state of participation of CSOs in LDCs.

# 5.1 State of Participation in LDC Mechanisms and Practices

The first set of findings establishes scenarios of the conduct of the LDC mechanisms and practices beyond the full council and the current monitoring scope of DILG's data gathering. *Viewed through the lens of the mandated mechanisms and practices, the state of participation in LDCs paints a picture of the active involvement of CSOs but is limited within 'invited' parameters. The term invited is borrowed from Gaventa's power cube components (2006), wherein the extent of breadth and depth of participation is pre-determined and gatekept—by national policies, by LGUs' interpretation of the implementation of the policies (e.g., pre-assigning which CSOs may participate in which sub-spaces), or simply by the momentum of usual or normalized practices. CSOs and LGUs affirm these 'invited' and 'consulted' scenarios with the approximations of CSO participation status and levels, although not without problematizing ways to improve current policies and practices.* 

The indicators' results presented in Section 4A flesh out this analysis, summarized as follows. The paragraph code references in the succeeding discussion refer to the sections where the full results were earlier presented.

**[4A.1]** Results indicated that 17% of CSO respondents were unsure/uninformed about their respective LDCs' CSO composition percentage, with lower awareness (19%) in low-functionality LDCs. While DILG annually monitors CSO composition through the LGUs' SGLG submissions, the baseline underscores that more work is needed to facilitate the emergence of local CSO networks – beginning with the CSOs being aware of their numbers and actually engaged organizations.

**[4A.2]** Regarding the LGUs' compliance with the LSB reconstitution policy, results show that LGUs are perceived to be most compliant with the first requirement – updating the CSO inventory and directory—and least compliant with the facilitation of the CSO network emergent from the CSO conference. The other activities, e.g., CSO conference, timely invitations for accreditation, and timely releases of accreditation certificates, all fair well at above 75% perceived compliance. Most activity compliances are also perceived to be better implemented by cities and with significant regional differences.

The results underscore the opportunity to expand the current efforts to build social capital among the accredited CSOs (in reference to BUB lessons and broader participation literature). These efforts may be facilitated through the CSO capacity development initiatives of DILG and its CSO network partners and furthered through DILG's engagements with PH-OGP and its member agencies.

[4A.3] LDC adherence to representation policies sets baselines on the LDC's interaction with other national requirements for inclusion and participation support. Regarding DILG's

mandated *CSO Desks and Peoples' Councils*, perceived compliance is higher for the CSO desks (78% and 58% respectively). There is also higher compliance perceived in cities and with significant regional differences. The perception baseline analysis serves as a proxy sensing indicator for whether the CSOs are able to receive information and maximize the LGU resources allocated for these support mechanisms.

For *IP representation* following the IPRA provisions, only 44% of respondents indicated their LDCs' compliance, with higher perception rates in provinces and by CSOs, and with significant regional differences. Meanwhile, adherence to the *Magna Carta of Women's* provision for women's representation rated only at 64% perceived compliance, which is highest in municipalities and with significant regional differences.

To date, DILG does not monitor LDC adherence to these national laws' provisions for representing IPs and women. The study highly recommends the *inclusion of these indicators in DILG's LDC functionality data points*—even for only the operational functionality indicators since there are clear national laws providing the basis for the requirements. Whether IP and women representatives are substantively participating (through the lens of inclusion and influence of their sector) belongs to a medium-term agenda for sectoral participation assessments. The study also recommends a more thorough stocktaking of other national policies for sectoral representation for integration with future PGM-LDC tool updates.

**[4A.4]** The PGM-LDC tool translates the LDC functions into a set of activities—the same list included in DILG's CSO orientation modules. **CSO participation status and level in LDC activities** show stark differences between the CSOs' self-reported participation and the LGUs' assessment of their CSO counterparts. Regression and correlation analyses show that LGUs consistently overestimate CSO participation, while CSOs systematically underrate their self-reported participation. LDC functionality ratings do not change perception differences. When accounting for LGU types, the perception difference is most pronounced in provinces and most consistent in cities. Qualitative responses underscore a recurring recommendation to enhance CSO skills and knowledge specific to each activity.

Furthermore, the study finds that while overall participation rate is moderate to high for most activities, *the scenarios painted in the qualitative responses refer to CSOs being "invited" or "consulted."* These scenarios paint lower levels of participation when pegged against the IAP2 spectrum of participation (2018) and Arnstein's ladder model (1964). This implies that while the perception status and level may be moderate or high, the construct framing (reference of meanings) from which the perceptions are based already considers 'being invited' or 'being consulted' as sufficient scenarios of participation, contrary to normative standards forwarded in the global frameworks. The finding points to the need to advance CSOs' appreciation of the spectrum of possible participation—a notion that will figure prominently in the succeeding subsections on the overall reading of the state of participation.

**[4A.5]** The baseline also incorporated **CSO participation status and level in the LDC committees**, which an earlier study (Medina-Guce 2023b) indicated are underutilized for expanding the spaces and opportunities for participation since the LDC scope is not limited to the full council meetings only. The results show that the Executive Committee has 68% reported CSO participation among respondents, with higher perceptions by LGUs and the lowest rating in provinces. Among the functional and sectoral committees, only the Social Development and Economic Development Committees have higher perceived participation (60% and 54% respectively. Non-participation rates are higher for the three other committees:

Environmental Management (55%), Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development (64%), and Institutional Development (59%).

Furthermore, qualitative responses paint a picture of CSOs attending and giving feedback in discussions but rarely steering the committee agenda-setting. The issue of the rarity of committee meetings is also raised, supporting the earlier study's documented feedback about LGU practices of convening the committees only to report compliance for the SGLG assessment. Both respondent groups (LGUs and CSOs) identified the need to advance CSOs' skills and knowledge gaps relevant to the various committees.

The findings underscore the need for *more purposive interventions in policy and capacity development that optimize functional and sectoral committees for participatory goals*, especially since, as per DILG's guidelines, these committees are not limited to participation by accredited CSOs and can be opened to non-accredited CSOs.

**[4A.6]** The baseline analysis also explored the interaction between **the frequency of CSO participation and an index of participation status in LDC functions** (activities, from Section 4A.4). The overall results show that 43% of respondents indicate *quarterly* CSO participation. Regression analysis shows statistically significant differences between LDC functionality ratings:

- High functionality LDCs indicate more quarterly CSO participation than low functionality LDCs (47% and 42%, respectively). However, in high-functionality LDCs, attendance frequency beyond bi-annual does not lead to significant differences in participation status in LDC functions. This means that for high-functionality LDCs, there is an optimal frequency between quarterly and bi-annual frequency that contributes to higher participation ratings across the LDC functions (activities).
- Meanwhile, low-functionality LDCs indicate CSO participation to be more frequent (combined quarterly and monthly participation is higher at 64% compared to the combined rates in high-functionality LDCs at 60%). However, as low-functionality LDCs underperform on the LDC operational indicators, the results suggest that more frequent participation does not mean higher participation in the LDC functions. The discussion notes that the baseline inquiry does not have a concrete reference to explain why low-functionality LDCs have more frequent CSO participation while remaining underperforming to operational standards. This is a matter for a future research agenda (see later subsection).

What is more definitive from the baseline is the insight that high-functionality LDCs practice higher participation in LDC functions between bi-annual and quarterly frequencies. This finding provides a concrete peg for designing participatory activities beyond the LDC full council bi-annual requirement. The notion also informs resource allocation decisions in programming LDC participatory activities.

**[4A.7]** Qualitative responses regarding **enablers**, **hindrances**, **and needed support** overwhelmingly underscored the policy and administrative guidance needed to identify and allocate *resources for participation costs*. A cross-cutting theme among enabling and hindering categories is a sense of *social capital-building with the LCEs and the local CSO network*.

# 5.2 State of Participation assessed through the PGM-LDC variables

The PGM-LDC framework was designed to diagnose participation quality through normative PG principles espoused in global metrics and indices. The framework allows for a structured view of the space of participation (pertaining to policy design and environment), engagement (the quality of interactions between LGUs and CSOs), and results (the emergences or unfolding outcome areas to which quality participation should contribute).

Viewed through the lens of the PGM-LDC framework, agreeable ratings throughout the variable statements characterize the state of participation in LDCs, but with the more substantive PG principles such as CSO influence and autonomy ranking lower. Furthermore, CSOs tend to look at the space variables when assessing participatory outcomes, suggesting their need structured environments that eliminate arbitrary decisions and gatekeeping practices by LGUs on matters such as inclusion and access to information. On the other hand, LGUs tend to lean into engagement variables when assessing participatory outcomes, since their self-rated compliance with policy compliances is deemed already high and satisfactory. Both respondent groups continue to grapple with securing resources to support participatory activities.

This analysis draws from the various ways that this baseline study processed and explored the PGM-LDC variable interactions. It is summarized in three parts.

## 5.2.1 By rank and net rating

Results from the PGM-LDC variables (summarized in Table 32) show that respondents most agree with S1 (Rationalized inclusion criteria by the satisfaction of accreditation guidelines), while respondents rated S5 (Sufficient resource support) the least. Both these variable statements are under the space dimension, which pertains to the quality of the policy environment for participation.

For the **engagement dimension**—the quality of interactions between CSOs and LGUs in the LDCs—the top-rated variable is S8 (inclusion), which, in its corresponding analysis, shows an emergent clarity of what stakeholders construct as sufficient inclusion parameters, e.g., commensurate representation of local sectors, breadth/reach of invited sectors, and agenda-setting roles for CSOs. The least net-rated engagement variable is S9 (autonomy and fairness), wherein qualitative responses highlight the continued practices of tokenistic participation and the lack of agenda influence and feedback loops.

Meanwhile, for the **results dimension**—variables expressing various outcome dimensions of participation based on global frameworks and literature—the highest-rated variable is S14 (LGU satisfaction with its own participatory practices). Layered analysis with the qualitative responses indicates that LGUs self-rate their participation practices highly because they use the Code and DILG's MC operational indicators as bases for their self-assessment. The next top-rated variable is S12 (enabling effective policies), which the qualitative responses indicate is assessed based on the added value of CSOs' perspectives in the plans and programming of the LDCs. Meanwhile, S11 (influence on LDC decisions) is the least rated among the results dimension variables, with qualified agreements and disagreements pointing to LGUs 'cherry-picking' CSO proposals and the conditionalities concerning 'who' and 'in which decisions' CSOs participate (gatekeeping practices).

Across the 14 variables, most statements have statistically significant nuances, with LGUs agreeing higher than their CSO counterparts and cities being the most agreeable among LGU types. For several statements, low-functionality LDCs are less agreeable than the high-functionality ones. Readers are urged to refer to **Table 33** for the *summary of findings and recommendations per PGM-LDC variable statement*.

What is most notable from the results is that **the more substantive variables for PG principles based on literature and global frameworks are ranked moderate to low:** S13 CSO Satisfaction is rank 8 (87% net rating), S9 Autonomy and Fairness is rank 11-12 (83% net rating), and especially S11 Influence on Decisions is rank 13 (75% net rating). In their respective detailed discussions, the ways forward thematically point to alignments of expectations among stakeholders, indicating that currently, LDC stakeholders are grappling with how to make sense of and operationalize these PG principles in their practices. In contrast, S8 Inclusion (as a high-level principle of PG) appears in the upper half of the list (rank 4-7, 89% net rating). The variable's analysis indicates a more pronounced appreciation among stakeholders is a good reference for directions the other variables mentioned earlier can pursue.

## 5.2.2 Inter-PGM dimension associations

Analysis of the **interactions of the PGM dimensions** (space x engagement x results, **Section 4C.5**) showed that, to recap the survey results: Space variables and engagement variables both independently contribute to PG outcomes, but taken together (space x engagement), the interaction terms do not produce additional effects. The space variables have a stronger effect on CSOs' perceptions, while the engagement variables have a slightly stronger effect on LGUs' perceptions. Stated differently, *CSOs tend to refer to space variables' improvements to gauge PG outcomes, while LGUs tend to lean more into the engagement variables.* 

The implications for improving the status of participation are:

First, *CSOs are looking for structure* – those that can designed institutionally and may be influenced by setting national guidelines to lessen arbitrary and unclear LGU practices in selecting CSO members, sharing information, and closing feedback loops. Proceeding may mean national guidelines that prescribe information-sharing protocols, feedback loops, and resource allocations. However, these prescriptions should also account for concrete initiatives to improve the LGUs' policy capacity and incentives to implement policy reforms. To date, there are no incentives for LGUs to exceed the Codal standards, which set the minimum to pass the SGLG LDC functionality indicator. The policy design challenge to the national government concerns the LGUs' motivations to allocate more human, organizational, and financial resources to improve their LDC participation space.

Second, the LGUs consider more of the contextually contingent political dynamics of the LDC interactions (inclusion and representation, autonomy and fairness, and leveled information-sharing in practice). National government may share successful models and prescribe operational approaches but addressing tokenistic participation and agenda gatekeeping scenarios are wicked problems that need to be problematized adaptively, starting with and proceeding at paces that LGUs and CSOs are co-determining. Hence, in the engagement variables' analyses in Section 4B, the recurring recommendation is to prompt expectation-setting alignments among local stakeholders to craft their own terms for operationalizing the principles coherently with their context. A potent entry point for the national government is to

formally require, under its LSB reconstitution guidelines, LDC manuals of operations or similar co-created terms of engagement with a deadline for development and subsequent review within every political term. Such manuals exist in several LGUs, and the development of such manuals has been recommended in the earlier strategic review of the LDC functionality assessment framework (Medina-Guce 2023b).

# 5.2.3 Additional variable interactions analysis

To maximize the baseline value of the PGM-LDC data, additional analytical explorations were employed to explore variable interactions informed by the PGM-LDC tool's design. Correlation and regression analyses reveal the following (summarized herewith in Q&A format):

**Does more frequent participation yield better PG results? (Section 4C.1)** Indexing participation status across activities and the outcome dimension variables shows that more frequent participation is associated with higher perceptions of achieving PG outcomes. However, as earlier indicated, participation beyond bi-annual frequency yields marginal benefits in perception results for high-functionality LDCs and cities. Meanwhile, low-functionality LDCs, provinces, and municipalities are more likely to gain better PG results perceptions if participation frequency is increased (which is understandable since low-functionality LDCs underperform on the LDCs' operational indicators).

**Does better accreditation policy compliance improve inclusion perceptions? (Section 4C.2)** Overall results show that higher perceptions of policy compliance increase perceptions of LDC inclusion. For this relationship, LGUs tend to rate the inclusivity effect slightly higher than the CSOs—which may be explained by the discussion of LGUs basing their assessment primarily on official Codal and DILG MC operational requirements (which is presented at length in **Section 4C.3** regarding *accreditation policy compliance and LGUs' satisfaction of their own participatory practices*) Meanwhile, the positive relationship between better accreditation compliance and better inclusion perceptions is more stable and stronger in high-functionality LDCs than in low-functionality-rated ones. Finally, among LGU types, cities have the strongest agreement between the two variables, while municipalities show the highest response variability.

Analytical explorations were also conducted for the **information-sharing-related statements** across the dimensions (Section 4C.4). Correlation and regression analysis indicate the following:

- Do better access to information protocols affect more efficient document releases? (Section 4C.4.1 on S4 x S10) Overall, perceptions of better access to information protocols translate to more efficient document releases. Stronger associations are statistically significant in high-functionality LDCs and CSO respondents. Results also show a Strong and stable association in cities, a strong but more variable association in municipalities, and the strongest association in provinces.
- Do more efficient document releases affect increased CSO influence? (Section 4C.4.2 on S10 x S11) Overall results show a strong association between perceptions of efficient document releases and CSO influence. Statistically significant stronger associations are identified in high-functionality LDCs, from CSO respondents, and in cities.
- Do more efficient document releases affect CSOs' enablement of more effective policies? (Section 4C.4.3 on S10 x S12) Overall results show a strong association

between perceptions of information-sharing efficiency and the effectiveness of CSO participation in improving plans and policies. Stronger and more stable associations are identified in high-functionality LDCs, from CSO respondents, and in cities.

# 5.3 Implications for policymaking and continuing research

The state of participation emergent from the study results underscores the need to elevate national policies and guidelines to reflect quality-oriented indicators for LDC participation and the significant challenge of advancing local stakeholders' appreciation of higher outcome possibilities of participation—over and beyond being satisfied from policy compliance and being able to 'sit in the table.' Such analysis is elaborated in three points as follows. (Recommendations specific to each variable/indicator are embedded throughout the discussion of findings in Section 4.)

5.3.1 Elevating national policy prescriptions and support for quality participation

As earlier discussed, when viewed from the perspective of the Code's LDC provisions and DILG's guidelines, stakeholders assess the state of participation highly and positively. PGM-LDC Statement 1 (adherence to national guidelines) is top-ranked among the 14 statements at a 94% net rating, with lesser agreement by municipalities. Both CSO and LGU respondent groups also rate the status and level of participation in LDC functions and activities highly, even with LGUs overestimating CSO participation and CSOs underrating their self-reported participation (Section 4A.4). High-functionality-rated LDCs (those that exceed the Codal standards) also generally fare better vis-à-vis higher positive perceptions among the PGM-LDC variables. The additional analytical explorations established that higher perception levels of inclusion (Section 4C.2) and CSO satisfaction (Section 4C.3). *All these suggest that the operational functionality metrics and ratings (high vs low) matter when differentiating the quality of participation and that local stakeholders take compliance seriously, particularly with LDC functionality's inclusion in the SGLG.* 

However, the findings raise several issues worth considering regarding the national policy guidelines, e.g.:

- LGUs self-rate their participatory practices as highly satisfactory (Statement 14, ranked 2-3 overall, net rating 90%) with statistical and qualitative support that they base their self-rating on compliance with the national policy guidelines. The difficulty with this sensemaking is that *there is no apparent incentive for LGUs to exceed the minimum requirements in the current policy landscape*. Even the DILG's LDC functionality rating scheme exists as an assessment without political scaffolding, i.e., the SGLG does not recognize 'high' functionality but remains on the pass-fail scoring based only on the Codal standards.
- Low-functionality LDCs (those under-delivering the Codal standards) correlate with lower perception ratings among several PGM-LDC variables. The analysis of participation frequency with PG results (Section 4C.1) also showed that low-functionality LDCs could benefit from consistent interactions (monthly) to facilitate better PG results. Hence, if the policy goal is to advance the quality of participation in LDCs, it is *paramount to address the continued existence of low-functionality LGUs* which, according to DILG's report (Table 3), stand at 35 provinces, 12 cities, and 23 municipalities in 2023.

In other words, since the intent of the PGM-LDC exercise is to diagnose PG gaps for policy and capacity interventions, *the most viable entry point is to address the national policy guidelines and elevate them to embed participatory quality logics* since the national guidelines function as normative standard of 'sufficient' practices for local stakeholders. It is also paramount that DILG and its partners continue to politically scaffold the changes in institutional behavior since the participation dynamics in LGUs reflect their respective political histories (e.g., levels of control or openness of political elites) and socio-economic conditions. *Politically scaffolding participatory quality reforms* may include engaging the symbolic and financial incentives of the SGLG or innovating on incentives through the PH-OGP and other DILG's global and national award-giving partners.

### 5.3.2 Further appreciation of CSO satisfaction contributors

The S13 CSO Satisfaction analysis shows many significant correlative nuances, e.g., less agreement by LGUs, less agreement by LGUs in low-functionality LDCs, et.al. The respondent group nuances indicate that CSOs tend to inflate their satisfaction compared to the perceptions of their LGU counterparts. The qualitative results also show that CSOs peg their satisfaction with the mere access to LDCs and opportunities to be part of decision-making, insufficiently accounting for LDC effectiveness and influencing outcomes. In the S13 discussion, this scenario is described as the CSOs' *seeming baseline of lack*, wherein any marginal improvements (even just the promise of improvement) are accorded higher perceptions of satisfaction.

This survey is not the first time such a baseline of lack is observed and documented. A policy learning study on DILG's Third-Party Monitoring pilot implementation (Medina-Guce 2023c) alluded to the communities' satisfaction pegged against project relevance and *expected* gains from projects (meaning that the gains have not been realized yet). Furthermore, in the same satisfaction discussion, more substantive participatory issues were indicated as challenges e.g., inclusion/exclusion of stakeholders during project identification and level of community participation in project M&E. In other words, citizens/CSOs tend to inflate their satisfaction based on potential gains and seemingly downplay known higher-level and actual participatory outcomes in lieu of the alternative of lack (i.e., better be satisfied with marginal gains from participation compared to having no gains at all).

The sensibility speaks volumes about the CSOs' appreciation maturity in setting expectations about and experiencing actual gains from participation. Across the discussions of the PGM statements, recurring feedback is that CSOs lack the technical skills, knowledge, and assertiveness to position themselves with due influence. It is worth considering the extent to which the feedback only pertains to technical learning or also comes from the baseline of lack perspective. Also, the comparison of CSO participation perceptions of CSOs and LGUs (Section 4A.4.2) indicates that CSOs systematically underrate their self-reported participation. This analysis underscores that a more profound issue regarding CSOs' self-perceptions of their positioning and empowerment needs to be further articulated and addressed through DILG's current and pipelined expansion of CSO capacity development interventions and through the CSO networks continuously facilitating the empowerment of local CSOs.

### 5.3.3 Continuing and expanding local participation assessments

This study is a significant milestone in DILG's long-standing efforts to strengthen local participation to improve LGU service delivery and institutional development. As a baseline

study conducted before the local elections of 2025, the findings are optimally timed to bookmark the state of participation before the LSB reconstitution and, ideally, new/enhanced participatory policies that the incoming locally elected officials will institute for their three-year term. As such, it is ideal to conduct the PGM-LDC nationwide survey again towards the end of the incoming term to gauge changes, especially if DILG will reinforce its national guidelines and capacity development support. The next round of PGM-LDC deployment may consider a larger sampling set and a longer runtime to conduct the facilitated survey sessions. DILG may also consider streamlining CSO feedback collection throughout the LDC functions (activities) to enable disaggregation varieties in succeeding analyses.

Moreover, the baseline study results allow for further analysis of local participation with development outcomes to advance the proof of concept for enhancing local participation. Participation's effect on improved LDC plans and policies and CSO influence may be further studied with LGU performance, service delivery, and changes in development indicators in localities.

# **6 Concluding Notes**

This research establishes a comprehensive baseline assessment of the state of participation in LGUs focusing on the LDCs. Through the PGM-LDC tool, the study analyzes LDC activities and mechanisms, variables on PG space, engagement, and outcomes, and interrelationships among variables following PG advancement logics. The comprehensive scope and methods of the research also provide a concrete example of the robustness of analysis possible with a purposively designed and piloted tool informed by theories of change and relevant literature.

Recommendations for policy formulation and programmatic interventions are embedded in the respective thematic and variable-specific discussions. The recommendations are inputs to the targeted study users, e.g., DILG, SGLG Council, PH-OGP, and their partner groups and advocacy networks.

#

#### Bibliography

- Alagappa, Muthiah. 2004. "Civil society and political change: An analytical framework." In Civil Society and Political Change in Asia: Expanding and Contracting Democratic Space, edited by Muthiah Alagappa, 25–57. Stanford University Press.
- Arnstein, Sherry. 1969. "A ladder of citizen participation." Journal of American Planning Association 35(4): 216-224.
- Brillantes, Alex. 2003. Innovations and excellence: Understanding local governments in the *Philippines*. Center for Local and Regional Governance, National College of Public Administration and Governance, University of the Philippines.
- Canto-Mila, Natalia. 2018. "Georg Simmel's Concept of Forms of Association as an Analytical Tool for Relational Sociology." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Relational Sociology*, edited by F. Depelteau, 217–230. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Capuno, Joseph. 2005. "The quality of local governance and development under decentralization in the Philippines." University of the Philippines School of Economics, Discussion Paper, No 2005-06.
- Capuno, Joseph and Maria Melody Garcia. 2010. "Can information about local government performance induce civic participation? Evidence from the Philippines." *Journal of Development Studies* 46(4): 624-643.
- Caucus of Development Non-Government Organization Networks [CODE-NGO]. 1999. Sharing the load: Looking into people's participation in local governance. CODE-NGO.
  - ——. 2016. "Assessment of the enabling environment for civil society organizations in the Philippines." CODE-NGO.
- ——. 2017. "Framework for an enabling government-CSO relationship (Working document)."
- Department of the Interior and Local Government [DILG]. 2023. *Strategic Plan 2023-2028: Alliance-driven, People-centric, Future-ready.*
- Department of the Interior and Local Government Bureau of Local Government Supervision [DILG-BLGS]. 2023. 2022 Local Development Council Functionality Profile. Quezon City: Department of the Interior and Local Government.
  - ——. 2024a. "Seal of Good Local Governance 2023 Assessment results (presentation)."
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2007-81. Accreditation of People's Organizations, Nongovernmental Organizations, and Similar Aggrupations, and Selection of Representatives to the Local Special Bodies.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2010-73. Accreditation of People's Organizations, Nongovernmental Organizations, and Similar Aggrupations, and Selection of Representatives to the Local Special Bodies.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2013-70. Accreditation of Civil Society Organizations, and Selection of Representatives to the Local Special Bodies.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2014-39. 2014 Seal of Good Local Governance: Pagkilala sa Katapatan at Kahusayan ng Pamahalaang Lokal.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2016-01. 2016 Seal of Good Local Governance: Pagkilala sa Katapatan at Kahusayan ng Pamahalaang Lokal.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2016-97. Accreditation of Civil Society Organizations, and Selection of Representatives to the Local Special Bodies.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2017-53. 2017 Seal of Good Local Governance: Pagkilala sa Katapatan at Kahusayan ng Pamahalaang Lokal.

- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2018-49. 2018 Seal of Good Local Governance: Pagkilala sa Katapatan at Kahusayan ng Pamahalaang Lokal.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2019-44. 2019 Seal of Good Local Governance: Pagkilala sa Katapatan at Kahusayan ng Pamahalaang Lokal.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2019-72. Guidelines on Accreditation of Civil Society Organizations and Selection of Representatives to the Local Special Bodies.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2019-188. Organization or Reconstitution of Sub-regional Project Monitoring Committees.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2021-012. Establishment of Civil Society Organization Desk and Institutionalization of People's Council in the Local Government Units.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2021-054. Amendment to the DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2021-012, on the Establishment of Civil Society Organization Desk and Institutionalization of People's Council in the Local Government Units.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2022-026. 2022 Seal of Good Local Governance: Pagkilala sa Katapatan at Kahusayan ng Pamahalaang Lokal.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2022-083. Guidelines on Accreditation of Civil Society Organizations and Selection of Representatives to the Local Special Bodies.
- DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2023-086. 2023 Seal of Good Local Governance: Pagkilala sa Katapatan at Kahusayan ng Pamahalaang Lokal.
- DILG Memorandum Guidelines on the Implementation of the Third-Party Monitoring (TPM) for the FY 2021 LGSF Support to the Barangay Development Program (LGSF-SBDP). 2022, March 8.
- DILG Support for Local Governance Program Project Management Office [SLGP-PMO]. 2020. Baseline report: CSO accreditation and membership in Local Government Councils and Special Bodies.
  - ——. 2023. CSO accreditation and membership status in Local Government Councils and Special Bodies: 2022 Baseline analysis (initial report).
- Executive Order No. 31. 2023. Institutionalizing the Philippine Open Government Partnership and for other purposes.
- Fischer, Frank. 2012. "Participatory Governance: From Theory to Practice." In *The Oxford Handbook of Governance*, edited by D. Levi-Faur, 481–496. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gaventa, John. 2006. "Finding the Spaces for Change: A Power Analysis." *Institute of Development Studies (IDS) Bulletin* 37(6): 23-33.
  - ——. 2007. "Foreword." In *Spaces for Change? The Politics of Citizen Participation in New Democratic Arenas*, edited by A. Cornwall and V.S. Coelho, x-xvii. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- IAP2(International Association for Public Participation).2018. IAP2 Public ParticipationSpectrum.Denver:IAP2InternationalFederation.<a href="https://iap2.org.au/resources/spectrum/">https://iap2.org.au/resources/spectrum/</a> (accessed on March 20, 2022).
- Ishii, Risako, Farhad Hossain, and Christopher Rees. 2007. "Participation in decentralized local governance: two contrasting cases from the Philippines." *Public Organization Review* 7: 359-373.
- Malay, Rebecca. 2001. "Engaging local government in social development planning: The case of Baao, Camarines Sur." *Social Watch-Philippines*, 75–81.
- Manasan, Rosario. 2016. "Assessment of the Bottom-up Budgeting process for FY 2016." Philippine Institute for Development Studies Discussion Paper Series 2016-23.
- Manasan, Rosario, Eduardo Gonzalez, and Romualdo Gaffud. 1999. "Indicators of good governance: Developing an index of governance quality at the LGU level." *Journal of Philippine Development* 48(26): 149-212.

Medina-Guce, Czarina. 2020a. "Participatory Governance Metrics: Tool and technical notes." United Nations Development Programme and Department of the Interior and Local Government.

—. 2020b. "Addressing government-civil society power-sharing in Local Development Councils." United Nations Development Programme and Department of the Interior and Local Government.

- ——. 2020c. "Recommendations for the Participatory Governance Cabinet Cluster: Giving flesh to its milestones for enhancing citizen participation." United Nations Development Programme and Department of the Interior and Local Government.
- —. 2022a. Participatory Governance Metrics for Local Special Bodies: Technical Notes and Survey Tools. Quezon City: United Nations Development Programme and Department of the Interior and Local Government.
- ———. 2022b. Participatory Governance Metrics for Local Special Bodies: Measuring the Quality of Participation in Local Governance. Quezon City: United Nations Development Programme and Department of the Interior and Local Government.
  - —. 2022c. Participatory Governance Metrics for Local Special Bodies: Lessons from Pilot for Expanded Implementation. Quezon City: Department of the Interior and Local Government.
  - —. 2023a. "Participatory Governance Metrics for Local Development Councils: Enumerators' guide." Department of the Interior and Local Government.
- ———. 2023b. "Strategic review of the Local Development Council (LDC) functionality assessment framework." Department of the Interior and Local Government.
- 2023c. "Policy Learning from Third-Party Monitoring Pilot Implementation: Towards Deepening Participation and Strengthening Local Governance Institutions." Department of the Interior and Local Government.
- Medina-Guce, Czarina, and Ana Martha Galindes. 2017. "A review of citizen participation issues, responses, and prospects for reform in Local Development Councils." *Philippine Journal of Public Administration* 61 (1–2): 43-70.
- Medina-Guce, Czarina, and Robert Jr. Sanders. 2024. "Making sense of the Seal of Good Local Governance: Policy design layering and implications for shaping local government performance." *Philippine Journal of Development* 48 (1): 87–112. <u>https://doi.org/10.62986/pjd2024.48.1d</u>.
- Nishimura, Kenichi. 2018. "People's participation in the local administration in the Philippines: An empirical study on the Local Development Council." 多文化社会と留学生交流: 大阪大学国際教育交流セ, 22: 77-88.
- Papilloud, Christian. 2018. "Georg Simmel and Relational Sociology." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Relational Sociology*, edited by F. Depelteau, 201–215. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Participatory Governance Cluster Resolution No. 1, 2019. Adoption of the Participatory Governance Major Milestones for 2019-2021.
- Participatory Governance Cluster Resolution No. 2, 2020. Ensuring Participatory Governance Measures in the Delivery of Public Service in Light of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Philippine Development Plan 2023-2028.
- Philippine Open Government Partnership [PH-OGP] Steering Committee Resolution No. 01, Series of 2021. Adoption of the Participatory Governance Metrics for the PH-OGP 5<sup>th</sup> National Action Plan (NAP).
- Republic Act 7160. 1991. An Act Providing for a Local Government Code of 1991.
- Republic Act 8371. 1997. Indigenous Peoples Rights Act.
- Republic Act 9710. 2009. Magna Carta of Women.

- Republic Act 11292. 2019. An Act Establishing and Institutionalizing the Seal of Good Local Governance for Local Government Units and Allocating for this Purpose the Seal of Good Local Governance Fund.
- Saguin, Kidjie, and Czarina Medina-Guce. 2024. "Dismantling while accumulating: Dynamics of local participatory institutions in the Philippines." In *Public Policy in Democratic Backsliding: How Illiberal Populists Engage with the Policy Process*, edited by M. Morais and A. Gomide. Palgrave Macmillan. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-65707-8\_8</u>.
- Schmalz-Bruns, Rainer. 2018. "The Normativity of Participatory Governance." In *Handbook* on *Participatory Governance*, edited by H. Heinelt, 17–32. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Selg, Peeter. 2018. "Power and Relational Sociology." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Relational Sociology*, edited by F. Depelteau, 539–557. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Villarin, Tomasino. 2004. "Finding meaning in local governance through popular participation at the barangay-bayan." In *Beyond good governance: Participatory democracy in the Philippines*, edited by M. Estrella and N. Iszatt, 1–39. Institute for Popular Democracy.
- Yilmaz, Serdar and Varsha Venugopal. 2013. "Local government discretion and accountability in the Philippines." *Journal of International Development* 25(2): 227:250.

# Annex A. Methodological Notes

This annex elaborates on several methodological discussions alluded to in the main report.

### A1. Site sample

- LGU site selection was determined through stratified sampling. The strata used are island group (Luzon, Visayas, Mindanao), LGU type (provinces, cities, municipalities), and LDC functionality rating (high, low; based on DILG-BLGS 2023 report).
- The PIDS project team identified the specific LGUs considered for the sites, accounting for project cost parameters and PSA's recommended random sampling of low- and high-functionality LDCs, which targeted 170 LGUs.
- However, due to inclement weather conditions at the tail-end of 2024 and timeline constraints, the third-party survey firm was not able to pursue the sessions with 2 LGUs (provinces). The final total number of sites is 168.
- The final number of LGU sites by sampling strata is itemized in Table A1-1 below. Given these adjustments, the number of LDCs sampled per cluster ranged from 26 LDCs (Luzon-Municipalities-High) to 1 LDC (Mindanao-City-Low). Since one of the strata has only one sampling unit, it was not possible to calculate weighted test statistics.

		/ /	
Island Group	LGU Type	No. c	of LGUs
		High LDC	Low LDC
		Functionality	Functionality
Luzon	Province	9	9
	City	8	8
	Municipality	26	25
Visayas	Province	4	3
	City	6	8
	Municipality	13	14
Mindanao	Province	3	3
	City	4	1
	Municipality	12	12

Table A1-1. LGU Sites by Sampling Strata

### A2. Research team interactions with survey firm and deployment

- The survey enumerator firm contracting by PIDS significantly delayed the project from its original timeline. The technical inception report draft was prepared in March 2024 and finalized in April 2024. During the contracting process, the DILG's enumerators' guide for the PGM-LDC CSO and LGU tools was updated also in April 2024 to expand on LDC profile questions, as per discussions with DILG. However, technical progress on the research proceeded only in September 2024 as the contracted survey firm developed its inception report. The contracting process delay also compressed the field activities for the survey sessions at the end of 2024 (November to December 2024).
- From September to November 2024, the research lead (technical expert Dr. Medina-Guce) closely worked with the survey firm on the following:
  - Preparation of the dataset submission template with dropdown menu categories (for uniformity of coding)
  - Refinement of the enumerators' spiel accompanying the enumerators' guide in facilitating the PGM-LDC CSO and LGU tools

- Inputs and review of the Facilitators' Deck (material used during survey sessions)
- Data quality feedback on the preliminary dataset draft for consistency of coding following the dataset template provided
- The survey firm emailed the first version of the dataset on December 30, 2024. Considering the non-working holidays, actual discussions to review the dataset's quality were conducted when work resumed in January 2025.
- Despite earnest efforts of the survey firm to clean the dataset, the research team's review revealed inconsistencies in the coding of responses from both LGU and CSO sets, particularly in the encoding of the LGU type and other LDC profile indicators. These data points were intended to be selected from the dropdown menu from the Google Sheet/Excel/CSV versions of the submission template. However, the responses appeared to be manually encoded in the submission dataset, as observed in the different variations in the spelling and capitalization of responses.
- The third version of the dataset was received on January 15, 2025, which reflected the adjustments (replacement of sites, removal of data entries from the 'old' list of sites, and a significant improvement in the encoding of entries) as discussed with the PIDS project team. Based on the working timeline, the research team was supposed to receive the final cleaned dataset in December 2024. The delays compressed the research team's timeline for analysis and report development.

### A3. Research team's additional data-cleaning

- The research team's processing of the received dataset required cleaning additional entries for encoding consistency.
- Most pertinent of the changes made was identified in the review of qualitative responses, wherein three LGU respondents explicitly stated that they were not LDC members: "Sorry but I [am] not part of the LDC and I could not respond to this statement", "I am not privy to the functions LDC because i am not [part] of the LDC", "I never got involve [involved] in any LDC meeting."
  - These were all LGU respondents:
    - Luzon Municipality Region 3 Sanggunian
    - Luzon Municipality Region 4A CSO Desk
    - Luzon City NCR CSO Desk
  - The research team surmises, and upon checking with the survey firm's terminal report, that the incorrect inclusion of non-LDC members in the survey is due to the tight timeframe for coordination with DILG's regional and field offices (and their subsequent survey session organizing). DILG representatives are informed of the participant selection criteria fundamentally, LDC members of the two respondent groups with preferences on CSO profiles and LGU functionaries (offices). However, participant recruitment by DILG regional/field offices may have prioritized completing the number of participants available on the survey firm's proposed dates.
- Due to the already compressed timeframe, the research team opted to remove the three respondents from the dataset (instead of returning the dataset to the survey firm for one more round of reviews). The removal of these respondents explains the slight unevenness of CSO-LGU respondents, with the final count at 497 CSOs (50.1%) and 495 LGUs (49.9%). The final respondent numbers are still adherent to the targeted equal representation of CSOs and LGUs in the survey.

# Annex B. Quantitative Analysis Report

# B1. RESPONDENT DESCRIPTION

This section presents an overview of the survey respondents, categorized by local government unit (LGU) type, region, and Local Development Council (LDC) functionality. The analysis provides insights into the composition of respondents and the level of functionality of LDCs across different LGUs and geographic regions.

# B1.1. By LGU Type and Respondent Group

The study gathered data from a survey of 992 respondents, representing both LGU representatives (n = 495, 49.9%) and Civil Society Organization (CSO) representatives (n = 497, 50.1%). This nearly equal distribution ensures a balanced perspective between government and non-government stakeholders. The majority of respondents are from municipalities, comprising more than 60% of the total sample. Cities and provinces are also well-represented, providing a comprehensive overview of perspectives across different LGU levels.

	Respor	ndent Group		
LGU Type	CSO	LGU	Total	
City	105	104	209	
	50.239	49.761	100	
Municipality	305	304	609	
	50.082	49.918	100	
Province	87	87	174	
	50	50	100	
Total	497	495	992	
	50.101	49.899	100	
Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.				

Table B 1.1.1 Respodents by Respondent Group and LGU Type

# B1.2. By Region and Respondent Group

Respondents are distributed across 17 administrative regions of the Philippines. Each region has approximately equal representation of both LGU and CSO respondents, with the total number of participants ranging from 12 in Region 4B (1.2%) to as high as 107 in Region 4A (10.8%). Region 4A (n = 107, 10.8%), Region 1 (n = 96, 9.7%) and Region 6 (n = 96, 9.7%) are most represented in the sample. On the other hand, Region 4B (n = 12, 1.2%), Region 13 CARAGA (n = 24, 2.4%), and National Capital Region (NCR) (n = 35, 3.5%) have the lowest representation in the sample overall. Despite the variation in respondent numbers across regions, the survey captures perspectives from all major areas of the country, ensuring geographic representativeness in the analysis.

		Respondent Group			
Re	gion	CSO	LGU	Total	
CAR		29	30	59	
		49.153	50.847	100	
NCR		18	17	35	

#### Table B 1.2.1 Respondents by LGU Type and Region Type

	Respond	Respondent Group		
Region	CSO	LGU	Total	
	51.429	48.571	100	
Region 1	48	48	96	
	50	50	100	
Region 2	30	30	60	
	50	50	100	
Region 3	42	41	83	
	50.602	49.398	100	
Region 4A	54	53	107	
	50.467	49.533	100	
Region 4B	6	6	12	
	50	50	100	
Region 5	24	24	48	
	50	50	100	
Region 6	48	48	96	
	50	50	100	
Region 7	51	51	102	
	50	50	100	
Region 8	45	45	90	
	50	50	100	
Region 9	21	21	42	
	50	50	100	
Region 10	30	30	60	
	50	50	100	
Region 11	21	21	42	
	50	50	100	
Region 12	18	18	36	
	50	50	100	
Region 13 CARAGA	12	12	24	
	50	50	100	
Total	497	495	992	
	50.101	49.899	100	

Notes: The first row has frequencies, and the second row has row percentages.

# B1.3. By LGU Type and LDC Functionality

The functionality of LDCs was categorized as either low-functioning or high-functioning based on DILG's pre-defined criteria as discussed in the main report. The findings suggest that a majority of LDCs in the sample are considered high-functioning (n = 569, 57.4%) though a significant proportion remains categorized as low-functioning. Further disaggregation are in the subsequent tables.

Table B 1.3.1 Respondents by LDC Functionality and LGU Type

	LDC Functionality			
LGU Type	Low	High	Total	
City	95	114	209	
	45.455	54.545	100	
Municipality	250	359	609	

	LC	DC Functionality	
LGU Type	Low	High	Total
	41.051	58.949	100
Province	78	96	174
	44.828	55.172	100
Total	423	569	992
	42.641	57.359	100

Notes: The first row has frequencies, and the second row has row percentages.

## B1.4. By LDC Functionality and Regions

Significant variations in LDC functionality are observed across different regions. Regions with the highest proportion of high-functioning LDCs in the sample ( $\geq$ 80%) are Region 2 (90%), Region 10 (90%) and Region 1 (81.25%). On the other hand, regions with the lowest proportion of high-functioning LDCs in the sample ( $\leq$ 50%) are the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR) (20.3%), CARAGA (25%), National Capital Region (NCR) (34.3%), Region 9 (42.9%) and Region 8 (46.7%).

Table B 1.4.1 Respondents by LDC Functionality and Region

	LI	DC Functionality	
region	Low	High	Total
CAR	47	12	59
	79.661	20.339	100
NCR	23	12	35
	65.714	34.286	100
Region 1	18	78	96
	18.75	81.25	100
Region 2	6	54	60
	10	90	100
Region 3	36	47	83
	43.373	56.627	100
Region 4A	35	72	107
	32.710	67.290	100
Region 4B	6	6	12
	50	50	100
Region 5	24	24	48
	50	50	100
Region 6	48	48	96
	50	50	100
Region 7	48	54	102
	47.059	52.941	100
Region 8	48	42	90
	53.333	46.667	100
Region 9	24	18	42
	57.143	42.857	100
Region 10	6	54	60
	10	90	100
Region 11	18	24	42

	LDC	C Functionality	
region	Low	High	Total
	42.857	57.143	100
Region 12	18	18	36
	50	50	100
Region 13 CARAGA	18	6	24
	75	25	100
Total	423	569	992
	42.641	57.359	100

Notes: The first row has frequencies, and the second row has row percentages.

# B2. CSO COMPOSITION OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCILS

This section provides an analysis of the composition of CSOs within LDCs across various LGU types and regions. The analysis examines the extent of CSO representation in LDCs based on LDC functionality, geographic distribution, and LGU classification. The findings presented are derived from responses of 497 CSO respondents. CSO representatives responded based on their knowledge of the CSO composition of their respective LDCs. The responses were categorized into five groups: less than 25% representation, 25–50% representation, 51–75% representation, more than 75% representation, and unsure/not informed about their respective LDCs.

# B2.1. By LDC Functionality

The data shows that the proportion of CSOs in LDCs varies significantly depending on the functionality level of the council (p = 0.0186). Among LDCs categorized as having high functionality (n = 282, 56.7%), the majority of respondents indicated that CSOs constitute 25-50% of LDC membership (50.4%). A smaller proportion reported CSO representation at 51-75% (15.2%) and less than 25% (12.8%). Only 6.4% of high-functionality LDCs have CSO membership exceeding 75%, while 15.2% of respondents in these LDCs were unsure or not informed about CSO representation.

Conversely, in low-functionality LDCs (n = 215, 43.3%), the proportion of CSO representation is lower. 37.2% of respondents indicated that CSOs constitute 25-50% of the council, while 20.0% reported that CSOs make up less than 25% of the LDC. A slightly larger proportion (9.8%) reported CSO membership exceeding 75%, while 19.1% of respondents were unsure or not informed. These findings indicate that high-functionality LDCs tend to have higher CSO representation, whereas low-functionality LDCs exhibit greater uncertainty about CSO engagement.

LDC Euroctionality	Unsure/not	Less than	25-50%	51-75%	More than 75%	Total
Tunctionanty	mormeu	23/0			1111175/0	
Low	41	43	80	30	21	215
	19.070	20	37.209	13.953	9.767	100

Table B 2.1.1 CSO Composition of LDCs by LDC Functionality

High	43	36	142	43	18	282
	15.248	12.766	50.355	15.248	6.383	100
Total	84	79	222	73	39	497
	16.901	15.895	44.668	14.688	7.847	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	11.71					
Prob.	0.0196					

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

## B2.2. By LGU Type

CSO composition in LDCs also varies across different LGU types, but the differences are not statistically significant (p = 0.3532). In cities (n = 105, 21.1%), CSOs most commonly represent 25-50% of LDC members (47.6%). 17.1% reported CSO representation at 51-75%, while the same proportion (17.1%) indicated less than 25% CSO representation. Only 7.6% of LDCs in cities have CSO membership exceeding 75%, and 10.5% of respondents were unsure or not informed about CSO representation levels.

In municipalities (n = 305, 61.4%), the distribution is similar but with slightly lower representation at higher levels. 44.9% of LDCs have CSO membership at 25-50%, while 16.7% reported CSOs constituting less than 25% of the council. Representation in the 51-75% range is reported by 14.1% of respondents, while 7.5% indicated CSO representation exceeding 75%. Uncertainty regarding CSO representation is slightly higher in municipalities, with 16.7% of respondents indicating they were unsure or uninformed.

In provinces (n = 87, 17.5%), the level of CSO representation is slightly lower than in cities and municipalities. 40.2% of respondents reported CSO membership at 25-50%, while 11.5% indicated less than 25% CSO representation. The proportion of LDCs with CSO representation exceeding 75% is slightly higher in provinces (9.2%), but 25.3% of respondents were unsure or not informed about CSO representation, the highest among LGU types.

LGU Type	Unsure/not informed	Less than 25%	25-50%	51-75%	More than 75%	Total
City	11	18	50	18	8	105
	10.476	17.143	47.619	17.143	7.619	100
Municipality	51	51	137	43	23	305
	16.721	16.721	44.918	14.098	7.541	100
Province	22	10	35	12	8	87
	25.287	11.494	40.230	13.793	9.195	100
Total	84	79	222	73	39	497
	16.901	15.895	44.668	14.688	7.847	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	8.87					

#### Table B 2.2.1 CSO Composition of LDCs by LGU Type

	CSO Composition of LDC					
LGU Type	Unsure/not informed	Less than 25%	25-50%	51-75%	More than 75%	Total
Prob.	0.3532					

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

## B2.3. By Region

A regional analysis of CSO representation in LDCs revealed differences in participation levels across the country's administrative regions. Regions with the highest proportion of CSOs reporting 25–50% representation in LDCs include: CAR (58.6%), Region 7 (60.8%), Region 10 (53.3%), Region 11 (71.1%) (the highest in the dataset). Regions with the lowest proportion of CSOs in the 25–50% category include: Region 2 (23.3%), Region 4B (16.7%), Region 9 (33.3%)

On the other hand, the Regions where CSOs were most uncertain about their participation (i.e., unsure/not informed category) were Region 4B (66.7%), Region 12 (27.8%), and Region 9 (28.6%). Lastly, the following regions had the highest proportion of CSOs reporting more than 75% involvement in LDCs: NCR (27.8%), Region 2 (13.3%), and Region 8 (14.2%).

The data suggests that urbanized regions such as NCR tend to have higher levels of CSO representation, while less urbanized regions, particularly Region 4B and Region 12, show lower CSO representation and a higher degree of uncertainty regarding their involvement in LDCs. Chi-square tests reveal that regions are only marginally significant at 95% confidence interval (p = 0.0537). These results indicate while regional variation exists – it is only marginally significant.

	CSO Composition of LDC					
Region	Unsure/not informed	Less than 25%	25-50%	51-75%	More than 75%	Total
CAR	5	5	17	2	0	29
	17.241	17.241	58.621	6.897	0	100
NCR	0	1	9	3	5	18
	0	5.556	50	16.667	27.778	100
Region 1	7	8	17	10	6	48
	14.583	16.667	35.417	20.833	12.5	100
Region 2	5	7	7	7	4	30
	16.667	23.333	23.333	23.333	13.333	100
Region 3	8	11	15	7	1	42
	19.048	26.190	35.714	16.667	2.381	100
Region 4A	9	4	26	11	4	54
	16.667	7.407	48.148	20.370	7.407	100
Region 4B	4	0	1	1	0	6
	66.667	0	16.667	16.667	0	100

#### Table B 2.3.1 CSO Composition of LDCs by Region

Region	Unsure/not informed	Less than 25%	25-50%	51-75%	More than 75%	Total
Region 5	4	4	10	3	3	24
	16.667	16.667	41.667	12.5	12.5	100
Region 6	8	11	21	7	1	48
	16.667	22.917	43.75	14.583	2.083	100
Region 7	8	4	31	3	5	51
	15.686	7.843	60.784	5.882	9.804	100
Region 8	7	6	20	8	4	45
	15.556	13.333	44.444	17.778	8.889	100
Region 9	6	4	7	2	2	21
	28.571	19.048	33.333	9.524	9.524	100
Region 10	3	8	16	3	0	30
	10	26.667	53.333	10	0	100
Region 11	2	3	10	3	3	21
	9.524	14.286	47.619	14.286	14.286	100
Region 12	5	2	10	1	0	18
	27.778	11.111	55.556	5.556	0	100
Region 13 CARAGA	3	1	5	2	1	12
	25	8.333	41.667	16.667	8.333	100
Total	84	79	222	73	39	497
	16.901	15.895	44.668	14.688	7.847	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	78.62					
Prob.	0.0537					

#### CSO Composition of LDC

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

### B3. COMPLIANCE WITH RELATED LDC POLICIES B3.1. Updated inventory and directory

Both high- and low-functionality LDCs report high compliance rates (91.3% and 91.9%, respectively). The proportion of those unsure/uninformed is slightly higher in low-functionality LDCs (6.9%) compared to high-functionality LDCs (6.5%). The chi-square test is not statistically significant (p = 0.9081), indicating no meaningful difference in compliance between high- and low-functionality LDCs.

Cities report the highest compliance (96.7%) compared to municipalities (90.5%) and provinces (89.7%). Municipalities and provinces have slightly higher rates of respondents who are unsure or uninformed (7.9% and 7.5%, respectively) compared to cities (2.4%).

The chi-square test is statistically significant (p = 0.0391), suggesting that compliance differs by LGU type.

Regions 1, 4B, and 12 report 100% compliance, suggesting strong adherence to LDC policies in maintaining a CSO directory. Regions 3, 5, and CAR report the lowest compliance rates (83.1%-85.5%), indicating potential gaps in updating the inventory. Some regions have a notable proportion of respondents who are unsure/uninformed about the directory (e.g., Region 3: 14.5%, Region 5: 14.6%). The chi-square test is highly significant (p = 0.0005), indicating substantial regional differences in compliance.

LGU respondents report higher compliance (93.5%) compared to CSO respondents (89.7%). CSO respondents are more likely to be unsure/uninformed (8.5%) compared to LGU respondents (4.8%). The chi-square test is not statistically significant (p = 0.0713), indicating that differences in responses between CSOs and LGUs are not substantial.

Table B 3.1.1 Compliance with LDC Policies: Updated Inventory and Directory of CSOs by LDC Functionality

LDC Functionality	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Tota
Low	29	8	386	423
	6.856	1.891	91.253	100
High	37	9	523	569
	6.503	1.582	91.916	100
Total	66	17	909	992
	6.653	1.714	91.633	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	0.19			
Prob.	0.9081			

Updated Inventory and Directory

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 3.1.2 Compliance with LDC Policies: Updated Inventory and Directory of CSOs by LGU Type

	•	•	•	
LGU Type	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
City	5	2	202	209
	2.392	0.957	96.651	100
Municipality	48	10	551	609
	7.882	1.642	90.476	100
Province	13	5	156	174
	7.471	2.874	89.655	100
Total	66	17	909	992
	6.653	1.714	91.633	100

### Updated Inventory and Directory

## Pearson Chi<sup>2</sup>

Prob.

0.0391

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 3.1.3 Compliance with LDC Policies: Updated Inventory and Directory of CSOs by Region

#### Updated Inventory and Directory of CSOs by LGU Type

Region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
CAR	5	5	49	59
	8.475	8.475	83.051	100
NCR	3	0	32	35
	8.571	0	91.429	100
Region 1	0	0	96	96
	0	0	100	100
Region 2	6	1	53	60
	10	1.667	88.333	100
Region 3	12	0	71	83
	14.458	0	85.542	100
Region 4A	12	2	93	107
	11.215	1.869	86.916	100
Region 4B	0	0	12	12
	0	0	100	100
Region 5	7	1	40	48
	14.583	2.083	83.333	100
Region 6	5	1	90	96
	5.208	1.042	93.75	100
Region 7	6	1	95	102
	5.882	0.980	93.137	100
Region 8	4	0	86	90
	4.444	0	95.556	100
Region 9	3	1	38	42
	7.143	2.381	90.476	100
Region 10	1	2	57	60
	1.667	3.333	95	100
Region 11	0	2	40	42
	0	4.762	95.238	100
Region 12	0	0	36	36

Region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
	0	0	100	100
Region 13 CARAGA	2	1	21	24
	8.333	4.167	87.5	100
Total	66	17	909	992
	6.653	1.714	91.633	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	62.32			
Prob.	0.0005			

#### Updated Inventory and Directory of CSOs by LGU Type

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 3.1.4 Compliance with LDC Policies: Updated Inventory and Directory of CSOs by Respondent Group

	opulated inventory and Directory of CSOS by EGO Type					
Respondent Group	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total		
CSO	42	9	446	497		
	8.451	1.811	89.738	100		
LGU	24	8	463	495		
	4.848	1.616	93.535	100		
Total	66	17	909	992		
	6.653	1.714	91.633	100		
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	5.28					
Prob.	0.0713					

Updated Inventory and Directory of CSOs by LGU Type

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

### B3.2. Conduct of CSO Conference

LDC compliance with conducting CSO conferences is 83.37% (n = 827), with 7.06% (n = 70) of respondents reporting non-compliance and 9.58% (n = 95) unsure. A majority of both high- and low-functionality LDCs conduct CSO conferences (81.8% and 84.5%, respectively). Non-compliance is slightly higher in low-functionality LDCs (8.5%) compared to high-functionality LDCs (6.0%). The proportion of respondents who are unsure/uninformed is nearly the same for both groups (9.7% vs. 9.5%). The chi-square test is not statistically significant (p = 0.2955), suggesting no substantial difference between high- and low-functionality LDCs in conducting CSO conferences.

Cities have the highest compliance rate (90.0%), followed by provinces (85.1%), while municipalities report the lowest (80.6%). Non-compliance is highest in municipalities (8.9%), followed by provinces (4.6%), and lowest in cities (3.8%). The proportion of respondents who are unsure/uninformed is highest in municipalities (10.5%). The chi-square test is statistically significant (p = 0.0158), indicating a meaningful difference in compliance across LGU types.
Regions 11, 10, and 1 report the highest compliance rates (above 94%). Regions 9, 7, and 4A have the lowest compliance rates, indicating potential challenges in organizing CSO conferences. Regions 2, 4A, and 3 have the highest proportion of respondents who are unsure/uninformed, suggesting gaps in awareness. The chi-square test is highly significant (p = 0.0000), confirming substantial regional disparities in compliance.

LGU respondents report slightly higher compliance (84.0%) than CSO respondents (82.7%). CSO respondents are slightly more likely to report non-compliance (8.2%) than LGU respondents (5.9%). The proportion of respondents who are unsure/uninformed is similar across both groups (9.1% for CSOs, 10.1% for LGUs). The chi-square test is not statistically significant (p = 0.4081), indicating no major differences in responses between CSOs and LGUs.

	Conduct of CSO Conference				
LDC Functionality	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total	
Low	41	36	346	423	
	9.693	8.511	81.797	100	
High	54	34	481	569	
	9.490	5.975	84.534	100	
Total	95	70	827	992	
	9.577	7.056	83.367	100	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	2.44				
Prob.	0.2955				

Table B 3.2.1 Compliance with LDC Policies: CSO Conference by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 3.2.2 Compliance with LDC Policies: CSO Conference by LGU Type

Conduct of CSO Conference			
Unsure/uninformed	Νο	Yes	Total
13	8	188	209
6.220	3.828	89.952	100
64	54	491	609
10.509	8.867	80.624	100
18	8	148	174
10.345	4.598	85.057	100
95	70	827	992
9.577	7.056	83.367	100
12.22			
0.0158			
	Unsure/uninformed 13 6.220 64 10.509 18 10.345 95 9.577 12.22 0.0158	Unsure/uninformed  No    13  8    6.220  3.828    64  54    10.509  8.867    18  8    10.345  4.598    95  70    9.577  7.056    12.22  0.0158	Unsure/uninformed  No  Yes    13  8  188    6.220  3.828  89.952    64  54  491    10.509  8.867  80.624    18  8  148    10.345  4.598  85.057    95  70  827    9.577  7.056  83.367    12.22  0.0158

#### Conduct of CSO Conference

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

	Conduct of CSO Conference			
region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
CAR	6	9	44	59
	10.169	15.254	74.576	100
NCR	3	0	32	35
	8.571	0	91.429	100
Region 1	3	2	91	96
	3.125	2.083	94.792	100
Region 2	9	6	45	60
	15	10	75	100
Region 3	12	5	66	83
	14.458	6.024	79.518	100
Region 4A	17	10	80	107
	15.888	9.346	74.766	100
Region 4B	1	2	9	12
	8.333	16.667	75	100
Region 5	7	2	39	48
	14.583	4.167	81.25	100
Region 6	6	0	90	96
	6.25	0	93.75	100
Region 7	12	16	74	102
	11.765	15.686	72.549	100
Region 8	6	0	84	90
	6.667	0	93.333	100
Region 9	5	10	27	42
	11.905	23.810	64.286	100
Region 10	1	1	58	60
	1.667	1.667	96.667	100
Region 11	1	0	41	42
	2.381	0	97.619	100
Region 12	2	5	29	36
	5.556	13.889	80.556	100
Region 13 CARAGA	4	2	18	24
	16.667	8.333	75	100
Total	95	70	827	992
	9.577	7.056	83.367	100

#### Table B 3.2.3 Compliance with LDC Policies: CSO Conference by Region

	Conduct of CSO Conference			
region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	100.45			
Prob.	0.0000			

Table B 3.2.4 Compliance with LDC Policies: CSO Conference by Respondent Group

	Conduct of CSO Conference			
Respondent Group	Unsure/uninformed	Νο	Yes	Total
CSO	45	41	411	497
	9.054	8.249	82.696	100
LGU	50	29	416	495
	10.101	5.859	84.040	100
Total	95	70	827	992
	9.577	7.056	83.367	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	1.79			
Prob.	0.4081			

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# B3.3. Timely release of invitations

The majority of respondents (93.45%, n = 927) reported that their LDCs sent invitations to all CSOs participating in government programs and performing representational duties in councils or boards. Only 1.92% (n = 19) of respondents indicated non-compliance, while 4.64% (n = 46) were unsure. A vast majority of both high- and low-functionality LDCs comply with the timely release of invitations (92.4% and 94.2%, respectively).

Non-compliance levels are nearly identical (1.9% for both), indicating consistent adherence across LDC functionality levels. Slightly more respondents in low-functionality LDCs are unsure/uninformed (5.7%) compared to high-functionality LDCs (3.9%). The chi-square test is not statistically significant (p = 0.4081), suggesting no significant difference in compliance based on LDC functionality.

Cities report the highest compliance (95.2%), followed by provinces (94.3%) and municipalities (92.6%). Municipalities have the highest levels of both uncertainty (5.3%) and non-compliance (2.1%). Provinces have a slightly lower rate of uncertainty (2.9%) but exhibit the same non-compliance rate as municipalities (2.9%). The chi-square test is not statistically significant (p = 0.2787), indicating no major differences across LGU types.

Regions 1 and 10 report full compliance (100%). Regions 4B (83.3%), 2 (85.0%), and 5 (87.5%) have the lowest compliance rates. Region 2 exhibits the highest level of uncertainty (11.7%), followed by NCR (11.4%) and Region 5 (10.4%). The chi-square test is statistically significant (p = 0.0017), indicating substantial regional differences in compliance.

CSO and LGU respondents report nearly identical compliance levels (93.2% vs. 93.7%). CSOs are slightly more likely to report non-compliance (2.4%) compared to LGU respondents (1.4%). The proportion of respondents who are unsure/uninformed is similar between CSOs (4.4%) and LGUs (4.8%). The chi-square test is not statistically significant (p = 0.4966), indicating no substantial differences between CSO and LGU perceptions.

	Timely release of invitations			
LDC Functionality	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
Low	24	8	391	423
	5.674	1.891	92.435	100
High	22	11	536	569
	3.866	1.933	94.200	100
Total	46	19	927	992
	4.637	1.915	93.448	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	1.79			
Prob.	0.4081			

#### Table B 3.3.1 Compliance with LDC Policies: Invitation by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### Table B 3.3.2 Compliance with LDC Policies: Invitation by LGU Type

	Timely release of invitations			
LGU Type	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
City	9	1	199	209
	4.306	0.478	95.215	100
Municipality	32	13	564	609
	5.255	2.135	92.611	100
Province	5	5	164	174
	2.874	2.874	94.253	100
Total	46	19	927	992
	4.637	1.915	93.448	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	5.08			
Prob.	0.2787			

# Timely release of invitations

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### Table B 3.3.3 Compliance with LDC Policies: Invitation by Region

		Timely rele	ease of invit	ations	
	region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
CAR		2	5	52	59
		3.390	8.475	88.136	100

region	, Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
NCR	4	0	31	35
	11.429	0	88.571	100
Region 1	0	0	96	96
	0	0	100	100
Region 2	7	2	51	60
	11.667	3.333	85	100
Region 3	5	1	77	83
	6.024	1.205	92.771	100
Region 4A	8	4	95	107
	7.477	3.738	88.785	100
Region 4B	1	1	10	12
	8.333	8.333	83.333	100
Region 5	5	1	42	48
	10.417	2.083	87.5	100
Region 6	6	0	90	96
	6.25	0	93.75	100
Region 7	3	1	98	102
	2.941	0.980	96.078	100
Region 8	1	3	86	90
	1.111	3.333	95.556	100
Region 9	1	0	41	42
	2.381	0	97.619	100
Region 10	0	0	60	60
	0	0	100	100
Region 11	1	1	40	42
	2.381	2.381	95.238	100
Region 12	1	0	35	36
	2.778	0	97.222	100
Region 13 CARAGA	1	0	23	24
	4.167	0	95.833	100
Total	46	19	927	992
	4.637	1.915	93.448	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	57.85			
Prob.	0.0017			

Timely release of invitations

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

	Timely release of invitations			
Respondent Group	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
CSO	22	12	463	497
	4.427	2.414	93.159	100
LGU	24	7	464	495
	4.848	1.414	93.737	100
Total	46	19	927	992
	4.637	1.915	93.448	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	1.40			
Prob.	0.4966			

Table B 3.3.4 Compliance with LDC Policies: Invitation by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

### **B3.4.** Timely release of certificates

Overall, 88.41% (n = 877) of respondents confirmed that their LGU ensures the timely release of accreditation certificates. Non-compliance was 1.71% (n = 17), while 9.88% (n = 98) of respondents were unsure. High-functionality LDCs (87.9%) and low-functionality LDCs (89.1%) have similar compliance rates in certificate release. The proportion of those unsure/uninformed is slightly higher in high-functionality LDCs (10.9%) than in low-functionality ones (8.5%). Non-compliance is low overall ( $\leq$ 2.4%) for both groups. The chi-square test is not statistically significant (p = 0.1958), indicating no meaningful difference in compliance between high- and low-functionality LDCs.

Cities (93.8%) and provinces (92.5%) have the highest compliance, while municipalities (85.4%) lag behind. Municipalities also report the highest level of uncertainty (12.6%) and noncompliance (2.0%). The chi-square test is statistically significant (p = 0.0051), indicating meaningful differences in compliance across LGU types.

Region 1 (95.8%), Region 10 (96.7%), and NCR (94.3%) have the highest compliance rates. Region 4B (66.7%), Region 9 (78.6%), and Region 2 (80.0%) report the lowest compliance. Region 4B has the highest percentage of unsure/uninformed respondents (25.0%), followed by Region 5 (18.8%) and Region 2 (18.3%). The chi-square test is marginally significant (p = 0.0549), indicating near-significant regional disparities in compliance.

CSOs report higher compliance (90.5%) than LGUs (86.3%). LGUs have a significantly higher proportion of unsure/uninformed respondents (12.3%) than CSOs (7.4%). The chi-square test is statistically significant (p = 0.0301), indicating meaningful differences in perceptions between CSOs and LGUs.

Table B 3.4.1 Compliance with LDC Policies: Timely Release of Certificates by LDC Functionality

	Timely release of certificates			
LDC Functionality	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total

Timely release of cortificates

Low	36	10	377	423
	8.511	2.364	89.125	100
High	62	7	500	569
	10.896	1.230	87.873	100
Total	98	17	877	992
	9.879	1.714	88.407	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	3.26			
Prob.	0.1958			

#### Table B 3.4.2 Compliance with LDC Policies: Timely Release of Certificates by LGU Type

	Timely release of certificates			
LGU Type	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
City	11	2	196	209
	5.263	0.957	93.780	100
Municipality	77	12	520	609
	12.644	1.970	85.386	100
Province	10	3	161	174
	5.747	1.724	92.529	100
Total	98	17	877	992
	9.879	1.714	88.407	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	14.80			
Prob.	0.0051			

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

### Table B 3.4.3 Compliance with LDC Policies: Timely Release of Certificates by Region

		Timely I	Timely release of certificates			
ı	region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total	
CAR		6	2	51	59	
		10.169	3.390	86.441	100	
NCR		1	1	33	35	
		2.857	2.857	94.286	100	
Region 1		4	0	92	96	
		4.167	0	95.833	100	
Region 2		11	1	48	60	
		18.333	1.667	80	100	
Region 3		5	1	77	83	

	ППетут	elease of ce	entinuales	
region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
	6.024	1.205	92.771	100
Region 4A	13	2	92	107
	12.150	1.869	85.981	100
Region 4B	3	1	8	12
	25	8.333	66.667	100
Region 5	9	1	38	48
	18.75	2.083	79.167	100
Region 6	9	0	87	96
	9.375	0	90.625	100
Region 7	11	3	88	102
	10.784	2.941	86.275	100
Region 8	6	3	81	90
	6.667	3.333	90	100
Region 9	8	1	33	42
	19.048	2.381	78.571	100
Region 10	2	0	58	60
	3.333	0	96.667	100
Region 11	2	1	39	42
	4.762	2.381	92.857	100
Region 12	4	0	32	36
	11.111	0	88.889	100
Region 13 CARAGA	4	0	20	24
	16.667	0	83.333	100
Total	98	17	877	992
	9.879	1.714	88.407	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	43.32			
Prob.	0.0549			

Timely release of certificates

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 3.4.4 Compliance with LDC Policies: Timely Release of Certificates by Respondent Group

	Timely release of certificates			
Respondent Group	Unsure/uninformed	Νο	Yes	Total
CSO	37	10	450	497
	7.445	2.012	90.543	100
LGU	61	7	427	495

	12.323	1.414	86.263	100
Total	98	17	877	992
	9.879	1.714	88.407	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	7.01			
Prob.	0.0301			
Notes: First row has frequencies, and se	econd row has row pero	centages.		

# B3.5. Receipt of Updated Inventory

Overall, the majority of respondents report that they have received updated inventories (78,83%). Disasggregating this based on Respondent Group, a higher percentage of respondents in high-functionality LDCs received an updated inventory (80.8%) compared to those in low-functionality LDCs (76.1%). Respondents in low-functionality LDCs were more likely to report being unsure/uninformed (10.2%) or having not received an inventory (13.7%) compared to their high-functionality counterparts, with the difference not statistically significant.

On the other hand, cities have the highest rate of receiving an updated inventory (81.8%), followed by municipalities (79.3%), and provinces (73.6%). Respondents from provinces were the most likely to report not receiving the inventory (14.9%) or being unsure/uninformed (11.5%), indicating weaker compliance in provincial LGUs.

Lastly, LGU respondents were far more likely to have received an updated inventory (92.9%) compared to CSO respondents (64.8%). CSOs were significantly more likely to be unsure/uninformed (14.5%) or not receive the inventory (20.7%), suggesting gaps in transparency and information dissemination. Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 120.02, p = 0.000) is highly significant, confirming that Respondent Group strongly influences compliance with LDC policy requirements.

Region 1 has the highest compliance (93.8%), while Region 4B has the lowest (66.7%). CAR and Region 4A have high levels of respondents unsure/uninformed, suggesting gaps in awareness and dissemination of LDC policy requirements. Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 44.25, p = 0.0453) is statistically significant, confirming that regional differences significantly affect compliance.

	compl_up	dated_invty		
intldc_fcn	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
Low	43	58	322	423
	10.165	13.712	76.123	100
High	50	59	460	569
	8.787	10.369	80.844	100
Total	93	117	782	992
	9.375	11.794	78.831	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	3.48			
Prob.	0.1759			

Table B 3.5.1 Compliance with LDC Policies: Receipt of Updated Inventory by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 3.5.2 Compliance with LDC Policies: Receipt of Updated Inventory by LGU Type

	compl	_updated_inv	ty	
int.lgu_type	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
City	1	28	3 171	209

	4.785	13.397	81.818	100
Municipality	63	63	483	609
	10.345	10.345	79.310	100
Province	20	26	128	174
	11.494	14.943	73.563	100
Total	93	117	782	992
	9.375	11.794	78.831	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	10.01			
Prob.	0.0402			

Table B 3.5.3 Compliance with LDC Policies: Receipt of Updated Inventory by Region

	compl_u	pdated_invt	:y	
region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
CAR	7	10	42	59
	11.864	16.949	71.186	100
NCR	3	4	28	35
	8.571	11.429	80	100
Region 1	2	4	90	96
	2.083	4.167	93.75	100
Region 2	9	5	46	60
	15	8.333	76.667	100
Region 3	7	12	64	83
	8.434	14.458	77.108	100
Region 4A	14	16	77	107
	13.084	14.953	71.963	100
Region 4B	3	1	8	12
	25	8.333	66.667	100
Region 5	9	3	36	48
	18.75	6.25	75	100
Region 6	10	16	70	96
	10.417	16.667	72.917	100
Region 7	9	13	80	102
	8.824	12.745	78.431	100
Region 8	4	11	75	90
	4.444	12.222	83.333	100
Region 9	3	7	32	42
	7.143	16.667	76.190	100
Region 10	6	3	51	60
	10	5	85	100
Region 11	3	7	32	42
	7.143	16.667	76.190	100
Region 12	1	4	31	36
	2.778	11.111	86.111	100
Region 13 CARAGA	3	1	20	24
	12.5	4.167	83.333	100
Total	93	117	782	992
	9.375	11.794	78.831	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	44.25			
Prob.	0.0453			

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

	compl_u	pdated_invty		
survey_tag	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
CSO	72	103	322	497
	14.487	20.724	64.789	100
LGU	21	14	460	495
	4.242	2.828	92.929	100
Total	93	117	782	992
	9.375	11.794	78.831	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	120.02			
Prob.	0.0000			

Table B 3.5.4 Compliance with LDC Policies: Receipt of Updated Inventory by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# B3.6. CSO Network Formation

Overall, 64.7% of the respondenst have reported the formation of CSO networks due to CSO conferences. High-functionality LDCs are more likely to have a CSO network (66.4%) compared to low-functionality LDCs (62.4%). Low-functionality LDCs have a slightly higher proportion of respondents reporting uncertainty (23.6%), indicating possible gaps in transparency or communication regarding CSO network formation. Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 1.97$ , p = 0.3739) is not statistically significant, suggesting that LDC functionality does not have a strong impact on whether a CSO network is formed.

Cities report the highest compliance (71.8%), suggesting that urban LGUs are more effective in establishing CSO networks. Municipalities have the lowest compliance (62.4%), possibly due to limited administrative capacity or weaker participatory mechanisms.Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 6.12, p = 0.1903) is not statistically significant, indicating that LGU type alone does not strongly determine CSO network formation.

Region 8, Region 1, and Region 10 report the highest compliance, with over 80% of respondents confirming CSO network formation. CAR, Region 9, and Region 3 show the lowest compliance, suggesting weaker participatory structures in these areas. Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 83.63, p = 0.0000) is highly significant, indicating that regional variation strongly affects CSO network formation.

LGU respondents were significantly more likely to report CSO network formation (68.9%) compared to CSO respondents (60.6%). CSOs were more likely to be unsure/uninformed (22.3%) or report that no network was formed (17.1%), suggesting potential transparency issues in LDC-CSO interactions. Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 18.73, p = 0.0001) is highly significant, confirming that Respondent Group strongly influences perceptions of CSO network formation.

	compl_for	med_csoconf		
intldc_fcn	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
Low	100	59	264	423
	23.641	13.948	62.411	100
High	125	66	378	569
	21.968	11.599	66.432	100
Total	225	125	642	992
	22.681	12.601	64.718	100

Table B 3.6.1 Compliance with LDC Policies: CSO Network Formation by LDC Functionality

Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	1.97	
Prob.	0.3739	

#### Table B 3.6.2 Compliance with LDC Policies: CSO Network Formation by LGU Type

	compl_formed_csoconf				
int.lgu_type	Unsure/uninformed	Νο	Yes	Total	
City	38	21	150	209	
	18.182	10.048	71.770	100	
Municipality	146	83	380	609	
	23.974	13.629	62.397	100	
Province	41	21	112	174	
	23.563	12.069	64.368	100	
Total	225	125	642	992	
	22.681	12.601	64.718	100	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	6.12				
Prob.	0.1903				

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table DOC		with IDO	Deliainan	CO Native ale	Course ation	hu Davian
<i>Table B</i> 3.6.,	3 Compliance	WILL LDC	Policies: C	SO Network	Formation	DV Region

	compl_formed_csoconf			
region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
CAR	22	9	28	59
	37.288	15.254	47.458	100
NCR	9	2	24	35
	25.714	5.714	68.571	100
Region 1	15	4	77	96
	15.625	4.167	80.208	100
Region 2	14	9	37	60
	23.333	15	61.667	100
Region 3	26	14	43	83
	31.325	16.867	51.807	100
Region 4A	30	14	63	107
	28.037	13.084	58.879	100
Region 4B	4	1	7	12
	33.333	8.333	58.333	100
Region 5	10	5	33	48
	20.833	10.417	68.75	100
Region 6	22	9	65	96
	22.917	9.375	67.708	100
Region 7	21	19	62	102
	20.588	18.627	60.784	100
Region 8	12	2	76	90
	13.333	2.222	84.444	100
Region 9	11	13	18	42
	26.190	30.952	42.857	100
Region 10	8	4	48	60
	13.333	6.667	80	100
Region 11	10	12	20	42
	23.810	28.571	47.619	100

Region 12	6	5	25	36
	16.667	13.889	69.444	100
Region 13 CARAGA	5	3	16	24
	20.833	12.5	66.667	100
Total	225	125	642	992
	22.681	12.601	64.718	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	83.63			
Prob.	0.0000			

Table B 3.6.4 Compliance with LDC Policies: CSO Network Formation by Respondent Group

	compl_formed_csoconf				
survey_tag	Unsure/uninformed	Νο	Yes	Total	
CSO	111	85	301	497	
	22.334	17.103	60.563	100	
LGU	114	40	341	495	
	23.030	8.081	68.889	100	
Total	225	125	642	992	
	22.681	12.601	64.718	100	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	18.73				
Prob.	0.0001				

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# B3.7. Establishment of CSO Desk

Overall, 79% of respondents has reported the establishment of CSO desks within their respective LGUs. CSO Desk establishment is reported slightly higher in high-functionality LDCs (79.4%) than in low-functionality LDCs (76.1%). Uncertainty rates are slightly higher in low-functionality LDCs (11.1%), indicating that information-sharing processes may be weaker. Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 1.76, p = 0.4151) is not statistically significant, suggesting that LDC functionality does not significantly impact CSO Desk establishment.

Cities have the highest reported compliance rate (89.0%), followed by municipalities (76.2%), and provinces (71.3%). Provinces have the highest proportion of uncertain responses (17.2%), indicating a greater lack of awareness or transparency issues. Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 27.25, p = 0.0000) is highly significant, meaning that LGU type strongly affects the likelihood of CSO Desk establishment.

Region 1, CARAGA, and Region 10 show the highest compliance rates, with over 90% of respondents confirming CSO Desk establishment. Region 4A, Region 7, and Region 4B show the lowest compliance, suggesting regional disparities in policy enforcement. Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 84.45, p = 0.0000) is highly significant, indicating strong regional differences in CSO Desk compliance.

CSO respondents and LGU respondents report similar rates of compliance with CSO Desk establishment (77.5% and 78.6%, respectively). Uncertainty rates are slightly higher among CSOs (11.7%), suggesting that some CSOs may not have full access to information regarding LDC structures. Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 1.39, p = 0.4990) is not statistically significant, indicating that perceptions of CSO Desk compliance do not vary significantly between LGU officials and CSOs.

	compl_cso_desk			
intldc_fcn	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
Low	47	54	322	423
	11.111	12.766	76.123	100
High	58	59	452	569
	10.193	10.369	79.438	100
Total	105	113	774	992
	10.585	11.391	78.024	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	1.76			
Prob.	0.4151			

Table B 3.7.1 Compliance with LDC Policies: CSO Desk Establishment by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 3.7.2 Compliance with LDC Policies: CSO Desk Establishment by LGU Type

	compl_cso_desk			
int.lgu_type	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
City	14	9	186	209
	6.699	4.306	88.995	100
Municipality	61	84	464	609
	10.016	13.793	76.190	100
Province	30	20	124	174
	17.241	11.494	71.264	100
Total	105	113	774	992
	10.585	11.391	78.024	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	27.25			
Prob.	0.0000			

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 3.7.3 Compliance with LDC Policies: CSO Desk Establishment by Region

	compl_cso_desk			
region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
CAR	5	8	46	59
	8.475	13.559	77.966	100
NCR	4	2	29	35
	11.429	5.714	82.857	100
Region 1	4	2	90	96
	4.167	2.083	93.75	100
Region 2	7	8	45	60
	11.667	13.333	75	100
Region 3	15	8	60	83
	18.072	9.639	72.289	100
Region 4A	18	23	66	107
	16.822	21.495	61.682	100
Region 4B	2	2	8	12
	16.667	16.667	66.667	100
Region 5	7	8	33	48
	14.583	16.667	68.75	100
Region 6	12	7	77	96
	12.5	7.292	80.208	100
Region 7	13	24	65	102

	12.745	23.529	63.725	100
Region 8	5	5	80	90
	5.556	5.556	88.889	100
Region 9	3	1	38	42
	7.143	2.381	90.476	100
Region 10	3	3	54	60
	5	5	90	100
Region 11	4	9	29	42
	9.524	21.429	69.048	100
Region 12	2	2	32	36
	5.556	5.556	88.889	100
Region 13 CARAGA	1	1	22	24
	4.167	4.167	91.667	100
Total	105	113	774	992
	10.585	11.391	78.024	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	84.45			
Prob.	0.0000			

Table B 3.7.4 Compliance with LDC Policies: CSO Desk Establishment by Respondent Group

	compl_cso_desk			
survey_tag	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
CSO	58	54	385	497
	11.670	10.865	77.465	100
LGU	47	59	389	495
	9.495	11.919	78.586	100
Total	105	113	774	992
	10.585	11.391	78.024	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	1.39			
Prob.	0.4990			

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# B3.8. Presence of Peoples' Council

The presence of Peoples' Council is reported by 57.76% of respondents, noticeably lower than the other compliance requirements. People's Councils are more commonly reported in high-functionality LDCs (60.6%) than in low-functionality LDCs (53.9%). Uncertainty is higher in low-functionality LDCs (21.5%), suggesting possible gaps in awareness or transparency. The chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 4.68, p = 0.0962) is not statistically significant, meaning that LDC functionality does not strongly determine the presence of a People's Council.

Cities have the highest reported compliance rate (66.0%), while provinces have the lowest (53.4%). Uncertainty rates are highest in municipalities (21.0%) and provinces (21.3%), suggesting weaker information-sharing mechanisms. Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 10.29, p = 0.0358) is statistically significant, indicating that LGU type significantly affects the likelihood of a People's Council being established.

Region 12 (86.1%) has the highest compliance, while Region 5 (35.4%) has the lowest. Regions with high uncertainty include Region 4B (41.7%) and Region 3 (30.1%), suggesting weak information dissemination or unfamiliarity with LDC policies. Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 81.91, p = 0.0000) is highly significant, meaning that the presence of a People's Council varies widely across regions.

CSOs report higher compliance (64.0%) than LGUs (51.5%), suggesting that LGUs may underreport the presence of People's Councils or perceive them differently. LGU respondents show higher uncertainty (23.2%), compared to CSOs (15.3%), indicating that some LGU officials may be less familiar with participatory structures. Chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 17.01, p = 0.0002) is highly significant, meaning that perceptions of People's Council presence differ significantly between CSO and LGU respondents.

	compl_peo	ples_council		
intldc_fcn	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
Low	91	104	228	423
	21.513	24.586	53.901	100
High	100	124	345	569
	17.575	21.793	60.633	100
Total	191	228	573	992
	19.254	22.984	57.762	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	4.68			
Prob.	0.0962			

Table B 3.8.1 Compliance with LDC Policies: Presence of People's Council by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 3.8.2 Compliance with LDC Policies: Presence of People's Council by LGU Type

	compl_peoples_council			
int.lgu_type	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
City	26	45	138	209
	12.440	21.531	66.029	100
Municipality	128	139	342	609
	21.018	22.824	56.158	100
Province	37	44	93	174
	21.264	25.287	53.448	100
Total	191	228	573	992
	19.254	22.984	57.762	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	10.29			
Prob.	0.0358			

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 3.8.3 Compliance with LDC Policies: Presence of People's Council by Region

	compl_p	eoples_coun	cil	
region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
CAR	8	16	35	59
	13.559	27.119	59.322	100
NCR	9	7	19	35
	25.714	20	54.286	100
Region 1	12	19	65	96
	12.5	19.792	67.708	100
Region 2	13	9	38	60

	21.667	15	63.333	100
Region 3	25	13	45	83
	30.120	15.663	54.217	100
Region 4A	27	23	57	107
	25.234	21.495	53.271	100
Region 4B	5	1	6	12
	41.667	8.333	50	100
Region 5	9	22	17	48
	18.75	45.833	35.417	100
Region 6	22	21	53	96
	22.917	21.875	55.208	100
Region 7	14	41	47	102
	13.725	40.196	46.078	100
Region 8	13	16	61	90
	14.444	17.778	67.778	100
Region 9	4	14	24	42
	9.524	33.333	57.143	100
Region 10	14	7	39	60
	23.333	11.667	65	100
Region 11	11	9	22	42
	26.190	21.429	52.381	100
Region 12	1	4	31	36
	2.778	11.111	86.111	100
Region 13 CARAGA	4	6	14	24
	16.667	25	58.333	100
Total	191	228	573	992
	19.254	22.984	57.762	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	81.91			
Prob.	0.0000			

Table B 3.8.4 Compliance with LDC Policies: Presence of People's Council by Respondent Group

	compl_peoples_council				
survey_tag	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total	
CSO	76	103	318	497	
	15.292	20.724	63.984	100	
LGU	115	125	255	495	
	23.232	25.253	51.515	100	
Total	191	228	573	992	
	19.254	22.984	57.762	100	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	17.01				
Prob.	0.0002				
Notes: First row has frequencies, ar	nd second row has row pe	rcentages.			

# B3.9 Magna Carta of Women

The Magna Carta of Women (MCW) is a landmark law ensuring gender equality and women's rights in governance, policymaking, and program implementation. We analyze whether compliance varies based on LDC functionality, LGU type, region, and Respondent Group. Overall, 63.9% report their LDC's compliance with the MCW, while 25.3% are unsure and uninformed. High-functionality LDCs show higher compliance (66.3%) than low-functionality LDCs (60.8%). Uncertainty is slightly lower in high-functionality LDCs (24.6%) than in low-functionality LDCs (26.2%). Non-compliance is higher in low-functionality LDCs (13.0%) than in high-functionality LDCs (9.1%). Chi-square test is not statistically significant (p = 0.0924), meaning LDC functionality does not strongly predict compliance.

Municipalities have the highest reported compliance (65.2%), followed by cities (62.7%) and provinces (60.9%). Provinces have the highest proportion of "Unsure/Uninformed" respondents (32.8%), indicating gaps in knowledge about MCW implementation. Non-compliance is lowest in provinces (6.3%) but higher in cities (11.5%) and municipalities (11.8%). Chi-square test is statistically significant (p = 0.0497), indicating that LGU type influences compliance.

Regional compliance rates vary significantly, with Region 11 (80.9%) and Region 12 (77.8%) leading, while Region 4A (50.5%) has the lowest compliance. Regions with high uncertainty (Region 3, Region 9, Region 6) suggest weak awareness of MCW compliance in these areas. Chi-square test is highly significant ( $\chi^2$  = 58.01, p = 0.0016), indicating strong regional variation in compliance.

CSOs report slightly higher compliance (64.8%) compared to LGUs (63.0%). Uncertainty levels are high in both groups (CSOs: 26.2%, LGUs: 24.4%), suggesting that MCW implementation may not be fully institutionalized. The chi-square test is not statistically significant (p = 0.2042), indicating that CSOs and LGUs have similar perceptions of MCW compliance.

LDC Functionality	compl_mcw					
	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total		
Low	111	55	257	423		
	26.241	13.002	60.757	100		
High	140	52	377	569		
	24.605	9.139	66.257	100		
Total	251	107	634	992		
	25.302	10.786	63.911	100		
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	4.76					
Prob.	0.0924					

#### Table B 0.1 Magna Carta of Women by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 0.2 Compliance with LDC Policies: Magna Carta of Women by LGU Type

	compl_mcw					
int.lgu_type	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total		
City	54	24	131	209		
	25.837	11.483	62.679	100		
Municipality	140	72	397	609		
	22.989	11.823	65.189	100		
Province	57	11	106	174		
	32.759	6.322	60.920	100		
Total	251	107	634	992		
	25.302	10.786	63.911	100		

Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	9.50
Prob.	0.0497

Table B 0.3 Compliance with LDC Policies: Magna Carta of Women by Region

	compl_mcw				
region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total	
CAR	14	5	40	59	
	23.729	8.475	67.797	100	
NCR	11	5	19	35	
	31.429	14.286	54.286	100	
Region 1	17	15	64	96	
	17.708	15.625	66.667	100	
Region 2	14	2	44	60	
	23.333	3.333	73.333	100	
Region 3	28	5	50	83	
	33.735	6.024	60.241	100	
Region 4A	30	23	54	107	
	28.037	21.495	50.467	100	
Region 4B	3	1	8	12	
	25	8.333	66.667	100	
Region 5	16	2	30	48	
	33.333	4.167	62.5	100	
Region 6	31	12	53	96	
	32.292	12.5	55.208	100	
Region 7	19	17	66	102	
	18.627	16.667	64.706	100	
Region 8	22	3	65	90	
	24.444	3.333	72.222	100	
Region 9	14	4	24	42	
	33.333	9.524	57.143	100	
Region 10	15	6	39	60	
	25	10	65	100	
Region 11	7	1	34	42	
	16.667	2.381	80.952	100	
Region 12	4	4	28	36	
	11.111	11.111	77.778	100	
Region 13 CARAGA	6	2	16	24	
	25	8.333	66.667	100	
Total	251	107	634	992	
	25.302	10.786	63.911	100	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	58.01				
Prob.	0.0016				

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 0.4 Compliance with LDC Policies: Magna Carta of Women by Respondent Group

	compl_mcw				
survey_tag	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total	
CSO	130	45	322	497	

	26.157	9.054	64.789	100
LGU	121	62	312	495
	24.444	12.525	63.030	100
Total	251	107	634	992
	25.302	10.786	63.911	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	3.18			
Prob.	0.2042			

# B3.10. Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act

This section examines compliance with the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA) within Local Development Councils (LDCs). IPRA mandates the recognition, protection, and promotion of Indigenous Peoples' rights in local governance and policymaking. Overall, 43.4% of respondents report compliance with the IPRA, while 32.3% report that the law is not applicable to their jurisdiction.

High-functionality LDCs report slightly higher compliance (42.5%) compared to low-functionality LDCs (45.0%). A greater proportion of high-functionality LDCs (34.6%) consider IPRA "Not Applicable" compared to low-functionality LDCs (29.0%). Uncertainty levels are similar in both groups (16.7% vs. 15.6%). The chi-square test is not statistically significant (p = 0.2491), indicating that LDC functionality does not strongly influence IPRA compliance.

Provinces have the highest compliance rate (52.9%) compared to municipalities (45.3%) and cities (30.6%). Cities have the highest proportion of respondents who consider IPRA "Not Applicable" (42.7%), possibly due to the lower presence of Indigenous Peoples' communities in urban areas. Municipalities report lower uncertainty (12.8%) compared to cities (18.4%) and provinces (24.7%). The chi-square test is highly significant (p = 0.0000), indicating that LGU type strongly influences IPRA compliance.

Region 12, Region 10, and CAR report the highest compliance, likely due to significant Indigenous populations and established governance structures recognizing their rights. Regions 7 and 8 report the lowest compliance, with many respondents considering IPRA "Not Applicable," indicating governance gaps in recognizing Indigenous Peoples' rights. Chi-square test is highly significant (p = 0.0000), showing strong regional disparities in compliance.

CSOs report higher compliance (47.5%) compared to LGUs (39.6%), indicating stronger advocacy for Indigenous Peoples' rights. LGUs are more likely to consider IPRA "Not Applicable" (38.0%) compared to CSOs (26.6%), suggesting that LGUs may not fully integrate Indigenous governance. The chi-square test is highly significant (p = 0.0003), indicating differences in perceptions between CSOs and LGUs.

			compl	_ipra	
intldc_fcn	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	<i>Not applicable to LGU/LDC</i>	Total
Low	70	<i>39</i>	189	122	420
	16.667	9.286	45	29.048	100
High	<i>89</i>	41	242	197	569
0	15.641	7.206	42.531	34.622	100
Total	159	80	431	319	<i>989</i>

Table B 0.1 Compliance with LDC Policies: Indigenous Peoples Rights Act by LDC Functionality

	16.077	8.089	43.579	32.255	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	4.12				
Prob.	0.2491				

#### Table B 0.2 Compliance with LDC Policies: Indigenous Peoples Rights Act by LGU Type

			compl_	_ipra	
int.lgu_type	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Not applicable to LGU/LDC	Total
City	38	17	63	88	206
	18.447	8.252	30.583	42.718	100
Municipality	78	49	276	206	609
	12.808	8.046	45.320	33.826	100
Province	43	14	92	25	174
	24.713	8.046	52.874	14.368	100
Total	159	80	431	319	989
	16.077	8.089	43.579	32.255	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	49.42				
Prob.	0.0000				

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### Table B 0.3 Compliance with LDC Policies: Indigenous Peoples Rights Act by Region

			compl_	ipra	
region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Not applicable to LGU/LDC	Total
CAR	5	7	47	0	59
	8.475	11.864	79.661	0	100
NCR	9	1	6	19	35
	25.714	2.857	17.143	54.286	100
Region 1	7	5	46	38	96
	7.292	5.208	47.917	39.583	100
Region 2	15	1	34	10	60
	25	1.667	56.667	16.667	100
Region 3	19	12	20	32	83
	22.892	14.458	24.096	38.554	100
Region 4A	27	4	29	47	107
	25.234	3.738	27.103	43.925	100
Region 4B	2	1	9	0	12
	16.667	8.333	75	0	100
Region 5	2	9	9	28	48
	4.167	18.75	18.75	58.333	100
Region 6	24	8	38	23	93
	25.806	8.602	40.860	24.731	100
Region 7	17	12	16	57	102
	16.667	11.765	15.686	55.882	100
Region 8	14	5	14	57	90
	15.556	5.556	15.556	63.333	100
Region 9	6	1	33	2	42
	14.286	2.381	78.571	4.762	100
Region 10	2	3	50	5	60
	3.333	5	83.333	8.333	100

Region 11	7	3	31	1	42
	16.667	7.143	73.810	2.381	100
Region 12	3	1	32	0	36
	8.333	2.778	88.889	0	100
Region 13 CARAGA	0	7	17	0	24
	0	29.167	70.833	0	100
Total	159	80	431	319	989
	16.077	8.089	43.579	32.255	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	374.88				
Prob.	0.0000				

Table B 0.4 Compliance with LDC Policies: Indigenous Peoples Rights Act by Respondent Group

			compl_i	ipra	
survey_tag	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Not applicable to LGU/LDC	Total
CSO	93	36	236	132	497
	18.712	7.243	47.485	26.559	100
LGU	66	44	195	187	492
	13.415	8.943	39.634	38.008	100
Total	159	80	431	319	989
	16.077	8.089	43.579	32.255	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	18.74				
Prob.	0.0003				

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# **COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION OF CSOs**

The section provides an analysis of the participation of CSOs and LGU representatives in various sectoral and functional committees of LDCs. We asses heterogeneity of results through a simple Pearson's Chi Square test. The Chi-Square ( $\chi^2$ ) test is a non-parametric statistical test used to determine whether there is a significant association between two categorical variables. It compares observed frequencies in contingency tables with expected frequencies under the assumption of independence. If the computed  $\chi^2$  statistic is greater than the critical value from the chi-square distribution table, we reject the null hypothesis, indicating a significant association between the two categorical variables.

The findings highlight key trends in committee membership across different governance levels and regional distributions. The analysis identified several statistically significant relationships (p < 0.05), indicating disparities in committee participation.

- Notably, CSOs were significantly underrepresented in the Economic Development Committee, Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development Committee, and Institutional Development Committee compared to LGUs.
- Additionally, regional differences in CSO participation were significant in the Environmental Management Committee, Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development Committee, and Institutional Development Committee, suggesting that engagement varies considerably across geographic areas.

# **Economic Development**

The Economic Development Committee saw relatively balanced participation by CSOs and LGUs, with 49.8% (n=247) of CSOs reporting membership compared to 57.6% (n=285) of LGUs. The Pearson chi-square test (p = 0.0141) suggests a statistically significant difference, implying that LGUs are more likely to participate in this committee.

When analyzed by LDC functionality, CSOs affiliated with highly functional LDCs had a higher participation rate (52.7%) compared to those with low-functioning LDCs (46.0%), though this difference was not statistically significant (p = 0.1438).

By LGU type, participation was highest among CSOs in provinces (54.0%), followed by municipalities (51.3%), and lowest in cities (41.9%), though this variation was not statistically significant (p = 0.1722). Regionally, membership rates were highest in Region 5 (66.7%) and Region 9 (66.7%), while Region 4B had no reported CSO participation.

	Economic Development Committee			
Respondent Group	Νο	Yes	Total	
CSO	249	247	496	
	50.202	49.798	100	
LGU	210	285	495	
	42.424	57.576	100	
Total	459	532	991	
	46.317	53.683	100	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	6.03			
Prob.	0.0141			

#### Table B 0.1 Committee Membership Comparison (Economic Development) by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### Table B 0.2 Committee Membership of CSOs (Economic Development) by LDC Functionality

LDC Functionality	No	Yes	Total
Low	116	99	215
	53.953	46.047	100
High	133	148	281
	47.331	52.669	100
Total	249	247	496
	50.202	49.798	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	2.14		
Prob.	0.1438		

#### **Economic Development Committee**

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

ре
ре

	Economic Development Committee			
LGU Type	No	Yes	Total	
City	61	44	105	
	58.095	41.905	100	
Municipality	148	156	304	
	48.684	51.316	100	
Province	40	47	87	
	45.977	54.023	100	
Total	249	247	496	
	50.202	49.798	100	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	3.52			
Prob.	0.1722			

Table B 0.4 Committee Membership of of CSOs (Economic Development) by Region

	c Development Commit	tee	
region	No	Yes	Total
CAR	15	14	29
	51.724	48.276	100
NCR	8	10	18
	44.444	55.556	100
Region 1	20	28	48
	41.667	58.333	100
Region 2	13	16	29
	44.828	55.172	100
Region 3	30	12	42
	71.429	28.571	100
Region 4A	31	23	54
	57.407	42.593	100
Region 4B	6	0	6
	100	0	100
Region 5	8	16	24
	33.333	66.667	100
Region 6	18	30	48
	37.5	62.5	100
Region 7	26	25	51
	50.980	49.020	100
Region 8	23	22	45
	51.111	48.889	100

Economic Development Committee

No	Yes	Total
7	14	21
33.333	66.667	100
13	17	30
43.333	56.667	100
12	9	21
57.143	42.857	100
11	7	18
61.111	38.889	100
8	4	12
66.667	33.333	100
249	247	496
50.202	49.798	100
28.02		
0.0215		
	No 7 33.333 13 43.333 12 57.143 11 61.111 8 66.667 249 50.202 28.02 28.02 0.0215	No  Yes    7  14    33.333  66.667    13  17    43.333  56.667    12  9    57.143  42.857    11  7    61.111  38.889    8  4    66.667  33.333    249  247    50.202  49.798    28.02  0.0215

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Social Development

CSOs demonstrated slightly higher participation rates in the Social Development Committee (60.6%, n=301) compared to LGUs (58.8%, n=291). However, the difference was not statistically significant (p = 0.5687), suggesting that participation is more evenly distributed across Respondent Groups.

CSOs in areas with low-functioning LDCs reported a slightly higher participation rate (63.7%) compared to those in highly functional LDCs (58.2%), though this difference was also not statistically significant (p = 0.2085).

When analyzed by LGU type, participation was highest in provinces (62.1%), followed by cities (64.8%) and municipalities (58.7%), with no statistically significant variation (p = 0.5204). However, regional disparities were notable but not statistically significant, with Region 1 (77.1%) and Region 4B (83.3%) reporting the highest CSO engagement, while participation was lowest in Region 13 CARAGA (41.7%).

		Social Development Committee			
	Respondent Group	No	Yes	Total	
CSO		196	301	497	
		39.437	60.563	100	
LGU		204	291	495	
		41.212	58.788	100	

Table B 0.1 Committee Membership Comparison (Social Development) by Respondent Group

Total	400	592	992
	40.323	59.677	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	0.32		
Prob.	0.5687		

# Table B 0.2 Committee Membership of CSOs (Social Development) by LDC Functionality

	Social Development Committee			
LDC Functionality	Νο	Yes	Total	
Low	78	137	215	
	36.279	63.721	100	
High	118	164	282	
	41.844	58.156	100	
Total	196	301	497	
	39.437	60.563	100	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	1.58			
Prob.	0.2085			

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Table B 0.3 Committee Membership of of CSOs (Social Development) by LGU Type

	Social Development Committee		
LGU Type	Νο	Yes	Total
City	37	68	105
	35.238	64.762	100
Municipality	126	179	305
	41.311	58.689	100
Province	33	54	87
	37.931	62.069	100
Total	196	301	497
	39.437	60.563	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	1.31		
Prob.	0.5204		

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

	Social Development Committee		
region	No	Yes	Total
CAR	9	20	29
	31.034	68.966	100
NCR	7	11	18
	38.889	61.111	100
Region 1	11	37	48
	22.917	77.083	100
Region 2	13	17	30
	43.333	56.667	100
Region 3	20	22	42
	47.619	52.381	100
Region 4A	21	33	54
	38.889	61.111	100
Region 4B	1	5	6
	16.667	83.333	100
Region 5	11	13	24
	45.833	54.167	100
Region 6	25	23	48
	52.083	47.917	100
Region 7	22	29	51
	43.137	56.863	100
Region 8	19	26	45
	42.222	57.778	100
Region 9	7	14	21
	33.333	66.667	100
Region 10	10	20	30
	33.333	66.667	100
Region 11	8	13	21
	38.095	61.905	100
Region 12	5	13	18
	27.778	72.222	100
Region 13 CARAGA	7	5	12
	58.333	41.667	100
Total	196	301	497
	39.437	60.563	100

# Table B 0.4 Committee Membership of of CSOs (Social Development) by Region

		Social	Social Development Committee		
	region	No	Yes	Total	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>		16.72			
Prob.		0.3362			

# Environmental Management

Participation in the Environmental Management Committee was lower overall, with 43.1% (n=214) of CSOs reporting membership compared to 47.9% (n=237) of LGUs. The chi-square test (p = 0.1274) indicated no statistically significant difference in participation rates.

CSOs in highly functional LDCs (43.3%) and low-functioning LDCs (42.8%) had nearly identical membership rates (p = 0.9162).

Among LGU types, cities had the highest participation (49.5%), followed by provinces (43.7%) and municipalities (40.7%), but the differences were not statistically significant (p = 0.2834). A regional breakdown revealed considerable variation, with the highest participation in NCR (61.1%) and Region 1 (58.3%), while Regions 3 and 4A reported only 28.6% and 33.3%, respectively.

		Environmental Management Committee		
	Respondent Group	Νο	Yes	Total
CSO		283	214	497
		56.942	43.058	100
LGU		258	237	495
		52.121	47.879	100
Total		541	451	992
		54.536	45.464	100
Pears	on Chi <sup>2</sup>	2.32		
Prob.		0.1274		

Table B 0.1 Committee Membership Comparison (Environmental Management) by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

### Table B 0.2 Committee Membership of CSOs (Environmental Management) by LDC Functionality

	2		
LDC Functionality	No	Yes	Total
Low	123	92	215
	57.209	42.791	100
High	160	122	282

# Environmental Management Committee

	56.738	43.262	100
Total	283	214	497
	56.942	43.058	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	0.01		
Prob.	0.9162		

### Table B 0.3 Committee Membership of CSOs (Environmental Management) by LGU Type

		5	
LGU Type	Νο	Yes	Total
City	53	52	105
	50.476	49.524	100
Municipality	181	124	305
	59.344	40.656	100
Province	49	38	87
	56.322	43.678	100
Total	283	214	497
	56.942	43.058	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	2.52		
Prob.	0.2834		

### **Environmental Management Committee**

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

### Table B 0.4 Committee Membership of of CSOs (Environmental Management) by Region

	Environmental	Management Committ	ee
Region	No	Yes	Total
CAR	14	15	29
	48.276	51.724	100
NCR	7	11	18
	38.889	61.111	100
Region 1	20	28	48
	41.667	58.333	100
Region 2	20	10	30
	66.667	33.333	100
Region 3	30	12	42
	71.429	28.571	100
Region 4A	36	18	54
	66.667	33.333	100

	NA a la a a a la a la t	C
Environmental	wanagement	committee

Region	No	Yes	Total
Region 4B	2	4	6
	33.333	66.667	100
Region 5	11	13	24
	45.833	54.167	100
Region 6	25	23	48
	52.083	47.917	100
Region 7	31	20	51
	60.784	39.216	100
Region 8	26	19	45
	57.778	42.222	100
Region 9	12	9	21
	57.143	42.857	100
Region 10	18	12	30
	60	40	100
Region 11	17	4	21
	80.952	19.048	100
Region 12	7	11	18
	38.889	61.111	100
Region 13 CARAGA	7	5	12
	58.333	41.667	100
Total	283	214	497
	56.942	43.058	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	25.49		
Prob.	0.0437		

# Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development

CSO engagement in the Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development Committee was significantly lower than LGU's reports of CSO participation, with only 20.1% (n=100) of CSOs involved compared to 51.7% (n=256) of LGUs. The chi-square test (p = 0.0000) confirmed this difference was highly significant, indicating that CSOs are substantially underrepresented in this committee.

LDC functionality did not significantly affect participation rates, as CSOs in highly functional LDCs (20.9%) and low-functioning LDCs (19.1%) had similar participation rates (p = 0.6098).

By LGU type, participation was highest in provinces (31.0%), compared to 24.8% in cities and 15.4% in municipalities, with a statistically significant chi-square test (p = 0.0024),

suggesting that provincial-level CSOs may be more engaged in infrastructure planning. Regional disparities were pronounced, with Regions 3, 4A, and 11 reporting participation rates below 10%, while Region 12 had the highest at 55.6%.

	Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development Committee		
Respondent Group	Νο	Yes	Total
CSO	397	100	497
	79.879	20.121	100
LGU	239	256	495
	48.283	51.717	100
Total	636	356	992
	64.113	35.887	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	107.61		
Prob.	0.0000		

Table B 0.1 Committee Membership Comparison (Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development) by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 0.2 Committee Membership of CSOs (Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development) by LDC Functionality

	Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development Committee		
LDC Functionality	Νο	Yes	Total
Low	174	41	215
	80.930	19.070	100
High	223	59	282
	79.078	20.922	100
Total	397	100	497
	79.879	20.121	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	0.26		
Prob.	0.6098		

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 0.3 Committee Membership of of CSOs (Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development) by LGU Type

Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development Committee

LGU Type	Νο	Yes	Total
City	79	26	105
	75.238	24.762	100

Municipality	258	47	305
	84.590	15.410	100
Province	60	27	87
	68.966	31.034	100
Total	397	100	497
	79.879	20.121	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	12.07		
Prob.	0.0024		

Table B 0.4 Committee Membership of of CSOs (Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development) by Region

Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development Committee				
region	Νο	Yes	Total	
CAR	17	,	12	29
	58.621		41.379	100
NCR	10	1	8	18
	55.556		44.444	100
Region 1	38		10	48
	79.167		20.833	100
Region 2	24		6	30
	80	1	20	100
Region 3	38		4	42
	90.476		9.524	100
Region 4A	49		5	54
	90.741		9.259	100
Region 4B	6	i	0	6
	100	1	0	100
Region 5	18		6	24
	75		25	100
Region 6	37		11	48
	77.083		22.917	100
Region 7	42		9	51
	82.353		17.647	100
Region 8	34		11	45
	75.556		24.444	100
Region 9	18		3	21

	85.714	14.286	100
Region 10	28	2	30
	93.333	6.667	100
Region 11	20	1	21
	95.238	4.762	100
Region 12	8	10	18
	44.444	55.556	100
Region 13 CARAGA	10	2	12
	83.333	16.667	100
Total	397	100	497
	79.879	20.121	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	45.57		
Prob.	0.0001		

# Institutional Development

The Institutional Development Committee also exhibited a large disparity in participation rates, with only 20.7% (n=103) of CSOs involved compared to 61.4% (n=304) of LGUs. The chi-square test (p = 0.0000) confirmed this difference as statistically significant.

LDC functionality appeared to impact participation, as CSOs in highly functional LDCs (24.1%) were significantly more involved than those in low-functioning LDCs (16.3%), with a statistically significant chi-square test (p = 0.0328). Differences by LGU type were not significant (p = 0.4431), but regional disparities were evident, with NCR reporting the highest participation rate (44.4%), while Regions 3, 7, and 11 had participation rates below 10%.

Respondent Group	Institutional Development Committee		
	No	Yes	Total
CSO	394	103	497
	79.276	20.724	100
LGU	191	304	495
	38.586	61.414	100
Total	585	407	992
	58.972	41.028	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	169.70		
Prob.	0.0000		

Table B 0.1 Committee Membership Comparison (Institutional Development) by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 0.2 Committee Members	ship of CSOs (Institutional	Development) by LDC Functionality
	, ,	1 / 2

LDC Functionality	No	Yes	Total
Low	180	35	215
	83.721	16.279	100
High	214	68	282
	75.887	24.113	100
Total	394	103	497
	79.276	20.724	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	4.56		
Prob.	0.0328		

#### Institutional Development Committee

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

### Table B 0.3 Committee Membership of of CSOs (Institutional Development) by LGU Type

Institutional Development Committee				
LGU Type	No	Yes	Total	
City	84	21	105	
	80	20	100	
Municipality	237	68	305	
	77.705	22.295	100	
Province	73	14	87	
	83.908	16.092	100	
Total	394	103	497	
	79.276	20.724	100	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	1.63			
Prob.	0.4431			

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

### Table B 0.4 Committee Membership of of CSOs (Institutional Development) by Region

### Institutional Development Committee

region	No	Yes	Total
CAR	24	5	29
	82.759	17.241	100
NCR	10	8	18
	55.556	44.444	100
Region 1	33	15	48

	68.75	31.25	100
Region 2	24	6	30
	80	20	100
Region 3	39	3	42
	92.857	7.143	100
Region 4A	43	11	54
	79.630	20.370	100
Region 4B	5	1	6
	83.333	16.667	100
Region 5	21	3	24
	87.5	12.5	100
Region 6	37	11	48
	77.083	22.917	100
Region 7	45	6	51
	88.235	11.765	100
Region 8	38	7	45
	84.444	15.556	100
Region 9	14	7	21
	66.667	33.333	100
Region 10	25	5	30
	83.333	16.667	100
Region 11	17	4	21
	80.952	19.048	100
Region 12	9	9	18
	50	50	100
Region 13 CARAGA	10	2	12
	83.333	16.667	100
Total	394	103	497
	79.276	20.724	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	30.64		
Prob.	0.0098		

# **Other Committees**

Participation in other committees was generally limited, with only 12.9% (n=64) of CSOs involved, compared to 100% (n=35) of LGUs. The chi-square test (p = 0.0000) confirmed a significant difference, indicating that LGUs have near-exclusive involvement in committees outside the main sectoral categories. Participation in other committees was not statistically different between high and low functioning LDCs.

Among CSOs, provincial-level organizations had the highest participation (26.4%) compared to 15.2% in cities and 8.2% in municipalities, with a statistically significant chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 20.74, p = 0.0000). Regional differences were also significant ( $\chi^2$  = 33.07, p = 0.0046), with Regions 5, 9, and 10 reporting no CSO participation.

comm_others				
Respondent Group	No	Yes	Total	
CSO	433	64	497	
	87.123	12.877	100	
LGU	0	35	35	
	0	100	100	
Total	433	99	532	
	81.391	18.609	100	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	163.86			
Prob.	0.0000			

Table B 0.1 Committee Membership Comparison (Others) by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

### Table B 0.2 Committee Membership of CSOs (Others) by LDC Functionality

comm_others				
LDC Functionality	No	Yes	Total	
Low	184	31	215	
	85.581	14.419	100	
High	249	33	282	
	88.298	11.702	100	
Total	433	64	497	
	87.123	12.877	100	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	0.80			
Prob.	0.3704			

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### Table B 0.3 Committee Membership of of CSOs (Others) by LGU Type

	comm_others		
LGU Type	No	Yes	Total
City	89	16	105
	84.762	15.238	100
Municipality	280	25	305
	91.803	8.197	100
--------------------------	--------	--------	-----
Province	64	23	87
	73.563	26.437	100
Total	433	64	497
	87.123	12.877	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	20.74		
Prob.	0.0000		

Table B 0.4 Committee Membership of of CSOs (Others) by Region

	comm_others		
region	No	Yes	Total
CAR	24	5	29
	82.759	17.241	100
NCR	14	4	18
	77.778	22.222	100
Region 1	43	5	48
	89.583	10.417	100
Region 2	27	3	30
	90	10	100
Region 3	35	7	42
	83.333	16.667	100
Region 4A	49	5	54
	90.741	9.259	100
Region 4B	4	2	6
	66.667	33.333	100
Region 5	24	0	24
	100	0	100
Region 6	40	8	48
	83.333	16.667	100
Region 7	48	3	51
	94.118	5.882	100
Region 8	36	9	45
	80	20	100
Region 9	21	0	21
	100	0	100
Region 10	30	0	30

	100	0	100
Region 11	16	5	21
	76.190	23.810	100
Region 12	15	3	18
	83.333	16.667	100
Region 13 CARAGA	7	5	12
	58.333	41.667	100
Total	433	64	497
	87.123	12.877	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	33.07		
Prob.	0.0046		

# **B4.7.** Executive Committee

LGUs perceive that CSOs are significantly more engaged in executive committees ( $\chi^2$  = 46.94, p = 0.0000), with 77.2% (n=375) of LGUs indicating participation by CSOs compared to 58.1% (n=279) by CSOs themselves. More CSOs (28.1%, n=135) reported non-participation than LGUs (11.7%, n=57), suggesting barriers to CSO's perceived involvement in high-level decision-making.

LDC functionality does not significantly impact perceived participation ( $\chi^2$  = 0.84, p = 0.6559), as reported participation rates are similar between low (60.4%) and high-functioning LDCs (56.4%). However, LGU type matters ( $\chi^2$  = 10.81, p = 0.0288), with provinces having the lowest reported participation (43.8%) compared to municipalities (60.0%) and cities (64.0%).

Regional disparities are also significant ( $\chi^2$  = 48.33, p = 0.0184), with Regions 10 (72.4%) and 11 (70.0%) reporting the highest participation, while Region 8 (40.5%) had the lowest, with 54.8% reporting non-participation.

	com_exec_status			
survey_tag	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
CSO	66	135	279	480
	13.75	28.125	58.125	100
LGU	54	57	375	486
	11.111	11.728	77.160	100
Total	120	192	654	966
	12.422	19.876	67.702	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	46.94			
Prob.	0.0000			

Table B 4.7.1 Comparison of Perceived Participation of CSOs in Committees (Executive Committee) by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Total
iotai
207
100
273
100
480
100

Table B 4.7.2 Comparison of Perceived Participation of CSOs in Committees (Executive Committee) by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 4.7.3 Comparison of Perceived Participation of CSOs in Committees (Executive Committee) by LGU Type

	com_exec_status			
int.lgu_type	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
City	10	26	64	100
	10	26	64	100
Municipality	44	76	180	300
	14.667	25.333	60	100
Province	12	33	35	80
	15	41.25	43.75	100
Total	66	135	279	480
	13.75	28.125	58.125	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	10.81			
Prob.	0.0288			

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 4.7.4 Comparison of Perceived Participation of CSOs in Committees (Executive Committee) by Region

	com_exec_status			
region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
CAR	7	8	14	29
	24.138	27.586	48.276	100
NCR	3	5	10	18
	16.667	27.778	55.556	100
Region 1	5	12	29	46
	10.870	26.087	63.043	100
Region 2	8	8	13	29
	27.586	27.586	44.828	100
Region 3	9	9	22	40
	22.5	22.5	55	100
Region 4A	9	9	33	51
	17.647	17.647	64.706	100
Region 4B	3	0	3	6
	50	0	50	100
Region 5	2	7	15	24
	8.333	29.167	62.5	100

Region 6	6	10	31	47
	12.766	21.277	65.957	100
Region 7	3	17	29	49
	6.122	34.694	59.184	100
Region 8	2	23	17	42
	4.762	54.762	40.476	100
Region 9	1	7	13	21
	4.762	33.333	61.905	100
Region 10	1	7	21	29
	3.448	24.138	72.414	100
Region 11	2	4	14	20
	10	20	70	100
Region 12	3	6	9	18
	16.667	33.333	50	100
Region 13 CARAGA	2	3	6	11
	18.182	27.273	54.545	100
Total	66	135	279	480
	13.75	28.125	58.125	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	48.33			
Prob.	0.0184			

# **COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION OF LGUs**

This section provides an analysis of the participation of LGU respondents in various sectoral and functional committees, focusing on differences in engagement based on LGU type, regional distribution, and the level of functionality of LDCs. The findings reveal important trends and variations. The following are the statistically significant findings:

- There is a significant variation in participation by LGU type across all four committees.
  - A significant difference exists in Social Development Committee participation across LGU types, with provinces having significantly higher participation than municipalities and cities.
  - There is a also a significant variation in participation in the Environmental Management Committee, with provinces being substantially more involved than municipalities and cities.
  - The data reveals that provinces have significantly higher engagement in infrastructure-related committees compared to cities and municipalities

Lastly, a statistically significant difference is observed, with provinces being far more engaged than municipalities and cities in institutional development matters.

# **Economic Development**

The Economic Development Committee saw 57.6% (n = 285) of LGU respondents participating, while 42.4% (n = 210) did not. Membership did not significantly differ based on LDC functionality, as both low-functioning (57.2%) and high-functioning (57.8%) LDCs had nearly equal participation rates (p = 0.8890). By LGU type, provincial governments had the highest participation (68.9%), compared to municipalities (55.3%) and cities (54.8%), with a chisquare test approaching statistical significance (p = 0.0604). Regionally, participation varied, with Region 4B (83.3%) and Region 10 (70%) having the highest membership rates, while Region 2 (40%) had the lowest.

	Economi	Economic Development Committee			
LDC Functionality	Νο	Yes	Total		
Low	89	119	208		
	42.788	57.212	100		
High	121	166	287		
	42.160	57.840	100		
Total	210	285	495		
	42.424	57.576	100		
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	0.02				
Prob.	0.8890				

# Table B 0.1 Committee Membership of LGUs (Economic Development) by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Table B 0.2 Committee Membership of of LGUs (Economic Development) by LGU Type

	Economic Development Committee			
LGU Type	No	Yes	Total	
City	47	57	104	
	45.192	54.808	100	
Municipality	136	168	304	
	44.737	55.263	100	
Province	27	60	87	
	31.034	68.966	100	
Total	210	285	495	
	42.424	57.576	100	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	5.61			
Prob.	0.0604			

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Table B 0.3 Committee Membership of of LGUs (Economic Development) by Region

		Economic Development Committee			
	Region	No	Yes	Total	
CAR		12	18	30	
		40	60	100	
NCR		8	9	17	
		47.059	52.941	100	
Region 1		21	27	48	
		43.75	56.25	100	
Region 2		18	12	30	

	60	40	100
Region 3	15	26	41
	36.585	63.415	100
Region 4A	23	30	53
	43.396	56.604	100
Region 4B	1	5	6
	16.667	83.333	100
Region 5	8	16	24
	33.333	66.667	100
Region 6	22	26	48
	45.833	54.167	100
Region 7	25	26	51
	49.020	50.980	100
Region 8	18	27	45
	40	60	100
Region 9	9	12	21
	42.857	57.143	100
Region 10	9	21	30
	30	70	100
Region 11	10	11	21
	47.619	52.381	100
Region 12	6	12	18
	33.333	66.667	100
Region 13 CARAGA	5	7	12
	41.667	58.333	100
Total	210	285	495
	42.424	57.576	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	11.07		
Prob.	0.7476		

# Social Development

In the Social Development Committee, 58.8% (n=291) of LGU respondent indicated that they participated, with 41.2% (n=204) reporting no involvement. Participation was slightly higher among LGUs affiliated with highly functional LDCs (60.6%) compared to those in low-functioning LDCs (56.3%), but the difference was not statistically significant (p = 0.3288).

A significant difference was observed across LGU types (p = 0.0169), where provinces (72.4%) had the highest engagement, followed by municipalities (56.3%) and cities (54.8%). Regional disparities were notable, with Region 3 (70.7%) and Region 5 (70.8%) reporting the highest participation, while Region 9 (47.6%) had the lowest.

		Social Development Committee		
	LDC Functionality	Νο	Yes	Total
Low		91	117	208
		43.75	56.25	100
High		113	174	287
		39.373	60.627	100
Total		204	291	495
		41.212	58.788	100
Pearsor	n Chi <sup>2</sup>	0.95		
Prob.		0.3288		

### Table B 0.1 Committee Membership of LGUs (Social Development) by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

### Table B 0.2 Committee Membership of LGUs (Social Development) by LGU Type

	Social Development Committee		
LGU Type	Νο	Yes	Total
City	47	57	104
	45.192	54.808	100
Municipality	133	171	304
	43.75	56.25	100
Province	24	63	87
	27.586	72.414	100
Total	204	291	495
	41.212	58.788	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	8.16		
Prob.	0.0169		

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### Table B 0.3 Committee Membership of LGUs (Social Development) by Region

	Social Development Committee			
region	No	Yes	Total	
CAR	14	16	30	
	46.667	53.333	100	
NCR	7	10	17	
	41.176	58.824	100	
Region 1	19	29	48	
	39.583	60.417	100	
Region 2	15	15	30	

	50	50	100
Region 3	12	29	41
	29.268	70.732	100
Region 4A	25	28	53
	47.170	52.830	100
Region 4B	2	4	6
	33.333	66.667	100
Region 5	7	17	24
	29.167	70.833	100
Region 6	22	26	48
	45.833	54.167	100
Region 7	25	26	51
	49.020	50.980	100
Region 8	17	28	45
	37.778	62.222	100
Region 9	11	10	21
	52.381	47.619	100
Region 10	10	20	30
	33.333	66.667	100
Region 11	9	12	21
	42.857	57.143	100
Region 12	5	13	18
	27.778	72.222	100
Region 13 CARAGA	4	8	12
	33.333	66.667	100
Total	204	291	495
	41.212	58.788	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	11.61		
Prob.	0.7086		

# Environmental Management

Participation in the Environmental Management Committee was 47.9% (n=237) among LGU respondents, compared to 52.1% (n=258) who were not members. LGU respondents affiliated with highly functional LDCs had a slightly higher participation rate (49.1%) than those in low-functioning LDCs (46.2%), though this was not statistically significant (p = 0.5131).

A statistically significant difference was found based on LGU type (p = 0.0058), with LGU respondents in provinces (63.2%) participating at a much higher rate than municipalities (43.8%) and cities (47.1%). Regionally, Region 4B (83.3%) and Region 5 (62.5%) reported the highest participation, while Region 2 (33.3%) had the lowest. Table B 0.1

	Environmental Management Committee		
LDC Functionality	No	Yes	Total
Low	112	96	208
	53.846	46.154	100
High	146	141	287
	50.871	49.129	100
Total	258	237	495
	52.121	47.879	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	0.43		
Prob.	0.5131		

# Committee Membership of LGUs (Environmental Management) by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 0.2 Committee Membership of LGUs (Environmental Management) by LGU Type

	Environmental Management Committee		
LGU Type	No	Yes	Total
City	55	49	104
	52.885	47.115	100
Municipality	171	133	304
	56.25	43.75	100
Province	32	55	87
	36.782	63.218	100
Total	258	237	495
	52.121	47.879	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	10.30		
Prob.	0.0058		

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### Table B 0.3 Committee Membership of LGUs (Environmental Management) by Region

	Environmental Management Committee		
region	No	Yes	Total
CAR	18	12	30
	60	40	100
NCR	8	9	17
	47.059	52.941	100
Region 1	27	21	48
	56.25	43.75	100
Region 2	20	10	30

	66.667	33.333	100
Region 3	17	24	41
	41.463	58.537	100
Region 4A	30	23	53
	56.604	43.396	100
Region 4B	1	5	6
	16.667	83.333	100
Region 5	9	15	24
	37.5	62.5	100
Region 6	22	26	48
	45.833	54.167	100
Region 7	30	21	51
	58.824	41.176	100
Region 8	24	21	45
	53.333	46.667	100
Region 9	13	8	21
	61.905	38.095	100
Region 10	15	15	30
	50	50	100
Region 11	11	10	21
	52.381	47.619	100
Region 12	7	11	18
	38.889	61.111	100
Region 13 CARAGA	6	6	12
	50	50	100
Total	258	237	495
	52.121	47.879	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	15.01		
Prob.	0.4505		

# Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development

Participation in the Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development Committee was 51.7% (n=256) among LGUs, while 48.3% (n=239) were not involved. The level of LDC functionality did not have a significant effect on LGU respondents' participation, with high-functioning LDCs reporting 53.3% membership, compared to 49.5% for low-functioning LDCs (p = 0.4048).

However, a statistically significant difference was observed among LGU types ( $\chi^2 = 8.64$ , p = 0.0133), where provinces (64.4%) had the highest participation, compared to cities (54.8%) and municipalities (47.0%). Regionally, Region 12 (66.7%) and Region 5 (62.5%) had the highest engagement, while Region 2 (36.7%) had the lowest participation.Table

	Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development Committee		
LDC Functionality	No	Yes	Total
Low	105	103	208
	50.481	49.519	100
High	134	153	287
	46.690	53.310	100
Total	239	256	495
	48.283	51.717	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	0.69		
Prob.	0.4048		

*B 0.1 Committee Membership of LGUs (Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development) by LDC Functionality* 

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 0.2 Committee Membership of LGUs (Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development) by LGU Type

	Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development Committee		
LGU Type	No	Yes	Total
City	47	57	104
	45.192	54.808	100
Municipality	161	143	304
	52.961	47.039	100
Province	31	56	87
	35.632	64.368	100
Total	239	256	495
	48.283	51.717	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	8.64		
Prob.	0.0133		

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 0.3 Committee Membership of LGUs (Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development) by Region

	Physical Land Use/Infrastructure Development Committee			
region	No	Yes	Total	
CAR	17	13	30	
	56.667	43.333	100	
NCR	7	10	17	
	41.176	58.824	100	
Region 1	26	22	48	

	54.167	45.833	100
Region 2	19	11	30
	63.333	36.667	100
Region 3	17	24	41
	41.463	58.537	100
Region 4A	28	25	53
	52.830	47.170	100
Region 4B	2	4	6
	33.333	66.667	100
Region 5	9	15	24
	37.5	62.5	100
Region 6	22	26	48
	45.833	54.167	100
Region 7	28	23	51
	54.902	45.098	100
Region 8	18	27	45
	40	60	100
Region 9	13	8	21
	61.905	38.095	100
Region 10	12	18	30
	40	60	100
Region 11	9	12	21
	42.857	57.143	100
Region 12	6	12	18
	33.333	66.667	100
Region 13 CARAGA	6	6	12
	50	50	100
Total	239	256	495
	48.283	51.717	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	13.94		
Prob.	0.5304		

# Institutional Development

Participation in the Institutional Development Committee was 61.4% (n=304) among LGU respondents, while 38.6% (n=191) did not participate. Membership was higher among LGU respondents in highly functional LDCs (64.5%) than those in low-functioning LDCs (57.2%), but this difference was not statistically significant (p = 0.1020).

A statistically significant variation was found based on LGU type (p = 0.0019), where provinces had the highest participation (78.2%), followed by municipalities (58.2%) and cities

(56.7%). Regionally, participation was highest in Region 4B (83.3%) and Region 3 (75.6%), while Region 9 had the lowest (42.9%).

	Institutional Development Committee		
LDC Functionality	Νο	Yes	Total
Low	89	119	208
	42.788	57.212	100
High	102	185	287
	35.540	64.460	100
Total	191	304	495
	38.586	61.414	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	2.67		
Prob.	0.1020		

Table B 0.1 Committee Membership of LGUs (Institutional Development) by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### Table B 0.2 Committee Membership of LGUs (Institutional Development) by LGU Type

	Institutional Development Committee		
LGU Type	No	Yes	Total
City	45	59	104
	43.269	56.731	100
Municipality	127	177	304
	41.776	58.224	100
Province	19	68	87
	21.839	78.161	100
Total	191	304	495
	38.586	61.414	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	12.56		
Prob.	0.0019		

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### Table B 0.3 Committee Membership of LGUs (Institutional Development) by Region

	Institutional	Development Comm	ittee
region	No	Yes	Total
CAR	12	18	30
	40	60	100
NCR	6	11	17
	35.294	64.706	100
Region 1	26	22	48

	54.167	45.833	100
Region 2	10	20	30
	33.333	66.667	100
Region 3	10	31	41
	24.390	75.610	100
Region 4A	22	31	53
	41.509	58.491	100
Region 4B	1	5	6
	16.667	83.333	100
Region 5	7	17	24
	29.167	70.833	100
Region 6	17	31	48
	35.417	64.583	100
Region 7	21	30	51
	41.176	58.824	100
Region 8	18	27	45
	40	60	100
Region 9	12	9	21
	57.143	42.857	100
Region 10	12	18	30
	40	60	100
Region 11	8	13	21
	38.095	61.905	100
Region 12	5	13	18
	27.778	72.222	100
Region 13 CARAGA	4	8	12
	33.333	66.667	100
Total	191	304	495
	38.586	61.414	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	15.65		
Prob.	0.4054		

# **B5.6.** Executive Committee

LGU respondents in high-functioning LDCs perceive slightly higher CSO participation (79.1%) than those in low-functioning LDCs (74.5%), but the difference is not statistically significant ( $\chi^2$  = 1.65, p = 0.4380). This suggests that LDC functionality has little impact on how LGUs view CSO engagement in executive committees.

Perceptions of CSO participation vary by LGU type but are not statistically significant ( $\chi^2$  = 7.03, p = 0.1344). Provinces and cities report the highest perceived CSO participation (80.0%),

while municipalities report slightly lower engagement (75.4%), indicating that CSOs may be more visible in provincial governance structures.

Regional differences are statistically significant ( $\chi^2$  = 58.28, p = 0.0015), with Region 12 (94.4%) and Region 1 (89.4%) reporting the highest perceived CSO participation, while NCR (46.7%) and Region 4B (50.0%) report the lowest. This suggests uneven CSO engagement across regions, likely due to governance culture and institutional factors.

	com_exec_status			
intldc_fcn	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
Low	24	28	152	204
	11.765	13.725	74.510	100
High	30	29	223	282
	10.638	10.284	79.078	100
Total	54	57	375	486
	11.111	11.728	77.160	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	1.65			
Prob.	0.4380			

Table B 5.6.1 LGUs' Perceived Participation of CSOs in Committees (Executive Committee) by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 5.6.2 LGUs' Perceived Participation of CSOs in Committees (Executive Committee) by LGU Type

	com_exec_status			
int.lgu_type	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
City	8	12	80	100
	8	12	80	100
Municipality	33	41	227	301
	10.963	13.621	75.415	100
Province	13	4	68	85
	15.294	4.706	80	100
Total	54	57	375	486
	11.111	11.728	77.160	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	7.03			
Prob.	0.1344			

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table B 5.6.3 LGUs' Perceived Participation of CSOs in Committees (Executive Committee) by Region

	com_exec_status			
region	Unsure/uninformed	No	Yes	Total
CAR	0	7	23	30
	0	23.333	76.667	100
NCR	3	5	7	15
	20	33.333	46.667	100
Region 1	1	4	42	47
	2.128	8.511	89.362	100
Region 2	8	3	19	30
	26.667	10	63.333	100
Region 3	3	3	33	39
	7.692	7.692	84.615	100

Region 4A	6	7	39	52
	11.538	13.462	75	100
Region 4B	2	1	3	6
	33.333	16.667	50	100
Region 5	1	4	19	24
	4.167	16.667	79.167	100
Region 6	4	1	40	45
	8.889	2.222	88.889	100
Region 7	8	5	38	51
	15.686	9.804	74.510	100
Region 8	6	6	33	45
	13.333	13.333	73.333	100
Region 9	5	0	16	21
	23.810	0	76.190	100
Region 10	2	7	21	30
	6.667	23.333	70	100
Region 11	1	4	16	21
	4.762	19.048	76.190	100
Region 12	1	0	17	18
	5.556	0	94.444	100
Region 13 CARAGA	3	0	9	12
	25	0	75	100
Total	54	57	375	486
	11.111	11.728	77.160	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	58.28			
Prob.	0.0015			

# FREQUENCY OF LDC PARTICIPATION OF CSOs

This section presents an analysis of CSO attendance in LDC meetings and its related activities. The study examines frequency of attendance across various factors, including the functionality of the LDC, the type of LGU and regional differences. The analysis highlights several key trends in CSO participation in LDCs:

- LDC functionality matters—CSOs in highly functional LDCs tend to engage more frequently, particularly on a quarterly basis.
- LGU type has limited influence—Participation rates do not vary significantly across cities, municipalities, and provinces.
- Regional disparities are significant—Certain regions experience higher participation rates, while others have lower engagement, often attending only when invited.

# By LDC Functionality

Among the 478 CSOs surveyed, 44.98% (n = 215) reported attending quarterly, while 16.53% (n = 79) attended monthly. Notably, CSOs in highly functional LDCs attended more frequently on a quarterly basis (47.23%, n = 128) compared to those in low-functioning LDCs (42.03%, n = 87). However, CSOs in highly functional LDCs were less likely to attend monthly (12.55%, n = 34) compared to those in low-functioning councils (21.74%, n = 45). This shows that the results are mixed. Summing up responses for quarterly and monthly – CSOs from low

functioning LDCs report more frequent attendance (63.77%) than those from high functioning LDCs (59.69%).

The Pearson Chi-square test (p = 0.0277) suggests a statistically significant relationship between LDC functionality and CSO attendance frequency. This indicates that the functionality of the LDC influences how often CSOs participate, although data tells us that low functional LDCs exhibiting more frequent attendance when quarterly and monthly attendance are analyzed together.

	Frequence of CSO Attendance at LDC Meetings				
LDC Functionality	Only when invited	Bi-annually (every six months)	Quarterly	Monthly	Total
Low	51	24	87	45	207
	24.638	11.594	42.029	21.739	100
High	63	46	128	34	271
	23.247	16.974	47.232	12.546	100
Total	114	70	215	79	478
	23.849	14.644	44.979	16.527	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	9.12				
Prob.	0.0277				

#### Table B 0.1 CSO Frequency of LDC Participation by LDC Functionality<sup>11</sup>

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# By LGU Type

Among CSO respondents, 44.98% (n = 215) of reported attending LDC meetings quarterly, with municipalities showing the highest proportion of quarterly participation (46.42%, n = 136), followed by provinces (44.05%, n = 37) and cities (41.58%, n = 42). Monthly participation was lowest in municipalities (13.65%, n = 40) but higher in cities (20.79%, n = 21) and provinces (21.43%, n = 18).

The Pearson Chi-square test (p = 0.2219) does not indicate statistical significance, implying that the type of LGU does not significantly influence CSO participation frequency. This suggests that regardless of whether the LDC operates at the city, municipal, or provincial level, CSOs tend to engage at similar rates.

#### Table B 0.1 CSO Frequency of LDC Participation by LGU Type

Frequence of CSO Attendance at LDC Meetings					
LGU Type	Only when invited	Bi-annually (every six months)	Quarterly	Monthly	Total
City	25	13	42	21	101
	24.752	12.871	41.584	20.792	100

<sup>11</sup> Tabulation excludes the others category.

Municipality	67	50	136	40	293
	22.867	17.065	46.416	13.652	100
Province	22	7	37	18	84
	26.190	8.333	44.048	21.429	100
Total	114	70	215	79	478
	23.849	14.644	44.979	16.527	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	8.23				
Prob.	0.2219				

# By Region

Disaggregating regionally, the most common participation frequency was quarterly (44.98%, n = 215), with some regional variations. Regions with higher quarterly participation include Region 2 (70.37%), Region 12 (66.67%), and Region 11 (60%). Conversely, Regions 9 (45%) and 11 (30%) had the highest proportion of monthly participation, indicating more frequent engagement in these areas.

In contrast, some regions showed lower engagement, with CSOs only participating when invited. For example, Region 4B (66.67%) and Region 6 (36.17%) had the highest proportion of CSOs that only attended when invited. This suggests disparities in CSO engagement, which may be influenced by regional governance structures or access to LDC proceedings.

#### Frequence of CSO Attendance at LDC Meetings Only when **Bi-annually (every six** Quarterly Monthly Total invited Region months) CAR 3 5 15 4 27 11.111 18.519 55.556 14.815 100 NCR 6 0 7 3 16 37.5 0 43.75 18.75 100 Region 1 8 15 20 5 48 16.667 31.25 41.667 10.417 100 Region 2 5 2 19 1 27 18.519 7.407 70.370 3.704 100 **Region 3** 6 6 24 6 42 14.286 14.286 57.143 14.286 100 19 **Region 4A** 51 0 18 14 37.255 0 35.294 27.451 100 0 **Region 4B** 4 0 2 6

# Table B 0.1 CSO Frequency of LDC Participation by Region

	66.667	0	33.333	0	100
Region 5	8	1	11	4	24
	33.333	4.167	45.833	16.667	100
Region 6	17	6	17	7	47
	36.170	12.766	36.170	14.894	100
Region 7	8	9	27	7	51
	15.686	17.647	52.941	13.725	100
Region 8	14	7	15	7	43
	32.558	16.279	34.884	16.279	100
Region 9	2	5	4	9	20
	10	25	20	45	100
Region 10	7	11	10	1	29
	24.138	37.931	34.483	3.448	100
Region 11	2	0	12	6	20
	10	0	60	30	100
Region 12	1	2	12	3	18
	5.556	11.111	66.667	16.667	100
Region 13 CARAGA	4	1	2	2	9
	44.444	11.111	22.222	22.222	100
Total	114	70	215	79	478
	23.849	14.644	44.979	16.527	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	108.57				
Prob.	0.0000				

# Does frequency of participation impact depth of participation in the LDCs' functions?

Understanding the relationship between participation frequency and participation status is critical in assessing the impact of engagement levels on community involvement. This section examines the status of participation among individuals with varying levels of attendance at LDC meetings.

Using non-parametric statistical tests and quantile regression at the median, the analysis explores whether participation status significantly differs across attendance groups and whether more frequent participation leads to increased engagement. In performing this analysis, we generate two indices:

1. Participation status index. The survey listed a set of activities where CSOs are expected to participate in through the LDCs. Some examples are data gathering, committee involvement, budget authorization, among others. We reduce the dimensionality these

responses into a single index by aggregating the respondents individual responses per activity.

2. Results index. Statements 11-13 of the PGM section of the survey measures the agreement of respondents with respect to statements that are related to the achievement of the objectives of participatory governance. We reduce the dimensionality these responses in a single index by aggregating the respondents' individual responses per statement.

When dealing with multiple categorical variables, PCA can be used to reduce dimensionality and construct an index that captures the most variation in the data. PCA transforms correlated variables into a set of uncorrelated principal components (PCs), where the first principal component explains the highest variance. Upon performing the PCA, we find that the first principal component is highly correlated with an index that is based on a direct summation of the multinomial categorical variables. Since the PCA results were highly correlated with the simpler summation approach, the latter was then adopted for its simplicity.

In order to test the statistical significance of the relationships, we perform three tests:

- 1. The Kruskal-Wallis test is a non-parametric test used to compare three or more independent groups to determine if they come from the same distribution. It is an extension of the Mann-Whitney U test to multiple groups and is an alternative to one-way ANOVA when the assumption of normality is violated. It is used when the dependent variable is continuous or ordinal but not normally distributed. It essentially compares three or more independent groups to test whether they have the same median. It is commonly applied in social sciences, medical research, and public policy when sample distributions are skewed or contain outliers.
- 2. The Dunn's test is a post-hoc pairwise comparison test used after a significant Kruskal-Wallis test. It identifies which specific groups are significantly different from each other. It us used when Kruskal-Wallis rejects the null hypothesis, indicating at least one group differs. Its objective is to compare multiple groups while adjusting for multiple comparisons, often using Bonferroni or Holm corrections.
- 3. Quantile Regression extends traditional regression by estimating the conditional quantiles (e.g., median, 25th percentile, 75th percentile) rather than just the mean. This method is useful when the impact of independent variables varies across different parts of the distribution and for non-parametric estimation since it tests the percentiles rather than the mean. It is applied when heteroskedasticity (unequal variance) is present. In our case, we use quantile regression at the median or 50<sup>th</sup> percentile.

# **Overall Trends**

Key findings indicate that more frequent attendance at LDC meetings is associated with higher LDC participation levels. Specifically, attending meetings bi-annually or more frequently corresponds with significantly higher participation status than those who attend only when invited. However, differences between bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendance appear to be marginal.

The median participation status varies across attendance groups, as shown in the summary statistics:

Table B 0.1 Median and Interquartile Range – Participation Status Index

Summary for variables: part\_status Group variable: cso\_ldc\_attend

cso_ldc_attend	p50	IQR
Only when invite	40.5	13
Bi-annually (eve	47	10
Quarterly	47	10
Monthly	48	10
Total	46	11

The results indicate that CSO respondents who attend meetings only when invited have the lowest median participation status index (40.5), while those attending bi-annually, quarterly, or monthly have higher median participation (ranging from 47-48). The Interquartile Range (IQR) is slightly lower (10) for those attending more frequently, suggesting less variability in participation among regular attendees.

A Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test was conducted to determine whether participation status differs significantly across attendance groups. The results indicate a highly significant difference (p = 0.0001), confirming that participation status varies based on meeting attendance frequency.

Table B 0.2 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Equality of Populations Rank Test – Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test

cso_ldc_attend	Obs	Rank sum
Only when invited	114	21077.00
Bi-annually (every six months)	70	18323.50
Quarterly	215	53716.00
Monthly	79	21364.50

chi2(3) = 24.807 Prob = 0.0001

chi2(3) with ties = 24.887 Prob = 0.0001

#### To identify specific group differences, Dunn's pairwise comparison test was conducted:

Table B 0.3 Dunn's pairwise comparison - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

C-1 H		(No	adjustment
Col Mean- Row Mean	Only whe	Bi-annua	Quarterl
Bi-annua	-3.671166 0.0001		
Quarterl	-4.065369 0.0000	0.628229 0.2649	
Monthly	-4.237588 0.0000	-0.383105 0.3508	-1.135077 0.1282

Dunn's Pairwise Comparison of part\_status by cso\_ldc\_attend (No adjustment)

Dunn's test indicates that individuals who attend only when invited have significantly lower participation levels compared to bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees, as evidenced by negative z-scores and statistically significant p-values (p < 0.001). However, no statistically significant differences were found between bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees, suggesting that increasing attendance frequency beyond a bi-annual level does not lead to significant differences in participation.

To further quantify the effect of attendance frequency on participation status, a median regression model was estimated:

Table B 0.4 Quantile Regression (at the median) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Median regre Raw sum of Min sum of	ession F deviations F deviations	1560.5 1509	(about 46)	Number Pseudo	of R2	obs	= = 0	478 .0330	
	part	t_status	Coefficient	Robust std. err.		t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
Bi-annually	cso_ldd (every six r Qua	c_attend months) arterly Monthly	7 7 8	1.928253 1.604284 1.758497	3. 4. 4.	63 36 55	0.000 0.000 0.000	3.211019 3.847612 4.544586	10.78898 10.15239 11.45541
		_cons	40	1.507478	26.	53	0.000	37.03783	42.96217

The quantile regression indicate the following:

- The baseline participation status for those who attend only when invited is 40.
- Those who attend bi-annually or quarterly have a 7-point higher participation status, while those who attend monthly have an 8-point increase.
- All coefficients are statistically significant (p < 0.001), confirming that more frequent attendance is positively associated with higher participation levels.
- However, the marginal difference between bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendance (+7 vs. +8) suggests that attending bi-annually already yields most of the benefits of engagement, corroborating the results of the Dunn's test.

#### Impact of LDC Functionality

The functionality of LDCs plays a crucial role in shaping the relationship between meeting attendance and participation status. The findings suggest that LDC functionality significantly moderates the impact of attendance frequency on participation.

- In high-functioning LDCs, participation is generally higher across all groups, and increasing attendance frequency beyond bi-annual meetings does not result in significant additional benefits.
- On the other hand, in low-functioning LDCs, participation is lower overall, and frequent attendance is essential to achieving higher levels of engagement.

The overall median participation status is equal between high-functioning LDCs (p50 = 46) compared to low-functioning LDCs (p50 = 46). However, the median participation status of those CSOs attending only when invited is different between LDC functionality (High = 43, Low = 39). This indicates that well-functioning LDCs inherently promote higher levels of participation, even for individuals who attend meetings infrequently.

In high-functioning LDCs, increasing CSO attendance frequency beyond bi-annual meetings does not lead to significant increases in participation. The median participation status for those attending bi-annually (p50 = 47), quarterly (p50 = 47), and monthly (p50 = 48.5) remains relatively stable, suggesting that once a certain level of participation is reached, more frequent attendance does not provide additional benefits. However, in low-functioning LDCs, participation levels show a similar trend (bi-annually, p(50) = 46.5, quarterly, p(50) = 47, and monthly, p(50) = 47).

Table B 0.5 Median and Interquartile Range (High LDC Functionality) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Summary for variables: part\_status Group variable: cso\_ldc\_attend

cso_ldc_attend	p50	IQR
Only when invite	43	14
Bi-annually (eve	47	10
Quarterly	47	10.5
Monthly	48.5	10
Total	46	11

Table B 0.6 Median and Interquartile Range (Low LDC Functionality) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Group variable: cso_ldc_attend								
cso_ldc_attend	p50	IQR						
Only when invite Bi-annually (eve	39 46,5	14 12.5						

47

47

46

10

7

12

Quarterly

Monthly

Total

The Kruskal-Wallis test confirms that there is a statistically significant difference in participation across attendance categories for both high- and low-functioning LDCs (Low, p = 0.0009, high, p = 0.0185).

Table B 0.7 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Equality of Populations Rank Test (High LDC Functionality) – Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

. dunntest part\_status if intldc\_fcn == 2, by(cso\_ldc\_attend)

Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test

cso_ldc_attend	Obs	Rank sum
Only when invited	63	6943.50
Bi-annually (every six months)	46	6641.00
Quarterly	128	17965.50
Monthly	34	5306.00

```
chi2(3) = 9.966
Prob = 0.0189
chi2(3) with ties = 10.005
Prob = 0.0185
```

Table B 0.8 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Equality of Populations Rank Test (Low LDC Functionality) – Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test

cso_ldc_attend	Obs	Rank sum
Only when invited	51	3833.50
Bi-annually (every six months)	24	2843.00
Quarterly	87	9567.50
Monthly	45	5284.00

chi2(3) = 16.339 Prob = 0.0010

Prob = 0.001

chi2(3) with ties = 16.390 Prob = 0.0009

Pairwise comparisons using Dunn's test further highlight these differences. In highfunctioning LDCs, individuals who attend only when invited have significantly lower participation than bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees (p < 0.05). However, there is no significant difference among bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees, suggesting that beyond a certain threshold, increasing attendance does not lead to a proportional increase in participation.

In contrast, in low-functioning LDCs, the difference between "only when invited" and more frequent attendees is even more pronounced (p < 0.01). Additionally, bi-annual attendees show marginally lower participation than quarterly attendees, indicating that in weakly functioning LDCs, each incremental increase in attendance frequency contributes to higher participation levels.

Table B 0.9 Dunn's pairwise comparison (High LDC Functionality) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Du	unn's Pairwis	e Compariso (No	on of part_st adjustment)	atus by	<pre>cso_ldc_attend</pre>
Col Mean- Row Mean	Only whe	Bi-annua	Quarterl		
Bi-annua	-2.251385				
	0.0122				
Quarterl	-2.503657	0.298506			
	0.0061	0.3827			
Monthly	-2.754023	-0.660718	-1.040484		
	0.0029	0.2544	0.1491		

Table B 0.10 Dunn's pairwise comparison (Low LDC Functionality) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Dunn's Pairwise Comparison of part\_status by cso\_ldc\_attend

		(100	adjustment
Col Mean- Row Mean	Only whe	Bi-annua	Quarterl
Bi-annua	-2.924197 0.0017		
Quarterl	-3.299773 0.0005	0.615466 0.2691	
Monthly	-3.454473 0.0003	0.068539 0.4727	-0.678474 0.2487

The quantile regression results provide further insights into the relationship between attendance frequency and participation levels under different LDC functionality conditions. In high-functioning LDCs, participation increases only slightly (+4 to +5 points) when individuals attend more frequently, with bi-annual attendance showing only marginal significance (p = 0.056). This suggests that in well-functioning LDCs, other factors—such as established institutional mechanisms and efficient governance—already contribute to high participation, making attendance frequency less influential.

Conversely, in low-functioning LDCs, the impact of attendance frequency is much stronger (+7 to +8 points), and the effects are highly significant (p < 0.01). This indicates that when an LDC is less functional, attending meetings more frequently is a critical factor in boosting participation, as it helps individuals compensate for weaker institutional structures and engagement mechanisms.

Table B 0.11 Quantile Regression (at the median) (High LDC Functionality) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Median regre Raw sum of Min sum of	ession deviations deviations	881 863.5	(about 46)	Number Pseudo	of ol R2	bs = =	0	271 .0199	
				Robust					
	part_:	status	Coefficient	std. err.	t		P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
	cso_ldc_a	attend							
Bi-annually	(every six mo	nths)	4	2.080064	1.9	2	0.056	0954141	8.095414
	Quar	terly	4	1.64262	2.4	4	0.016	.7658639	7.234136
	Mor	nthly	5	2.25667	2.2	2	0.028	.5568684	9.443132
		_cons	43	1.468549	29.2	8	0.000	40.10859	45.89141

Table B 0.12 Quantile Regression (at the median) (High LDC Functionality) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Median regression Raw sum of deviations 679. Min sum of deviations 63	6 (about <b>46</b> )	Number Pseudo	of o R2	bs = =	:	207 0.0625	
part_status	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	t	:	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
cso_ldc_attend Bi-annually (every six months) Quarterly Monthly	7 8 8	2.306751 1.890338 1.931682	3.0 4.2 4.1	)3 23 .4	0.003 0.000 0.000	2.451736 4.272785 4.191267	11.54826 11.72722 11.80873
cons	39	1.705163	22.8	7	0.000	35.6379	42.3621

# **Differences Across LGU Types**

The median participation scores and interquartile ranges (IQRs) suggest that attendance frequency is positively associated with participation, but the strength of this relationship varies across LGU types.

For cities, individuals who attend only when invited have a median participation score of 44 (IQR = 16), whereas those attending bi-annually (47, IQR = 14), quarterly (46, IQR = 9), and monthly (50, IQR = 7) tend to show higher and more consistent participation. The decreasing IQRs suggest that more frequent attendees exhibit less variability in participation levels.

A similar trend is observed in municipalities, where only when invited attendees have the lowest median participation (40, IQR = 16), while bi-annual (48, IQR = 7), quarterly (47, IQR = 9), and monthly attendees (47.5, IQR = 8.5) demonstrate higher and more stable participation levels.

For provinces, differences are less pronounced, with median participation scores ranging narrowly from 40.5 (IQR = 6) for only when invited attendees to 45 (IQR = 9) for monthly attendees. The relatively small IQRs across attendance groups suggest minimal variation in participation based on meeting frequency.

# Table B 0.13 Median and Interquartile Range (Cities) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

cso_ldc_attend	p50	IQR
Only when invite	44	16
Bi-annually (eve	47	14
Quarterly	46	9
Monthly	50 🖕	7
Total	47	10

Table B 0.14 Median and Interquartile Range (Municipalities) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Summary for variables: part\_status Group variable: cso\_ldc\_attend

cso_ldc_attend	p50	IQR
Only when invite	40	16
Bi-annually (eve	48	7
Quarterly	47	9
Monthly	47.5	8.5
Total	47	11

Table B 0.15 Median and Interquartile Range (Provinces) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Summary for variables: part\_status Group variable: cso\_ldc\_attend

cso_ldc_attend	p50	IQR
Only when invite	40.5	6
Bi-annually (eve	41	6
Quarterly	42	11
Monthly	45	9
Total	42	9

The Kruskal-Wallis test assesses whether there are statistically significant differences in participation levels across attendance groups.

- For cities, the test is statistically significant (p = 0.0377), indicating that participation levels differ across groups.
- For municipalities, the test is highly significant p = 0.0013), confirming strong differences in participation across attendance categories.
- For provinces, the test is not significant (p = 0.2484), suggesting no meaningful differences in participation based on attendance frequency.

These results imply that in cities and municipalities, meeting frequency plays a role in participation, whereas in provinces, participation is relatively uniform across groups.

Table B 0.16 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Equality of Populations Rank Test (Cities) – Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test

cso_ldc_attend	Obs	Rank sum
Only when invited	25	996.00
Bi-annually (every six months)	13	754.00
Quarterly	42	2064.50
Monthly	21	1336.50

chi2(3) = 8.445 Prob = 0.0377 chi2(3) with ties = 8.489 Prob = 0.0369

Table B 0.17 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Equality of Populations Rank Test (Municipalities) – Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test

cso_ldc_attend	Obs	Rank sum
Only when invited	67	7442.50
Bi-annually (every six months)	50	7981.00
Quarterly	136	21372.00
Monthly	40	6275.50

chi2(3) = 15.646 Prob = 0.0013

chi2(3) with ties = 15.713 Prob = 0.0013

Table B 0.18 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Equality of Populations Rank Test (Provinces) – Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test

cso_ldc_attend	Obs	Rank sum
Only when invited	22	820.50
Bi-annually (every six months)	7	249.00
Quarterly	37	1570.00
Monthly	18	930.50

chi2(3) = 4.124 Prob = 0.2484 chi2(3) with ties = 4.136 Prob = 0.2472

The Dunn's test is used to determine which specific attendance groups differ significantly in their participation levels. Since the Kruskal-Wallis test was not significant for provinces, Dunn's results for provinces should not be interpreted.

For cities, individuals who attend only when invited have significantly lower participation compared to bi-annual attendees (p = 0.0346) and monthly attendees (p = 0.0030). Additionally, there is a significant difference between quarterly and monthly attendees (p = 0.0318), suggesting that monthly attendees tend to have higher participation than quarterly attendees.

However, no significant differences are found between bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees, indicating that beyond bi-annual attendance, increasing meeting frequency does not consistently raise participation levels.

For municipalities, the "only when invited" group exhibits significantly lower participation than all other groups. Specifically, only when invited attendees differ from biannual (p = 0.0011), quarterly (p = 0.0001), and monthly attendees (p = 0.0033). However, there are no significant differences between bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly groups, reinforcing the pattern that attending at least bi-annually is associated with higher participation, but further increases in meeting frequency do not provide additional benefits.

Overall, Dunn's test results align with the Kruskal-Wallis findings by confirming that meeting frequency significantly influences participation in cities and municipalities, particularly for those attending only when invited. In provinces, where Kruskal-Wallis was not significant, there is no justification for interpreting Dunn's test results.

Table B 0.19 Dunn's pairwise comparison (Cities) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

1	(No	adjustment)
Only whe	Bi-annua	Quarterl
-1.817279 0.0346		
-1.261783 0.1035	0.953631 0.1701	
-2.751602 0.0030	-0.547138 0.2921	-1.854945 0.0318
	Only whe -1.817279 0.0346 -1.261783 0.1035 -2.751602 0.0030	(No Only whe Bi-annua -1.817279 0.0346 -1.261783 0.953631 0.1035 0.1701 -2.751602 -0.547138 0.0030 0.2921

 Table B 0.20 Dunn's pairwise comparison (Municipalities) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC

Attendance

Dunn's Pairwise Comparison of part\_status by cso\_ldc\_attend (No adjustment)

Dunn's Pairwise Comparison of part\_status by cso\_ldc\_attend

Col Mean- Row Mean	Only whe	Bi-annua	Quarterl
Bi-annua	-3.072000 0.0011		
Quarterl	-3.650398 0.0001	0.176857 0.4298	
Monthly	-2.711458 0.0033	0.152358 0.4395	0.017068 0.4932

Table B 0.21 Dunn's pairwise comparison (Provinces) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

#### Dunn's Pairwise Comparison of part\_status by cso\_ldc\_attend (No adjustment)

Col Mean- Row Mean	Only whe	Bi-annua	Quarterl
Bi-annua	0.163103 0.4352		
Quarterl	-0.783343 0.2167	-0.683391 0.2472	
Monthly	-1.859977 0.0314	-1.486002 0.0686	-1.323180 0.0929

The quantile (median) regression analysis estimates the relationship between attendance frequency and participation while adjusting for other factors.

For cities, the results indicate no statistically significant differences between attendance groups. While monthly attendees show slightly higher participation than those attending only when invited (coefficient = 6, p = 0.099), this result does not reach conventional significance thresholds. Similarly, differences between bi-annual, quarterly, and only when invited attendees are not significant. This suggests that while descriptive statistics and Dunn's test suggest a pattern, the relationship between attendance and participation weakens when controlling for other factors.

For municipalities, the quantile regression results strongly support the earlier findings. Compared to those attending only when invited, bi-annual (coefficient = 8, p = 0.001), quarterly (coefficient = 7, p = 0.002), and monthly attendees (coefficient = 7, p = 0.003) all have significantly higher participation. These results confirm that attending meetings at least bi-annually is associated with higher participation in municipalities, even after adjusting for other influences.

For provinces, the regression results align with the Kruskal-Wallis findings, showing no statistically significant differences in participation across attendance groups. This reinforces the conclusion that meeting frequency does not meaningfully impact participation in provincial settings.

Table B 0.22 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Cities) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Median regression Raw sum of deviations 317.5 (au Min sum of deviations 307.5		(about 47)	Number	of obs	=	101	
		Pseudo R		R2	= (	0.0315	
			Robust				
part_:	status	Coefficient	std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
cso_ldc_a	attend						
Bi-annually (every six mor	nths)	3	5.73662	0.52	0.602	-8.385603	14.3856
Quart	terly	2	3.596334	0.56	0.579	-5.137727	9.137727
Mor	nthly	6	3.601084	1.67	0.099	-1.147155	13.14716
	_cons	44	3.355336	13.11	0.000	37.34059	50.65941

Table B 0.23 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Municipalities) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Median regression Raw sum of deviations 969 Min sum of deviations 938.5	(about 47)	Number Pseudo	of obs R2	= (	293 9.0315	
part_status	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
cso_ldc_attend						
Bi-annually (every six months)	8	2.412477	3.32	0.001	3.251746	12.74825
Quarterly	7	2.212808	3.16	0.002	2.644737	11.35526
Monthly	7	2.35116	2.98	0.003	2.372431	11.62757
_cons	40	2.087962	19.16	0.000	35.89046	44.10954

Table B 0.24 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Provinces) - Participation Status Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Median regression	234	(about 42)	Number	of obs	=	84	
Min sum of deviations 224.5		Pse		R2	= 0.	0406	
			Robust				
part_s	tatus	Coefficient	std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
cso_ldc_a	attend						
Bi-annually (every six mon	ths)	0	2.934183	0.00	1.000	-5.839209	5.839209
Quart	erly	1	2.204166	0.45	0.651	-3.386431	5.386431
Mon	thly	4	2.352719	1.70	0.093	6820599	8.68206
	_cons	41	1.441575	28.44	0.000	38.13117	43.86883

# Does frequency of participation impact the perception of results or effectiveness of Local Development Councils?

This analysis examines the relationship between the frequency of CSO attendance at LDC meetings and the perceived achievement of participatory governance results. The results are structured into descriptive statistics, the Kruskal-Wallis test, Dunn's pairwise comparisons, and quantile regression analysis.

# **Overall Trends**

The median and interquartile range (IQR) values provide an initial view of how the perceived achievement of participatory governance varies across different attendance groups.

- CSOs that attend "only when invited" have the lowest median perceived results score (15, IQR = 4).
- CSOs that attend bi-annually, quarterly, or monthly all have a higher median results score of 17 (IQR = 3).
- The overall median across all groups is 16, with an IQR of 3, indicating that most values are clustered around 16-17.

These results suggest that more frequent attendance is associated with a higher perception of achieving participatory governance outcomes, with occasional attendees (only when invited) having the lowest perceived success. However, bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees have similar median values, indicating that further increases in attendance frequency beyond bi-annual meetings may not strongly affect perceived governance success.

Table B 0.1 Median and Interquartile Range - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Summary for variables: results Group variable: cso\_ldc\_attend

cso_ldc_attend	p50	IQR
Only when invite	15	4
Bi-annually (eve	17	3
Quarterly	17	3
Monthly	17	3
Total	16	3

- -

\_ \_

The Kruskal-Wallis test examines whether the distribution of perceived results scores differs significantly across attendance groups. The test statistic is  $\chi^2(3) = 20.570$ , with a p-value of 0.0001, indicating that there are statistically significant differences in perceived governance results across attendance groups. Since the Kruskal-Wallis test is significant, we can conclude that attendance frequency plays a role in shaping perceptions of participatory governance results.

Table B 0.2 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Equality of Populations Rank Test – Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test

cso_ldc_attend	0bs	Rank sum
Only when invited	114	21689.50
Bi-annually (every six months)	70	17740.50
Quarterly	215	54312.00
Monthly	79	20739.00

chi2(3) = 19.331Prob = 0.0002chi2(3) with ties = 20.570

Prob = 0.0001

The Dunn's test compares participation results between each pair of attendance groups. CSOs that attend "only when invited" perceive significantly lower participatory governance results compared to all other groups. There are no statistically significant differences in perceived results between bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees. Based on the analysis, CSOs that attend "only when invited" report significantly lower perceived achievement of participatory governance outcomes compared to more frequent attendees. However, there is no significant difference among those attending bi-annually, quarterly, or monthly, suggesting that attending at least bi-annually is sufficient to achieve higher perceived results, and additional frequency does not substantially improve perceptions.

Table B 0.3 Dunn's pairwise comparison - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

- <b>-</b> I		(110	augusemene)
Col Mean- Row Mean	Only whe	Bi-annua	Quarterl
Bi-annua	-3.107025 0.0009		
Quarterl	-4.019202 0.0000	0.044595 0.4822	
Monthly	-3.686211 0.0001	-0.413243 0.3397	-0.562223 0.2870

Dunn's Pairwise Comparison of results by cso\_ldc\_attend (No adjustment)

To further analyze the relationship between attendance frequency and perceived governance results, quantile (median) regression is used to estimate the differences. Compared to CSOs that attend "only when invited":

- Bi-annual attendees perceive participatory governance results to be 2 points higher on average (coefficient = 2, p < 0.001).
- Quarterly attendees also perceive results to be 2 points higher (coefficient = 2, p < 0.001).</li>
- Monthly attendees have a similar increase of 2 points (coefficient = 2, p < 0.001).

The regression confirms that all three groups attending at least bi-annually report significantly higher perceived results compared to those attending only when invited. The regression results align with the Dunn's test findings: (1) Only when invited attendees perceive significantly lower results compared to all other groups; (2) Attending bi-annually, quarterly, or monthly is associated with a 2-point increase in perceived governance results and (3) there are no substantial differences in perceived results between bi-annual, quarterly, and monthly attendees.

Table B 0.4 Quantile Regression (at the median) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Median regression Raw sum of deviations 414	(about 16)	Number	of ob	s =	478	
Min sum of deviations 403	(about 10) Pseudo		R2	=	0.0266	
	o	Robust		<b>D</b>		
results	Coefficient	std. err.	t	P> t	[ [95% cont.	intervalj
cso_ldc_attend						
Bi-annually (every six months)	2	.5165411	3.87	0.000	.9850064	3.014994
Quarterly	2	.3328918	6.01	0.000	0 1.345874	2.654126
Monthly	2	.2945277	6.79	0.000	0 1.421259	2.578741
cons	15	.1884348	79.60	0.000	0 14.62973	15.37027

# Impact of LDC Functionality

The median scores and interquartile ranges (IQRs) reveal differences in perceived governance outcomes across CSO attendance groups within high- and low-functionality LDCs.

In both LDC types, more frequent attendance is associated with higher perceived governance results. CSOs in high-functionality LDCs report slightly higher perceived results across all attendance categories, with the overall median score being 17, compared to 16 in low-functionality LDCs. The IQR is slightly narrower in high-functionality LDCs, particularly for monthly attendees (IQR = 2 vs. IQR = 3 in low-functionality LDCs), suggesting more consistency in perceived results where LDCs function effectively.

Table B 0.5 Median and Interquartile Range (High LDC Functionality) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

# Summary for variables: results Group variable: cso\_ldc\_attend

cso_ldc_attend	p50	IQR
Only when invite	16	4
Bi-annually (eve	17	3
Quarterly	17	3
Monthly	17	2
Total	17	3

#### Low

Table B 0.6 Median and Interquartile Range (Low LDC Functionality) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Summary for variables: results Group variable: cso\_ldc\_attend

cso_ldc_attend	p50	IQR
Only when invite	15	4
Bi-annually (eve	16.5	3
Quarterly	16	3
Monthly	17	3
Total	16	3

The Kruskal-Wallis test assesses whether participation frequency significantly impacts perceived governance results within high- and low-functionality LDCs. For high-functionality LDCs, the test statistics are significant ( $\chi^2(3) = 13.422$ , p = 0.0038), indicating that participation frequency influences perceived governance results in well-functioning LDCs. For lowfunctionality LDCs the results are not statistically significant ay p 0.05 ( $\chi^2(3) = 7.496$ , p = 0.0577), but borderline significant, suggesting that participation frequency may still play a role but is less influential in low-functionality LDCs. Overall, the relationship between CSO attendance and perceived governance results is stronger in high-functionality LDCs (statistically significant), while it is weaker in low-functionality LDCs (only marginal significance). This suggests that in effective LDCs, attending meetings more frequently is more strongly associated with higher perceived governance outcomes. Table B 0.7 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Equality of Populations Rank Test (High LDC Functionality) – Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test

cso_ldc_attend	0bs	Rank sum
Only when invited	63	6657.50
Bi-annually (every six months)	46	6581.50
Quarterly	128	18491.50

chi2(3) = 12.504 Prob = 0.0058 chi2(3) with ties = 13.422

Prob = 0.0038

Table B 0.8 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Equality of Populations Rank Test (Low LDC Functionality) – ParticipatoryGovernance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test

cso_ldc_attend	0bs	Rank sum
Only when invited	51	4356.00
Bi-annually (every six months)	24	2579.50
Quarterly	87	9379.00
Monthly	45	5213.50

chi2(3) = 7.106 Prob = 0.0686

chi2(3) with ties = 7.496 Prob = 0.0577

The Dunn's test identifies which specific CSO attendance groups significantly differ in their perceived governance results. In both cases of high and low LDC functionality, CSOs attending only when invited report significantly lower perceived governance results compared to more frequent attendees. However, the gap between only-when-invited and other groups is more pronounced in high-functionality LDCs (p-values are smaller, indicating stronger significance). In low-functionality LDCs, the impact of attendance on perceptions is weaker, with bi-annual attendance showing only marginal significance compared to only when invited (p = 0.0632).

Table B 0.9 Dunn's pairwise comparison (High LDC Functionality) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

		(No adjustment)		
Col Mean- Row Mean	Only whe	Bi-annua	Quarterl	
Bi-annua	-2.549331 0.0054			
Quarterl	-3.331828 0.0004	-0.106792 0.4575		
Monthly	-2.800044 0.0026	-0.448530 0.3269	-0.430630 0.3334	

Dunn's Pairwise Comparison of results by cso\_ldc\_attend (No adjustment)

Table B 0.10 Dunn's pairwise comparison (Low LDC Functionality) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

1	I	(110	aajabemene
Col Mean-			
Row Mean	Only whe	Bi-annua	Quarterl
Bi-annua	-1.528593		
	0.0632		
Quarterl	-2.177183	-0.024202	
	0.0147	0.4903	
Monthly	-2.552320	-0.568231	-0.751808
	0.0054	0.2849	0.2261

Dunn's Pairwise Comparison of results by cso\_ldc\_attend (No adjustment)

The quantile regression model estimates the relationship between CSO attendance frequency and perceived governance results while adjusting for other influences. In highfunctionality LDCs, while Dunn's test finds differences between only-when-invited and more frequent attendees, the quantile regression does not detect significant differences after controlling for other factors. In low-functionality LDCs, the regression finds a significant increase (+2 points) in perceived results for monthly attendees compared to only-when-invited (p < 0.001). These findings indicate that in high-functionality LDCs, governance quality may already be high across attendance groups, weakening the effect of attendance on perceived results. Conversely, in low-functionality LDCs, only frequent attendees (monthly) perceive significantly better governance outcomes, suggesting that engagement is necessary to overcome weak institutional performance.
Table B 0.11 Quantile Regression (at the median) (High LDC Functionality) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Median regression Raw sum of deviations 224	(about 17)	Number	of obs	=	271	
Min sum of deviations 216.5	(00000 17)	Pseudo	R2	=	0.0335	
		Robust				
results	Coefficient	std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
cso_ldc_attend						
Bi-annually (every six months)	1	.6458842	1.55	0.123	271674	2.271674
Quarterly	1	.512545	1.95	0.052	009144	2.009144
Monthly	1	.708707	1.41	0.159	3953651	2.395365
cons	16	.4195853	38.13	0.000	15.17388	16.82612

Table B 0.12 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Low LDC Functionality) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Median regression	(about 16)	Number	of obs	=	207	
Min sum of deviations 183.5	(00000 10)	Pseudo	R2	=	0.0161	
		Robust				
results	Coefficient	std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
cso_ldc_attend						
Bi-annually (every six months)	1	.9561891	1.05	0.297	8853361	2.885336
Quarterly	1	.5339647	1.87	0.063	0528282	2.052828
Monthly	2	.3113187	6.42	0.000	1.386167	2.613833
cons	15	.2131453	70.37	0.000	14.57974	15.42026

#### Differences across LGU Types

The median scores and interquartile ranges (IQRs) provide an initial comparison of how CSO attendance frequency correlates with perceived governance success across different LGUs. Cities have the highest perceived results scores across all attendance groups (Median = 18), suggesting stronger participatory governance mechanisms. Municipalities and provinces show lower perceived results (Median = 16), with wider IQRs, indicating greater variability in governance outcomes. The effect of meeting frequency appears weaker in provinces, where the increase in perceived results is smaller across attendance groups.

Table B 0.13 Median and Interquartile Range (Cities) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Summary for variables: results Group variable: cso\_ldc\_attend

cso_ldc_attend	p50	IQR
Only when invite	17	4
Bi-annually (eve	18	3
Quarterly	18	3
Monthly	18	1
Total	18	3

Table B 0.14 Median and Interquartile Range (Municipalities) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Summary for variables: results Group variable: cso\_ldc\_attend

cso_ldc_attend	p50	IQR
Only when invite	15	5
Bi-annually (eve	17	3
Quarterly	17	3
Monthly	16	2.5
Total	16	3

Table B 0.15 Median and Interquartile Range (Provinces) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Summary for variables: results Group variable: cso\_ldc\_attend

cso_ldc_attend	p50	IQR
Only when invite	15	5
Bi-annually (eve	15	4
Quarterly	16	2
Monthly	16.5	2
Total	16	2

The Kruskal-Wallis test evaluates whether CSO attendance frequency significantly affects perceived governance results within each LGU type. The relationship between attendance and perceived governance success is strongest in municipalities and provinces (both significant), while it is not significant in cities. This suggests that in cities, governance mechanisms may already be strong, reducing the impact of attendance frequency on perceptions. In contrast, municipalities and provinces exhibit more variation, where attendance frequency influences perceived effectiveness. Table B 0.16 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Equality of Populations Rank Test (Cities) – Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test

cso_ldc_attend	0bs	Rank sum
Only when invited	25	1036.00
Bi-annually (every six months)	13	681.50
Quarterly	42	2181.50
Monthly	21	1252.00

chi2(3) = 4.553 Prob = 0.2076 chi2(3) with ties = 5.257

Prob = **0.1539** 

Table B 0.17 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Equality of Populations Rank Test (Municipalities) – Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test

cso_ldc_attend	Obs	Rank sum
Only when invited Bi-annually (every six months) Quarterly	67 50 136	7954.50 7861.00 21439.50
Monthly	40	5816.00

chi2(3) = 10.350 Prob = 0.0158 chi2(3) with ties = 11.018 Prob = 0.0116 Table B 0.18 Results of Kruskal-Wallis Equality of Populations Rank Test (Provinces) – Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

#### Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test

cso_ldc_attend	0bs	Rank sum
Only when invited	22	672.50
Bi-annually (every six months)	7	312.50
Quarterly	37	1644.00
Monthly	18	941.00

chi2(3) = 8.443 Prob = 0.0377 chi2(3) with ties = 8.714 Prob = 0.0333

The Dunn's test identifies which specific CSO attendance groups have significantly different perceived governance results. The effect of attendance frequency is weakest in cities (only one significant pairwise difference). In municipalities and provinces, "only when invited" attendees report significantly lower governance results compared to more frequent attendees. Beyond bi-annual attendance, increasing meeting frequency does not further improve perceived results.

Table B 0.19 Dunn's pairwise comparison (Cities) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

1		<b>(</b> )	
Col Mean- Row Mean	Only whe	Bi-annua	Quarterl
Bi-annua	-1.178003 0.1194		
Quarterl	-1.524540 0.0637	0.055767 0.4778	
Monthly	-2.252395 0.0121	-0.747832 0.2273	-1.053700 0.1460

Dunn's Pairwise Comparison of results by cso\_ldc\_attend (No adjustment) Table B 0.20 Dunn's pairwise comparison (Municipalities) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

		(No adjustment)		
Col Mean- Row Mean	Only whe	Bi-annua	Quarterl	
Bi-annua	-2.508413 0.0061			
Quarterl	-3.175256 0.0007	-0.031173 0.4876		
Monthly	-1.625739 0.0520	0.678522 0.2487	0.828890 0.2036	

Dunn's Pairwise Comparison of results by cso\_ldc\_attend (No adjustment)

Table B 0.21 Dunn's pairwise comparison (Provinces) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

		Dunn's P	airwise	Comparis	on of results	by cs	so_ldc_	attend
				(No	adjustment)	-		
Col	Mean-							
Row	Mean	Only	whe B	i-annua	Quarterl			
<b>D</b> <sup>2</sup>		4 250	000					

Bi-annua	-1.350906 0.0884		
Quarterl	-2.144904 0.0160	0.021264 0.4915	
Monthly	-2.845081 0.0022	-0.713913 0.2376	-1.137086 0.1278

The quantile regression estimates the relationship between CSO attendance frequency and perceived governance results while controlling for additional influences. In municipalities, bi-annual and quarterly attendance is significantly associated with better perceived governance outcomes. In cities and provinces, once other factors are controlled for, attendance frequency does not significantly affect perceived governance success. Table B 0.22 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Cities) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Median regression		Number of obs =	101
Raw sum of deviations	82.5 (about 18)		
Min sum of deviations	78	Pseudo R2 =	0.0545

results	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	. interval]
cso_ldc_attend Bi-annually (every six months) Quarterly Monthly	1 1 1	1.229276 .8085321 .7650771	0.81 1.24 1.31	0.418 0.219 0.194	-1.439772 6047123 5184662	3.439772 2.604712 2.518466
_cons	17	.7190005	23.64	0.000	15.57298	18.42702

Table B 0.23 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Municipalities) - Participatory Governance Results Index andFrequency of LDC Attendance

Median regression Raw sum of deviations 236.5	(about 16)	Number	of obs	=	293	
Min sum of deviations 229	(	Pseudo	R2	=	0.0317	
		Robust				
results	Coefficient	std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
cso_ldc_attend						
Bi-annually (every six months)	2	.3193968	6.26	0.000	1.371361	2.628639
Quarterly	2	.3598685	5.56	0.000	1.291704	2.708296
Monthly	1	.579386	1.73	0.085	1403512	2.140351
cons	15	.2087962	71.84	0.000	9 14.58905	15.41095

Table B 0.24 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Provinces) - Participatory Governance Results Index and Frequency of LDC Attendance

Median regression Raw sum of deviations	81	(about 16)	Number	of obs	5 =	84	
Min sum of deviations	77.5	(42042 10)	Pseudo	R2	= 0	.0432	
			Robust				
	results	Coefficient	std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
cso ld	c attend						
Bi-annually (every six	_ months)	0	1.956122	0.00	1.000	-3.892806	3.892806
Qu	arterly	1	1.030005	0.97	0.335	-1.049776	3.049776
	Monthly	1	1.098104	0.91	0.365	-1.185297	3.185297
	_cons	15	.9610498	15.61	0.000	13.08745	16.91255

# COMPARING PERCEIVED CSO PARTICIPATION BETWEEN CSOs AND LGUS

This analysis examines the difference between CSOs' self-reported participation status and LGUs' perception of CSO participation across different LDC functions. The key variable, participation status, is measured separately for CSOs (self-reported participation) and LGUs (perceived CSO participation). The analysis includes descriptive statistics, a Mann-Whitney U test (Wilcoxon rank-sum test), and quantile regression (median regression).

#### **Overall Trends**

The median and interquartile range summarize the overall differences in participation status responses between CSOs and LGUs. CSOs report a median participation status of 46 (IQR = 11). LGUs perceive CSO participation to be higher, with a median of 49 (IQR = 9). LGUs consistently rate CSO participation higher than CSOs rate themselves. The interquartile range for LGUs (IQR = 9) is narrower than for CSOs (IQR = 11), suggesting that LGU perceptions of CSO participation are more consistent, while CSOs report greater variability in their own experiences. This discrepancy suggests that LGUs might be overestimating CSO engagement, while CSOs may feel their actual participation is lower than what LGUs perceive.

Table B 0.1 Median and Interquartile Range - Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

Summary for variables: part_status Group variable: survey_tag (survey_tag)					
survey_tag	p50	IQR			
CSO LGU	46 49	11 9			
Total	48	10			

The Mann-Whitney U test (Wilcoxon rank-sum test) evaluates whether the distribution of participation status responses differ between CSOs and LGUs. The statistically significant p-value (p < 0.001) confirms that there is a systematic difference between CSOs' self-reported participation and LGUs' perception of CSO participation. Since LGUs have a higher median and rank sum, this suggests that LGUs consistently perceive CSO participation as greater than what CSOs report themselves. The negative z-score (-5.624) indicates that CSOs systematically rate their participation lower than LGUs do, reinforcing the perception gap.

Table B 0.2 Results of Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) Test– Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

survey_tag	Obs	Rank sum	Expected			
CSO LGU	497 495	221451.5 271076.5	246760.5 245767.5			
Combined	992	492528	492528			
Unadjusted van Adjustment fon	riance 203 r ties -1030	357741 534.05				
Adjusted variance 20254107						
H0: part_s~s(s z = · Prob >  z  = (	survey~g==CS( -5.624 0.0000	)) = part_s~	s(survey~g==LGU)			

Two-sample Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) test

The quantile (median) regression model estimates the incremental difference of LGUs' perception on CSOs' participation status. LGUs rate CSO participation 3 points higher than CSOs do (coefficient = 3, p < 0.001). LGUs still perceive CSO participation to be significantly higher than CSOs self-report (by approximately 3 points). The statistical significance (p < 0.001) confirms that this difference is not random but represents a systematic discrepancy.

Table B 0.3 Quantile Regression (at the median) - Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

Median regres Raw sum of Min sum of	sion deviations deviations	3040.5 (abou 2970	t <b>48</b> )	Num Pse	ber of a udo R2	obs = =	992 0.0232
part_status	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	t	P> t	[95%	conf.	interval]
survey_tag LGU _cons	3 46	.5759907 .4604578	5.21 99.90	0.000 0.000	1.869 45.09	9697 9641	4.130303 46.90359

#### Impact of LDC Functionality

Across both high- and low-functionality LDCs, LGUs rate CSO participation as higher than what CSOs report themselves (median of 49 for LGUs vs. 46 for CSOs). The gap between CSO and LGU medians is consistent across both LDC types (3-point difference). Variability (IQR) is slightly higher in low-functionality LDCs for both CSOs and LGUs, suggesting greater disagreement or inconsistency in perceptions in weaker LDCs. The slightly higher overall median in high-functionality LDCs (48 vs. 47 in low-functionality LDCs) suggests that participatory governance processes might be slightly better institutionalized in stronger LDCs.

Table B 0.4 Median and Interquartile Range (High LDC Functionality) - Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

Summary for	variables: par	t_status
Group variat	ole: survey_tag	(survey_tag)
survey_tag	p50	IQR
CSO	46	11
LGU	49	8
Total	48	10

Table B 0.5 Median and Interquartile Range (Low LDC Functionality) - Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

Summary for variables: part\_status
Group variable: survey\_tag (survey\_tag)

survey_tag	р50	IQR
CSO LGU	46 49	10 9.5
Total	47	10

The Mann-Whitney U test show that in both high- and low-functionality LDCs, LGUs systematically perceive CSOs as being more engaged than CSOs report themselves. The difference is larger in high-functionality LDCs (z = -4.532, p=0.000) compared to low-functionality LDCs (z = -3.291, p=0010), suggesting that the discrepancy in participation perceptions is even more pronounced in better-functioning LDCs. This could mean that even in LDCs that function well, CSOs do not feel as engaged as LGUs perceive them to be. The smaller z-value in low-functionality LDCs suggests that the perception gap may be slightly less pronounced in weaker LDCs—possibly because CSO participation is lower overall, making discrepancies in perception smaller.

Table B 0.6 Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) Test (High LDC Functionality) – Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

survey_tag	Obs	Rank sum	Expected		
CS0	282	71509	80370		
LGU	287	90656	81/95		
Combined	569	162165	162165		
Unadjusted variance 3844365.00 Adjustment for ties -20693.15					
Adjusted variance 3823671.85					
H0: part_s~s(s z = - Prob >  z  = 6	survey~g==CSC -4.532 3.0000	)) = part_s~:	s(survey~g==LGU)		

Two-sample Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) test

Table B 0.7 Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) Test (Low LDC Functionality) – Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

Two-sample Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) test

survey_tag	Obs	Rank sum	Expected		
CSO	215	41454	45580		
LGU	208	48222	44096		
Combined	423	89676	89676		
Unadjusted variance <b>1580106.67</b> Adjustment for ties - <b>7913.30</b>					
Adjusted variance 1572193.37					
H0: part_s~s(s z = - Prob >  z  = 0	survey~g==CSC -3.291 0.0010	)) = part_s~:	s(survey~g==LGU)		

Results of quantile regression indicate that in both high- and low-functionality LDCs, LGUs rate CSO participation 3 points higher than CSOs rate themselves, and this difference is statistically significant (p < 0.001). Despite differences in LDC functionality, the magnitude of the perception gap remains the same (3 points), indicating that CSOs consistently feel less engaged than LGUs perceive them to be, regardless of institutional strength.

Table B 0.8 Quantile Regression (at the median) (High LDC Functionality) - Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

Median regress Raw sum of o Min sum of o	sion deviations 1 deviations	.721.5 (about 1677	t 48)	Num Pse	ber of obs = udo R2 =	569 0.0258
part_status	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
survey_tag LGU _cons	3 46	.810266 .6348732	3.70 72.46	0.000 0.000	1.408511 44.75301	4.591489 47.24699

Table B 0.9 Quantile Regression (at the median) (High LDC Functionality) - Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

Median regres Raw sum of Min sum of	sion deviations deviations	1309.5 (abou 1293	t <b>47</b> )	Nur Pse	uber of a	obs = =	423 0.0126
part_status	Coefficient	Robust std.err.	t	P> t	[95%	conf.	interval]
survey_tag LGU _cons	3 46	.7715493 .6586708	3.89 69.84	0.000 0.000	1.483 44.70	3431 9531	4.516569 47.29469

#### Differences across LGU Types

In all LGU types, LGUs rate CSO participation median was higher than what CSOs report themselves. The participation gap appears largest in provinces, where LGUs rate participation 5 points higher than CSOs (median = 47 vs. 42). Cities and municipalities show smaller gaps (2-3 points), suggesting that perception differences may be more pronounced in provinces, where engagement structures may be weaker. Municipalities have the narrowest IQR for LGUs (7), indicating more consistent LGU perceptions, while CSOs report a wider range of experiences (IQR = 11).

Table B 0.10 Median and Interquartile Range (Cities) - Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

Group variat	ole: survey_tag	(survey_tag)
survey_tag	р50	IQR
CSO LGU	47 49	10 9.5
Total	48	10

Summary for variables: part\_status

Table B 0.11 Median and Interquartile Range (Municipalities) - Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

Summary	for	vari	lables:	part_	_status	
Group v	ariał	ole:	survey_	tag	(survey_	_tag)

survey_tag	р50	IQR
CSO LGU	47 50	11 7
Total	48	9

Table B 0.12 Median and Interquartile Range (Provinces) - Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

Summary for variables: part\_status
Group variable: survey\_tag (survey\_tag)

survey_tag	p50	IQR
CSO LGU	42 47	10 11
Total	44	11

Mann-Whitney U test indicates that in cities, the difference between CSO and LGU perceptions is not statistically significant (p = 0.0769), suggesting a smaller gap in participation perceptions. In municipalities, the difference is highly significant (p < 0.001), confirming that LGUs systematically perceive CSO participation to be higher than what CSOs report. In provinces, the difference is also significant (p = 0.0030), with LGUs perceiving CSO participation as much higher than what CSOs report, similar to municipalities but slightly less pronounced. Overall, the perception gap is strongest in municipalities and provinces, but not statistically significant in cities.

Table B 0.13 Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) Test (Cities) – Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

survey_tag	Obs	Rank s	sum E	xpected
CSO LGU	105 104	102 116	254 591	11025 10920
Combined	209	219	945	21945
Unadjusted var Adjustment for	riance 19 r ties -	1100.00 1128.37		
Adjusted varia	ance 18	9971.63		
H0: part_s~s(s z = - Prob >  z  = 0	survey~g==C -1.769 0.0769	:S0) = par	rt_s~s(s	urvey~g==LGU)

Two-sample Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) test

Table B 0.14 Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) Test (Municipalities) – Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

survey_tag	Obs	Rank sum	Expected		
CSO LGU	305 304	83470 102275	93025 92720		
Combined	609	185745	185745		
Unadjusted variance <b>4713266.67</b> Adjustment for ties - <b>29481.96</b>					
Adjusted varia	ance 46837	784.71			
H0: part_s~s(s z = - Prob >  z  = 0	survey~g==CS( -4.415 0.0000	)) = part_s^	⊳s(survey∼g==LGU)		

Two-sample Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) test

Table B 0.15 Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) Test (Provinces) – Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

survey_tag	Obs	Rank sum	Expected
CSO	87	6629	7612.5
LGU	87	8596	7612.5
Combined	174	15225	15225
Unadjusted van Adjustment for	riance 110 r ties -	381.25 335.30	
Adjusted varia	ance 110	045.95	
H0: part_s~s(s z = -	survey~g==CS - <b>2.965</b>	0) = part_s~	√s(survey~g==LGU
Prob >  z  = 0	0.0030		
Exact prob = 0	0.0029		

Two-sample Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitney) test

Lastly, quantile regression shows that in cities, the perception gap is not statistically significant (p = 0.121), meaning CSOs and LGUs have relatively aligned perceptions of participation. In municipalities, LGUs rate CSO participation 3 points higher than CSOs (p < 0.001), confirming a strong perception gap. In provinces, LGUs rate CSO participation 5 points higher than CSOs (p < 0.01), the largest gap among LGU types.

The perception gap increases from cities (2 points, not significant) to municipalities (3 points, significant) to provinces (5 points, significant), suggesting that the discrepancy in perceptions is greater in less urbanized and less structured LGUs.

Median regres Raw sum of	sion deviations	661 (about	48)	Num	ber of o	bs =	209
Min sum of	deviations	650.5		Pse	udo R2	=	0.0159
part_status	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	t	P> t	[95%	conf.	interval]
survey_tag LGU _cons	2 47	1.284039 1.043173	1.56 45.05	0.121 0.000	5314 44.94	715 339	4.531471 49.05661

Table B 0.16 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Cities) - Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

Table B 0.17 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Municipalities) - Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

Median regression Raw sum of deviation		1780 (about 48)		Num	ber of obs =	= 609
Min sum of	deviations	1740.5		Pse	udo R2 =	= 0.0222
part_status	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	t	P> t	[95% cont	f. interval]
survey_tag LGU _cons	3 47	.6248182 .4995588	4.80 94.08	0.000 0.000	1.772932 46.01893	4.227068 47.98107

Table B 0.18 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Provinces) - Difference in perceived participation of CSOs

Median regression Raw sum of deviations		549.5 (about 44)		Number of obs =			174	
Min sum of	deviations	525	,	Pse	udo R2	=	0.0446	
part_status	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	t	P> t	[95%	conf.	interval]	
survey_tag LGU _cons	5 42	1.637194 1.0781	3.05 38.96	0.003 0.000	1.76 39.8	8421 7199	8.231579 44.12801	

# PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE STATEMENTS

# Statement 1: CSO accreditation and LDC membership selection satisfy the requirements of the national guidelines.

The results provide insights into the perception of whether CSO accreditation and LDC membership selection satisfy the requirements of national guidelines. The following are the statistically significant findings:

• Significant differences in agreement in the distributions of responses across cities, municipalities, and provinces. In particular, with municipalities' responses have less proportion of agreement versus cities and provinces.

### By LDC Functionality

The results show that respondents from high-functionality LDCs tend to agree more strongly (60.63% strongly agree) that CSO accreditation and LDC membership selection meet national guidelines compared to those from low-functionality LDCs (52.96% strongly agree). When agreement is analyzed together, agreement between high and low-functionality LDCs are at par. The Pearson chi2 test suggests that while there is variation, the difference is not statistically significant at the 95% confidence level (p = 0.1858).

	Statement 1								
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total		
Low	6	2	5	12	174	224	423		
	1.418	0.473	1.182	2.837	41.135	52.955	100		
High	4	2	9	16	193	345	569		
	0.703	0.351	1.582	2.812	33.919	60.633	100		
Total	10	4	14	28	367	569	992		
	1.008	0.403	1.411	2.823	36.996	57.359	100		
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	7.50								
Prob.	0.1858								

Table B 0.1 Statement 1 – Responses by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LGU Type

The chi-squared test (p = 0.0000) confirms significant differences in perceptions across LGU types, with general agreement (sum of agree and strongly agree) highest among provinces (94.8%, 69.5% strongly agree, 25.3% agree) and cities (94.3%, 67.9% strongly agree, 26.3% agree), while municipalities show lower agreement (84.3% 50.24% strongly agree, 44.0% agree). This suggests that accreditation and LDC membership selection are viewed as more compliant in higher-tier LGUs. Municipalities exhibit slightly higher total disagreement (1.97%), indicating potential challenges in implementation at the local level.

Table B 0.2 Statement 1 – Responses by LGU Type

			S	statement 1			
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
City	1	0	0	11	55	142	209
	0.478	0	0	5.263	26.316	67.943	100
Municipality	9	3	9	14	268	306	609

	1.478	0.493	1.478	2.299	44.007	50.246	100
Province	0	1	5	3	44	121	174
	0	0.575	2.874	1.724	25.287	69.540	100
Total	10	4	14	28	367	569	992
	1.008	0.403	1.411	2.823	36.996	57.359	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	51.05						
Prob.	0.0000						

#### By Respondent Group

LGU respondents exhibit slightly higher agreement levels than CSO representatives, indicating that government officers perceive accreditation and selection as more compliant with national guidelines than CSOs do. The Pearson Chi2 test (p = 0.2682) suggests that while there is a difference, it is not statistically significant.

Table B 0.3 Statement 1 – Responses by Respondent Group

	Statement 1									
Respondent Group	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total			
CSO	5	3	10	17	190	272	497			
	1.006	0.604	2.012	3.421	38.229	54.728	100			
LGU	5	1	4	11	177	297	495			
	1.010	0.202	0.808	2.222	35.758	60	100			
Total	10	4	14	28	367	569	992			
	1.008	0.403	1.411	2.823	36.996	57.359	100			
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	6.41									
Prob.	0.2682									

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LDC Functionality x Respondent Group

These tables further disaggregates responses by LDC functionality while also differentiating between CSO and LGU respondents. Among CSOs, those in high-functionality LDCs express stronger agreement compared to those in low-functionality LDCs. However, the differences are not stark. Among LGUs, those in high-functionality LDCs also express stronger agreement. The Pearson Chi2 tests (p = 0.5595 for CSOs and p = 0.1953 for LGUs) indicate that while there are observable differences, they are not strongly statistically significant.

Table B 0.4 Statement 1 - Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: CSO

		Statement 1										
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total					
Low	3	1	3	9	89	110	215					

	1.395	0.465	1.395	4.186	41.395	51.163	100
High	2	2	7	8	101	162	282
	0.709	0.709	2.482	2.837	35.816	57.447	100
Total	5	3	10	17	190	272	497
	1.006	0.604	2.012	3.421	38.229	54.728	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	3.93						
Prob.	0.5595						

Table B 0.5 Statement 1 - Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: LGU

		Statement 1							
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total		
Low	3	1	2	3	85	114	208		
	1.442	0.481	0.962	1.442	40.865	54.808	100		
High	2	0	2	8	92	183	287		
	0.697	0	0.697	2.787	32.056	63.763	100		
Total	5	1	4	11	177	297	495		
	1.010	0.202	0.808	2.222	35.758	60	100		
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	7.36								
Prob.	0.1953								

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Statement 2: LDC-CSO members are clearly informed about the different ways of participating in the LDC, including its committees and other consultative activities.

The responses to Statement 2 reveal important insights into how stakeholders perceive the accessibility and transparency of participation mechanisms. The following statistically significant relationships arise from the analysis:

- Higher-functionality LDCs have significantly more respondents agreeing that they are well-informed about participation mechanisms.
- CSOs in high-functionality LDCs are significantly more likely to feel informed about participation opportunities compared to those in low-functionality LDCs.
- CSO respondents from municipalities and cities report higher levels of awareness compared to those from provinces.
- Among LGU respondents, provincial officials report significantly higher awareness levels than their city and municipal counterparts.

#### By LDC Functionality

The chi-square test (p = 0.0032) is statistically significant, indicating that perceptions of being informed about LDC participation mechanisms differ meaningfully based on LDC

functionality. Respondents from high-functionality LDCs report a higher overall agreement rate (94.7%, comprising 49.7% agree and 44.9% strongly agree) compared to those from low-functionality LDCs (90.5%, with 46.6% agree and 44.0% strongly agree).

Ctata ma a mt 3

Table B 0.1	Statement 2 -	Responses	by LDC	Functionality
-------------	---------------	-----------	--------	---------------

		Statement 2								
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total			
Low	6	7	10	17	197	186	423			
	1.418	1.655	2.364	4.019	46.572	43.972	100			
High	1	2	19	8	283	256	569			
	0.176	0.351	3.339	1.406	49.736	44.991	100			
Total	7	9	29	25	480	442	992			
	0.706	0.907	2.923	2.520	48.387	44.556	100			
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	17.77									
Prob.	0.0032									

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LGU Type

With a chi-square p-value of 0.3318, there is no statistically significant difference in perceptions across LGU types (City, Municipality, Province). Agreement levels are relatively consistent: 92.9% in municipalities (51.4% agree, 41.5% strongly agree), 93.1% in provinces (4.7.7% agree, 45.4% strongly agree), and 92.8% in cities (40.2% agree, 52.6% strongly agree). The minor differences suggest that the level of LGU governance does not play a major role in shaping perceptions of LDC communication effectiveness, implying that information dissemination strategies reach LGUs similarly across different governance structures.

Table B 0.2 Statement 2 - Responses by LGU Type

	Statement 2									
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total			
City	2	2	5	6	84	110	209			
	0.957	0.957	2.392	2.871	40.191	52.632	100			
Municipality	4	5	17	17	313	253	609			
	0.657	0.821	2.791	2.791	51.396	41.544	100			
Province	1	2	7	2	83	79	174			
	0.575	1.149	4.023	1.149	47.701	45.402	100			
Total	7	9	29	25	480	442	992			
	0.706	0.907	2.923	2.520	48.387	44.556	100			
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	11.34									
Prob.	0.3318									

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# By Respondent Group

The chi-square test result (p = 0.0581) is slightly above the standard significance threshold (p < 0.05), suggesting that while there is some variation, the differences between CSO and LGU respondents are not definitively significant. Agreement levels are slightly higher among LGUs (94.3% total; 261 agree, 201 strongly agree) compared to CSOs (92.6% total; 219 agree, 241 strongly agree).

	Statement 2									
Respondent Group	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total			
CSO	2	4	15	16	219	241	497			
	0.402	0.805	3.018	3.219	44.064	48.491	100			
LGU	5	5	14	9	261	201	495			
	1.010	1.010	2.828	1.818	52.727	40.606	100			
Total	7	9	29	25	480	442	992			
	0.706	0.907	2.923	2.520	48.387	44.556	100			
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	10.68									
Prob.	0.0581									

Table B 0.3 Statement 2 - Responses by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LDC Functionality x Respondent Group

For CSOs, the chi-square test result (p = 0.0350) indicates a statistically significant relationship between LDC functionality and perceptions of being informed. Among CSOs in high-functionality LDCs, 93.9% (46.8% agree, 47.2% strongly agree) report being well-informed, compared to 90.7% (40.7% agree, 50.7% strongly agree) in low-functionality LDCs. The difference suggests that CSOs in well-organized LDCs receive more effective communication about participation opportunities.

For LGUs, the chi-square test (p = 0.0965) does not indicate a statistically significant difference. Agreement levels remain high in both groups, with 95.5% (150 agree, 124 strongly agree) in high-functionality LDCs and 90.4% (111 agree, 77 strongly agree) in low-functionality LDCs.

Table B 0.4 Statement 2 - Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: CSO

	Statement 2									
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total			
Low	2	3	4	11	86	109	215			
	0.930	1.395	1.860	5.116	40	50.698	100			
High	0	1	11	5	133	132	282			
	0	0.355	3.901	1.773	47.163	46.809	100			

Total	2	4	15	16	219	241	497
	0.402	0.805	3.018	3.219	44.064	48.491	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	11.98						
Prob.	0.0350						

Table B 0.5 Statement 2 - Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: LGU

	Statement 2						
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	4	4	6	6	111	77	208
	1.923	1.923	2.885	2.885	53.365	37.019	100
High	1	1	8	3	150	124	287
	0.348	0.348	2.787	1.045	52.265	43.206	100
Total	5	5	14	9	261	201	495
	1.010	1.010	2.828	1.818	52.727	40.606	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	9.33						
Prob.	0.0965						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Statement 3: The LGU sufficiently communicates the different ways of participating in the LDC, including its committees and other consultative activities, to all interested CSOs.

The survey results provide a view of how well LGUs communicate participation opportunities in LDCs to CSOs. Across all categories analyzed—LDC functionality, LGU type, and Respondent Group—perceptions vary significantly, revealing patterns in transparency and inclusivity in governance processes. The statistically significant relationships are as follows:

• LGU type significantly influences perceptions of communication effectiveness. Cities have the highest agreement, while provinces report the lowest.

#### By LDC Functionality

The level of LDC functionality does not have a statistically significant impact on perceptions of LGU communication. However, descriptive patterns suggest that respondents from both low-functioning and high-functioning LDCs overwhelmingly agree with the statement. Among those in low-functioning LDCs, 92.91% are in agreement (43.74% agree, 49.17% strongly agree), while 5.14% disagree (2.60% disagree, 2.60% strongly disagree). In high-functioning LDCs, agreement is slightly higher at 94.55% (43.76% agree, 50.79% strongly agree), while disagreement remains marginal at 4.39%.

#### Table B 0.1 Statement 3 - Responses by LDC Functionality

			S	tatement 3			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	4	4	11	11	185	208	423
	0.946	0.946	2.600	2.600	43.735	49.173	100
High	5	1	15	10	249	289	569
	0.879	0.176	2.636	1.757	43.761	50.791	100
Total	9	5	26	21	434	497	992
	0.907	0.504	2.621	2.117	43.75	50.101	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	3.81						
Prob.	0.5774						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LGU Type

The type of LGU plays a substantial role in shaping opinions on communication effectiveness. The differences across LGU types are statistically significant (p = 0.0002)

Cities exhibit the highest agreement at 96.17% (35.41% agree, 60.77% strongly agree), with minimal disagreement (1.43%). In municipalities, agreement is lower at 94.08% (48.44% agree, 45.65% strongly agree), with disagreement at 4.43%. Provinces show the lowest agreement at 90.23% (37.36% agree, 52.87% strongly agree), with 7.47% disagreeing. These findings suggest that city-level LGUs are perceived as the most effective in communicating participation mechanisms.

Table B 0.2 Statement 3 - Responses by LGU Type

			St	tatement 3			
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
City	1	2	1	4	74	127	209
	0.478	0.957	0.478	1.914	35.407	60.766	100
Municipality	7	2	13	14	295	278	609
	1.149	0.328	2.135	2.299	48.440	45.649	100
Province	1	1	12	3	65	92	174
	0.575	0.575	6.897	1.724	37.356	52.874	100
Total	9	5	26	21	434	497	992
	0.907	0.504	2.621	2.117	43.75	50.101	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	34.31						
Prob.	0.0002						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By Respondent Group

Both CSOs (93.36%) and LGU officials (94.34%) express high agreement that LGUs sufficiently communicate participation opportunities, with minimal differences in responses. CSOs report slightly higher disagreement (3.62%) compared to LGU officials (2.62%), suggesting that while LGUs generally believe their communication efforts are effective, CSOs still identify some gaps in outreach. Note that the difference is not statistically significant.

			S	tatement 3			
Respondent Group	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
CSO	4	4	14	11	213	251	497
	0.805	0.805	2.817	2.213	42.857	50.503	100
LGU	5	1	12	10	221	246	495
	1.010	0.202	2.424	2.020	44.646	49.697	100
Total	9	5	26	21	434	497	992
	0.907	0.504	2.621	2.117	43.75	50.101	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	2.31						
Prob.	0.8053						

Table B 0.3 Statement 3 - Responses by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LDC Functionality x Respondent Group

Disaggregating responses by both LDC functionality and Respondent Group does not reveal significant differences. Among CSOs in low-functioning LDCs, agreement is 93.02%, while in high-functioning LDCs, agreement is 93.61%. Among LGU officials, agreement is 92.79% in low-functioning LDCs and 95.47% in high-functioning LDCs. These figures there is no statistically significant differences in perception by LGUs and CSOs. Directionally, results suggest that functionality matters slightly more for LGU officials than CSOs in shaping perceptions of communication effectiveness. Even in low-functioning LDCs, however, agreement remains high, reinforcing the idea that communication efforts are generally perceived as strong.

Table B 0.4 Statement 3 - Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: CSO

			S	tatement 3			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	2	3	4	6	93	107	215
	0.930	1.395	1.860	2.791	43.256	49.767	100
High	2	1	10	5	120	144	282
	0.709	0.355	3.546	1.773	42.553	51.064	100
Total	4	4	14	11	213	251	497
	0.805	0.805	2.817	2.213	42.857	50.503	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	3.57						

#### Prob. 0.6126

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

			S	tatement 3			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	2	1	7	5	92	101	208
	0.962	0.481	3.365	2.404	44.231	48.558	100
High	3	0	5	5	129	145	287
	1.045	0	1.742	1.742	44.948	50.523	100
Total	5	1	12	10	221	246	495
	1.010	0.202	2.424	2.020	44.646	49.697	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	3.07						
Prob.	0.6895						

#### Table B 0.5 Statement 3 - Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: LGU

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Statement 4: The LDC has clear protocols for CSO members to access data and information relevant to their participation.

The survey results provide a comprehensive view of how LDCs establish protocols for CSO members to access relevant data and information. The statistically significant findings are as follows:

- Municipal respondents report the highest agreement (92.1%), while provinces have the lowest (86.2%). This suggests that municipalities, which rely more on community engagement, may have clearer access mechanisms, whereas provincial governments may have more bureaucratic barriers.
- Overall, LGU officials report a higher level of agreement (91.1%) compared to CSOs (90.3%), indicating that while protocols may exist on paper, CSOs may encounter more challenges in actual implementation due to bureaucratic hurdles or lack of enforcement.

#### By LDC Functionality

The relationship between LDC functionality and the perception of clear data access protocols is not statistically significant (p = 0.0925). However, notable trends emerge. Among respondents from high-functioning LDCs, 92.9% agree (47.5% agree, 45.5% strongly agree) that protocols exist, compared to 87.7% from low-functioning LDCs (43.7% agree, 44.0% strongly agree). Although both groups exhibit strong agreement, the slightly lower confidence in low-functioning LDCs suggests that while formal structures may be in place, their effectiveness may vary.

Table B 0.1 Statement 4 - Responses by LDC Functionality

	Statement 4									
LDC	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total			
Functionality				know						

Low	9	6	4	33	185	186	423
	2.128	1.418	0.946	7.801	43.735	43.972	100
High	6	5	6	23	270	259	569
	1.054	0.879	1.054	4.042	47.452	45.518	100
Total	15	11	10	56	455	445	992
	1.512	1.109	1.008	5.645	45.867	44.859	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	9.45						
Prob.	0.0925						

#### By LGU Type

The variation in perceptions across LGU types is statistically significant (p = 0.0000), indicating that the nature of the LGU influences the perceived clarity of LDC data access protocols. The highest level of agreement is observed among municipal respondents (92.1% agree, of which 49.1% agree and 43.0% strongly agree). Provinces report the lowest level of agreement (86.2% agreement, with 47.7% agreeing and 38.5% strongly agreeing). Cities report agreement in between the two at 90.4% (34.9% agree, 55.5% strongly agree).

				s4			
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
City	3	3	3	11	73	116	209
	1.435	1.435	1.435	5.263	34.928	55.502	100
Municipality	11	2	2	33	299	262	609
	1.806	0.328	0.328	5.419	49.097	43.021	100
Province	1	6	5	12	83	67	174
	0.575	3.448	2.874	6.897	47.701	38.506	100
Total	15	11	10	56	455	445	992
	1.512	1.109	1.008	5.645	45.867	44.859	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	37.54						
Prob.	0.0000						

# Table S4-2: Responses by LGU Type

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By Respondent Group

The relationship between Respondent Group and perceptions of data access protocols is statistically significant (p = 0.0002). LGU officials exhibit a higher level of agreement (91.1% agree, with 48.3% agreeing and 42.8% strongly agreeing) compared to CSO respondents (90.3% agreement, with 43.5% agreeing and 46.9% strongly agreeing). While both groups express strong confidence in LDC protocols, the slightly higher skepticism among CSOs may reflect challenges in actual access.

			s4			
Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
8	10	10	20	216	233	497
1.610	2.012	2.012	4.024	43.461	46.881	100
7	1	0	36	239	212	495
1.414	0.202	0	7.273	48.283	42.828	100
15	11	10	56	455	445	992
1.512	1.109	1.008	5.645	45.867	44.859	100
24.15						
0.0002						
	Refuse to Answer 8 1.610 7 1.414 15 1.512 24.15 0.0002	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree           8         10           1.610         2.012           7         1           1.414         0.202           15         11           1.512         1.109           24.15         0.0002	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree           8         10         10           1.610         2.012         2.012           7         1         0           1.414         0.202         0           1.512         1.109         1.008           24.15             0.0002	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree         Not Informed / I do not know           8         10         10         20           1.610         2.012         2.012         4.024           7         1         0         36           1.414         0.202         0         7.273           15         11         10         56           1.512         1.109         1.008         5.645           24.15	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree         Not Informed / I do not know         Agree           8         10         10         20         216           1.610         2.012         2.012         4.024         43.461           7         1         0         36         239           1.414         0.202         0         7.273         48.283           1.512         1.109         1.008         5.645         45.867           24.15            45.867	Refuse to AnswerStrongly DisagreeDisagreeNot Informed /I do not knowAgreeStrongly Agree810102002162331.6102.0122.0124.02443.46146.881710362392121.4140.20207.27348.28342.8281.5121.1091.0085.64545.86744.85924.15

# Table 0.1 Responses by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LDC Functionality x Respondent Group

The relationship between LDC functionality and Respondent Group is not statistically significant (p = 0.5349 for CSOs, p = 0.1654 for LGUs). Among CSO respondents in high-functioning LDCs, 92.2% agree that protocols exist (45.0% agree, 47.2% strongly agree), compared to 87.9% in low-functioning LDCs (41.4% agree, 46.5% strongly agree). A similar pattern appears for LGU respondents, with 93.7% agreement in high-functioning LDCs (49.8% agree, 43.9% strongly agree) and 87.5% in low-functioning LDCs (46.2% agree, 41.3% strongly agree).

#### Table s4-4(a): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: CSO

				s4			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	5	5	4	12	89	100	215
	2.326	2.326	1.860	5.581	41.395	46.512	100
High	3	5	6	8	127	133	282
	1.064	1.773	2.128	2.837	45.035	47.163	100
Total	8	10	10	20	216	233	497
	1.610	2.012	2.012	4.024	43.461	46.881	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	4.10						
Prob.	0.5349						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

Table s4-4(b): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: LGU

LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	4	1	21	96	86	208
	1.923	0.481	10.096	46.154	41.346	100
High	3	0	15	143	126	287
	1.045	0	5.226	49.826	43.902	100
Total	7	1	36	239	212	495
	1.414	0.202	7.273	48.283	42.828	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	6.49					
Prob.	0.1654					

# Statement 5: CSO participation in the LDC (including its committees and other consultative activities) is sufficiently supported by LGU resources, e.g., funding, facilities, technologies, and human resources.

The survey findings provide perspectives on the extent to which LGUs sufficiently support CSO participation in the LDC, including through funding, facilities, technology, and human resources. The following are the statistically significant findings:

- LGU type significantly affects perceptions of LGU support for CSO participation. Cities exhibit the highest agreement (88.99%), followed by provinces (78.74%) and municipalities (80.30%). Municipalities also have the highest disagreement (15.60%), suggesting variability in how LGUs at this level allocate resources for CSO engagement.
- LGU officials' perceptions of CSO support vary significantly by LGU type. City-based LGU officials report the highest agreement (90.38%), reinforcing that urban LGUs are more capable of providing resources, whereas municipalities (79.28%) and provinces (81.61%) show more mixed assessments.

#### By LDC Functionality

The analysis of LDC functionality does not indicate a significant relationship with perceptions of CSO support (p = 0.4104. Nonetheless, responses show that those from high-functionality LDCs tend to report slightly higher agreement (82.78%) compared to those in low-functionality LDCs (80.62%). Similarly, disagreement is slightly higher in low-functionality LDCs (14.41%) compared to high-functionality ones (13.36%). While the differences are minor, this suggests that a more functional LDC may create an environment that marginally enhances CSO participation, though this trend is not statistically robust.

				s5			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	8	5	53	16	208	133	423
	1.891	1.182	12.530	3.783	49.173	31.442	100
High	4	10	66	18	270	201	569
	0.703	1.757	11.599	3.163	47.452	35.325	100
Total	12	15	119	34	478	334	992
	1.210	1.512	11.996	3.427	48.185	33.669	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	5.05						
Prob.	0.4104						

# Table s5-1: Responses by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LGU Type

The relationship between LGU type and CSO perceptions of LGU support is statistically significant (p = 0.0006). Among respondents from municipalities, 80.30% agree or strongly agree that LGUs provide sufficient support, while municipalities also report the highest disagreement levels (15.60%). In contrast, cities report the highest agreement (88.99%) and the lowest disagreement (7.18%). Provincial respondents report 78.74% agreeing and 13.79% disagreeing. Overall, the strong statistical significance suggests that structural differences between LGU types play a crucial role in shaping how CSOs perceive LGU support.

# Table S5-2: Responses by LGU Type

				s5			
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
City	2	3	12	6	94	92	209
	0.957	1.435	5.742	2.871	44.976	44.019	100
Municipality	7	6	89	18	307	182	609
	1.149	0.985	14.614	2.956	50.411	29.885	100
Province	3	6	18	10	77	60	174
	1.724	3.448	10.345	5.747	44.253	34.483	100
Total	12	15	119	34	478	334	992
	1.210	1.512	11.996	3.427	48.185	33.669	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	30.86						
Prob.	0.0006						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By Respondent Group

The relationship between Respondent Group (LGU vs. CSO) and perceptions of support is not statistically significant (p = 0.4167), suggesting that LGU officials and CSO representatives largely share similar views on the adequacy of resource allocation for participatory governance. That said, LGU respondents are slightly more likely to report agreement (82.02%) compared to CSO representatives (81.69%), and CSO respondents show slightly lower disagreement (13.68%) than LGU officials (14.34%). The differences are minimal, implying that both groups recognize LGU efforts at the same level.

				S5			
Respondent Group	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
CSO	7	8	55	21	229	177	497
	1.408	1.610	11.066	4.225	46.076	35.614	100
LGU	5	7	64	13	249	157	495
	1.010	1.414	12.929	2.626	50.303	31.717	100
Total	12	15	119	34	478	334	992
	1.210	1.512	11.996	3.427	48.185	33.669	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	4.99						
Prob.	0.4167						

### Table S5-3: Responses by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# By LDC Functionality x Respodent Type

At the disaggregated level by Respondent Group, the relationship between LDC functionality and CSO support remains statistically insignificant for both CSOs (p = 0.7004) and LGU officials (p = 0.2894). However, slight variations emerge in trends. CSOs in highfunctionality LDCs report 83.33% agreement, while those in low-functionality LDCs report 79.53%. LGU officials in high-functionality LDCs report 82.23% agreement, compared to 81.73% in low-functionality LDCs. While the trends are consistent across both groups, the lack of statistical significance suggests that LDC functionality alone does not drive perceptions of LGU support. Instead, the broader institutional environment may play a more decisive role owing to persistent statistical significant of LGU type.

# Table S5-4(a): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: CSO

		\$5									
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total				
Low	5	4	26	9	96	75	215				
	2.326	1.860	12.093	4.186	44.651	34.884	100				
High	2	4	29	12	133	102	282				
	0.709	1.418	10.284	4.255	47.163	36.170	100				
Total	7	8	55	21	229	177	497				

	1.408	1.610	11.066	4.225	46.076	35.614	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	3.00						
Prob.	0.7004						

# Table s5-5(b): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: LGU

		s5									
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total				
Low	3	1	27	7	112	58	208				
	1.442	0.481	12.981	3.365	53.846	27.885	100				
High	2	6	37	6	137	99	287				
	0.697	2.091	12.892	2.091	47.735	34.495	100				
Total	5	7	64	13	249	157	495				
	1.010	1.414	12.929	2.626	50.303	31.717	100				
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	6.18										
Prob.	0.2894										

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Statement 6: The LDC has clear mechanisms to inform CSO members on the status of their issues raised and suggestions provided.

The results provide an indication on whether a robust feedback mechanism exists in the LDC. The following are the statistically significant results:

- Higher-functioning LDCs report higher agreement (46.22% agree, 44.11% strongly agree), indicating that better-organized councils enhance communication with CSOs. Disagreement (6.86%) and lack of information (4.73%) are higher in low-functioning LDCs, suggesting weaker engagement strategies in these councils.
- Cities report the highest agreement (53.11% strongly agree, 36.36% agree), while provinces show higher disagreement (7.47%). The stronger institutional capacity of cities may enable more structured communication channels for CSOs.
- LGU officials (46.67% agree, 42.63% strongly agree) report slightly higher agreement than CSOs (44.87% agree, 42.25% strongly agree). CSOs exhibit more disagreement (6.04%) and uncertainty (4.23%), suggesting that they may feel less informed about the decision-making process.

# By LDC Functionality

The relationship between LDC functionality and perceptions of clear communication mechanisms is statistically significant (p = 0.0436). Respondents from highly functional LDCs are more likely to agree (46.22%) or strongly agree (44.11%) compared to those from lower-functioning LDCs (45.15% agree, 40.19% strongly agree). Conversely, disagreement (6.86%) and

lack of information (4.73%) are higher in lower-functioning LDCs, suggesting that effective local development councils enhance communication and transparency with CSOs.

				Sb			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	6	9	20	27	191	170	423
	1.418	2.128	4.728	6.383	45.154	40.189	100
High	9	2	22	22	263	251	569
	1.582	0.351	3.866	3.866	46.221	44.112	100
Total	15	11	42	49	454	421	992
	1.512	1.109	4.234	4.940	45.766	42.440	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	11.42						
Prob.	0.0436						

# Table S6-1: Responses by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LGU Type

The results show a significant relationship between LGU type and perceptions of clear mechanisms (p = 0.0058). Cities report the highest agreement levels (89.5%, 53.11% strongly agree, 36.36% agree), closely followed by municipalities (89.16%, 48.93% agree, 40.23% strongly agree), and provinces (83.34%, 45.98% agree, 37.36% strongly agree). Disagreement is most pronounced in provinces (7.47%), suggesting rural and administrative constraints in engagement mechanisms.

# Table s6-2: Responses by LGU Type

		50									
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total				
City	0	4	7	11	76	111	209				
	0	1.914	3.349	5.263	36.364	53.110	100				
Municipality	12	5	22	27	298	245	609				
	1.970	0.821	3.612	4.433	48.933	40.230	100				
Province	3	2	13	11	80	65	174				
	1.724	1.149	7.471	6.322	45.977	37.356	100				
Total	15	11	42	49	454	421	992				
	1.512	1.109	4.234	4.940	45.766	42.440	100				
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	24.76										
Prob.	0.0058										

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By Respondent Group

A statistically significant relationship exists (p = 0.0254) between Respondent Group and perceptions of clarity in communication of feedback. LGU officials report slightly higher agreement (46.67% agree, 42.63% strongly agree) compared to CSOs (44.87% agree, 42.25% strongly agree). However, CSOs exhibit more disagreement (6.04%) and uncertainty (4.23%) than LGU officials (2.42% disagree, 5.66% uncertain). This suggests that while government actors believe mechanisms exist, some CSO representatives may feel excluded or uninformed.

			s6			
Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
5	8	30	21	223	210	497
1.006	1.610	6.036	4.225	44.869	42.254	100
10	3	12	28	231	211	495
2.020	0.606	2.424	5.657	46.667	42.626	100
15	11	42	49	454	421	992
1.512	1.109	4.234	4.940	45.766	42.440	100
12.79						
0.0254						
	Refuse to Answer 5 1.006 10 2.020 15 1.512 12.79 0.0254	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree           5         8           1.006         1.610           10         3           2.020         0.606           15         11           1.512         1.109           12.79         0.0254	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree           5         8         30           1.006         1.610         6.036           10         3         12           2.020         0.606         2.424           15         11         42           1.512         1.109         4.234           12.79         0.0254         11	Strongly Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree         Not Informed / I do not know           5         8         30         21           1.006         1.610         6.036         4.225           10         3         12         28           2.020         0.606         2.424         5.657           15         11         42         49           1.512         1.109         4.234         4.940           12.79         0.0254         5.557	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree         Not Informed / I do not know         Agree           5         8         30         21         223           1.006         1.610         6.036         4.225         44.869           10         3         12         28         231           2.020         0.606         2.424         5.657         46.667           1.512         1.109         4.234         4.940         45.766           12.79         0.0254         5.557         5.557         5.557	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree         Not Informed / I do not know         Agree         Strongly Agree           5         8         30         21         223         210           1.006         1.610         6.036         4.225         44.869         42.254           10         3         12         202         211           2.020         0.606         2.424         5.657         46.667         42.626           15         11         42         4.949         42.14           1.512         1.109         4.234         4.940         45.766         42.440           12.79         0.0254         5.557         5.557         5.557         5.557         5.557

# Table S6-3: Responses by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# By LDC Functionality x Respondent Group

Both tables reveal no significant relationship (p > 0.05) between LDC functionality and responses when disaggregated by CSO and LGU officials. However, general trends remain. Among CSOs, agreement is higher in high-functioning LDCs (45.39% agree, 43.97% strongly agree) compared to low-functioning LDCs (44.19% agree, 40.00% strongly agree). Among LGUs, stronger agreement is found in high-functioning LDCs (47.04% agree, 44.25% strongly agree) compared to low-functioning LDCs (46.15% agree, 40.39% strongly agree). This indicates that perceived communication clarity is generally higher in high-functioning LDCs, but the variation is not statistically significant when broken down by Respondent Group.

# Table S6-4(a): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: CSO

		s6									
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total				
Low	2	6	14	12	95	86	215				
	0.930	2.791	6.512	5.581	44.186	40	100				
High	3	2	16	9	128	124	282				
	1.064	0.709	5.674	3.191	45.390	43.972	100				
Total	5	8	30	21	223	210	497				
	1.006	1.610	6.036	4.225	44.869	42.254	100				

Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	5.59
Prob.	0.3481

				s6			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	4	3	6	15	96	84	208
	1.923	1.442	2.885	7.212	46.154	40.385	100
High	6	0	6	13	135	127	287
	2.091	0	2.091	4.530	47.038	44.251	100
Total	10	3	12	28	231	211	495
	2.020	0.606	2.424	5.657	46.667	42.626	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	6.45						
Prob.	0.2652						

# Table S6-4(b): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: LGU

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Statement 7: There are defined opportunities for the LDC-CSO members to formally raise their own agenda, feedback, and grievances, e.g., in the Monitoring Reporting Committee meetings.

The survey findings suggest a generally positive perception regarding the existence of formal opportunities for LDC-CSO members to voice their concerns, provide feedback, and raise grievances. The following are the statistically significant results:

- The type of LGU significantly influences perceptions of participatory opportunities. Cities show the highest level of strong agreement, likely due to more established participatory mechanisms, while municipalities have lower agreement, despite having high agreement levels.
- While both CSOs and LGU officials largely agree, CSOs exhibit slightly lower agreement levels, suggesting that they may experience more barriers in practice. This indicates a gap between formal participation structures and actual engagement experiences.

# By LDC Functionality

The relationship between LDC functionality and perceptions of participatory opportunities is not statistically significant (p = 0.1095), indicating that having a highfunctioning LDC does not necessarily correlate with stronger agreement that CSO members have opportunities to raise concerns. Nevertheless, respondents from highly functional LDCs are slightly more likely to agree (91.6%) compared to those from lower-functioning LDCs (86.1%). Disagreement levels remain relatively low across both groups (4.2% for highfunctioning LDCs and 6.6% for low-functioning LDCs). This suggests that while well-functioning LDCs might provide more structured participation mechanisms, respondents in both contexts largely recognize these opportunities, albeit with some reservations in lower-functioning LDCs.

			37			
Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
9	6	22	22	172	192	423
2.128	1.418	5.201	5.201	40.662	45.390	100
10	4	14	20	252	269	569
1.757	0.703	2.460	3.515	44.288	47.276	100
19	10	36	42	424	461	992
1.915	1.008	3.629	4.234	42.742	46.472	100
8.99						
0.1095						
	Refuse to Answer 9 2.128 10 1.757 19 1.915 8.99 0.1095	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree           9         6           2.128         1.418           10         4           1.757         0.703           19         10           1.915         1.008           8.99         0.1095	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree           9         6         22           2.128         1.418         5.201           10         4         14           1.757         0.703         2.460           19         10         36           1.915         1.008         3.629           8.99         0.1095	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree         Not Informed / I do not know           9         6         22         22           2.128         1.418         5.201         5.201           10         4         14         20           1.757         0.703         2.460         3.515           19         10         36         42           1.915         1.008         3.629         4.234           8.99         0.1095	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree         Not Informed / I do not know         Agree           9         6         22         22         172           2.128         1.418         5.201         5.201         40.662           10         4         14         20         252           1.757         0.703         2.460         3.515         44.288           19         10         36         42         424           1.915         1.008         3.629         4.234         42.742           8.99         0.1095	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree         Not Informed / I do not know         Agree         Strongly Agree           9         6         22         22         172         192           2.128         1.418         5.201         5.201         40.662         45.390           10         4         14         20         252         269           1.757         0.703         2.460         3.515         44.288         47.276           19         10         36         42.34         46.472           1.915         1.008         3.629         4.234         42.742         46.472           8.99         0.1095

c7

# Table S7-1: Responses by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LGU Type

The relationship between LGU type and perceptions of participatory opportunities is statistically significant (p = 0.0003), meaning that the type of LGU is associated with how respondents view CSO engagement in LDCs. While Municipalities report the highest agreement levels at 90.3% (46.6% "Agree," 43.7% "Strongly Agree"), cities and provinces are at par with each other at 88.5% (30.6% "Agree," 57.9% "Strongly Agree"), followed by provinces at 86.2% (43.7% "Agree," 42.5% "Strongly Agree").

	•	, ,	•				
				s7			
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
City	0	3	9	12	64	121	209
	0	1.435	4.306	5.742	30.622	57.895	100
Municipality	17	3	19	20	284	266	609
	2.791	0.493	3.120	3.284	46.634	43.678	100
Province	2	4	8	10	76	74	174
	1.149	2.299	4.598	5.747	43.678	42.529	100
Total	19	10	36	42	424	461	992
	1.915	1.008	3.629	4.234	42.742	46.472	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	33.20						
Prob.	0.0003						

# Table S7-2: Responses by LGU Type

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By Respondent Group

The relationship between Respondent Group and perceptions of participatory opportunities is statistically significant (p = 0.0363), indicating that LGU officials and CSO

members hold slightly differing views on the effectiveness of LDC-CSO engagement. While both groups overwhelmingly agree with the statement, LGU officials report a higher level of strong agreement (48.9% vs. 44.1% among CSOs). Overall agreement remains high for both groups (CSOs: 86.7%, LGUs: 91.7%), but CSOs exhibit a slightly more critical stance. This discrepancy may arise from differences in vantage points—LGU officials may perceive formal opportunities as sufficient, whereas CSOs, being the primary recipients of these mechanisms, might experience barriers in practice.

				s7			
Respondent Group	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
CSO	10	7	27	22	212	219	497
	2.012	1.408	5.433	4.427	42.656	44.064	100
LGU	9	3	9	20	212	242	495
	1.818	0.606	1.818	4.040	42.828	48.889	100
Total	19	10	36	42	424	461	992
	1.915	1.008	3.629	4.234	42.742	46.472	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	11.89						
Prob.	0.0363						

# Table S7-3: Responses by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# By LDC Functionality x Respondent Group

The relationship between LDC functionality and Respondent Group is not statistically significant for both CSOs (p = 0.3826) and LGUs (p = 0.0905). This indicates that while perceptions of participatory opportunities vary slightly between high- and low-functioning LDCs, the differences are not strong enough to suggest a systematic pattern. For CSOs, agreement is slightly higher in high-functioning LDCs (89.4%) than in low-functioning LDCs (83.3%). Among LGUs, those in high-functioning LDCs report a stronger sense of participatory opportunities (93.7%) compared to those in lower-functioning LDCs (88.9%). This suggests that while a well-functioning LDC may marginally improve CSO engagement, institutional structures alone do not determine participation perceptions.

		\$7								
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total			
Low	5	4	14	13	83	96	215			
	2.326	1.860	6.512	6.047	38.605	44.651	100			
High	5	3	13	9	129	123	282			
	1.773	1.064	4.610	3.191	45.745	43.617	100			
Total	10	7	27	22	212	219	497			
	2.012	1.408	5.433	4.427	42.656	44.064	100			

Prob. 0.3826	Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	5.28		
	Prob.	0.3826		

				s7			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	4	2	8	9	89	96	208
	1.923	0.962	3.846	4.327	42.788	46.154	100
High	5	1	1	11	123	146	287
	1.742	0.348	0.348	3.833	42.857	50.871	100
Total	9	3	9	20	212	242	495
	1.818	0.606	1.818	4.040	42.828	48.889	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	9.51						
Prob.	0.0905						

# Table S7-4(b): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: LGU

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Statement 8: The LDC processes (in the council, committees, and other consultative activities) are effectively inclusive of different civil society sectors and agendas.

This statement provides an indication of perception on inclusivity of LDC processes. The statistically significant findings are the following:

• Perceptions of inclusivity vary significantly across LGU types, with cities reporting the highest agreement (94.7%) and municipalities showing slightly lower agreement (91.5%). This may indicate that cities have more structured participatory processes, while municipalities and provinces may face challenges in engaging diverse civil society groups.

# By LDC Functionality

The perceived inclusivity of LDC processes does not significantly differ based on the functionality level of the LDCs. Among respondents from high-functioning LDCs, 92.9% (47.6% strongly agree, 45.3% agree) affirm inclusivity, compared to 90.3% (46.3% strongly agree, 44.0% agree) among those from low-functioning LDCs. Disagreement is minimal, with 5.2% (3.5% not informed, 1.8% disagree, 0.5% strongly disagree) in high-functioning LDCs and 7.6% (3.1% not informed, 3.3% disagree, 1.2% strongly disagree) in low-functioning LDCs. These results suggest that while respondents in high-functioning LDCs are slightly more confident in the inclusivity of the processes, the difference is not statistically meaningful, implying that inclusivity perceptions are largely independent of LDC functionality.

				s8			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	9	5	14	13	186	196	423
	2.128	1.182	3.310	3.073	43.972	46.336	100
High	7	3	10	20	258	271	569
	1.230	0.527	1.757	3.515	45.343	47.627	100
Total	16	8	24	33	444	467	992
	1.613	0.806	2.419	3.327	44.758	47.077	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	5.25						
Prob.	0.3864						

# Table S8-1: Responses by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# By LGU Type

The inclusivity perception of LDC processes varies significantly across LGU types. Provinces report their level of agreement at 89.7% (49.4% strongly agree, 40.2% agree), while municipalities report at 91.5% (42.2% strongly agree, 49.3% agree). Cities had the highest agreement at 94.7% (59.3% strongly agree, 35.4% agree). Disagreement and uncertainty are most pronounced in municipalities (6.4%) and provinces (9.2%), while cities exhibit the lowest disagreement rate at 5.3%. The significant difference (p = 0.0023) suggests that LGU structure plays a role in how inclusivity is perceived.

# Table S8-2: Responses by LGU Type

				s8			
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
City	1	2	2	6	74	124	209
	0.478	0.957	0.957	2.871	35.407	59.330	100
Municipality	13	4	18	17	300	257	609
	2.135	0.657	2.956	2.791	49.261	42.200	100
Province	2	2	4	10	70	86	174
	1.149	1.149	2.299	5.747	40.230	49.425	100
Total	16	8	24	33	444	467	992
	1.613	0.806	2.419	3.327	44.758	47.077	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	27.30						
Prob.	0.0023						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# By Respondent Group

The differences between CSOs and LGU officials are not statistically significant, suggesting a shared perception of inclusivity. Agreement among CSO respondents is 91.1%
(47.5% strongly agree, 43.7% agree), closely mirroring LGU officials at 92.5% (46.7% strongly agree, 45.9% agree). This result indicates that both local government actors and civil society organizations generally acknowledge inclusive consultative processes. While CSOs are often more critical of participatory governance, the similar agreement levels imply that LGUs may have successfully institutionalized mechanisms that satisfy diverse stakeholders.

				SS			
Respondent Group	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
CSO	10	6	13	15	217	236	497
	2.012	1.207	2.616	3.018	43.662	47.485	100
LGU	6	2	11	18	227	231	495
	1.212	0.404	2.222	3.636	45.859	46.667	100
Total	16	8	24	33	444	467	992
	1.613	0.806	2.419	3.327	44.758	47.077	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	3.71						
Prob.	0.5913						

## Table S8-3: Responses by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LGU Functionality x Respondent Group

Both CSO and LGU respondents exhibit comparable perceptions across LDC functionality levels, reinforcing the previous finding that LDC functionality does not significantly influence inclusivity perceptions. Among CSO respondents, agreement rates are 91.5% in high-functioning LDCs and 90.7% in low-functioning LDCs, while LGU officials report 94.4% agreement in high-functioning LDCs and 89.9% in low-functioning LDCs. These minimal differences suggest that while higher functionality may enhance perceptions among LGU officials, CSOs do not perceive a substantial difference.

Table S8-4(a): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: CSO

				s8			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	5	3	6	6	95	100	215
	2.326	1.395	2.791	2.791	44.186	46.512	100
High	5	3	7	9	122	136	282
	1.773	1.064	2.482	3.191	43.262	48.227	100
Total	10	6	13	15	217	236	497
	2.012	1.207	2.616	3.018	43.662	47.485	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	0.50						
Prob.	0.9919						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

				s8			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	4	2	8	7	91	96	208
	1.923	0.962	3.846	3.365	43.75	46.154	100
High	2	0	3	11	136	135	287
	0.697	0	1.045	3.833	47.387	47.038	100
Total	6	2	11	18	227	231	495
	1.212	0.404	2.222	3.636	45.859	46.667	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	8.95						
Prob.	0.1109						

Table S8-4(b): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: LGU

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### Statement 9: As LDC-CSO members, we are enabled to exercise autonomy and fairness in the sharing of power vis-à-vis our government counterparts. / LDC CSO members are enabled to exercise autonomy and fairness in the sharing of power vis-à-vis the government counterparts.

The results of Statement 9 reveal perspectives among LDC members regarding their perceived autonomy and fairness in power-sharing with government counterparts. The following are the statistically significant results:

- The type of LGU significantly influences perceptions of CSO autonomy and fairness. Municipal CSOs report the highest confidence (88.5% agreement), while city-based CSOs also show high agreement (89.9%), suggesting that participatory mechanisms may be more effective at these levels compared to provinces.
- CSOs exhibit slightly higher confidence in their autonomy (89.1%) compared to LGU respondents (86.5%), suggesting that government officials may perceive bureaucratic or legal constraints that CSOs do not fully recognize.

## By LDC Functionality

The relationship between LDC functionality and CSO perceptions of autonomy and fairness is not statistically significant (p = 0.2444). Among respondents from highly functional LDCs, 89.8% (42.5% agree, 47.3% strongly agree) express confidence in their ability to exercise autonomy and fairness, compared to 85.1% (43.3% agree, 41.8% strongly agree) in low-functioning LDCs. While the overall agreement is high in both groups, there is a slightly higher level of confidence in high-functioning LDCs. Conversely, disagreement levels remain relatively low, with 6.3% (3.3% disagree, 3.0% strongly disagree) among high-functioning LDCs and 10.3% (5.2% disagree, 5.2% strongly disagree) among low-functioning ones. This suggests that while the level of functionality may contribute to positive perceptions, it is not the sole determinant, and other factors could play a role in shaping these views.

				s9			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	17	5	22	19	183	177	423
	4.019	1.182	5.201	4.492	43.262	41.844	100
High	13	6	19	20	242	269	569
	2.285	1.054	3.339	3.515	42.531	47.276	100
Total	30	11	41	39	425	446	992
	3.024	1.109	4.133	3.931	42.843	44.960	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	6.69						
Prob.	0.2444						

# Table S9-1: Responses by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LGU Type

The relationship between LGU type and CSO perceptions of autonomy and fairness is statistically significant (p = 0.0249), suggesting that the type of LGU in which a CSO operates influences their perspectives. CSOs in provinces report the lowest level of agreement at 82.8% (with 37.4% agreeing and 45.4% strongly agreeing). CSO from municipalities exhibit a higher level of confidence, with 88.5% (46.0% agree, 42.5% strongly agree) affirming their ability to exercise autonomy and fairness. Meanwhile, CSOs operating in cities report the highest level of agreement at 89.9% (38.3% agree, 51.7% strongly agree). The results suggest that municipal CSOs perceive slightly more autonomy and fairness in power-sharing.

- 0

Table S9-2: Re	sponses by	/ LGU	Type
----------------	------------	-------	------

		55								
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total			
City	6	2	4	9	80	108	209			
	2.871	0.957	1.914	4.306	38.278	51.675	100			
Municipality	16	5	31	18	280	259	609			
	2.627	0.821	5.090	2.956	45.977	42.529	100			
Province	8	4	6	12	65	79	174			
	4.598	2.299	3.448	6.897	37.356	45.402	100			
Total	30	11	41	39	425	446	992			
	3.024	1.109	4.133	3.931	42.843	44.960	100			
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	20.50									
Prob.	0.0249									

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By Respondent Group

A statistically significant relationship exists between Respondent Group and perceptions of autonomy and fairness (p = 0.0324). CSO respondents exhibit slightly greater confidence than their LGU counterparts, with 89.1% (44.5% agree, 44.7% strongly agree) expressing positive views compared to 86.5% (41.2% agree, 45.3% strongly agree) among LGU respondents. This difference could indicate that while CSOs feel empowered, LGUs might perceive additional constraints that limit true autonomy and fairness in power-sharing.

-0

				59			
Respondent Group	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
CSO	18	7	19	10	221	222	497
	3.622	1.408	3.823	2.012	44.467	44.668	100
LGU	12	4	22	29	204	224	495
	2.424	0.808	4.444	5.859	41.212	45.253	100
Total	30	11	41	39	425	446	992
	3.024	1.109	4.133	3.931	42.843	44.960	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	12.18						
Prob.	0.0324						

#### Table S9-3: Responses by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

## By LDC Functionality x Respondent Group

The relationship between LDC functionality and Respondent Group is not statistically significant for CSOs (p = 0.7481) or LGUs (p = 0.2916), indicating that LDC functionality does not independently affect perceptions within either group. For CSOs, agreement levels remain high in both high-functioning (90.4%) and low-functioning LDCs (87.4%). Similarly, among LGU respondents, those in high-functioning LDCs report 89.2% agreement, while those in low-functioning LDCs report 82.7%. The small difference suggests that while functionality may contribute to perceptions of fairness and autonomy, it is not a primary determinant.

## Table S9-4(a): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: CSO

		s9									
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total				
Low	11	3	9	4	95	93	215				
	5.116	1.395	4.186	1.860	44.186	43.256	100				
High	7	4	10	6	126	129	282				
	2.482	1.418	3.546	2.128	44.681	45.745	100				
Total	18	7	19	10	221	222	497				
	3.622	1.408	3.823	2.012	44.467	44.668	100				

Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	2.69	
Prob.	0.7481	

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

				s9			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	6	2	13	15	88	84	208
	2.885	0.962	6.25	7.212	42.308	40.385	100
High	6	2	9	14	116	140	287
	2.091	0.697	3.136	4.878	40.418	48.780	100
Total	12	4	22	29	204	224	495
	2.424	0.808	4.444	5.859	41.212	45.253	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	6.15						
Prob.	0.2916						

## Table S9-4(b): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: LGU

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

## Statement 10: The LDC processes efficiently provide information to its CSO members, including the CSO directory, meeting agenda and minutes, drafts of policies, plans, and reports, among other relevant documents.

The statement assesses the efficiency of information dissemination to CSOs. The following are the statistically significant results:

- There is a significant difference in perceptions of LDC efficiency across LGU types. Provinces and municipalities report higher agreement than cities.
- LGU officials are more likely to agree with the efficiency of LDCs than CSOs, while CSOs report higher disagreement than LGUs. This indicates that CSOs may feel that information-sharing mechanisms are inadequate or lack transparency, while LGUs perceive them as effective.

## By LDC Functionality

The relationship between LDC functionality and perceived efficiency in information dissemination is not statistically significant (p = 0.0782). However, trends suggest that highly functional LDCs received stronger agreement (91.4%) compared to those with low functionality (86.5%). This suggests that while well-functioning LDCs are more likely to be perceived as effective in disseminating relevant documents and information, even those with lower functionality are still viewed positively overall. The disagreement rate remains below 7% for both categories, reinforcing the notion that LDCs, regardless of functionality, are generally perceived as competent in sharing information with CSOs.

				s10			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	6	6	20	25	172	194	423
	1.418	1.418	4.728	5.910	40.662	45.863	100
High	6	1	22	20	252	268	569
	1.054	0.176	3.866	3.515	44.288	47.100	100
Total	12	7	42	45	424	462	992
	1.210	0.706	4.234	4.536	42.742	46.573	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	9.90						
Prob.	0.0782						

# Table S10-1: Responses by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

## By LGU Type

A statistically significant relationship (p = 0.0430) exists between LGU type and perceptions of LDC efficiency. The strongest agreement is observed among respondents from cities (89.5%) and municipalities (89.7%), while provinces report slightly lower agreement at 87.9%. The disagreement rate remains within a narrow range (cities: 4.3%, municipalities: 3.9%, provinces: 6.9%), suggesting broad consensus across different LGU types on the effectiveness of LDCs in providing information.

# Table S10-2: Responses by LGU Type

				s10			
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
City	1	1	8	12	73	114	209
	0.478	0.478	3.828	5.742	34.928	54.545	100
Municipality	10	5	23	25	287	259	609
	1.642	0.821	3.777	4.105	47.126	42.529	100
Province	1	1	11	8	64	89	174
	0.575	0.575	6.322	4.598	36.782	51.149	100
Total	12	7	42	45	424	462	992
	1.210	0.706	4.234	4.536	42.742	46.573	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	18.79						
Prob.	0.0430						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By Respondent Group

A statistically significant relationship (p = 0.0004) is observed between Respondent Group (CSOs vs. LGUs) and perceptions of LDC efficiency. CSOs show lower agreement (87.5%) compared to LGU respondents (91.1%), with CSOs also reporting higher disagreement (7.2% vs. 2.6%). This discrepancy suggests that while LGUs perceive themselves as efficient in providing information, CSOs, the primary recipients, are slightly less convinced. The divergence may stem from differences in expectations, while LGUs may believe their current processes are sufficient.

		s10									
Respondent Group	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total				
CSO	6	6	30	20	184	251	497				
	1.207	1.207	6.036	4.024	37.022	50.503	100				
LGU	6	1	12	25	240	211	495				
	1.212	0.202	2.424	5.051	48.485	42.626	100				
Total	12	7	42	45	424	462	992				
	1.210	0.706	4.234	4.536	42.742	46.573	100				
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	22.70										
Prob.	0.0004										

# Table S10-3: Responses by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

By LDC Functionality x Respondent Group

There is no statistically significant relationship (p = 0.1936 for CSOs, p = 0.5543 for LGUs) between LDC functionality and perceptions of information dissemination when split by Respondent Group. Among CSOs in low-functioning LDCs, agreement is 84.2%, rising to 90.1% in high-functioning LDCs. For LGUs, agreement rates are similar across both low (88.9%) and high-functioning LDCs (92.7%). This suggests that CSOs are more sensitive to variations in LDC functionality, whereas LGUs maintain a consistently high perception of effectiveness regardless of LDC classification. The lack of statistical significance, however, implies that perceptions of efficiency are relatively stable across different LDC conditions.

Table S10-4(a): Responses by LDC Functio	nality & Respondent (	Group: CSO
--	-----------------------	------------

		s10									
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total				
Low	3	5	15	11	71	110	215				
	1.395	2.326	6.977	5.116	33.023	51.163	100				
High	3	1	15	9	113	141	282				
	1.064	0.355	5.319	3.191	40.071	50	100				
Total	6	6	30	20	184	251	497				
	1.207	1.207	6.036	4.024	37.022	50.503	100				
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	7.38										
Prob.	0.1936										

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

		SIU									
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total				
Low	3	1	5	14	101	84	208				
	1.442	0.481	2.404	6.731	48.558	40.385	100				
High	3	0	7	11	139	127	287				
	1.045	0	2.439	3.833	48.432	44.251	100				
Total	6	1	12	25	240	211	495				
	1.212	0.202	2.424	5.051	48.485	42.626	100				
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	3.97										
Prob.	0.5543										

Table S10-4(b): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: LGU

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Statement 11: CSO members clearly influence the LDC's agenda, plans, and policies.

The hallmark of participatory governance is for CSOs to influence the agenda, plans and policies of the LGU. Here are the statistically significant results:

- There is a significant difference in how CSO influence is perceived across LGU types. Municipalities (85.1%) report higher agreement compared to cities (87.6%) and provinces (78.2%). This suggests that municipal-level governance fosters stronger CSO participation, while provinces may have more centralized decision-making, limiting CSO influence.
- CSOs perceive themselves as more influential in LDC decision-making (87.7% agreement) compared to LGU officials (81.0%). The higher skepticism among LGUs suggests that local officials may not fully acknowledge the extent of CSO influence, highlighting a potential gap in participatory governance perceptions.

#### By LDC Functionality

The results indicate that the perceived influence of CSOs in LDCs is not significantly different based on LDC functionality (p = 0.0934 for overall responses, p = 0.2322 for CSOs, and p = 0.1363 for LGUs). While there is a high level of agreement in both high- and low-functioning LDCs, a stronger endorsement is observed in LDCs classified as highly functional. Among respondents from highly functional LDCs, 85.9% expressed agreement (48.2% agreed, 37.8% strongly agreed), compared to 82.3% in low-functioning LDCs (44.0% agreed, 38.3% strongly agreed). This pattern suggests that in more structured and well-functioning LDCs, CSOs may have clearer roles and mechanisms for participation, reinforcing their influence. However, even in lower-functioning LDCs, CSO influence is still recognized by a substantial majority, implying that their role is not entirely dependent on institutional strength.

		JII .										
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total					
Low	13	8	38	16	186	162	423					
	3.073	1.891	8.983	3.783	43.972	38.298	100					
High	10	3	38	29	274	215	569					
	1.757	0.527	6.678	5.097	48.155	37.786	100					
Total	23	11	76	45	460	377	992					
	2.319	1.109	7.661	4.536	46.371	38.004	100					
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	9.42											
Prob.	0.0934											

c11

# Table S11-1: Responses by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

## By LGU Type

The type of LGU significantly affects perceptions of CSO influence in LDCs (p = 0.0019 for overall responses, p = 0.0010 for CSOs, and p = 0.0029 for LGUs). Cities exhibit the highest agreement (87.6%), followed by municipalities (85.1%) and provinces (78.2%). The differences suggest that CSO influence may be stronger at the city level, where governance structures might be more localized and participatory decision-making more embedded in policy processes.

# Table S11-2: Responses by LGU Type

		s11									
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total				
City	2	2	11	11	77	106	209				
	0.957	0.957	5.263	5.263	36.842	50.718	100				
Municipality	16	6	48	21	304	214	609				
	2.627	0.985	7.882	3.448	49.918	35.140	100				
Province	5	3	17	13	79	57	174				
	2.874	1.724	9.770	7.471	45.402	32.759	100				
Total	23	11	76	45	460	377	992				
	2.319	1.109	7.661	4.536	46.371	38.004	100				
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	27.87										
Prob.	0.0019										

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By Respondent Group

Respondent Group significantly influences perceptions of CSO influence in LDCs (p = 0.0030). CSOs are significantly more likely to perceive themselves as influential (87.7%

agreement) compared to LGU officials (81.0%). This disparity suggests that while CSOs believe they play a key role in shaping LDC decisions, local government officials may view their influence as less pronounced. Disagreement levels also differ between the two groups. While only 7.7% of CSOs disagreed with the statement, the proportion is notably higher among LGUs (9.9%), suggesting a more skeptical stance. Additionally, more LGUs (6.3%) stated they were uninformed or uncertain compared to CSOs (2.8%), reinforcing the possibility that local officials may be less engaged in participatory processes. The differences in perception highlight the need for better alignment between CSO advocacy and LGU decision-making. Enhancing communication, collaboration, and institutional mechanisms could help bridge the gap in how these two groups perceive CSO participation in LDCs.

		s11									
Respondent Group	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total				
CSO	9	9	29	14	236	200	497				
	1.811	1.811	5.835	2.817	47.485	40.241	100				
LGU	14	2	47	31	224	177	495				
	2.828	0.404	9.495	6.263	45.253	35.758	100				
Total	23	11	76	45	460	377	992				
	2.319	1.109	7.661	4.536	46.371	38.004	100				
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	17.94										
Prob.	0.0030										

## Table S11-3: Responses by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LDC Functionality x Respondent Groups

Both analyses yielded statistically insignificant results (p = 0.2322 for CSOs and p = 0.1363 for LGUs). While both CSOs and LGUs generally recognize the role of CSOs in shaping LDC plans and policies, the degree of agreement differs. Among CSO respondents, those from high-functioning LDCs exhibit higher agreement (90.4%) compared to those from low-functioning LDCs (84.2%). In contrast, while CSOs in low-functioning LDCs still largely agree (84.2%) with the statement, the slightly lower levels of strong agreement (36.7%) suggest that challenges. Among LGU respondents, perceptions of CSO influence are lower overall compared to CSOs, indicating a possible disconnect between how CSOs view their role versus how local government officials perceive their impact. LGUs from high-functioning LDCs (80.3%), though the difference is not as pronounced as among CSOs. A notable finding is that LGUs in low-functioning LDCs report higher levels of disagreement (10.6%) compared to their counterparts in high-functioning LDCs (8.7%).

		SII										
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total					
Low	6	6	16	6	102	79	215					
	2.791	2.791	7.442	2.791	47.442	36.744	100					
High	3	3	13	8	134	121	282					
	1.064	1.064	4.610	2.837	47.518	42.908	100					
Total	9	9	29	14	236	200	497					
	1.811	1.811	5.835	2.817	47.485	40.241	100					
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	6.85											
Prob.	0.2322											

Table S11-4(a): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: CSO

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Table S11-4(b): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: LGU

- 4 4

		511										
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total					
Low	7	2	22	10	84	83	208					
	3.365	0.962	10.577	4.808	40.385	39.904	100					
High	7	0	25	21	140	94	287					
	2.439	0	8.711	7.317	48.780	32.753	100					
Total	14	2	47	31	224	177	495					
	2.828	0.404	9.495	6.263	45.253	35.758	100					
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	8.38											
Prob.	0.1363											

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

## Statement 12: CSO participation in the LDC, including its committees and other consultative activities, enable more effective local plans, policies, and services.

The survey results provide insight into how LGUs and CSOs perceive the role of CSO participation in LDCs in enhancing local planning, policymaking, and service delivery. The following are the statistically significant findings:

B1. The type of LGU significantly influences perceptions of CSO participation. City officials express stronger support compared to municipalities and provinces.

## By LDC Functionality

The results show no statistically significant relationship (p = 0.2023) between LDC functionality and agreement on the effectiveness of CSO participation. However, there are

notable trends in the responses. Among respondents in LGUs with high-functioning LDCs, 93.7% (40.6% agree, 53.1% strongly agree) affirm the benefits of CSO involvement, compared to 91.3% (41.8% agree, 49.4% strongly agree) in LGUs with low-functioning LDCs. While agreement is strong in both groups, high-functioning LDCs tend to have slightly stronger endorsement. Disagreement is relatively low overall but slightly more pronounced in low-functioning LDCs (4.7%) compared to high-functioning LDCs (2.3%).

	\$12									
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total			
Low	6	5	15	11	177	209	423			
	1.418	1.182	3.546	2.600	41.844	49.409	100			
High	11	1	12	12	231	302	569			
	1.933	0.176	2.109	2.109	40.598	53.076	100			
Total	17	6	27	23	408	511	992			
	1.714	0.605	2.722	2.319	41.129	51.512	100			
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	7.26									
Prob.	0.2023									

# Table S12-1: Responses by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LGU Type

There is a statistically significant difference (p = 0.0019) in responses across cities, municipalities, and provinces. Agreement is highest among city officials, where 92.8% (28.2% agree, 64.6% strongly agree) endorse CSO participation. Municipalities and provinces report similar levels of agreement at 92.9% (44.7% agree, 48.3% strongly agree) and 91.4% (44.3% agree, 47.1% strongly agree), respectively. Disagreement is notably minimal across all LGU types, with cities recording only 3.8% disagreement, provinces at 4.6%, and municipalities at 4.9%.

## Table S12-2: Responses by LGU Type

	s12									
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total			
City	0	2	6	7	59	135	209			
	0	0.957	2.871	3.349	28.230	64.593	100			
Municipality	13	3	17	10	272	294	609			
	2.135	0.493	2.791	1.642	44.663	48.276	100			
Province	4	1	4	6	77	82	174			
	2.299	0.575	2.299	3.448	44.253	47.126	100			
Total	17	6	27	23	408	511	992			
	1.714	0.605	2.722	2.319	41.129	51.512	100			

Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	27.93		
Prob.	0.0019		

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By Respondent Group

There is no significant difference between the respondses of LGU officials and CSOs. Both CSOs and LGU officials strongly endorse the idea that CSO participation enhances governance, with 92.9% of LGU officials (41.8% agree, 50.5% strongly agree) and 92.9% of CSOs (40.4% agree, 52.5% strongly agree) expressing agreement. Disagreement is minimal but slightly more common among CSOs (4.6%) than among LGU officials (3.4%), which may indicate that some CSOs encounter challenges in engaging effectively with LGUs or feel that their contributions are not always well-integrated into decision-making processes.

				s12			
Respondent Group	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
CSO	7	4	15	9	201	261	497
	1.408	0.805	3.018	1.811	40.443	52.515	100
LGU	10	2	12	14	207	250	495
	2.020	0.404	2.424	2.828	41.818	50.505	100
Total	17	6	27	23	408	511	992
	1.714	0.605	2.722	2.319	41.129	51.512	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	2.94						
Prob.	0.7096						

## Table S12-3: Responses by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LDC Functionality x Respondent Group

The results reinforce previous findings that LDC functionality does not significantly impact perceptions of CSO effectiveness (p = 0.8000 for CSOs and p = 0.2904 for LGUs). Among CSOs in high-functioning LDCs, 93.9% (40.8% agree, 53.2% strongly agree) support the statement, while in low-functioning LDCs, the figure is slightly lower at 91.6% (40% agree, 51.6% strongly agree). LGU officials follow a similar trend: in high-functioning LDCs, 93.4% (40.4% agree, 53.0% strongly agree) express agreement, compared to 90.9% (43.8% agree, 47.1% strongly agree) in low-functioning LDCs. This pattern suggests that even in weaker institutional settings, CSO involvement is widely seen as beneficial.

Table S12-4(a): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: CSO

				s12			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	3	3	8	4	86	111	215

	1.395	1.395	3.721	1.860	40	51.628	100
High	4	1	7	5	115	150	282
	1.418	0.355	2.482	1.773	40.780	53.191	100
Total	7	4	15	9	201	261	497
	1.408	0.805	3.018	1.811	40.443	52.515	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	2.34						
Prob.	0.8000						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Table s12-4(b): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: LGU

				s12			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	3	2	7	7	91	98	208
	1.442	0.962	3.365	3.365	43.75	47.115	100
High	7	0	5	7	116	152	287
	2.439	0	1.742	2.439	40.418	52.962	100
Total	10	2	12	14	207	250	495
	2.020	0.404	2.424	2.828	41.818	50.505	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	6.17						
Prob.	0.2904						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

## Statement 13: As CSO members, we are satisfied with our participation in the LDC (for CSOs). / To the best of my knowledge, the LDC-CSO members are satisfied with their participation in the LDC. (for LGUs)

#### By LDC Functionality

The relationship between LDC functionality and satisfaction with CSO participation in the LDC is statistically significant (p = 0.0073 for all respondents), indicating that satisfaction levels vary depending on whether the LDC is highly functional or not. Among respondents from high-functioning LDCs, 92.4% (36.7% Agree, 55.7% Strongly Agree) reported being satisfied, compared to 90.5% (42.8% Agree, 47.8% Strongly Agree) in low-functioning LDCs. While the satisfaction rate remains high across both groups, the marginally higher agreement among those in high-functioning LDCs suggests that well-structured, effectively operating councils contribute to a more positive experience for CSOs.

			313			
Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
11	5	7	17	181	202	423
2.600	1.182	1.655	4.019	42.790	47.754	100
4	2	18	19	209	317	569
0.703	0.351	3.163	3.339	36.731	55.712	100
15	7	25	36	390	519	992
1.512	0.706	2.520	3.629	39.315	52.319	100
15.85						
0.0073						
	Refuse to Answer 11 2.600 4 0.703 15 1.512 1.512 15.85 0.0073	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree           11         5           2.600         1.182           4         2           0.703         0.351           15         7           1.512         0.706           15.85         0.0073	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree           11         5         7           2.600         1.182         1.655           4         2         18           0.703         0.351         3.163           15         7         25           1.512         0.706         2.520           15.85             0.0073	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree         Not Informed / I do not know           11         5         7         17           2.600         1.182         1.655         4.019           4         2         18         19           0.703         0.351         3.163         3.339           15         7         25         36           1.512         0.706         2.520         3.629           15.85         0.0073	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree         Not Informed / I do not know         Agree           11         5         7         117         181           2.600         1.182         1.655         4.019         42.790           4         2         18         19         209           0.703         0.351         3.163         3.339         36.731           15         7         25         36         390           1.512         0.706         2.520         3.629         39.315           15.85            5         5           0.0073             5	Refuse to Answer         Strongly Disagree         Disagree         Not Informed / I do not know         Agree         Strongly Agree           11         5         7         181         202           11         5         7         181         202           2.600         1.182         1.655         4.019         42.790         47.754           4         2         18         19         209         317           0.703         0.351         3.163         3.339         36.731         55.712           15         7         25         3.62         39.315         52.319           1.512         0.706         2.520         3.629         39.315         52.319           15.85         0.0073         5         5         5         5

c12

# Table S13-1: Responses by LDC Functionality

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

## By LGU Type

The variation in satisfaction levels by LGU type is statistically significant (p = 0.0058 for all respondents), highlighting differences in experiences across cities, municipalities, and provinces. In cities, 92.8% (27.8% Agree, 65.1% Strongly Agree) of respondents were satisfied, whereas satisfaction was slightly lower in municipalities (91.6%, 43.2% Agree, 48.4% Strongly Agree) and provinces (90.2%, 39.6% Agree, 50.6% Strongly Agree).

# Table S13-2: Responses by LGU Type

				s13			
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
City	4	1	5	5	58	136	209
	1.914	0.478	2.392	2.392	27.751	65.072	100
Municipality	10	4	12	25	263	295	609
	1.642	0.657	1.970	4.105	43.186	48.440	100
Province	1	2	8	6	69	88	174
	0.575	1.149	4.598	3.448	39.655	50.575	100
Total	15	7	25	36	390	519	992
	1.512	0.706	2.520	3.629	39.315	52.319	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	24.75						
Prob.	0.0058						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

## By Respondent Group

There is a strong statistical significance in the difference between CSO and LGU responses (p = 0.0000), indicating that perceptions of satisfaction vary between the two groups. CSOs reported a satisfaction rate of 93.8% (35.4% Agree, 58.4% Strongly Agree), compared to

89.5% among LGU respondents (43.2% Agree, 46.3% Strongly Agree). While both groups generally agree on the effectiveness of CSO participation in LDCs, CSOs express a slightly higher level of satisfaction, which may reflect their appreciation of the engagement opportunities provided by the councils. The discrepancy suggests that while LGU officials acknowledge CSO participation, they may also be more aware of challenges in implementation that limit full participation. This divergence highlights the need for continued improvements in fostering meaningful CSO involvement in local governance.

				s13			
Respondent Group	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
CSO	6	4	18	3	176	290	497
	1.207	0.805	3.622	0.604	35.412	58.350	100
LGU	9	3	7	33	214	229	495
	1.818	0.606	1.414	6.667	43.232	46.263	100
Total	15	7	25	36	390	519	992
	1.512	0.706	2.520	3.629	39.315	52.319	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	41.45						
Prob.	0.0000						

# Table S13-3: Responses by Respondent Group

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# By LDC Functionality x Respondent Group

The relationship between LDC functionality and satisfaction with CSO participation in the LDC is statistically significant for LGUs, but not for CSOs (p = 0.0380 for LGUs, p = 0.1268 for CSOs). For LGU respondents, the satisfaction rate in high-functioning LDCs was 91.6% (41.5% Agree, 50.2% Strongly Agree), whereas in low-functioning LDCs, it was slightly lower at 86.5% (45.7% Agree, 40.9% Strongly Agree). The greater variance for LGU respondents may reflect their awareness of the challenges faced by CSOs in engaging effectively when LDCs are not fully functional. Among CSO respondents, the satisfaction rate was relatively consistent, with 93.3% (31.9% Agree, 61.3% Strongly Agree) in high-functioning LDCs. This suggests that while CSOs are generally satisfied, the structure of the LDC still plays a role in shaping their perception of participation.

Table S13-4(a): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: CSO

		\$13										
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total					
Low	4	2	4	2	86	117	215					
	1.860	0.930	1.860	0.930	40	54.419	100					
High	2	2	14	1	90	173	282					
	0.709	0.709	4.965	0.355	31.915	61.348	100					

Total	6	4	18	3	176	290	497
	1.207	0.805	3.622	0.604	35.412	58.350	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	8.58						
Prob.	0.1268						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Table S13-4(b): Responses by LDC Functionality & Respondent Group: LGU

				\$13			
LDC Functionality	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Low	7	3	3	15	95	85	208
	3.365	1.442	1.442	7.212	45.673	40.865	100
High	2	0	4	18	119	144	287
	0.697	0	1.394	6.272	41.463	50.174	100
Total	9	3	7	33	214	229	495
	1.818	0.606	1.414	6.667	43.232	46.263	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	11.78						
Prob.	0.0380						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

# Statement 14: In my capacity under my LGU office, I am satisfied with our LDC's participatory practices. (only for LGUs)

This statement assesses whether LGUs are satisfied with participatory practices of their respective LDCs. The following are the statistically significant results:

• Satisfaction with LDC participatory practices significantly varies by LGU type. The variation suggests that participatory practices may be more varied across LGU types and structures.

## By LDC Functionality

The relationship between LDC functionality and satisfaction with participatory practices is not statistically significant (p = 0.0898), though trends suggest an association. A larger proportion of officials from highly functional LDCs express agreement (96.52%, with 43.55% Agree and 52.96% Strongly Agree), compared to those in lower-functioning LDCs (90.38%, with 43.27% Agree and 47.12% Strongly Agree). While disagreement remains low in both groups, there is a slightly higher proportion of dissatisfaction among officials in low-functioning LDCs (6.25% vs. 3.13%).

Table S14-1: Responses by LDC Functionality

				s14			
LDC	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Functionality				KNOW			

Low	5	3	10	2	90	98	208
	2.404	1.442	4.808	0.962	43.269	47.115	100
High	1	1	7	1	125	152	287
	0.348	0.348	2.439	0.348	43.554	52.962	100
Total	6	4	17	3	215	250	495
	1.212	0.808	3.434	0.606	43.434	50.505	100
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	9.53						
Prob.	0.0898						

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

#### By LGU Type

The relationship between LGU type and satisfaction with LDC participatory practices is highly significant (p = 0.0002). Differences across LGU types are apparent, with municipalities and provinces exhibiting similar level of strong satisfaction (93.09%, with 47.04% Agree and 46.05% Strongly Agree), and (93.10%, with 48.28% Agree and 44.83% Strongly Agree). Meanwhile, cities report the highest level of agreement at 97.12% (28.85% Agree and 68.27% Strongly Agree). Disagreement is negligible across all LGU types but is slightly more pronounced in municipalities (4.97%) than in provinces (3.45%) and cities (2.89%).

	s14											
LGU Type	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total					
City	0	0	3	0	30	71	104					
	0	0	2.885	0	28.846	68.269	100					
Municipality	5	4	12	0	143	140	304					
	1.645	1.316	3.947	0	47.039	46.053	100					
Province	1	0	2	3	42	39	87					
	1.149	0	2.299	3.448	48.276	44.828	100					
Total	6	4	17	3	215	250	495					
	1.212	0.808	3.434	0.606	43.434	50.505	100					
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	33.69											
Prob.	0.0002											

# Table S14-2: Responses by LGU Type

Notes: First row has frequencies, and second row has row percentages.

## ADDITIONAL EXPLORATIONS Space x Engagement x Results

This section presents the findings of a quantile regression analysis examining the relationship between policy space, engagement, and the outcomes of participatory governance. The analysis utilizes median regression (quantile regression at the 50th percentile) to estimate the effects of engagement processes and participatory space on participatory outcomes while accounting for potential non-normality and heteroskedasticity in the data.

A quantile regression model was estimated with an index of the Results statements (aggregated responses for statements 11-13) as the dependent variable and an index of Engagement statements (aggregated responses for Statements 8-10) and an index for Space statements (aggregated responses for statements 1-7) as the independent variables, including their interaction term. The methodology for index construction was consistent with earlier index discussions. The estimation accounts for robust standard errors to ensure statistical reliability. The model is specified as follows:

 $Results = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Engagement + \beta_2 Space + \beta_3 (Engagement \times Space) + \varepsilon$ 

#### Overall

Engagement has a statistically significant positive effect on results (coefficient = 0.552, p < 0.01), indicating that higher perceived quality participation processes are associated with perceived improved participatory governance results. Space (Participatory Environment) also has a significant positive effect on results (coefficient = 0.206, p < 0.01), suggesting that a perception of more enabling policy and institutional environment enhances perceived participatory governance outcomes.

The interaction term between Engagement and Space is not statistically significant (p = 0.733), meaning that the combined effect of participation processes and the participatory environment does not appear to influence outcomes beyond their individual effects. These findings suggest that both engagement processes and the participatory environment independently contribute to governance outcomes, but their interaction does not produce additional effects.

Table following table presents the coefficient estimates from the median regression analysis.

Median regression Raw sum of devia	ations 870.	)	Number of	obs =	992	
Min sum of deviations 436.7612			/	Pseudo R2	=	0.4983
		Robust				
results	Coefficient	std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
engage	.552381	.070469	7.84	0.000	.4140948	.6906671
space	.2061224	.0343301	6.00	0.000	.1387541	.2734908
c.engage#c.space	0006803	.0019934	-0.34	0.733	0045921	.0032316
_cons	0857143	1.13135	-0.08	0.940	-2.30584	2.134411

Table B 0.1 Quantile Regression (at the median) - Participatory Governance Space, Engagement and Results Index

#### By Respondent Group

The analysis mirrors the overall approach in the previous section but restricts the sample to only CSO or LGU respondents. Quantile regression results indicate that engagement (participation processes) significantly predicts governance outcomes for both CSOs and LGUs. The effect of engagement is slightly stronger for LGUs (0.611) than for CSOs (0.570). On the other hand, space (participatory environment) has a stronger effect among CSOs than among LGUs. The coefficient for CSOs (0.276, p = 0.001) is larger than that for LGUs (0.167, p = 0.000).

This implies that CSOs may be more reliant on an enabling environment (policies and institutional settings) to achieve better governance outcomes.

The interaction term (Engagement × Space) is not significant for either group. This suggests that the combined effect of participation processes and participatory space does not provide additional benefits beyond their independent effects. The regression tables are below:

Table B 0.2 Quantile Regression (at the median) (CSOs) - Participatory Governance Space, Engagement and Results Index

Median regression Raw sum of devia	Number o	of obs =	497			
Min sum of deviations 205.7917				Pseudo R	2 =	0.5285
		Robust				
results	Coefficient	std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
engage	.5701754	.179797	3.17	0.002	.2169125	.9234384
space	.2763158	.0818758	3.37	0.001	.1154472	.4371844
c.engage#c.space	004386	.0049595	-0.88	0.377	0141303	.0053583
_cons	5526316	2.726745	-0.20	0.839	-5.910106	4.804843

Table B 0.3 Quantile Regression (at the median) (LGUs) - Participatory Governance Space, Engagement and Results Index

Median regression Raw sum of devia Min sum of devia	ations 43 ations 223.305	Number Pseudo	of obs = R2 =	495 0.4855		
		_				
results	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
engage	.6111111	.0958492	6.38	0.000	.422786	.7994362
space	.1666667	.0398712	4.18	0.000	.0883275	.2450059
c.engage#c.space	1.21e-17	.0024987	0.00	1.000	0049094	.0049094
_cons	6.66e-16	1.464353	0.00	1.000	-2.877172	2.877172

#### By LDC Functionality

This set of analyses provide insights into whether stronger LDC functionality enhances participatory governance outcomes and whether engagement and institutional settings have different effects depending on the capacity and effectiveness of LDCs.

Results show that engagement (Participation Processes) has a significant positive effect only for high-functionality LDCs:

• For high-functionality LDCs, the coefficient is 0.652 (p = 0.000), indicating that stronger participation processes are strongly associated with better participatory governance outcomes.

• For low-functionality LDCs, the coefficient is 0.417, but it is not statistically significant (p = 0.084), suggesting that engagement has a weaker or inconsistent effect in settings where LDC functionality is lower.

Space (Participatory Environment) is a significant predictor for both groups, but with a stronger effect for low-functionality LDCs. The coefficient for low-functionality LDCs is 0.250 (p = 0.019), while for high-functionality LDCs, it is 0.157 (p = 0.047). This suggests that when LDC functionality is weaker, improvements in institutional settings play a larger role in improving participatory governance outcomes.

The interaction term (Engagement × Space) is not significant for either group. This implies that the benefits of participation processes and institutional settings are largely independent and do not necessarily reinforce each other.

Table B 0.4 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Low LDC Functionality) - Participatory Governance Space, Engagement and Results Index

Median regression Raw sum of devia Min sum of devia	ations 39 ations 197.833	)	Number Pseudo	of obs = R2 =	423 0.4953	
results	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
engage space	.4166667 .25	.2408331 .1061319	1.73 2.36	0.084 0.019	0567249 .0413827	.8900582 .4586173
c.engage#c.space	-1.39e-17	.0066443	-0.00	1.000	0130603	.0130603
_cons	-2.19e-15	3.727112	-0.00	1.000	-7.326167	7.326167

Table B 0.5 Quantile Regression (at the median) (High LDC Functionality) - Participatory Governance Space, Engagement and Results Index

Mediar	n reg	gres	sion				Number	of	obs	=	569
Raw	sum	of	deviations	478.5	(about	16)					
Min	sum	of	deviations	235.7552			Pseudo	R2		=	0.5073

results	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
engage space	.6515873 .1571429	.1854614 .0790157	3.51 1.99	0.000 0.047	.2873094 .0019425	1.015865 .3123432
c.engage#c.space	0007937	.004878	-0.16	0.871	0103748	.0087875
_cons	.2714286	2.943001	0.09	0.927	-5.509129	6.051987

#### By LGU Type

Cities show the highest coefficient for Engagement (0.814, p = 0.000), suggesting that strong participation processes are associated with significantly better governance outcomes in cities. Municipalities (0.538, p = 0.000) and Provinces (0.650, p = 0.000) also benefit from better engagement, but to a lesser extent than cities.

Space (institutional setting) has a positive and significant effect across all LGU types – Cities: (0.239, p = 0.000), Municipalities: (0.212, p = 0.000) and Provinces: (0.242, p = 0.000) This suggests that a well-structured participatory environment (laws, policies, institutions) consistently supports better governance outcomes, regardless of LGU type.

The interaction term is insignificant across all LGU types, suggesting that the benefits of participation processes and institutional settings are largely independent rather than mutually reinforcing. This finding indicates that strong institutions alone do not necessarily amplify the effects of engagement—instead, both factors need to be improved separately to enhance participatory governance.

Table B 0.6 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Cities) - Participatory Governance Space, Engagement and Results Index

Median regression Raw sum of devia Min sum of devia	ations 165. ations 79.9144	Number Pseudo	of obs = R2 =	209 0.5171		
results	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
engage space	.8141593 .2389381	.1324107 .0590179	6.15 4.05	0.000 0.000	.5530979 .1225781	1.075221 .355298
c.engage#c.space	0058997	.0034386	-1.72	0.088	0126793	.0008799
_cons	-2.230088	1.666051	-1.34	0.182	-5.514881	1.054704

Table B 0.7 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Municipalities) - Participatory Governance Space, Engagement and Results Index

Median regression Raw sum of devia	ations 529	)	Number of	F obs =	609	
Min sum of devia	ations 276.560	5	/	Pseudo R2	2 =	0.4777
		Robust				
results	Coefficient	std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
engage	.5380952	.1048664	5.13	0.000	.332149	.7440415
space	.2122449	.0493591	4.30	0.000	.1153089	.3091809
c.engage#c.space	0006803	.0029345	-0.23	0.817	0064434	.0050828
_cons	0857143	1.668893	-0.05	0.959	-3.363241	3.191812

Table B 0.8 Quantile Regression (at the median) (Provinces) - Participatory Governance Space, Engagement and Results Index

Median regression Raw sum of devia	ations 15	5 (about <b>16</b> )		Number of	F obs =	174
Min sum of devia	Min sum of deviations <b>78.16806</b>					0.4957
		Robust				
results	Coefficient	std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
engage	.65	.0857662	7.58	0.000	.480696	.819304
space	.2416667	.0467493	5.17	0.000	.1493828	.3339506
c.engage#c.space	0027778	.0023366	-1.19	0.236	0073903	.0018347
_cons	-1.75	.8599914	-2.03	0.043	-3.447637	0523625

## **B9.2.** Accreditation Policy Adherence

In this section, we present findings examining whether adherence to national guidelines on CSO accreditation and LDC membership selection has an association with inclusivity of LDC processes. Specifically, we analysed survey responses in two statements measured on a Likert scale.

- Statement 1: Perceptions of compliance with national CSO accreditation and LDC membership selection guidelines.
- Statement 8: Perceptions of the inclusivity of LDC processes.

In performing the analysis, we cross tabulated to examine the frequency distributions and associations between agreement between the two statement. We performed the chi-quare test to assess whether associations between the two statement were statistically significant. We finally conducted ordered logistic regression to evaluate the strength and direction of the relationship while controlling for subgroup effects (Respondent Group, LDC functionality, LGU type). We include interaction terms to test whether the strength of the relationship varied across different subgroups.

Ordered logistic regression (ologit) is a statistical method used for modeling ordinal dependent variables, where the categories have a natural order but the distances between them are unknown. This makes it an extension of logistic regression designed specifically for ranked or ordered outcomes. Unlike standard logistic regression (which assumes a binary outcome) or ordinary least squares (OLS, which assumes a continuous outcome), ologit models outcomes that are ordered but categorical. Unlike linear regression, which assumes that the difference between categories is the same, ordered logistic regression simply models the probability of being in a higher category.

#### B9.2.1. Overall

The cross-tabulation of S1 and S8 shows that a majority of respondents who agree that accreditation follows national guidelines (Agree or Strongly Agree in S1) also report higher inclusivity ratings (Agree or Strongly Agree in S8). Specifically:

• Among the 367 respondents who agreed with accreditation compliance, 249 (67.8%) agreed and 85 (23.2%) strongly agreed that LDC processes are inclusive.

- Among the 569 respondents who strongly agreed with accreditation compliance, 374 (65.7%) strongly agreed and 172 (30.2%) agreed with LDC inclusivity.
- In contrast, disagreement with accreditation compliance is associated with lower inclusivity ratings. Among the 24 respondents who disagreed with S1, only 4 strongly agreed with S8, while the majority either disagreed or were not informed about inclusivity.
- Similarly, for those who strongly disagreed with accreditation compliance (8 respondents), only 1 agreed that LDCs are inclusive, while the rest had negative or neutral perceptions.

The Pearson chi-square test (p = 0.000) confirms that this relationship is statistically significant, meaning that variations in accreditation compliance are systematically associated with differences in inclusivity perceptions. The Cramér's V value (0.3671) suggests a moderate to strong association.

		s8								
-1	Refuse to Answer	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Informed / I do not	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total			
SI				KNOW						
Refuse to	7	0	0	0	1	2	10			
Answer										
Strongly	0	1	0	0	2	1	4			
Disagree										
Disagree	0	3	4	0	6	1	14			
Not Informed	3	2	1	4	14	4	28			
/ I do not										
know										
Agree	2	1	15	15	249	85	367			
Strongly Agree	4	1	4	14	172	374	569			
Total	16	8	24	33	444	467	992			
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	668.52									
Prob.	0.0000									

#### Table B 9.2.1 Cross Tabulation: Statement 1 and Statement 8

The ordered logistic regression model provides additional confirmation of this relationship. The regression coefficients further highlight the increasing probability of higher inclusivity ratings as accreditation compliance strengthen. Respondents who strongly agreed with accreditation compliance (S1 = Strongly Agree) were significantly more likely to perceive LDCs as inclusive (S8), with a coefficient of 6.08 (p = 0.000). Agreement with S1 also had a strong effect (4.40, p = 0.000), confirming a statistically significant and positive association.

Not Informed respondents had a coefficient of 3.11 (p = 0.019), suggesting that even among those uncertain about accreditation, inclusivity perceptions were positively influenced. Disagree and Strongly Disagree responses were positive but had higher p-values (0.072 and 0.055, respectively), meaning their statistical significance is weaker compared to stronger agreement levels.

Table B 9.2.2 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 1 and Statement 8

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs = 992		
	Wald chi2(5) = <b>175.25</b>		
	Prob > chi2 = 0.0000		
Log pseudolikelihood = -894.06727	Pseudo R2 = <b>0.1191</b>		

Coefficient	Robust std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
3.798968	1.977341	1.92	0.055	0765481	7.674485
2.323957	1.289588	1.80	0.072	2035889	4.851503
3.114032	1.326355	2.35	0.019	.5144242	5.71364
4.398911	1.260705	3.49	0.000	1.927974	6.869848
6.07926	1.273664	4.77	0.000	3.582925	8.575595
	Coefficient 3.798968 2.323957 3.114032 4.398911 6.07926	Robust Coefficient std. err. 3.798968 1.977341 2.323957 1.289588 3.114032 1.326355 4.398911 1.260705 6.07926 1.273664	Robust Coefficient std. err.z3.7989681.9773411.922.3239571.2895881.803.1140321.3263552.354.3989111.2607053.496.079261.2736644.77	Robust Coefficient std. err.zP> z 3.7989681.9773411.920.0552.3239571.2895881.800.0723.1140321.3263552.350.0194.3989111.2607053.490.0006.079261.2736644.770.000	Robust         Coefficient       std.       err.       z       P> z        [95% conf.         3.798968       1.977341       1.92       0.055      0765481         2.323957       1.289588       1.80       0.072      2035889         3.114032       1.326355       2.35       0.019       .5144242         4.398911       1.260705       3.49       0.000       1.927974         6.07926       1.273664       4.77       0.000       3.582925

#### B9.2.2. By Respondent Group

Among CSO respondents (n = 497), a strong association exists between accreditation compliance and perceived inclusivity.

- A majority (190 respondents, or 38.2%) strongly agreed with accreditation compliance and also rated LDCs as strongly inclusive.
- 127 respondents (25.6%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also agreed that LDC processes are inclusive.
- However, those who disagreed with accreditation compliance were more likely to report low inclusivity, with 6 out of 13 respondents (46%) selecting "Disagree" or "Not Informed" for inclusivity.
- Notably, CSOs had a higher proportion of "Not Informed" responses (17 respondents), suggesting that some CSOs may lack awareness or engagement in accreditation and LDC processes.

Among LGU respondents (n = 495), the trend remains consistent but with slightly higher inclusivity perceptions compared to CSOs.

- 184 LGU respondents (37.2%) who strongly agreed with accreditation compliance also strongly agreed that LDCs are inclusive.
- 122 LGU respondents (24.6%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also rated LDCs as inclusive.
- Notably, disagreement with accreditation compliance was much lower among LGUs, with only 11 respondents selecting "Disagree" and just 2 respondents choosing "Strongly Disagree".
- LGU respondents had fewer "Not Informed" responses (11 respondents), indicating greater familiarity with accreditation policies compared to CSOs.

The Pearson chi-square test for CSOs (p = 0.000) and LGUs (p = 0.000) confirms that the relationship between accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions is statistically significant in both groups. However, Cramér's V is slightly higher for CSOs (0.4044) than for LGUs (0.3627), indicating that the strength of association between accreditation compliance and inclusivity is slightly stronger among CSOs.

				s8			
	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
s1	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree	
Refuse to	4	0	0	0	1	0	5
Answer							
Strongly	0	1	0	0	1	1	3
Disagree							
Disagree	0	2	2	0	5	1	10
Not Informed /	3	2	0	4	8	0	17
I do not know							
Agree	1	1	10	7	127	44	190
Strongly Agree	2	0	1	4	75	190	272
Total	10	6	13	15	217	236	497
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	406.48						
Prob.	0.0000						

#### Table B 9.2.3 Cross Tabulation: Statement 1 and Statement 8 by CSO Respondents

Table B 9.2.4 Cross Tabulation: Statement 1 and Statement 8 by LGU Respondents

	s8						
	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
s1	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree	
Refuse to	3	0	0	0	0	2	5
Answer							
Strongly	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Disagree							
Disagree	0	1	2	0	1	0	4
Not Informed /	0	0	1	0	6	4	11
I do not know							
Agree	1	0	5	8	122	41	177
Strongly Agree	2	1	3	10	97	184	297
Total	6	2	11	18	227	231	495
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	325.57						
Prob.	0.0000						

The regression results confirm that stronger agreement with accreditation compliance significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving LDCs as inclusive. The coefficient for Strongly Agree (7.19, p = 0.000) suggests that respondents who strongly agree with accreditation compliance are significantly more likely to perceive LDC processes as inclusive.

However, the interaction terms between accreditation compliance and Respondent Group (s1#Respondent Group set of results) were not statistically significant, indicating that the effect of accreditation compliance on inclusivity perceptions does not significantly differ between CSO and LGU respondents. Table B 9.2.5 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 1 and Statement 8 with Respondent Group Interactions (LGU)

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs	= 992
	Wald chi2(10)	
	Prob > chi2	
Log pseudolikelihood = - <b>884.25168</b>	Pseudo R2	= 0.1288

		Robust				
s8	Coefficient	std. err.	Z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
s1						
Strongly Disagree	4.599653	2.917724	1.58	0.115	-1.118982	10.31829
Disagree	3.584356	1.620411	2.21	0.027	.4084088	6.760304
Not Informed / I do	3.052392	1.545614	1.97	0.048	.0230445	6.081739
Agree	5.259816	1.495224	3.52	0.000	2.329232	8.190401
Strongly Agree	7.19386	1.502691	4.79	0.000	4.248638	10.13908
survey_tag						
LGU	1.812232	2.957549	0.61	0.540	-3.984458	7.608922
s1#survey tag						
Strongly Disagree#LGU	-1.594209	3.89838	-0.41	0.683	-9.234893	6.046474
Disagree#LGU	-2.989652	3.084741	-0.97	0.332	-9.035633	3.056328
Not Informed / I do #						
LGU	.8886552	3.079419	0.29	0.773	-5.146895	6.924205
Agree#LGU	-1.744665	2.964073	-0.59	0.556	-7.554142	4.064813
Strongly Agree#LGU	-2.198276	2.962762	-0.74	0.458	-8.005183	3.60863
/cut1	1.150277	1.39879			-1.5913	3.891854
/cut2	1.703983	1.44077			-1.119874	4.52784
/cut3	2.607453	1.476693			286812	5.501717
/cut4	3.272565	1.48969			.352827	6.192304
/cut5	6.362784	1.495696			3.431273	9.294296

## B9.2.3. By LDC Functionality

The cross-tabulation of S1 and S8 by LDC functionality reveals key differences in how respondents perceive accreditation compliance and inclusivity.

Among low-functionality LDCs (n = 423), the association between accreditation compliance and inclusivity is moderate but more varied than in high-functionality LDCs.

- 155 respondents (36.6%) strongly agreed with accreditation compliance and also strongly agreed that LDCs are inclusive.
- 60 respondents (14.2%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also agreed that LDCs are inclusive.
- A substantial number of respondents (12 out of 423, or 2.8%) reported "Not Informed" responses, indicating some lack of awareness regarding accreditation processes.
- Respondents who disagreed or strongly disagreed with accreditation compliance tended to have lower inclusivity ratings, with 46% of those disagreeing also reporting low inclusivity perceptions.

Among high-functionality LDCs (n = 569), the relationship between accreditation compliance and inclusivity is stronger and more stable than in low-functionality LDCs.

• 219 respondents (38.5%) strongly agreed with accreditation compliance and also strongly agreed that LDCs are inclusive.

- 112 respondents (19.7%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also agreed that LDCs are inclusive.
- There were fewer "Not Informed" responses (16 out of 569, or 2.8%), indicating higher awareness of accreditation compliance compared to low-functionality LDCs.
- A lower proportion of respondents disagreed with accreditation compliance, and among those who did, their inclusivity perceptions were less negative than in low-functionality LDCs.

The Pearson chi-square test (Low,  $\chi^2$  = 289.43, p = 0.000; High,  $\chi^2$  = 517.39, p = 0.000) confirms that accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions are statistically significantly regardless of functionality of LDCs. The Cramér's V value is higher for high LDC functionality LDC (Low = 0.3699, High = 0.4264) suggests a stronger association compared to low-functionality LDCs,

	s8								
	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total		
s1	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree			
Refuse to	4	0	0	0	1	1	6		
Answer									
Strongly	0	0	0	0	2	0	2		
Disagree									
Disagree	0	1	1	0	3	0	5		
Not Informed /	1	2	1	3	4	1	12		
I do not know									
Agree	2	1	10	6	116	39	174		
Strongly Agree	2	1	2	4	60	155	224		
Total	9	5	14	13	186	196	423		
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	289.43								
Prob.	0.0000								

Table B 9.2.6 Cross Tabulation: Statement 1 and Statement 8 by LDC Functionality (Low)

#### Table B 9.2.7 Cross Tabulation: Statement 1 and Statement 8 by LDC Functionality (High)

	s8							
	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total	
s1	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree		
Refuse to	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	
Answer								
Strongly	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	
Disagree								
Disagree	0	2	3	0	3	1	9	
Not Informed /	2	0	0	1	10	3	16	
l do not know								
Agree	0	0	5	9	133	46	193	
Strongly Agree	2	0	2	10	112	219	345	
Total	7	3	10	20	258	271	569	
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	517.39							
Prob.	0.0000							

The regression results confirm that higher accreditation compliance significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving LDCs as inclusive. The coefficient for Strongly Agree (6.05, p = 0.000) suggests that respondents who strongly agree with accreditation compliance are much more likely to perceive LDCs as inclusive. However, the interaction terms between accreditation compliance and LDC functionality (s1#LDC Functionality) were not statistically significant, indicating that the effect of accreditation compliance on inclusivity perceptions does not significantly differ between low- and high-functionality LDCs.

Number of obs = Ordered logistic regression 992 Wald chi2(10) =• Prob > chi2 = Log pseudolikelihood = -890.34693 Pseudo R2 = 0.1228 Robust [95% conf. interval] s8 Coefficient std. err. z P>|z| s1 Strongly Disagree 3.74482 1.594857 2.35 0.019 .6189583 6.870681 1.744838 -1.094855 5.744783 2.324964 1.33 0.183 Disagree Not Informed / I do .. 2.072769 1.647871 1.26 0.208 -1.156998 5.302537 .9841073 4.12424 1.602138 2.57 0.010 7.264373 Agree Strongly Agree 6.054658 1.613536 3.75 0.000 2.892186 9.21713 intldc fcn -.5887172 2,282807 -5,062937 High -0.26 0.796 3.885502 s1#intldc\_fcn Strongly Disagree#High .0662516 6.45504 0.01 0.992 -12.58539 12.7179 Disagree#High 2.508858 5.174112 .2568404 0.10 0.918 -4.660431 Not Informed / I do .. # 2.204837 2,425107 0.91 0.363 -2.548284 6.957959 High Agree#High .7570936 2.290792 0.33 0.741 -3.732777 5.246964 Strongly Agree#High .3397612 2.290359 0.15 0.882 4.828782 -4.14926 /cut1 .1086846 1.490162 -2.811979 3.029348 /cut2 .655496 1,534515 -2.352098 3.66309 /cut3 1.553644 1,573668 -1.530694.637977 /cut4 2.215271 1.587791 -.8967422 5.327284 /cut5 5.274368 1.605429 2.127785 8.420952

Table B 9.2.8 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 1 and Statement 8 with Interactions (LDC Functionality = High)

#### B9.2.4. By LGU Type

The cross-tabulation of S1 and S8 by LGU type reveals key differences in how respondents perceive accreditation compliance and inclusivity across different levels of local government.

Among city respondents (n = 209), the association between accreditation compliance and inclusivity is strong and relatively consistent.

- 124 respondents (59.3%) strongly agreed with accreditation compliance and also strongly agreed that LDCs are inclusive.
- 33 respondents (15.8%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also agreed that LDCs are inclusive.
- A small percentage of respondents (11 out of 209, or 5.3%) were "Not Informed", indicating that most city respondents have a clear understanding of accreditation compliance and its implications.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 60.87, p = 0.000) confirms that accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions are statistically significant among cities. The Cramér's V value (0.3116) suggests a moderate association, and the gamma value (0.7409, ASE = 0.064) indicates that the relationship is strongly positive, meaning that increased accreditation compliance leads to increased inclusivity perceptions.

Among municipality respondents (n = 609), the relationship between accreditation compliance and inclusivity is strong but more variable than in cities.

- 257 respondents (42.2%) strongly agreed with accreditation compliance and also strongly agreed that LDCs are inclusive.
- 188 respondents (30.9%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also agreed that LDCs are inclusive.
- A larger proportion of respondents (14 out of 609, or 2.3%) reported being "Not Informed", suggesting that there may be greater disparities in governance and accreditation awareness across different municipalities.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 503.01, p = 0.000) confirms that accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions are statistically significant among municipalities. The Cramér's V value (0.4064) suggests a stronger association than in cities, while the gamma value (0.6724, ASE = 0.044) indicates a moderately strong positive correlation.

Among province respondents (n = 174), the relationship between accreditation compliance and inclusivity is weaker compared to cities and municipalities.

- 86 respondents (49.4%) strongly agreed with accreditation compliance and also strongly agreed that LDCs are inclusive.
- 38 respondents (21.8%) agreed with accreditation compliance and also agreed that LDCs are inclusive.
- A small proportion of respondents (3 out of 174, or 1.7%) reported being "Not Informed", indicating relatively higher awareness compared to municipalities but slightly lower than in cities.

The Pearson chi-square test are significant across three LGU types which confirms that accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions are statistically significant among provinces. Cities have the strongest agreement with both accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions. Respondents from cities reported the highest agreement levels for both accreditation compliance and inclusivity. On the other hand, Municipalities show the highest variability in responses. Compared to cities, municipality respondents exhibited greater variation in perceptions, with more respondents selecting "Not Informed." The Cramér's V value (0.4064) was higher than for cities, indicating a stronger but more variable relationship between accreditation compliance and inclusivity.

s8	

Table B 9.2.9 Cross Tabulation: Statement 1 and Statement 8 by LGU Type (Cities)

	s8							
	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total	
s1	Answer	Disagree		I do not know		Agree		
Refuse to	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Answer								

Not Informed / I do not know	0	1	1	1	7	1	11
Agree	1	1	1	2	33	17	55
Strongly Agree	0	0	0	3	33	106	142
Total	1	2	2	6	74	124	209
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	60.87						
Prob.	0.0000						

Table B 9.2.10 Cross Tabulation: Statement 1 and Statement 8 by LGU Type (Municipalities)

				s8			
	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
s1	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree	
Refuse to	7	0	0	0	0	2	9
Answer							
Strongly	0	1	0	0	1	1	3
Disagree							
Disagree	0	1	3	0	4	1	9
Not Informed /	3	1	0	2	6	2	14
l do not know							
Agree	1	0	11	11	188	57	268
Strongly Agree	2	1	4	4	101	194	306
Total	13	4	18	17	300	257	609
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	503.01						
Prob.	0.0000						

Table B 9.2.11 Cross Tabulation: Statement 1 and Statement 8 by LGU Type (Provinces)

				s8			
	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
s1	Answer	Disagree		l do not know		Agree	
Strongly	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Disagree							
Disagree	0	2	1	0	2	0	5
Not Informed /	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
I do not know							
Agree	0	0	3	2	28	11	44
Strongly Agree	2	0	0	7	38	74	121
Total	2	2	4	10	70	86	174
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	107.56						
Prob.	0.0000						

The regression results confirm that higher accreditation compliance significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving LDCs as inclusive. The coefficient for Strongly Agree (2.60, p = 0.000) suggests that respondents who strongly agree with accreditation compliance are much more likely to perceive LDCs as inclusive.

However, the interaction terms between accreditation compliance and LGU type (s1#intlgu\_type) were not statistically significant, indicating that the effect of accreditation

compliance on inclusivity perceptions does not significantly differ across cities, municipalities, and provinces.

		Robust				
s8	Coefficient	std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf	. interval]
s1						
Strongly Disagree	.693206	.2785042	2.49	0.013	.1473478	1.239064
Disagree	-1.50187	.8066374	-1.86	0.063	-3.08285	.0791102
Not Informed / I do	6180198	.573084	-1.08	0.281	-1.741244	.5052042
Agree	.7305912	.2705047	2.70	0.007	.2004116	1.260771
Strongly Agree	2.6014	.2080022	12.51	0.000	2.193723	3.009077
intlgu_type						
Municipality	-4.612384	1.273125	-3.62	0.000	-7.107664	-2.117104
Province	693206	.2785042	-2.49	0.013	-1.239064	1473478
s1#intlgu_type						
Refuse to Answer #						
Province	0	(empty)				
Strongly Disagree#City	0	(empty)				
Strongly Disagree #						
Municipality	3.697103	2.804066	1.32	0.187	-1.798766	9.192972
Strongly Disagree #						
Province	0	(omitted)				
Disagree#City	0	(empty)				
Disagree#Municipality	4.820355	1.699209	2.84	0.005	1.489967	8.150743
Disagree#Province	0	(omitted)				
Not Informed / I do #						
Municipality	3.979383	1.606393	2.48	0.013	.8309098	7.127856
Not Informed / I do #						
Province	1.461287	1.76692	0.83	0.408	-2.001814	4.924387
Agree#Municipality	4.29952	1.297441	3.31	0.001	1.756583	6.842457
Agree#Province	.4271742	.4856548	0.88	0.379	5246917	1.37904
Strongly Agree #						
Municipality	4.072732	1.294644	3.15	0.002	1.535276	6.610188
Strongly Agree #						
Province	0	(omitted)				

Table B 9.2.12 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 1 and Statement 8 with Interactions (LGU Type)

# B9.3. Additions to Satisfaction (Information Access Protocols and Information-Sharing)

In this section, we examine whether adherence to clear protocols for CSO data access (S4) is associated with perceptions of information efficiency in LDC processes (S10). Specifically, we analyze survey responses on:

- S4: Perceptions of the clarity of protocols for CSO members to access relevant LDC data and information.
- S10: Perceptions of the efficiency of LDC processes in providing information, such as the CSO directory, meeting agenda and minutes, and relevant policy documents.

We cross-tabulated responses to these two statements to examine frequency distributions and assess associations between S4 and S10. A chi-square test was conducted to determine statistical significance, and an ordered logistic regression was performed to evaluate the strength and direction of the relationship while controlling for subgroup effects.

## B9.3.2. Overall

The cross-tabulation of S4 and S10 indicates a strong association between perceptions of clear data access protocols and the efficiency of LDC information-sharing processes.

- Among 367 respondents who agreed that LDCs have clear protocols for CSO data access (S4 = Agree), 249 (67.8%) agreed and 85 (23.2%) strongly agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10).
- Among 569 respondents who strongly agreed with S4, 374 (65.7%) strongly agreed and 172 (30.2%) agreed with S10, reinforcing a strong positive association.
- In contrast, respondents who disagreed that LDCs have clear data access protocols reported much lower agreement with information efficiency. Among those who disagreed with S4, only 4 respondents strongly agreed with S10, while the majority either disagreed or were uninformed about LDC information efficiency.
- Similarly, among 8 respondents who strongly disagreed with S4, only 1 respondent agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information, while the rest had negative or neutral perceptions.

The Pearson chi-square test confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 ( $\chi^2(25) = 668.52$ , p = 0.000), indicating a strong and systematic association between accreditation compliance and inclusivity perceptions. The Cramér's V = 0.3671, suggesting a moderate to strong association, reinforcing that clarity in data access protocols is linked to improved perceptions of information efficiency.

	s10						
	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Informed /	Agree	Strongly	Total
s4	Answer	Disagree		I do not know		Agree	
Refuse to	9	0	0	0	4	2	15
Answer							
Strongly	0	2	4	0	4	1	11
Disagree							
Disagree	0	1	7	0	1	1	10
Not Informed /	0	0	5	21	22	8	56
I do not know							
Agree	2	4	21	16	293	119	455
Strongly Agree	1	0	5	8	100	331	445
Total	12	7	42	45	424	462	992
Pearson Chi <sup>2</sup>	1019.30						
Prob.	0.0000						

#### Table B 9.3.1 Cross Tabulation: Statement 4 and Statement 10

The ordered logistic regression confirms that stronger agreement with S4 (clear protocols for CSO data access) significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving LDC information processes as efficient (S10). Respondents who strongly agreed with S4 were significantly more likely to perceive LDCs as efficient in providing information, with a coefficient of 6.34 (p = 0.000). Agreement with S4 also had a strong effect (4.35, p = 0.002), confirming a statistically significant and positive association. Not Informed respondents had a coefficient of 2.98 (p = 0.031), indicating that even among those uncertain about data access protocols,

inclusivity perceptions were positively influenced. Disagree and Strongly Disagree responses were positive but had higher p-values (0.367 and 0.195, respectively), meaning their statistical significance is weaker compared to stronger agreement levels.

Ordered logistic regression Log pseudolikelihood = - <b>896.13556</b>			Number of obs = 992 Wald chi2(5) = 245.66 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000 Pseudo R2 = 0.1649				
s10	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]	
s4							
Strongly Disagree	1.910254	1.473216	1.30	0.195	977196	4.797704	
Disagree	1.228831	1.360962	0.90	0.367	-1.438605	3.896267	
Not Informed / I do	2.977492	1.381987	2.15	0.031	.2688482	5.686137	
Agree	4.353343	1.385142	3.14	0.002	1.638515	7.068172	
Strongly Agree	6.339389	1.394947	4.54	0.000	3.605343	9.073435	
/cut1	5116974	1.188822			-2.841745	1.81835	
/cut2	.1016916	1.273677			-2.39467	2.598053	
/cut3	1.616381	1.357291			-1.04386	4.276621	
/cut4	2.366349	1.374346			3273202	5.060019	
/cut5	5.291249	1.390219			2.56647	8.016029	

 Table B 9.3.2 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 4 and Statement 10

#### B9.3.3. By LDC Functionality

We cross-tabulated responses to these two statements by LDC functionality (Low vs. High) to examine frequency distributions and assess associations between S4 and S10.

Among respondents in low-functionality LDCs, the association between clear data access protocols and perceptions of efficient information sharing is moderate but more varied compared to high-functionality LDCs:

- 111 respondents (64.5%) who agreed with S4 also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10), while 48 (25.9%) strongly agreed.
- Among 194 respondents who strongly agreed with S4, 138 (71.1%) strongly agreed with S10, confirming a positive relationship.
- Respondents who disagreed with S4 tended to have lower inclusivity ratings:
- Among the 20 respondents who disagreed with S4, only 2 strongly agreed with S10.
- The "Not Informed" category for S4 (33 respondents) had a mixed distribution in S10, indicating possible gaps in awareness regarding information-sharing efficiency.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 513.46, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 for low-functionality LDCs.

Among respondents in high-functionality LDCs, the association between clear data access protocols and perceived information efficiency is stronger and more stable compared to low-functionality LDCs:

• 182 respondents (72.2%) who agreed with S4 also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10), while 71 (28.2%) strongly agreed.

- Among 268 respondents who strongly agreed with S4, 193 (72.0%) strongly agreed with ٠ S10, showing a strong positive relationship.
- Disagreement with S4 is much lower in high-functionality LDCs, but where present, it • correlates with low inclusivity ratings.
- Fewer "Not Informed" responses were recorded, indicating greater awareness of • accreditation policies compared to low-functionality LDCs.

The Pearson chi-square test is statistically significant for both cuts. The Cramer's V is slightly higher among low functionality LDCs (Low = 0.4927, High = 0.4547), both indicating a strong association.

Table B 9.3.3 Cross Tabulation: Statement 4 and Statement 10 by LDC Functionality (Low)

2

2

44

138

186

0.4927 gamma = 0.7281 ASE = 0.041

Kendall's tau-b = 0.5100 ASE = 0.037

Disagree

Strongly Agree

Agree

Total

Likelihood-ratio chi2(25) = 215.2716

Pearson chi2(25) = 513.4642

Cramér's V =

Not Informed / I do n

-> intldc_fcn = Low						
			s4			
s10	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	6	0	0	0	0	6
Strongly Disagree	0	2	0	0	4	6
Disagree	0	1	2	3	12	20
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	0	13	10	25
Agree	1	2	1	13	111	172
Strongly Agree	2	1	1	4	48	194
Total	9	6	4	33	185	423
	s4					
s10	Strongly	Total				
Refuse to Answer	0	6				
Strongly Disagree	0	6				
Disernes		1 20				

20

25

172

194

423

Pr = 0.000

Pr = 0.000

Table B 9.3.4 Cross Tabulation: Statement 4 and Statement 10 by LDC Functionality (High)

-> intldc\_fcn = High

			s4			
s10	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	3	0	0	0	2	6
Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	1
Disagree	0	3	5	2	9	22
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	0	8	6	20
Agree	3	2	0	9	182	252
Strongly Agree	0	0	0	4	71	268
Total	6	5	6	23	270	569

	s4	
s10	Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	1	6
Strongly Disagree	0	1
Disagree	3	22
Not Informed / I do n	6	20
Agree	56	252
Strongly Agree	193	268
Total	259	569
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 588.1971	Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 252.5236	Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	sV = 0.4547	7
gar	nma = 0.7387	ASE = 0.039
Kendall's tau	u-b = <b>0.501</b> 6	6 ASE = 0.035

The ordered logistic regression confirms that higher accreditation compliance significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving LDCs as efficient in providing information. Respondents who strongly agreed with S4 were significantly more likely to perceive LDCs as efficient, with a coefficient of 6.97 (p = 0.000) Agreement with S4 had a strong effect (4.83, p = 0.002), confirming a statistically significant and positive association. However, LDC functionality is not statistically significant, implying that there is no systematic difference between LDCs with low and high functionality.

The interaction terms between S4 and LDC functionality were not statistically significant, indicating that the effect of data access clarity on information efficiency perceptions does not differ significantly between low- and high-functionality LDCs.
Table B 9.3.5 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 4 and Statement 10 with Interactions (LDC Functionality = High)

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs	=	992
	Wald chi2(11)	=	387.45
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0000
Log pseudolikelihood = -893.27118	Pseudo R2	=	0.1676

		Robust				
s10	Coefficient	std. err.	Z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
s4						
Strongly Disagree	2.61219	1.964508	1.33	0.184	-1.238175	6.462556
Disagree	3.219959	2.133211	1.51	0.131	9610572	7.400975
Not Informed / I do	3.499532	1.54432	2.27	0.023	.4727216	6.526343
Agree	4.834887	1.54668	3.13	0.002	1.80345	7.866324
Strongly Agree	6.969237	1.559926	4.47	0.000	3.911838	10.02664
intldc_fcn						
High	1.472927	2.536334	0.58	0.561	-3.498197	6.44405
s4#intldc fcn						
	-1.656197	2.939725	-0.56	0.573	-7.417952	4.105559
Disagree#High	-3.438061	2.986093	-1.15	0.250	-9.290697	2.414574
Not Informed / I do #						
High	-1.231968	2.582934	-0.48	0.633	-6.294426	3.83049
Agree#High	-1.239926	2.540497	-0.49	0.626	-6.219209	3.739357
Strongly Agree#High	-1.479345	2.545781	-0.58	0.561	-6.468984	3.510294
/cut1	.0374474	1.335353			-2.579797	2.654691
/cut2	.6689613	1.424374			-2.12276	3.460682
/cut3	2.225322	1.513244			7405822	5.191227
/cut4	2.984933	1.530203			0142097	5.984076
/cut5	5.917595	1.55188			2.875966	8.959223

## B9.3.4. By Respondent Group

We analyze whether perceptions of clear protocols for CSO data access (S4) are associated with perceived efficiency of LDC information-sharing processes (S10) across different Respondent Groups.

Among CSO respondents, the association between clear data access protocols and perceived information efficiency is strong and consistent:

- 130 respondents (70.7%) who agreed with S4 also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10), while 59 (32.1%) strongly agreed.
- Among 251 respondents who strongly agreed with S4, 188 (74.9%) strongly agreed with S10, reinforcing a strong positive relationship.
- Disagreement with S4 correlates with lower inclusivity ratings:
- Among 30 respondents who disagreed with S4, only 2 strongly agreed with S10.
- A higher proportion of CSOs reported "Not Informed" responses (20 respondents), suggesting that some CSOs lack awareness or engagement in data access and LDC information-sharing processes.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 535.15, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 for CSO respondents. Cramér's V = 0.4641, indicating a strong association.

Among LGU respondents, the association between clear data access protocols and perceived information efficiency is also strong but slightly more variable than in CSOs:

- 163 respondents (67.9%) who agreed with S4 also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10), while 59 (24.6%) strongly agreed.
- Among 211 respondents who strongly agreed with S4, 143 (67.8%) strongly agreed with S10, reinforcing a strong positive relationship.
- Disagreement with S4 is much lower among LGUs, but where present, it correlates with lower inclusivity ratings.
- Fewer LGU respondents selected "Not Informed", indicating greater familiarity with data access protocols compared to CSOs.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 448.08, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 for LGU respondents. Cramér's V = 0.4757, indicating a strong association.

Table B 9.3.6 Cross Tabulation: Statement 4 and Statement 10 (CSOs)

```
-> survey_tag = CSO
```

			s4			
s10	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	4	0	0	0	1	6
Strongly Disagree	0	2	1	0	3	6
Disagree	0	4	7	4	13	30
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	0	9	10	20
Agree	3	3	1	6	130	184
Strongly Agree	1	1	1	1	59	251
Total	8	10	10	20	216	497

	s4	
s10	Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	1	6
Strongly Disagree	0	6
Disagree	2	30
Not Informed / I do n	1	20
Agree	41	184
Strongly Agree	188	251
Total	233	497
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 535.1477	Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 283.8024	Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	s V = 0.4641	
gar	nma = 0.8121	ASE = 0.031
Kendall's tau	u-b = 0.5803	ASE = 0.032

Table B 9.3.7 Cross Tabulation: Statement 4 and Statement 10 (LGUs)

-> survey\_tag = LGU

			s4			
s10	Refuse to St	trongly Not	Infor	Agree	Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	5	0	0	1	0	6
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	1	0	1
Disagree	0	0	1	8	3	12
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	12	6	7	25
Agree	1	1	16	163	59	240
Strongly Agree	1	0	7	60	143	211
Total	7	1	36	239	212	495
Pearson chi2()	20) = 448.0852	Pr = 0.000				
Likelihood-ratio chi2(	20) = 169.7517	Pr = 0.000				
Cramér's	s V = 0.4757					
gar	nma = 0.6380	ASE = 0.051				
Kendall's ta	u-b = 0.4202	ASE = 0.040				

The ordered logistic regression confirms that higher accreditation compliance significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving LDCs as efficient in providing information. Respondents who strongly agreed with S4 were significantly more likely to perceive LDCs as efficient, with a coefficient of 5.72 (p = 0.008). Agreement with S4 had a positive but less statistically significant effect (3.31, p = 0.127). Respondent Group (LGU) is not statistically significant, showing that there are no systematic difference between LGUs and CSOs.

The interaction terms between S4 and Respondent Group were not statistically significant, indicating that the effect of data access clarity on information efficiency perceptions does not significantly differ between CSOs and LGUs.

Table B 9.3.8 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 1 and Statement 8 with Interactions (Respondent Group)

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs	= 992
	Wald chi2(9)	
	Prob > chi2	
Log pseudolikelihood = - <b>886.12922</b>	Pseudo R2	= 0.1742

s10	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	z	P>   z	[95% conf.	interval]
<u>م</u>						
Strongly Disagree	.656731	2,256336	0.29	0.771	-3.765606	5,079068
Disagree	.1780393	2.190077	0.08	0.935	-4.114433	4.470512
Not Informed / I do	1.300996	2.170877	0.60	0.549	-2.953845	5.555836
Agree	3.305994	2.166723	1.53	0.127	940705	7.552692
Strongly Agree	5.723041	2.173576	2.63	0.008	1.46291	9.983171
survey_tag						
LGU	-2.040134	2.570434	-0.79	0.427	-7.078092	2.997824
s4#survey tag						
Strongly Disagree#LGU	4.210045	2.710339	1.55	0.120	-1.102122	9.522212
Disagree#LGU	0	(empty)				
Not Informed / I do #						
LGU	3.153209	2.610946	1.21	0.227	-1.964151	8.27057
Agree#LGU	2.130641	2.576974	0.83	0.408	-2.920135	7.181416
Strongly Agree#LGU	1.313085	2.579371	0.51	0.611	-3.742389	6.368559
/cut1	-1.604566	2.154573			-5.827452	2.61832
/cut2	9711704	2.156539			-5.19791	3.255569
/cut3	.5827356	2.157097			-3.645097	4.810569
/cut4	1.353677	2.157517			-2.874979	5.582334
/cut5	4.299607	2.166443			.0534557	8.545758

## B9.3.5. By LGU Type

This section examines whether the perceived efficiency of LDC information-sharing processes (S10) is associated with the perceived clarity of CSO data access protocols (S4) across different LGU types (Cities, Municipalities, and Provinces). The findings suggest that respondents who perceive LDCs as having clearer access protocols for CSOs are significantly more likely to view LDC information-sharing as efficient. However, the strength of this association varies across LGU types.

Among city respondents, the association between perceived clarity of access protocols (S4) and efficiency of LDC information provision (S10) is strong and consistent:

- Among respondents who agreed that the LDC has clear access protocols (S4 = Agree), 42 (57.5%) also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10 = Agree), while 26 (35.6%) strongly agreed.
- Among those who strongly agreed with S4, a majority (86 respondents, 74.1%) strongly agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information.
- Respondents who disagreed with S4 were less likely to view LDCs as efficient, with only 1 respondent strongly agreeing with S10.
- The "Not Informed" category was relatively small (11 respondents), but their perceptions were mixed, with some leaning toward agreement with S10 and others expressing uncertainty.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 308.68, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 within city respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.5435 suggests a moderate to strong association.

Among municipality respondents, the association between S4 (clarity of access protocols) and S10 (perceived efficiency of LDC information provision) remains strong but slightly more variable:

- Among respondents who agreed that the LDC has clear access protocols (S4 = Agree), 204 (68.2%) also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10 = Agree), while 62 (20.7%) strongly agreed.
- Among those who strongly agreed with S4, the majority (192 respondents, 73.3%) strongly agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information.
- Disagreement with S4 is more pronounced in municipalities, with 6 respondents strongly disagreeing and 48 respondents disagreeing with S10, indicating a higher level of skepticism toward LDC information efficiency compared to cities.
- The "Not Informed" category had 33 respondents, showing some level of uncertainty about LDC information-sharing processes.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 576.21, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 within municipality respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.4350 suggests a moderate to strong association, though slightly weaker than in cities.

Among province respondents, the association between perceived clarity of access protocols (S4) and perceived efficiency of LDC information-sharing (S10) is the strongest of the three LGU types:

- Among respondents who agreed that the LDC has clear access protocols (S4 = Agree), 47 (56.6%) also agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10 = Agree), while 31 (37.3%) strongly agreed.
- Among those who strongly agreed with S4, 53 respondents (79.1%) strongly agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information.
- Disagreement with S4 was relatively low, with only 3 respondents disagreeing with S10.
- The "Not Informed" category was higher compared to cities and municipalities, with 12 respondents expressing uncertainty about both access protocols and LDC information-sharing efficiency.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 325.83, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S4 and S10 within province respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.6120 suggests the strongest association among the three LGU types.

Table B 9.3.9 Cross Tabulation: Statement 4 and Statement 10 (Cities)

-> intlgu\_type = City

			s	10			
s4	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	1	0	0	0	2	0	3
Strongly Disagree	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
Disagree	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	1	6	2	2	11
Agree	0	0	1	4	42	26	73
Strongly Agree	0	0	2	2	26	86	116
Total	1	1	8	12	73	114	209
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 308.68	32 Pr = 0	.000				
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = <mark>104.1</mark> 5	80 Pr = 0	.000				

elinood-ratio chi2(25)	=	104.1580	Pr = 0.000
Cramér's V	=	0.5435	
gamma	=	0.7128	ASE = 0.064
Kendall's tau-b	=	0.4804	ASE = 0.059

### Table B 9.3.10 Cross Tabulation: Statement 4 and Statement 10 (Municipalities)

-> intlgu\_type = Municipality

			s	10			
s4	Refuse to	Strongly [	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	7	0	0	0	2	2	11
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Disagree	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	4	10	16	3	33
Agree	2	4	17	10	204	62	299
Strongly Agree	1	0	1	5	63	192	262
Total	10	5	23	25	287	259	609
Pearson chi2()	25) = 576.215	50 Pr = 0.00	<b>0</b> 0				
Likelihood-ratio chi2(	25) = 279.599	98 Pr = 0.00	<b>00</b>				
Cramér'	s V = 0.435	50					
gai	mma = 0.768	37 ASE = 0.03	34				
Kendall's ta	u-b = 0.527	73 ASE = 0.03	31				

### Table B 9.3.11 Cross Tabulation: Statement 4 and Statement 10 (Provinces)

-> intlgu\_type = Province

			s	10			
s4	Refuse to	Strongly I	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Strongly Disagree	0	0	3	0	2	1	6
Disagree	0	1	3	0	0	1	5
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	0	5	4	3	12
Agree	0	0	3	2	47	31	83
Strongly Agree	0	0	2	1	11	53	67
Total	1	1	11	8	64	89	174
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 325.83	63 Pr = 0.00	<b>0</b> 0				
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 94.11	75 Pr = 0.00	<b>20</b>				
Cramér	sV = 0.61	20					
gar	nma = 0.67	67 ASE = 0.0	77				
Kendall's tau	u-b = <b>0.46</b>	69 ASE = 0.0	65				

The ordered logistic regression confirms that perceived clarity of CSO access protocols (S4) significantly increases the likelihood of respondents viewing LDC information-sharing as

efficient (S10). However, the strength and direction of this effect vary across LGU types (Cities, Municipalities, and Provinces).

- Respondents in cities who strongly agreed with S4 had a statistically significant effect, with a coefficient of 4.01 (p = 0.027), confirming that stronger agreement with S4 is significantly associated with higher perceptions of LDC information efficiency (S10).
- Municipalities had a negative but non-significant effect (coefficient = -2.81, p = 0.245), suggesting that, compared to city respondents, municipality respondents were slightly less likely to perceive clear access protocols as a strong driver of LDC efficiency.
- Provinces had an extremely large negative coefficient (-80.81, p = 0.000), indicating that province respondents were far less likely than city respondents to perceive CSOs as having clear access to LDC information. However, this coefficient is highly extreme and may be influenced by convergence issues in the model, suggesting potential problems with data separation or limited variation in responses.

The interaction terms between S4 and LGU type were statistically significant, indicating that the effect of perceived access clarity on perceptions of LDC information efficiency varies significantly between cities, municipalities, and provinces.

Number of obs =

Wald chi2(16) =

Prob > chi2 =

992

•

Log pseudolikelihood = -885.55697	F	'seudo R2	= 0.17	48		
		Robust				
s10	Coefficient	std. err.	z	P>   z	[95% conf.	interval]
Strongly Disagree	-1.218963	2.138268	-0.57	0.569	-5.409891	2.971965
Disagree	-1.555881	1.836203	-0.85	0.397	-5.154773	2.043011
Not Informed / I do not know	.3066497	1.870323	0.16	0.870	-3.359116	3.972415
Agree	2.431353	1.811765	1.34	0.180	-1.119642	5.982348
Strongly Agree	4.007816	1.813536	2.21	0.027	.4533516	7.562281
intlgu_type						
Municipality	-2.812253	2.417003	-1.16	0.245	-7.549491	1.924985
Province	-80.80747	.7424094	-108.84	0.000	-82.26256	-79.35237
s4#intlgu_type						
Strongly Disagree#Municipality	3.108075	3.345873	0.93	0.353	-3.449715	9.665866
Strongly Disagree#Province	82.07525	1.674961	49.00	0.000	78.79238	85.35811
Disagree#Municipality	4.133777	2.731008	1.51	0.130	-1.2189	9.486454
Disagree#Province	81.10676					
Not Informed / I do not know#Municipality	3.074644	2.486742	1.24	0.216	-1.799282	7.948569
Not Informed / I do not know#Province	81.60157	1.114523	73.22	0.000	79.41715	83.786
Agree#Municipality	2.17036	2.427016	0.89	0.371	-2.586504	6.927223
Agree#Province	80.88021	.800612	101.02	0.000	79.31104	82.44938
Strongly Agree#Municipality	2.780265	2.431805	1.14	0.253	-1.985986	7.546515
Strongly Agree#Province	81.06785	.8345618	97.14	0.000	79.43214	82.70356
/cut1	-3.019006	1.931121			-6.803933	.7659205
/cut2	-2.351006	1.870616			-6.017345	1.315333
/cut3	7604498	1.810769			-4.309491	2.788591
/cut4	.0058359	1.799561			-3.521239	3.532911
/cut5	2.977887	1.799925			5499015	6.505676

Table B 9.3.12 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 4 and Statement 10 with Interactions (LGU Type)

Ordered logistic regression

# B9.4. Additions to Satisfaction (Information-Sharing and CSO Influence)

In this section, we examine whether perceptions of efficient LDC processes in providing information to CSOs (S10) are associated with perceptions of CSO influence over LDC agenda, plans, and policies (S11). Specifically, we analyze survey responses on:

- S10: Perceptions of the efficiency of LDC processes in providing information, such as the CSO directory, meeting agenda and minutes, and relevant policy documents.
- S11: Perceptions of whether CSO members influence the LDC's agenda, plans, and policies.

We cross-tabulated responses to these two statements to examine frequency distributions and assess associations between S10 and S11. A chi-square test was conducted to determine statistical significance, and an ordered logistic regression was performed to evaluate the strength and direction of the relationship while controlling for subgroup effects.

## B9.4.1. Overall

The cross-tabulation of S10 and S11 indicates a strong association between perceptions of efficient LDC information-sharing processes and the perceived influence of CSOs in decision-making.

- Respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10) were significantly more likely to agree that CSOs influence the LDC's agenda (S11). Among those who agreed with S10, the majority (305 respondents) also agreed with S11, while only a small proportion disagreed or were uninformed.
- Similarly, among respondents who strongly agreed with S10, an overwhelming majority (320 respondents) also strongly agreed that CSOs influence the LDC's agenda, confirming a strong positive association.
- Conversely, those who disagreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10) were far less likely to agree that CSOs influence the LDC agenda. Among the 42 respondents who disagreed with S10, only 8 strongly agreed with S11, while the rest either disagreed or were uninformed.
- The "Not Informed" category showed a mixed distribution, indicating some level of uncertainty among respondents regarding both LDC information-sharing efficiency and CSO influence.

The Pearson chi-square test confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 ( $\chi^2(25) = 994.15$ , p = 0.000), indicating a strong association. The Cramér's V of 0.4477 suggests a moderate to strong relationship.

Table B 9.4.1 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 11

> tab s11 s10, all

			s10			
s11	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	6	0	0	3	9	23
Strongly Disagree	0	4	3	0	3	11
Disagree	2	3	16	6	41	76
Not Informed / I do n	1	0	2	23	11	45
Agree	2	0	21	12	305	460
Strongly Agree	1	0	0	1	55	377
Total	12	7	42	45	424	992

	s10	
s11	Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	5	23
Strongly Disagree	1	11
Disagree	8	76
Not Informed / I do n	8	45
Agree	120	460
Strongly Agree	320	377
Total	462	992
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 994.1539	Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 594.2853	Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	s V = 0.4477	,
gar	nma = <b>0.7974</b>	ASE = 0.022
Kendall's ta	u-b = <b>0.5822</b>	ASE = 0.022

The ordered logistic regression further confirms the positive relationship between information efficiency (S10) and CSO influence (S11). Respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10) were significantly more likely to believe that CSOs influence the LDC's agenda, with a coefficient of 3.39 (p = 0.000). Those who strongly agreed with S10 had an even stronger effect, with a coefficient of 5.85 (p = 0.000), confirming a highly significant relationship.

The "Disagree" category was marginally significant (p = 0.050), while the "Not Informed" category was slightly weaker in significance (p = 0.054). "Strongly Disagree" had no significant effect (p = 0.994), indicating that a lack of perception of information efficiency does not necessarily correlate with perceptions of CSO influence.

These results suggest that perceptions of efficient LDC information-sharing processes strongly enhance the likelihood that respondents view CSOs as influential in shaping LDC decisions. The statistical findings confirm a robust and systematic relationship between the two variables.

Table B 9.4.2 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 10 and Statement 11

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs	= 99
	Wald chi2(5)	= 381.3
	Prob > chi2	= 0.000
Log pseudolikelihood = -950.69181	Pseudo R2	= 0.200

		Robust				
s11	Coefficient	std. err.	Z	P> z	[95% conf.	. interval]
s10						
Strongly Disagree	.0067217	.8870677	0.01	0.994	-1.731899	1.745342
Disagree	1.790359	.9145129	1.96	0.050	0020537	3.582771
Not Informed / I do	1.747937	.908688	1.92	0.054	0330588	3.528933
Agree	3.387458	.9083571	3.73	0.000	1.60711	5.167805
Strongly Agree	5.852129	.927759	6.31	0.000	4.033755	7.670503
/cut1	6167009	.8716014			-2.325008	1.091607
/cut2	1554775	.8726761			-1.865891	1.554936
/cut3	1.366588	.8923592			3824036	3.11558
/cut4	1.878672	.8958716			.1227959	3.634548
/cut5	5.083982	.9185235			3.283709	6.884255

## B9.4.2. By LDC Functionality

We examine whether perceptions of efficient LDC information-sharing processes (S10) are associated with the perceived influence of CSOs in shaping LDC agendas, plans, and policies (S11) across LDCs with low and high functionality.

Among respondents from low-functionality LDCs, the association between perceived information efficiency and CSO influence is moderate but variable:

- Among respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10), 116 (62.4%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11), while 28 (15.1%) strongly agreed, reinforcing a positive relationship.
- Respondents who strongly agreed that LDC processes efficiently provide information also overwhelmingly agreed that CSOs have an influence: 133 (82.1%) strongly agreed with S11.
- Conversely, among respondents who disagreed with S10, only 4 respondents strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decisions, while the majority disagreed or were uninformed.
- The Not Informed category showed mixed perceptions, with most respondents lacking a strong stance on both information efficiency and CSO influence.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 443.27, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 within low-functionality LDCs. The Cramér's V of 0.4578 suggests a moderate to strong association.

Among respondents from high-functionality LDCs, the association between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence is stronger and more consistent than in low-functionality LDCs:

- Among respondents who agreed that LDC processes efficiently provide information (S10), 189 (69.0%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11), while 27 (9.9%) strongly agreed.
- Among those who strongly agreed that LDC processes are efficient, an overwhelming majority (187 respondents, 87.0%) strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decision-making.
- Respondents who disagreed with S10 were much less likely to view CSOs as influential in high-functionality LDCs, mirroring trends observed in low-functionality LDCs.
- The Not Informed category was less prevalent in high-functionality LDCs than in lowfunctionality LDCs, suggesting greater awareness of LDC processes and CSO engagement.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 644.12, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 for high-functionality LDCs, with a Cramér's V of 0.4758, indicating a strong association.

### Table B 9.4.3 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 11 (Low LDC Functionality)

```
-> intldc_fcn = Low
```

			s10			
s11	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	4	0	0	2	4	13
Strongly Disagree	0	3	1	0	3	8
Disagree	1	3	7	4	19	38
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	1	11	2	16
Agree	1	0	11	7	116	186
Strongly Agree	0	0	0	1	28	162
Total	6	6	20	25	172	423

s11	s10 Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	3	13
Strongly Disagree	1	8
Disagree	4	38
Not Informed / I do n	2	16
Agree	51	186
Strongly Agree	133	162
Total	194	423
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 443.267	6 Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 262.379	3 Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	s V = 0.457	8
gar	nma = 0.771	2  ASE = 0.035

Kendall's tau-b = 0.5660 ASE = 0.033

Table B 9.4.4 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 11 (High LDC Functionality)

-> intldc\_fcn = High

			s10			
s11	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	2	0	0	1	5	10
Strongly Disagree	0	1	2	0	0	3
Disagree	1	0	9	2	22	38
Not Informed / I do n	1	0	1	12	9	29
Agree	1	0	10	5	189	274
Strongly Agree	1	0	0	0	27	215
Total	6	1	22	20	252	569

s11	s10 Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	2	10
Strongly Disagree	0	3
Disagree	4	38
Not Informed / I do n	6	29
Agree	69	274
Strongly Agree	187	215
Total	268	569
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 644.124	9 Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 345.389	6 Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	s V = 0.475	8
gar	nma = 0.817	1 ASE = 0.029
Kendall's tau	u-b = <b>0.594</b>	9 ASE = 0.029

The ordered logistic regression confirms that perceived LDC information efficiency significantly increases the likelihood of respondents viewing CSOs as influential in both high- and low-functionality LDCs:

- Respondents who agreed with S10 had a strong positive association with S11, with a coefficient of 4.53 (p = 0.000).
- Respondents who strongly agreed with S10 had an even larger effect, with a coefficient of 6.89 (p = 0.000), confirming a highly significant relationship.
- Those who disagreed with S10 also showed a positive but smaller effect (3.05, p = 0.009), while the Not Informed category had a similar effect (2.84, p = 0.014).

However, LDC functionality (high vs. low) was not statistically significant (p = 0.196), indicating that there is no systematic difference in how LDC functionality moderates the effect of S10 on S11.

The interaction terms between S10 and LDC functionality were also not statistically significant, implying that the relationship between LDC information efficiency and CSO influence remains consistent regardless of whether the LDC has low or high functionality.

Table B 9.4.5 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 10 and Statement 11 with Interactions (LDC Functionality)

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs	=	992
	Wald chi2(10)	=	
	Prob > chi2	=	
Log pseudolikelihood = -948.69589	Pseudo R2	=	0.2020

		Robust				
s11	Coefficient	std. err.	Z	P>   z	[95% conf.	interval]
s10						
Strongly Disagree	1.135884	1.105823	1.03	0.304	-1.03149	3.303258
Disagree	3.048102	1.16586	2.61	0.009	.7630589	5.333144
Not Informed / I do	2.835756	1.150385	2.47	0.014	.5810422	5.09047
Agree	4.525885	1.140443	3.97	0.000	2.290658	6.761112
Strongly Agree	6.894738	1.152801	5.98	0.000	4.635289	9.154186
intldc fcn						
High	2.164816	1.675127	1.29	0.196	-1.118373	5.448004
s10#intldc fcn						
	-2.637158	1.697169	-1.55	0.120	-5.963547	.6892315
Disagree#High	-2.510185	1.751318	-1.43	0.152	-5.942705	.9223355
Not Informed / I do #						
High	-2.185321	1.705914	-1.28	0.200	-5.528851	1.158208
Agree#High	-2.259274	1.686209	-1.34	0.180	-5.564183	1.045634
Strongly Agree#High	-2.096407	1.689443	-1.24	0.215	-5.407654	1.214839
/cut1	.4264919	1.07739			-1.685155	2.538138
/cut2	.9005911	1.093457			-1.242545	3.043727
/cut3	2.445048	1.11854			.2527508	4.637346
/cut4	2.958902	1.12424			.7554311	5.162372
/cut5	6.166249	1.136661			3.938434	8.394063

## B9.4.3. By Respondent Group

In this section, we examine whether perceptions of efficient LDC information-sharing processes (S10) are associated with the perceived influence of CSOs in shaping LDC agendas, plans, and policies (S11) across different Respondent Groups (CSOs vs. LGUs).

Among CSO respondents, the association between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence is strong and consistent:

- Among respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10 = Agree), 145 (61.4%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11 = Agree), while 19 (8.1%) strongly agreed, reinforcing a positive relationship.
- Respondents who strongly agreed that LDC processes efficiently provide information overwhelmingly agreed that CSOs have an influence: 180 (90.0%) strongly agreed with S11.
- Conversely, among respondents who disagreed with S10, only 2 respondents strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decisions, while the majority disagreed or were uninformed.
- The Not Informed category showed mixed perceptions, with most respondents lacking a strong stance on both information efficiency and CSO influence.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 506.05, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 within CSO respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.4513 suggests a moderate to strong association.

Among LGU respondents, the association between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence is also strong but slightly more variable compared to CSOs:

- Among respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10 = Agree), 160 (71.4%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11 = Agree), while 36 (16.1%) strongly agreed.
- Among those who strongly agreed that LDC processes are efficient, a large majority (140 respondents, 79.1%) strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decision-making.
- Respondents who disagreed with S10 were much less likely to view CSOs as influential in LGUs, mirroring trends observed in CSOs.
- The Not Informed category was slightly higher in LGUs compared to CSOs, suggesting some variance in awareness of LDC processes and CSO engagement.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 641.52, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 for LGU respondents, with a Cramér's V of 0.5091, indicating a strong association.

Table B 9.4.6 Cross	Tabulation:	Statement	10 and Stater	nent 11 (CSOs)
---------------------	-------------	-----------	---------------	----------------

-> survey\_tag = CSO

			s10			
s11	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	2	0	0	2	3	9
Strongly Disagree	0	3	3	0	2	9
Disagree	0	3	10	2	12	29
Not Informed / I do n	1	0	1	8	3	14
Agree	2	0	16	8	145	236
Strongly Agree	1	0	0	0	19	200
Total	6	6	30	20	184	497

s11	s10 Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	2	9
Strongly Disagree	1	9
Disagree	2	29
Not Informed / I do n	1	14
Agree	65	236
Strongly Agree	180	200
Total	251	497
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 506.0467	7 Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 345.6062	2 Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	s V = 0.4513	3
gar	mma = 0.8574	4 ASE = 0.025
Kendall's tau	u-b = <b>0.634</b> 0	5 ASE = 0.028

Table B 9.4.7 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 11 (LGUs)

-> survey\_tag = LGU

			s10			
s11	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	4	0	0	1	6	14
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0	0	1	2
Disagree	2	0	6	4	29	47
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	1	15	8	31
Agree	0	0	5	4	160	224
Strongly Agree	0	0	0	1	36	177
Total	6	1	12	25	240	495

s11	s10 Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	3	14
Strongly Disagree	0	2
Disagree	6	47
Not Informed / I do n	7	31
Agree	55	224
Strongly Agree	140	177
Total	211	495
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 641.516	3 Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 269.804	0 Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	sV = <b>0.509</b>	1
gar	nma = 0.738	9 ASE = 0.037
Kendall's tau	u-b = <b>0.529</b>	6 ASE = 0.034

The ordered logistic regression confirms that perceived LDC information efficiency significantly increases the likelihood of respondents viewing CSOs as influential:

- Respondents who agreed with S10 had a moderate positive association with S11, with a coefficient of 1.65 (p = 0.250).
- Respondents who strongly agreed with S10 had a strong and statistically significant effect, with a coefficient of 4.21 (p = 0.004), confirming that stronger agreement with S10 is significantly associated with higher perceptions of CSO influence.

The effect of being an LGU respondent (Respondent Group = LGU) is negative and marginally significant (coefficient = -3.12, p = 0.066), suggesting that LGU respondents may perceive CSOs as slightly less influential in LDC decision-making compared to CSO respondents.

However, interaction terms between S10 and Respondent Group (CSO vs. LGU) were not statistically significant, indicating that the relationship between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence does not significantly differ between CSOs and LGUs.

Table B 9.4.8 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 10 and Statement 11 with Interactions (Respondent Group)

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs :	- 992
	Wald chi2(10) =	
	Prob > chi2 =	
Log pseudolikelihood = -945.83551	Pseudo R2 =	= 0.2044

		Robust				
s11	Coefficient	std. err.	Z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
s10						
Strongly Disagree	-1.763151	1.470553	-1.20	0.231	-4.645383	1.119081
Disagree	.0402594	1.463933	0.03	0.978	-2.828997	2.909516
Not Informed / I do	.0499995	1.455903	0.03	0.973	-2.803518	2.903517
Agree	1.648902	1.434832	1.15	0.250	-1.163317	4.461121
Strongly Agree	4.208149	1.446164	2.91	0.004	1.37372	7.042577
survey_tag						
LGU	-3.118972	1.696213	-1.84	0.066	-6.443488	.2055431
s10#survey_tag						
Strongly Disagree#LGU	2.642963	1.69859	1.56	0.120	6862117	5.972137
Disagree#LGU	2.929163	1.769435	1.66	0.098	5388656	6.397192
Not Informed / I do #						
LGU	2.939581	1.727631	1.70	0.089	4465139	6.325676
Agree#LGU	3.012456	1.705291	1.77	0.077	3298528	6.354764
Strongly Agree#LGU	2.793001	1.709569	1.63	0.102	5576933	6.143696
/cut1	-2.47632	1.482771			-5.382498	.4298573
/cut2	-2.002001	1.460313			-4.864161	.86016
/cut3	4384583	1.426547			-3.234439	2.357522
/cut4	.0807828	1.424153			-2.710505	2.872071
/cut5	3.290144	1.43896			.4698336	6.110455

### B9.4.4. By LGU Type

This section examines whether the perceived efficiency of LDC information-sharing processes (S10) is associated with the perceived clarity of CSO data access protocols (S4) across different LGU types (Cities, Municipalities, and Provinces). The findings suggest that respondents who perceive LDCs as having clearer access protocols for CSOs are significantly more likely to view LDC information-sharing as efficient. However, the strength of this association varies across LGU types

Among city respondents, the association between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence is strong and consistent:

- Among respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10 = Agree), 50 (64.9%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11 = Agree), while 15 (19.5%) strongly agreed.
- Among those who strongly agreed with S10, a majority (90 respondents, 84.9%) strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decisions.
- Respondents who disagreed with S10 were less likely to view CSOs as influential in cities, with only 1 respondent strongly agreeing with S11.
- The Not Informed category was relatively small but showed mixed perceptions, with 7 respondents unaware of LDC information-sharing processes.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 287.31, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 within city respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.5243 suggests a moderate to strong association.

Among municipality respondents, the association between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence is also strong, though slightly more variable:

- Among respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10 = Agree), 209 (68.8%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11 = Agree), while 35 (11.5%) strongly agreed.
- Among those who strongly agreed with S10, the majority (178 respondents, 83.2%) strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decision-making.
- Disagreement with S10 is more pronounced in municipalities, with 6 respondents strongly disagreeing and 48 respondents disagreeing with S11, indicating greater skepticism toward CSO influence compared to cities.
- The Not Informed category had 21 respondents, showing some uncertainty about LDC information-sharing processes.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 546.59, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 within municipality respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.4237 suggests a moderate to strong association.

Among province respondents, the association between perceived LDC information efficiency and CSO influence is weaker than in cities and municipalities:

- Among respondents who agreed that the LDC efficiently provides information (S10 = Agree), 46 (58.2%) also agreed that CSOs influence the LDC agenda (S11 = Agree), while 5 (6.3%) strongly agreed.
- Among those who strongly agreed with S10, 52 respondents (91.2%) strongly agreed that CSOs influence LDC decision-making.
- Disagreement with S10 was relatively low, with only 3 respondents disagreeing with S11.
- The Not Informed category was relatively higher compared to cities, with 13 respondents reporting uncertainty about LDC information-sharing efficiency.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 238.10, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S11 within province respondents. The Cramér's V of 0.5231 suggests a moderate to strong association.

Table B 9.4.9 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 11 (Cities)

-> intlgu\_type = City

			s10			
s11	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	0	0	0	1	1	2
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0	0	1	2
Disagree	0	0	3	3	4	11
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	0	7	2	11
Agree	1	0	5	0	50	77
Strongly Agree	0	0	0	1	15	106
Total	1	1	8	12	73	209

	s10	
s11	Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	0	2
Strongly Disagree	0	2
Disagree	1	11
Not Informed / I do n	2	11
Agree	21	77
Strongly Agree	90	106
Total	114	209
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 287.3057	Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = <mark>148.71</mark> 44	Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	s V = 0.5243	3
gar	nma = <b>0.833</b> 5	ASE = 0.040

	Samma	-	0.0333	AJL	-	0.040
Kendall's	tau-b	=	0.6201	ASE	=	0.047

Table B 9.4.10 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 11 (Municipalities)

-> intlgu\_type = Municipality

			s10			
s11	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	5	0	0	2	5	16
Strongly Disagree	0	2	2	0	1	6
Disagree	2	3	6	2	31	48
Not Informed / I do n	1	0	2	10	6	21
Agree	1	0	13	11	209	304
Strongly Agree	1	0	0	0	35	214
Total	10	5	23	25	287	609

s11	s10 Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	4	16
Strongly Disagree	1	6
Disagree	4	48
Not Informed / I do n	2	21
Agree	70	304
Strongly Agree	178	214
Total	259	609
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 546.5852	Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2	25) = 356.2197	Pr = 0.000
Cramér	s V = 0.4237	,

	gamma	=	0.7989	ASE =	0.030
Kendall's	tau-b	=	0.5754	ASE =	0.029

Table B 9.4.11 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 11 (Provinces)

-> intlgu\_type = Province

			s10			
s11	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	1	0	0	0	3	5
Strongly Disagree	0	1	1	0	1	3
Disagree	0	0	7	1	6	17
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	0	6	3	13
Agree	0	0	3	1	46	79
Strongly Agree	0	0	0	0	5	57
Total	1	1	11	8	64	174

	s10	
s11	Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	1	5
Strongly Disagree	0	3
Disagree	3	17
Not Informed / I do n	4	13
Agree	29	79
Strongly Agree	52	57
Total	89	174
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 238.097	2 Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 123.291	5 Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	s V = 0.523	1
gar	mma = 0.768	1 ASE = 0.054
Kendall's ta	u-b = 0.559	8 ASE = 0.051

The ordered logistic regression confirms that perceived LDC information efficiency significantly increases the likelihood of respondents viewing CSOs as influential:

- Respondents in cities who strongly agreed with S10 had a statistically significant effect, with a coefficient of 2.65 (p = 0.000), confirming that stronger agreement with S10 is significantly associated with higher perceptions of CSO influence.
- Municipalities had a negative and statistically significant effect (coefficient = -3.93, p = 0.000), suggesting that municipality respondents were significantly less likely than city respondents to perceive CSOs as influential in LDC decision-making.
- Provinces had an extremely large negative coefficient (-43.13, p = 0.000), indicating that province respondents were far less likely than city respondents to perceive CSOs as influential. However, this coefficient may be influenced by convergence issues in the model.

The interaction terms between S10 and LGU type were statistically significant, indicating that the effect of perceived information efficiency on CSO influence perceptions varies significantly between cities, municipalities, and provinces.

Table B 9.4.12 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 10 and Statement 11 with Interactions (LGU Type)

Ordered logistic regression Log pseudolikelihood = -937.26095		Number of obs = 992 Wald chi2(16) = . Prob > chi2 = . Pseudo R2 = 0.2116				
		Robust				
	Coefficient	std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
s10						
Strongly Disagree	-4.231583	.3686232	-11.48	0.000	-4.954071	-3.509095
Disagree	-1.576242	.6470258	-2.44	0.015	-2.844389	3080943
Not Informed / I do	-2.418439	.4314527	-5.61	0.000	-3.264071	-1.572807
Agree	.0599948	.3574482	0.17	0.867	6405908	.7605803
Strongly Agree	2.65241	.3666348	7.23	0.000	1.933819	3.371001
intlgu_type						
Municipality	-3.926129	.9830923	-3.99	0.000	-5.852954	-1.999303
Province	-43.13299	.0006327	-6.8e+04	0.000	-43.13423	-43.13175
s10#intlgu_type						
Strongly Disagree #						
Municipality	4.512444	1.024285	4.41	0.000	2.504883	6.520005
Strongly Disagree #						
Province	43.13371	•		•	•	•
Disagree#Municipality	3.7531	1.195088	3.14	0.002	1.410771	6.095429
Disagree#Province	41.97845	.6960618	60.31	0.000	40.61419	43.34271
Not Informed / I do #						
Municipality	4.554735	1.071364	4.25	0.000	2.4549	6.65457
Not Informed / I do #						
Province	43.4252	.3681472	117.96	0.000	42.70364	44.14675
Agree#Municipality	3.475718	1.011804	3.44	0.001	1.492619	5.458816
Agree#Province	42.32757	.3351574	126.29	0.000	41.67067	42.98446
Strongly Agree #						
Municipality	3.374026	1.023444	3.30	0.001	1.368112	5.37994
Strongly Agree #						
Province	42.06147	.3357833	125.26	0.000	41.40335	42.7196
/cut1	-4.470153	.3966737			-5.247619	-3.692687
/cut2	-3.991757	.3543195			-4.686211	-3.297304
/cut3	-2.419845	.2962086			-3.000404	-1.839287
/cut4	-1.893337	.2832017			-2.448402	-1.338272
/cut5	1.351006	.2794621			.8032705	1.898742

Note: 1 observation completely determined. Standard errors questionable.

## B9.5. Additions to Satisfaction (Information-Sharing and Effectiveness of CSO Participation)

In this section, we examine whether perceptions of efficient information-sharing processes in LDCs (Statement 10) are associated with the perception that CSO participation improves local plans, policies, and services (Statement 12). Specifically, we analyze survey responses on:

- S10: Perceptions of the efficiency of LDC processes in providing CSOs with essential information, such as the CSO directory, meeting agenda and minutes, and drafts of policies, plans, and reports.
- S12: Perceptions that CSO participation in the LDC, including its committees and consultative activities, leads to more effective local plans, policies, and services.

We cross-tabulated responses to these two statements to examine frequency distributions and assess associations between S10 and S12. A chi-square test was conducted to determine statistical significance, and an ordered logistic regression was performed to evaluate the strength and direction of the relationship while controlling for subgroup effects.

## B9.4.5. Overall

The cross-tabulation of S10 and S12 indicates a strong association between LDC informationsharing efficiency and the perceived effectiveness of CSO participation in local governance.

- Among 408 respondents who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10 = Agree), 286 (70.1%) agreed and 70 (17.2%) strongly agreed that CSO participation improves local governance (S12).
- Among 511 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 384 (75.1%) strongly agreed and 115 (22.5%) agreed with S12, reinforcing a strong positive association.
- In contrast, respondents who disagreed that LDCs efficiently provide information reported much lower agreement with CSO participation effectiveness.
- Among 27 respondents who disagreed with S10, only 1 strongly agreed that CSO participation enhances governance, while the majority either disagreed or were uninformed.
- Similarly, among 6 respondents who strongly disagreed with S10, only 1 respondent agreed with S12, while the rest had negative or neutral perceptions.

The Pearson chi-square test confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 ( $\chi^2(25) = 809.80$ , p = 0.000), indicating a strong and systematic association between perceptions of LDC efficiency and CSO effectiveness. Cramér's V = 0.4041, suggesting a moderate-to-strong association.

Table B 9.5.1 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 12

> tab s12 s10, all

			s10			
s12	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	6	0	1	3	3	17
Strongly Disagree	0	2	1	1	1	6
Disagree	1	1	10	1	13	27
Not Informed / I do n	1	0	2	12	6	23
Agree	1	4	25	22	286	408
Strongly Agree	3	0	3	6	115	511
Total	12	7	42	45	424	992

	s10	
s12	Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	4	17
Strongly Disagree	1	6
Disagree	1	27
Not Informed / I do n	2	23
Agree	70	408
Strongly Agree	384	511
Total	462	992
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 809.799	5 Pr = <b>0.000</b>
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 509.509	1 Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	s V = 0.404	1
gar	nma = 0.811	6 ASE = 0.023
Kendall's tau	u-b = <b>0.578</b>	6 ASE = 0.024

The ordered logistic regression confirms that stronger agreement with S10 (LDC efficiency) significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving CSO participation as effective (S12).

• Respondents who strongly agreed with S10 were significantly more likely to perceive CSO participation as effective, with a coefficient of 5.97 (p = 0.000).

- Agreement with S10 also had a strong effect (3.49, p = 0.001), confirming a statistically significant and positive association.
- The Not Informed category had a coefficient of 1.89 (p = 0.086), indicating that even among those uncertain about LDC information efficiency, perceptions of CSO effectiveness were positively influenced.
- Disagree and Strongly Disagree responses were not statistically significant, suggesting that negative perceptions of LDC efficiency do not necessarily lead to outright rejection of CSO effectiveness, but they dampen confidence in participatory governance.

Table B 9.5.2 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 10 and Statement 1.	2
---	---

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs	= 992
	Wald chi2(5)	= 283.24
	Prob > chi2	= 0.0000
Log pseudolikelihood = - <b>766.05709</b>	Pseudo R2	= 0.2224

		Robust				
s12	Coefficient	std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
s10						
Strongly Disagree	1.073927	1.226728	0.88	0.381	-1.330415	3.478269
Disagree	1.739496	1.085995	1.60	0.109	3890153	3.868008
Not Informed / I do	1.885249	1.098514	1.72	0.086	2677989	4.038297
Agree	3.488299	1.088012	3.21	0.001	1.355834	5.620764
Strongly Agree	5.969482	1.107679	5.39	0.000	3.79847	8.140493
/cut1	7503063	1.022477			-2.754324	1.253711
/cut2	4002343	1.027743			-2.414573	1.614104
/cut3	.5252681	1.04502			-1.522933	2.573469
/cut4	1.011249	1.052927			-1.052451	3.074948
/cut5	4.388458	1.097531			2.237337	6.539578

### B9.4.6. By LDC Functionality

We cross-tabulated responses to these two statements by LDC functionality (Low vs. High) to examine whether the relationship between S10 (LDC efficiency) and S12 (CSO effectiveness) differs between LDCs with varying levels of operational quality.

Among respondents in low-functionality LDCs, the association between information efficiency and CSO effectiveness is moderate but more varied compared to high-functionality LDCs.

- 113 respondents (63.8%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation enhances governance (S12), while 35 (19.8%) strongly agreed.
- Among 209 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 154 (73.7%) strongly agreed with S12, confirming a positive relationship.
- Respondents who disagreed with S10 tended to have lower perceptions of CSO effectiveness:
- Among 20 respondents who disagreed with S10, only 1 strongly agreed with S12.
- The Not Informed category for S10 (33 respondents) had a mixed distribution in S12, indicating possible gaps in awareness regarding both information efficiency and CSO contributions.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 357.11, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 in low-functionality LDCs.

Among respondents in high-functionality LDCs, the association between LDC efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness is stronger and more stable compared to low-functionality LDCs.

- 173 respondents (74.9%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation improves governance (S12), while 35 (15.2%) strongly agreed.
- Among 302 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 230 (76.2%) strongly agreed with S12, showing a strong positive relationship.
- Disagreement with S10 was much lower in high-functionality LDCs, but where present, it correlated with low perceptions of CSO effectiveness.
- Fewer "Not Informed" responses were recorded, indicating greater awareness of LDC efficiency and participatory mechanisms compared to low-functionality LDCs.

The Pearson chi-square test is statistically significant for both low and high-functionality LDCs. However, Cramér's V is slightly higher for low-functionality LDCs (Low = 0.4109, High = 0.4090), indicating that perceptions of CSO participation effectiveness are more strongly influenced by LDC efficiency when LDC functionality is lower.

Table B 9.5.3 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 12 (Low LDC Functionality)

-> intldc\_fcn = Low

			s10			
s12	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	3	0	0	2	0	6
Strongly Disagree	0	2	0	1	1	5
Disagree	1	1	5	1	6	15
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	1	5	3	11
Agree	1	3	12	13	113	177
Strongly Agree	1	0	2	3	49	209
Total	6	6	20	25	172	423

	s10		
s12	Strongly	Total	
Refuse to Answer	1	6	
Strongly Disagree	1	5	
Disagree	1	15	
Not Informed / I do n	2	11	
Agree	35	177	
Strongly Agree	154	209	
Total	194	423	
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 357.108	7 Pr = 0.00	0
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 208.108	2 Pr = 0.00	0
Cramér's	s V = 0.410	9	
gar	nma = 0.770	9 ASE = 0.03	8
Kendall's tau	u-b = <b>0.545</b>	9 ASE = 0.03	7

Table B 9.5.4 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 12 (High LDC Functionality)

-> intldc\_fcn = High

			s10			
s12	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	3	0	1	1	3	11
Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	1
Disagree	0	0	5	0	7	12
Not Informed / I do n	1	0	1	7	3	12
Agree	0	1	13	9	173	231
Strongly Agree	2	0	1	3	66	302
Total	6	1	22	20	252	569
	s10					
s12	Strongly	Total				
Refuse to Answer	3	11				
Strongly Disagree	0	1				
Disagree	0	12				
Not Informed / I do n	0	12				
Agree	35	231				
Strongly Agree	230	302				
Total	268	569				
Pearson chi2(	25) = 475.82	38 Pr = 0.0	000			
Likelihood-ratio chi2(	25) = 321.88	80 Pr = 0.0	000			
Cramér	s V = 0.40	90				
ga	mma = 0.84	31 ASE = 0.0	28			
Kendall's ta	u-b = 0.60	50 ASE = 0.0	31			

The regression results further validate the significant relationship between LDC information efficiency (S10) and perceptions of CSO participation impact (S12):

- Respondents who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) were significantly more likely to perceive CSO participation as beneficial, with a coefficient of 3.76 (p = 0.003).
- Strong agreement with S10 had an even larger effect, with a coefficient of 5.95 (p = 0.000), confirming that respondents who strongly believe in LDC information efficiency also strongly believe in the benefits of CSO participation.

The LDC functionality variable itself was not statistically significant (p = 0.818), implying that while high-functionality LDCs exhibit a stronger association, the general effect of information efficiency on CSO perceptions remains consistent across both types of LDCs.

Interaction terms between S10 and LDC functionality were also not statistically significant, indicating that the impact of information efficiency on CSO participation perceptions does not vary significantly between low- and high-functionality LDCs.

Table B 9.5.5 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 10 and Statement 12 with Interactions (LDC Functionality)

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs	= 992
	Wald chi2(10)	
	Prob > chi2	
Log pseudolikelihood = -763.47098	Pseudo R2	= 0.2250

		Robust				
s12	Coefficient	std. err.	Z	P>   z	[95% conf.	interval]
s10						
Strongly Disagree	1.052984	1.405177	0.75	0.454	-1.701113	3.80708
Disagree	2.205786	1.322458	1.67	0.095	3861843	4.797756
Not Informed / I do	2.066846	1.32474	1.56	0.119	5295967	4.663289
Agree	3.764323	1.279012	2.94	0.003	1.257507	6.27114
Strongly Agree	5.950284	1.295336	4.59	0.000	3.411472	8.489095
intldc fcn						
High	.4958734	2.153094	0.23	0.818	-3.724113	4.71586
s10#intldc fcn						
	1.383735	2.270121	0.61	0.542	-3.06562	5.83309
Disagree#High	9400989	2.234022	-0.42	0.674	-5.318702	3.438504
Not Informed / I do #						
High	3909873	2.243043	-0.17	0.862	-4.787271	4.005297
Agree#High	5660247	2.160908	-0.26	0.793	-4.801327	3.669277
Strongly Agree#High	0287096	2.167888	-0.01	0.989	-4.277691	4.220272
/cut1	5332732	1.225423			-2.935058	1.868512
/cut2	181782	1.228235			-2.589079	2.225515
/cut3	.7524689	1.243624			-1.684989	3.189927
/cut4	1.241243	1.252514			-1.213639	3.696125
/cut5	4.623942	1.280515			2.114179	7.133705

## B9.5.3. By Respondent Group

Among CSO respondents, there is a strong and consistent association between perceptions of LDC information efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness.

- 132 respondents (65.7%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation enhances governance (S12), while 37 (18.4%) strongly agreed.
- Among 261 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 211 (80.8%) strongly agreed with S12, reinforcing a strong positive relationship.
- Respondents who disagreed with S10 reported lower perceptions of CSO effectiveness:
- Among 15 respondents who disagreed with S10, only 1 strongly agreed that CSO participation improves local governance.
- A higher proportion of CSOs reported "Not Informed" responses (20 respondents), suggesting that some CSOs lack awareness of LDC efficiency and its impact on participatory governance.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 438.32, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 for CSO respondents. Cramér's V = 0.4200, indicating a strong association.

Among LGU respondents, the association between LDC information efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness is also strong but slightly more variable than in CSOs.

- 154 respondents (74.4%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation enhances governance (S12), while 33 (13.5%) strongly agreed.
- Among 250 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 173 (69.2%) strongly agreed with S12, confirming a strong positive relationship.
- Disagreement with S10 was lower among LGU respondents, but where present, it correlated with lower perceptions of CSO effectiveness.
- Fewer LGU respondents selected "Not Informed" compared to CSOs, indicating greater familiarity with LDC information-sharing processes.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 588.13, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 for LGU respondents. Cramér's V = 0.4875, indicating a strong association.

### Table B 9.5.6 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 12 (CSOs)

#### -> survey\_tag = CSO

			s10			
s12	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	2	0	1	2	0	7
Strongly Disagree	0	1	1	0	1	4
Disagree	0	1	8	1	5	15
Not Informed / I do n	1	0	1	6	1	9
Agree	1	4	17	10	132	201
Strongly Agree	2	0	2	1	45	261
Total	6	6	30	20	184	497

	s10	
s12	Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	2	7
Strongly Disagree	1	4
Disagree	0	15
Not Informed / I do n	0	9
Agree	37	201
Strongly Agree	211	261
Total	251	497
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 438.318	8 Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 311.380	7 Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	s V = 0.420	0
gar	mma = 0.849	2 ASE = 0.027
Kendall's tau	u-b = <b>0.626</b>	7 ASE = 0.031

Table B 9.5.7 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 12 (LGUs)

-> survey\_tag = LGU

			s10			
s12	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	4	0	0	1	3	10
Strongly Disagree	0	1	0	1	0	2
Disagree	1	0	2	0	8	12
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	1	6	5	14
Agree	0	0	8	12	154	207
Strongly Agree	1	0	1	5	70	250
Total	6	1	12	25	240	495

s12	s10 Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	2	10
Strongly Disagree	0	2
Disagree	1	12
Not Informed / I do n	2	14
Agree	33	207
Strongly Agree	173	250
Total	211	495
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 588.129	6 Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 226.255	7 Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	sV = <b>0.487</b>	5
gar	nma = <b>0.76</b> 8	1 ASE = 0.039
Kendall's tau	u-b = <b>0.526</b>	1 ASE = 0.035

The ordered logistic regression confirms that higher perceived efficiency of LDC informationsharing (S10) significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving CSO participation as effective (S12).

- Respondents who strongly agreed with S10 were significantly more likely to perceive CSO participation as effective, with a coefficient of 4.51 (p = 0.025).
- Agreement with S10 also had a positive effect (1.90, p = 0.345), although this was not statistically significant at conventional levels.
- Not Informed respondents had a negative coefficient (-0.10, p = 0.960), suggesting that a lack of awareness about LDC efficiency may dampen confidence in CSO effectiveness.

The interaction terms between S10 and Respondent Group (CSO vs. LGU) were not statistically significant, indicating that the effect of LDC efficiency on perceptions of CSO participation effectiveness is similar for both respondent groups.

Table B 9.5.8 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 10 and Statement 12 with Interactions (Respondent Group)

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs	=	992
	Wald chi2(10)	=	
	Prob > chi2	=	
Log pseudolikelihood = -761.20231	Pseudo R2	= 0.2	2273

		Robust				
s12	Coefficient	std. err.	Z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
s10						
Strongly Disagree	1033917	2.118176	-0.05	0.961	-4.254941	4.048157
Disagree	.018808	2.022528	0.01	0.993	-3.945274	3.98289
Not Informed / I do	1016036	2.021501	-0.05	0.960	-4.063673	3.860466
Agree	1.895423	2.006377	0.94	0.345	-2.037004	5.82785
Strongly Agree	4.507846	2.017673	2.23	0.025	.5532803	8.462412
survey tag						
LGU	-2.849891	2.297947	-1.24	0.215	-7.353783	1.654002
s10#survey tag						
Strongly Disagree#LGU	.7452375	2.378844	0.31	0.754	-3.917211	5.407686
Disagree#LGU	3.412186	2.391337	1.43	0.154	-1.274748	8.09912
Not Informed / I do #						
LGU	3.70657	2.380725	1.56	0.119	9595652	8.372704
Agree#LGU	2.944209	2.305769	1.28	0.202	-1.575015	7.463434
Strongly Agree#LGU	2.689468	2.311535	1.16	0.245	-1.841058	7.219994
/cut1	-2.393607	2.029151			-6.370669	1.583456
/cut2	-2.022483	2.012263			-5.966445	1.921479
/cut3	-1.04294	1.985902			-4.935237	2.849356
/cut4	5411784	1.986807			-4.435249	3.352892
/cut5	2.852006	2.009536			-1.086612	6.790625

## B9.5.4. By LGU Type

Among respondents from cities, the association between LDC information efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness is strong and consistent.

- 41 respondents (69.5%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation enhances governance (S12), while 9 (15.3%) strongly agreed.
- Among 135 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 104 (77.0%) strongly agreed with S12, reinforcing a strong positive relationship.
- Respondents who disagreed with S10 were significantly less likely to view CSO participation as effective, with only 1 out of 6 respondents expressing strong agreement with S12.
- The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 233.66, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 for city respondents. Cramér's V = 0.5287, indicating a strong association.

Among respondents from municipalities, the association between LDC information efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness remains strong but is slightly more varied.

- 201 respondents (73.9%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation enhances governance (S12), while 39 (14.3%) strongly agreed.
- Among 294 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 215 (73.1%) strongly agreed with S12, reinforcing a positive relationship.
- Respondents who disagreed with S10 had much lower perceptions of CSO effectiveness, with only 1 of the 17 respondents in this category strongly agreeing that CSO participation enhances governance.
- A higher proportion of respondents from municipalities reported "Not Informed" responses (25 respondents), suggesting greater disparities in governance and accreditation awareness across municipalities.
- The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 574.30, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 for municipality respondents. Cramér's V = 0.4343, indicating a moderate-to-strong association.

Among respondents from provinces, the association between LDC information efficiency and CSO participation effectiveness is still present but relatively weaker compared to cities and municipalities.

- 44 respondents (57.1%) who agreed that LDCs efficiently provide information (S10) also agreed that CSO participation enhances governance (S12), while 22 (28.6%) strongly agreed.
- Among 82 respondents who strongly agreed with S10, 65 (79.3%) strongly agreed with S12, reinforcing a strong positive relationship.
- Disagreement with S10 correlates with lower inclusivity ratings, with only 1 of the 4 respondents who disagreed with S10 strongly agreeing with S12.
- Fewer provincial respondents selected "Not Informed" (8 respondents), indicating relatively higher awareness compared to municipalities but slightly lower than in cities.
- The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 144.20, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S10 and S12 for provincial respondents. Cramér's V = 0.4071, indicating a moderate-to-strong association.

Table B 9.5.9 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 12 (Cities)

-> intlgu\_type = City

s12	Refuse to	Strongly	s10 Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0	1	1	2
Disagree	0	1	4	0	1	6
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	0	5	1	7
Agree	1	0	4	4	41	59
Strongly Agree	0	0	0	2	29	135
Total	1	1	8	12	73	209

	s10	
s12	Strongly	Total
Strongly Disagree	0	2
Disagree	0	6
Not Informed / I do n	1	7
Agree	9	59
Strongly Agree	104	135
Total	114	209
Pearson chi2(2	20) = 233.664	7 Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	20) = 134.374	0 Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	s V = 0.528	37
gar	nma = <b>0.87</b> 4	2 ASE = 0.036
Kendall's tau	u-b = <b>0.628</b>	ASE = 0.047

Table B 9.5.10 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 12 (Municipalities)

### -> intlgu\_type = Municipality

			s10			
s12	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	5	0	0	2	3	13
Strongly Disagree	0	2	0	0	0	3
Disagree	1	0	5	1	9	17
Not Informed / I do n	1	0	2	4	3	10
Agree	0	3	14	15	201	272
Strongly Agree	3	0	2	3	71	294
Total	10	5	23	25	287	609

s12	s10 Strongly	Total	
Refuse to Answer	3	13	
Strongly Disagree	1	3	
Disagree	1	17	
Not Informed / I do n	0	10	
Agree	39	272	
Strongly Agree	215	294	
Total	259	609	
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 574.302	23 Pr = 0.0	000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 329.095	57 Pr = 0.0	000
Cramér's	s V = 0.434	13	
gar	nma = <b>0.80</b> 5	4 ASE = 0.	032
Kendall's tau	u-b = <b>0.57</b> 3	33 ASE = 0.	<b>031</b>

-> intigu_type = Provi	nce					
			s10			
s12	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	1	0	1	1	0	4
Strongly Disagree	0	0	1	0	0	1
Disagree	0	0	1	0	3	4
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	0	3	2	6
Agree	0	1	7	3	44	77
Strongly Agree	0	0	1	1	15	82
Total	1	1	11	8	64	174

Table B 9.5.11 Cross Tabulation: Statement 10 and Statement 12 (Provinces)

s dual an anna Duandara

s12	s10 Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	1	4
Strongly Disagree	0	1
Disagree	0	4
Not Informed / I do n	1	6
Agree	22	77
Strongly Agree	65	82
Total	89	174
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 144.199	94 Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 85.399	91 Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	sV = 0.407	/1
gar	nma = 0.761	L5 ASE = 0.060
Kendall's tau	u-b = 0.526	53 ASE = 0.057

The ordered logistic regression confirms that higher perceived efficiency of LDC informationsharing (S10) significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving CSO participation as effective (S12), though effects differ across LGU types.

- Strong agreement with S10 significantly increases the likelihood of perceiving CSO participation as effective, with a coefficient of 3.79 (p = 0.000).
- Agreement with S10 also had a positive effect (1.05, p = 0.002), confirming a significant and positive association.
- Respondents from municipalities (-3.05, p = 0.014) and provinces (-57.64, p = 0.000) were significantly less likely to perceive CSO participation as effective compared to city respondents, suggesting that LDC efficiency has a greater impact on CSO participation perceptions in city governments.

Interaction terms between S10 and LGU type were statistically significant for municipalities and provinces, indicating that the effect of LDC information efficiency on CSO participation perceptions varies across different LGU types.

Table B 9.5.12 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 10 and Statement 12 with Interactions (LGU Type)

Ordered logistic regression Log pseudolikelihood = -753.18953			Number of obs = 992 Wald chi2(16) = . Prob > chi2 = . Pseudo R2 = 0.2354			
s12	Coefficient	Robust std. err.	Z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
s10						
Strongly Disagree	-2.948802	. 3106048	-9.49	0.000	-3.557576	-2.340028
Disagree	-1.915311	.5680829	-3.37	0.001	-3.028733	8018886
Not Informed / I do	-1.280267	.6373266	-2.01	0.045	-2.529404	0311294
Agree	1.052838	.3457031	3.05	0.002	.3752724	1.730404
Strongly Agree	3.791249	.4278258	8.86	0.000	2.952726	4.629772
intlgu type						
Municipality	-3.049841	1.234895	-2.47	0.014	-5.470192	6294904
Province	-57.6406	.8831127	-65.27	0.000	-59.37147	-55.90973
s10#intlgu type						
Strongly Disagree #						
Municipality	4.076504	1.542845	2.64	0.008	1.052584	7.100424
Strongly Disagree #						
Province	60.33561	.8904174	67.76	0.000	58.59042	62.08079
Disagree#Municipality	3.942817	1.404391	2.81	0.005	1.190261	6.695373
Disagree#Province	58.45882	1.259042	46.43	0.000	55.99114	60.9265
Not Informed / I do #						
Municipality	3.490914	1.453388	2.40	0.016	.6423261	6.339502
Not Informed / I do #						
Province	57.43666	•	•	•	•	
Agree#Municipality	2.458281	1.255041	1.96	0.050	0015539	4.918117
Agree#Province	56.92607	.9454191	60.21	0.000	55.07309	58.77906
Strongly Agree #						
Municipality	2.285521	1.293832	1.77	0.077	2503438	4.821386
Strongly Agree #						
Province	56.28/42	.9/4489	57.76	0.000	54.37746	58.19/38
/cut1	-3.792256	.3823487			-4.541646	-3.042867
/cut2	-3.428362	.3505809			-4.115488	-2.741236
/cut3	-2.468336	.2950975			-3.046716	-1.889956
/cut4	-1.964129	.2705994			-2.494494	-1.433764
/cut5	1.456001	.2654043			.9358183	1.976184

Note: 1 observation completely determined. Standard errors questionable.

## **B9.6.** Compliance With Accreditation and LGU's Satisfaction with Participatory Practices

In this section, we examine whether perceptions of compliance with national accreditation guidelines for CSO accreditation and LDC membership (Statement 1) are associated with satisfaction with the participatory practices of the LDC (Statement 14). Specifically, we analyze survey responses on:

- S1: Perceptions that CSO accreditation and LDC membership selection satisfy the requirements of the national guidelines.
- S14: Satisfaction with the participatory practices of the LDC in one's capacity under an LGU office.

We cross-tabulated responses to these two statements to examine frequency distributions and assess associations between S1 and S14. A chi-square test was conducted to determine statistical significance, and an ordered logistic regression was performed to evaluate the strength and direction of the relationship while controlling for subgroup effect.

The cross-tabulation of S1 and S14 indicates a moderate association between perceptions of compliance with national accreditation guidelines and satisfaction with participatory practices in the LDC.

- Among 215 respondents who agreed that LDCs comply with national guidelines for CSO accreditation (S1 = Agree), 110 (51.2%) agreed and 98 (45.6%) strongly agreed that they are satisfied with the LDC's participatory practices (S14).
- Among 250 respondents who strongly agreed with S1, 51 (20.4%) agreed and 191 (76.4%) strongly agreed with S14, reinforcing a strong positive association between accreditation compliance and participatory satisfaction.
- In contrast, respondents who disagreed that LDCs comply with national accreditation guidelines reported much lower satisfaction with participatory practices. Among those who disagreed with S1, only 3 respondents strongly agreed with S14, while the majority either disagreed or were uninformed about LDC participatory practices.
- Similarly, among 4 respondents who strongly disagreed with S1, only 1 respondent agreed that they are satisfied with LDC participatory practices, while the rest had negative or neutral perceptions.

The Pearson chi-square test confirms a statistically significant relationship between S1 and S14 ( $\chi^2(25) = 281.44$ , p = 0.000), indicating a strong and systematic association between accreditation compliance and participatory satisfaction. The Cramér's V = 0.3372 suggests a moderate association, reinforcing that perceptions of national accreditation compliance influence how participatory practices are perceived within the LDC.

Table B 9.6.1	Cross Tabulation:	Statement 1 a	nd Statement 14

> tab s14 s1, all

			s1			
s14	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	2	0	0	0	2	6
Strongly Disagree	0	0	2	0	1	4
Disagree	0	1	1	0	12	17
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	0	0	1	3
Agree	1	0	1	5	110	215
Strongly Agree	2	0	0	6	51	250
Total	5	1	4	11	177	495

s14	s1 Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	2	6
Strongly Disagree	1	4
Disagree	3	17
Not Informed / I do n	2	3
Agree	98	215
Strongly Agree	191	250
Total	297	495
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 281.439	5 Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 103.157	1 Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	s V = 0.337	2
gar	nma = 0.565	2 ASE = 0.059
Kendall's tau	u-b = 0.334	6 ASE = 0.041

The ordered logistic regression confirms that stronger agreement with S1 (national accreditation compliance) increases the likelihood of being satisfied with LDC participatory practices (S14). However, the effect sizes are not statistically significant.

- Respondents who strongly agreed with S1 were more likely to express satisfaction with LDC participatory practices, with a coefficient of 2.60 (p = 0.398).
- Agreement with S1 had a positive but weak effect (1.14, p = 0.710), indicating that while a positive relationship exists, its statistical significance is limited.
- The Not Informed category had a coefficient of 2.25 (p = 0.469), suggesting that even among those uncertain about accreditation compliance, there is some positive association with participatory satisfaction.
- Disagree (-1.90, p = 0.551) and Strongly Disagree (-1.79, p = 0.563) responses were negative but not statistically significant, suggesting that negative perceptions of accreditation compliance do not necessarily result in outright dissatisfaction with participatory practices but may weaken confidence in governance structures.

Overall, while there is a positive association between perceived compliance with national accreditation standards and satisfaction with LDC participatory practices, the statistical significance of the regression model is weak. This suggests that other contextual factors, such as actual implementation of participatory mechanisms and internal governance quality, may play a more direct role in shaping satisfaction levels.

Table R	962	Ordered	ogistic i	regression	- Statement 1	and Statement 14
Table D	0.0.2	01001001	-05/01/07	ogrocoron	otatonnont i	and otatonnont i i

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs	= 495
	Wald chi2(4)	= .
	Prob > chi2	
Log pseudolikelihood = -428.60219	Pseudo R2	= 0.0851

		Robust				
s14	Coefficient	std. err.	Z	P>   z	[95% conf.	interval]
s1						
Strongly Disagree	-1.79645	3.105738	-0.58	0.563	-7.883584	4.290684
Disagree	-1.899812	3.184401	-0.60	0.551	-8.141124	4.3415
Not Informed / I do	2.256932	3.11639	0.72	0.469	-3.85108	8.364944
Agree	1.140079	3.071097	0.37	0.710	-4.87916	7.159319
Strongly Agree	2.596542	3.069985	0.85	0.398	-3.420518	8.613603
/cut1	-2.95203	3.20737			-9.238359	3.3343
/cut2	-2.391518	3.142342			-8.550395	3.76736
/cut3	-1.201383	3.075783			-7.229806	4.82704
/cut4	-1.07283	3.071934			-7.09371	4.94805
/cut5	2.011038	3.067492			-4.001136	8.023212

## By LDC Functionality

The association between perceived compliance with national accreditation guidelines and satisfaction with participatory practices is strong but more varied in low-functionality LDCs compared to high-functionality LDCs.

- Among 90 respondents who agreed that their LDC complies with accreditation guidelines (S1 = Agree), 51 (56.7%) agreed and 36 (40.0%) strongly agreed that they are satisfied with participatory practices (S14).
- Among 98 respondents who strongly agreed with S1, 24 (24.5%) agreed and 73 (74.5%) strongly agreed with S14, confirming a strong positive relationship.

- Disagreement with S1 is strongly associated with dissatisfaction. Among 10 respondents who disagreed with S1, only 2 strongly agreed that they are satisfied with LDC participatory practices.
- Similarly, among 3 respondents who strongly disagreed with S1, only 1 respondent agreed with S14, while the others had negative or neutral perceptions.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 242.95, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S1 and S14 in low-functionality LDCs. Cramér's V = 0.4833, indicating a moderate-to-strong association.

The association between accreditation compliance and satisfaction with participatory practices is also significant but exhibits a more stable trend in high-functionality LDCs.

- Among 125 respondents who agreed with S1, 59 (47.2%) agreed and 36 (28.8%) strongly agreed with S14, showing a positive relationship.
- Among 152 respondents who strongly agreed with S1, 118 (77.6%) strongly agreed with S14, reinforcing a strong association.
- Disagreement with S1 is rare but when present, correlates with lower satisfaction. Only 1 of the 7 respondents who disagreed with S1 strongly agreed with S14.
- The Not Informed category (8 respondents) was more mixed in S14, suggesting uncertainty in both accreditation compliance and participatory perceptions.

The Pearson chi-square test ( $\chi^2$  = 57.73, p = 0.000) confirms a statistically significant relationship between S1 and S14 in high-functionality LDCs. Cramér's V = 0.2243, suggesting a weaker association than in low-functionality LDCs.

Table B 9.6.3 Cross Tabulation: Statement 1 and Statement 14 (Low LDC Functionality)

			s1			
s14	Refuse to	Strongly	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Total
Refuse to Answer	2	0	0	0	2	5
Strongly Disagree	0	0	2	0	0	3
Disagree	0	1	0	0	7	10
Not Informed / I do n	0	0	0	0	1	2
Agree	0	0	0	3	51	90
Strongly Agree	1	0	0	0	24	98
Total	3	1	2	3	85	208

	s1	
s14	Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer	1	5
Strongly Disagree	1	3
Disagree	2	10
Not Informed / I do n	1	2
Agree	36	90
Strongly Agree	73	98
Total	114	208
Pearson chi2(2	25) = 242.952	7 Pr = 0.000
Likelihood-ratio chi2(2	25) = 72 <b>.</b> 164	2 Pr = 0.000
Cramér's	sV = 0.483	3
gar	nma = 0.622	3 ASE = 0.080
Kendall's tau	u-b = <b>0.387</b>	4 ASE = 0.061
Table B 9.6.4 Cross Tabulation: Statement 1 and Statement 14 (High LDC Functionality)

-> intldc\_fcn = High

				s1			
s14	Refuse	eto l	Disagree	Not Infor	Agree	Strongly	Total
Refuse to Answer		0	0	0	0	1	1
Strongly Disagree		0	0	0	1	0	1
Disagree		0	1	0	5	1	7
Not Informed / I do n		0	0	0	0	1	1
Agree		1	1	2	59	62	125
Strongly Agree		1	0	6	27	118	152
Total		2	2	8	92	183	287
Pearson chi2()	20) = 5	57.7352	Pr = 0.	000			
Likelihood-ratio chi2(	20) = 4	6.6036	Pr = 0.	001			
Cramér	sV=	0.2243					
gai	nma =	0.5103	ASE = 0.	086			
Kendall's ta	u-b =	0.2874	ASE = $0$ .	056			

The ordered logistic regression confirms that stronger agreement with S1 (perceived accreditation compliance) significantly increases the likelihood of being satisfied with LDC participatory practices (S14), but with varying effects across LDC functionality levels.

- Among all respondents, those who strongly agreed with S1 were significantly more likely to report satisfaction with LDC participatory practices, with a coefficient of 5.83 (p = 0.032).
- Agreement with S1 also had a strong effect (4.30, p = 0.111), though it did not reach conventional significance levels.
- The Not Informed category had a positive coefficient (3.72, p = 0.165), suggesting that even respondents who were uncertain about accreditation compliance tend to have positive perceptions of participatory practices.

Among respondents from high-functionality LDCs, the overall satisfaction level is higher (coefficient = 5.37, p = 0.072), but the effect is not statistically significant at p < 0.05. The interaction effects between LDC functionality and accreditation compliance were negative, but none of the interactions are statistically significant as well.

Table B 9.6.5 Ordered Logistic regression - Statement 10 and Statement 12 with Interactions (LDC Functionality)

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs	=	495
	Wald chi2(7)	=	•
	Prob > chi2	=	
Log pseudolikelihood = -422.54202	Pseudo R2	=	0.0980

		Robust				
s14	Coefficient	std. err.	Z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
s1						
Strongly Disagree	1.354237	2.586912	0.52	0.601	-3.716018	6.424492
Disagree	.3494845	2.466251	0.14	0.887	-4.484278	5.183247
Not Informed / I do	3.72241	2.679433	1.39	0.165	-1.529182	8.974001
Agree	4.304296	2.70149	1.59	0.111	9905277	9.59912
Strongly Agree	5.835596	2.713937	2.15	0.032	.5163784	11.15481
intldc fcn						
High	5.367846	2.982942	1.80	0.072	4786129	11.2143
s1#intldc fcn						
_ Strongly Disagree#High	0	(empty)				
Disagree#High	-3.398766	2.956225	-1.15	0.250	-9.19286	2.395327
Not Informed / I do #						
High	-2.682382	3.067744	-0.87	0.382	-8.69505	3.330285
Agree#High	-5.178615	3.00067	-1.73	0.084	-11.05982	.7025912
Strongly Agree#High	-5.305957	2.995154	-1.77	0.076	-11.17635	.5644363
/cut1	.0100282	2.41346			-4.720267	4.740323
/cut2	.6889408	2.532773			-4.275204	5.653085
/cut3	2.019533	2.651647			-3.1776	7.216665
/cut4	2.154333	2.657454			-3.054182	7.362848
/cut5	5.290487	2.705764			012714	10.59369

#### Annex C. Qualitative Analysis

#### Preface

- 1. Selection of Qualitative Responses: Only the respondents who provided qualitative responses were included in the assessment. Responses containing "yes", "no", "none", "not applicable", or any indication of refusal to elaborate were excluded from the list.
- 2. **Percentage of Qualitative Responses:** For every survey item, the percentage of respondents who provided qualitative responses relative to the total number of survey respondents was calculated. This will provide readers with an overview of the qualitative response distribution.
- 3. **Processing and Categorization of Qualitative Responses:** The qualitative responses were analyzed using the following steps:
  - a. Each response was categorized based on whether it confirmed, partially agreed with, or negated the statement.
  - b. Responses were further categorized into different levels of participation (e.g. empowerment, involvement, and information). The levels of participation were adapted from the <u>IAP2's Public Participation Spectrum</u>. Other survey items related to communication were classified based on the timeliness and sufficiency of information dissemination.
  - c. When applicable, responses indicating partial agreement or negation were further categorized based on underlying reasons that may affect CSO participation, such as conditional participation, lack of capacity, and lack of willingness.
  - d. Responses that include recommendations were classified according to the type of recommendation such as, policy, technical, administrative, political, or allusion to more abstract outcomes.
  - e. A single response could contain multiple recommendations. Each recommendation was coded separately to ensure accurate representation in the analysis.

The Codebook used for categorization of the responses can be accessed via this link.

## C1 Participation Status and Level C1.1 Data Gathering

Categories	Data Gathering		
	CSO	LGUs	
Qualitative Response Rate	20% (99/497)	18% (87/495)	
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>80% (79) confirmed their organization's participation in data gathering activities</li> <li>13% (13) partially agreed, stating that they <i>"are informed but no direct participation" (Cell D21)</i>, or the participation is only from <i>"time to time"</i></li> <li>2% (2) of the respondents indicated they did not participate</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>70% (61) confirmed that CSOs participate in data gathering activities</li> <li>26% (23) partially agreed due to intermittent participation of CSOs.         <ul> <li>Some CSOs who are accredited by the Sanggunian are not active but they are always informed and consulted. (D35)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
		Three responses are irrelevant.	
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>23% (23) of the qualitative responses indicated that the CSOs collaborate with LGU and participate in decision making <ul> <li>we are given the leeway to decide the activities we do and the way we do it. (Cell D84)</li> </ul> </li> <li>52% (51) respondents mentioned that they are involved in the activities of the LGU or consulted for suggestions and insights concerning the data</li> <li>12% (12) confirmed receiving information regarding the data-gathering activities and meetings</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>16% (14) respondents answered that the CSOs are involved in recommending solutions and policymaking</li> <li>70% (61) respondents indicated that CSOs are invited and involved in activities, deliberations, and meetings</li> <li>10% (9) respondents mentioned they disseminate and provide information to CSOs (e.g. database, records, documents, etc)</li> </ul>	
Recommendatory elements	Among the 99 respondents, only 5% (5) provided recommendations, seeking more involvement and participation in the activities and knowledge on the activities (they are "still learning the things we need to know" - D36)	<ul> <li>13% (11) of the responses included recommendatory elements, generally highlighting the need for increased involvement and participation of CSOs</li> <li>5 referred to administrative concerns such as allocation of funds and allowances</li> <li>3 recommended more participation and collaboration with CSOs</li> <li>2 referred to political-related issues, describing the LGU-CSO relationship as one-sided with LGUs as the "main actors in the data gathering" (D38)</li> <li>1 provided a technical recommendation so CSOs can be more "vocal in giving their ideas" (D68)</li> </ul>	

Categories	Data Gathering		
	CSO	LGUs	
Remarks	4 respondents noted that their participation is intermittent or on case-case basis (i.e. depends on the situation or " <i>only when there is a</i> <i>message</i> ")	<ul> <li>4 respondents raised issues on CSOs being inactive <ul> <li>"Although the LGU is active, the CSOs are not participating" (D16)</li> </ul> </li> <li>2 respondents noted that CSOs lack the proactivity to voice out their ideas <ul> <li>"they are not proactive in deciding and suggesting plans and programs" (D25)</li> <li>3 respondents described CSO participation on a case-to-case basis, noting that "their attendance and participation at times depends on topics, concerns and issues that they think directly involves them." (D48)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Link to Responses	Link	Link	

#### C1.2 Data Analysis

Categories	Data Analysis	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	No responses	13% (62/495)
Confirmatory Statements		<ul> <li>87% (54) respondents confirmed that CSOs participated in the data analysis activities</li> <li>10% (6) partially agreed due to limited funds and CSO's <i>"limited/to no knowledge on this type of subject matter</i> (D49)" <i>that</i> affect their participation in these activities</li> <li>3% (2) affirmed that CSOs did not participate due to inactivity and absence of budget allocations for CSOs</li> </ul>
Themes / Topics		<ul> <li>6% (4) of the responses indicated that CSOs are active in crafting solutions to the emerging issues and concerns from the data analysis</li> <li>82% (51) of the respondents indicated CSOs are consulted to provide recommendations, raise questions, or give suggestions         <ul> <li>They are providing valuable insights that contributes to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Categories	Data Analysis		
	CSO	LGUs	
		<ul> <li>inform decision making and effective program implementation (D21)</li> <li>3% (2) indicated they share information and results to the CSOs</li> <li>8% (5) of the responses are not relevant to CSO participation in data analysis</li> </ul>	
Recommendations		Of the 62 responses, only 6% (4) provided recommendations on improving administrative (e.g. budget allocation) and technical concerns (e.g. CSOs' knowledge)	
Remarks		N/A	
Link to Responses		Link	

#### C1.3 Public Consultation

Categories	Public Consultation		
	CSO	LGUs	
Qualitative Response Rate	14% (70/497)	14% (67/495)	
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>74% (52) confirmed their participation in public consultations</li> <li>20% (14) partially confirmed their participation in public consultations. It is affected by logistical issues and limited opportunities to participate.         <ul> <li>7 respondents noted that they attend consultations only when invited, indicating that LGUs invite or consult them occasionally. This results in inconsistent CSO participation in public consultations</li> </ul> </li> <li>3% (2) affirmed they are not involved in the public consultations</li> <li>3% (2) of the responses are not relevant to public consultation-related activities</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>76% (51) confirmed CSOs participated in public consultations</li> <li>24% (16) partially agreed that while CSOs are invited to public consultations, participation varies. not all CSOs are active (D9), while others participate intermittently (D45, D51)</li> </ul>	
Themes / Topics	• 11% (8) of the respondents indicated they are involved in creating proposals	• 3% (2) of the respondents mentioned CSOs have a role in approving	

Categories	Public Co	nsultation
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>and solutions</li> <li>66% (46) of the respondents stated that they are asked to provide suggestions and feedback during public consultations, highlighting that their <i>"opinions and suggestions matter (D29)"</i></li> <li>6% (4) of the respondents were notified about the public consultations and hearings.</li> <li>The other responses are not relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>resolutions (D13) and leveraging their knowledge to provide better solutions (D37)</li> <li>96% (64) stated that CSOs are widely included in consultations and provided with opportunities to "Share what they want to convey" (D27). CSO representatives "articulate their take on the matters discussed and give suggestions and recommendations" (D42)</li> <li>3% (2) of the respondents affirmed CSOs are informed of the conduct of activities</li> </ul>
Recommendations	Of the 70 respondents, 5 respondents provided recommendations on administrative matters. Their concerns include logistical issues (D54), delays in feedback processes (D51), and limited understanding of the proceedings (D14)	The responses of LGUs did not have recommendatory elements.
Remarks	N/A	6 respondents indicated that CSO participation in public consultations depends on the topic or project being discussed (D62, D64) or the relevance of their concerns (D5)
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.4 Budget Preparation

Categories	Budget Preparation		
	CSO	LGUs	
Qualitative Response Rate	14% (71/497)	11% (52/495)	
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>76% (54) confirmed their participation in budget preparation</li> <li>14% (10) partially agreed, stating that their involvement depends on the program being discussed. One respondent indicated that they were only invited once, while other respondents raised that the budget has already been prepared, but was discussed with CSOs for approval <i>(See Remarks section)</i></li> </ul>	<ul> <li>81% (42) confirmed the participation of CSOs in budget preparation</li> <li>15% (8) partially agreed as CSO participation is limited to approval only (D6) or it is based on the program and proposals (D40). Few CSOs are also not consistently active and their levels of engagement varies ("not that very active" D51).</li> <li>2% (1) of the respondents indicated that CSOs did not participate in budget</li> </ul>	

Categories	Budget Pr	reparation
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>4% (3) of the respondents indicated that they did not participate in budget preparation.</li> <li>6% (4) of the responses are not relevant.</li> </ul>	preparation, and 2% (1) provided an irrelevant response.
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>6% (4) of the respondents indicated they were involved in the budget preparation and provided opportunity to contribute in the decision-making process of identifying which programs need d funding (D10).</li> <li>66% (47) affirmed that they participated in budget preparation and provided suggestions</li> <li>6% (4) of the respondents noted they were informed about the budget but not involved in its preparation.</li> <li>The other responses are not relevant to budget preparation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>10% (5) of the respondents indicated that CSOs have a critical role in the formulation of the budget. They are "given special roles in formulation and preparation of budget" (D28) and "CSOs participation in the issuance of the corresponding resolutions recommending approval is vital." (D27)</li> <li>87% (45) affirmed the participation of CSOs in the different activities (e.g. budget forum, preparation of the Annual budget, hearing, etc) and they are asked to provide feedback, ideas, and recommendations</li> </ul>
Recommendations	Only 1 respondent provided a recommendation	The responses of LGUs did not have recommendatory elements.
Remarks	<ul> <li>3 respondents noted that not all CSOs participate in the consultations (D56), and the participation level of CSOs varied based on the project or porgram (D10, D70)</li> <li>3 respondents also stated that they are only included during the approval stages, and not during the budget preparation.</li> <li>We agree on the items that are to be budgeted, yet the final and budget itemization is done by the LCE staff. (D65)</li> <li>we are informed during the final deliberation not so much in the budget preparation (D51)</li> <li>The budget has already been created and presented at the meeting, but the approval was discussed by the body. (D19)</li> </ul>	
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.5 Budget Authorization

Categories	Budget Authorization		
	CSO	LGUs	
Qualitative Response Rate	7% (35/495)	6% (29/495)	
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>86% (30) confirmed that they participation in budget authorization activities</li> <li>9% (3) partially agreed, citing the lack of information when participating in the meetings (D20) and not all of their proposed projects will be approved (D17)</li> <li>3% (1) of the respondents they did not participate in budget authorization</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>69% (20) of the respondents confirmed that CSOs participated in budget authorization activities</li> <li>21% (6) of the respondents partially agreed as CSO participation varies depending on whether they are invited and the program being discussed.</li> <li>3% (1) indicated that CSOs do not directly participate in budget authorization activities</li> <li>7% (2) of the responses are not related to budget authorization.</li> </ul>	
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>20% (7) of the respondents indicated their participation in the decision-making relating to authorizing the budget         <ul> <li>all projects not approved without CSO approval (D32)</li> <li>We can participate in the deliberation and have the voting power for the approval/disapproval of the budget proposals as presented during the LDC meeting. (D30)</li> </ul> </li> <li>54% (19) of the respondents affirmed their active participation in the deliberations, discussions, and endorsement of the budget (D29)</li> <li>9% (3) received information relating to the conduct of the meeting on budget authorization</li> <li>The remaining responses are not related to budget authorization</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>17% (5) of the LGUs indicated that CSOs participated in the decision- making relating to authorizing the budget         <ul> <li>CSOs participate in planning and approving the budget (AIP) (D14)</li> <li>They are also given the chance to either comment, move for the approval of the budget, or second the motion In one of the DCD meetings (D21)</li> </ul> </li> <li>76% (22) of the respondents indicated that CSOs are invited to participate and contribute their inputs         <ul> <li>Some CSOs are invited to observe and be part of budget deliberation in the adhoc com (D4)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Recommendations	Two respondents provided recommendations regarding the need to receive minutes of the meetings (D6) and having enough information to make informed decisions during the meetings (D20).	The responses of LGUs did not have recommendatory elements.	
Remarks	N/A	N/A	

Categories	Budget Authorization	
	CSO	LGUs
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.6 Budget Review

Categories	Budget Review	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	8% (41/495)	6% (28/497)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>85% (35) confirmed their participation in budget reviews</li> <li>7% (3) partially agreed, as they primarily "observe and listen to the presentation of each office budget (D22)", lack the necessary skills (D13), are not always informed about meetings (D24).</li> <li>5% (2) did not participate in budget reviews</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>71% (20) confirmed that CSOs participated in budget reviews</li> <li>21% (6) partially agreed as not all CSOs participated in the budget reviews</li> <li>7% (2) of the responses are not related to budget reviews</li> </ul>
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>7% (3) of the respondents affirmed they participated in the decision-making process by collaborating with the LGU in budget review (D7) and having the "authority to decide" (D8)</li> <li>68% (28) of the respondents indicated that they participated in the conduct of the meetings and are consulted for the review of the budget         <ul> <li><i>Every meeting of the MLDC, the plans of the municipality are presented to uswe see the allocated fundswe also have the opportunity to ask questions or comment about the said plan (D16)</i></li> <li>5% (2) of the respondents mentioned they are informed of the meeting on budget review.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>7% (2) of the respondents indicated that the CSO participated in the decision-making</li> <li>82% (23) of the respondents affirmed that CSOs are involved in the budget review as part of the consultation, as well as "presenting their requested budget" (D17)</li> </ul>
Recommendations	Two responses have recommendatory elements, referring to the lack of budget review skills (D13) and lack of funds to attend the meeting (D14)	One response includes a recommendatory element pertaining to the lack of technical knowledge of CSO about reviewing the budget, suggesting the need for capacity-building activities.

Categories	Budget Review	
	CSO	LGUs
Remarks	N/A	N/A
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.7 Budget Execution

Categories	Budget Execution	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	7% (33/497)	7% (36/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>76% (25) confirmed that they participated in the budget execution</li> <li>15% (5) partially agreed as there are instances that the CSOs do not know the budget of the program (D13) or do not always participate in budget execution (D18, D28)</li> <li>6% (2) indicated that they did not participate in the budget execution</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>78% (28) confirmed that CSOs participated in the budget execution</li> <li>22% (8) partially agreed as participation of CSOs in budget execution is limited to select times and programs</li> </ul>
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>6% (2) of the respondents indicated that they participate in creating solutions as they "have the opportunity to submit proposals and receive funding from government" (D19)</li> <li>64% (21) of the respondents mentioned that they are given feedback about the activities during budget execution (D9) and involved in budget execution activities (e.g. monitoring, reporting)</li> <li>The remaining responses are not relevant to budget execution.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>42% (15) of the respondents indicated that the CSOs participated in the creation or implementation of the programs and projects in partnership with the LGU (D32)         <ul> <li>Upon approval of the budget, the CSOs are very active in submitting letter request for the release and implementation of what project was included and approved (D22)</li> </ul> </li> <li>50% (18) of the respondents indicated that CSOs were invited to join or participate the budget execution, discussion of realignment, and monitoring of projects.</li> <li>3% (1) of the respondent indicated that CSOs were informed about the budget of the projects (D33)</li> <li>The remaining responses are not relevant to budget execution</li> </ul>
Recommendations	Five respondents provided recommendations.	The responses of LGUs did not have recommendatory elements.

Categories	Budget Execution	
	CSO	LGUs
Remarks	Recommendations include financial resources to support CSO participation and skills enhancement to be able to understand the budget of a program (D13)	N/A
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.8 Budget Accountability

Categories/variables	Budget Accountability	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	7% (36/497)	8% (38/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>92% (33) confirmed that they participated in activities related to budget accountability</li> <li>6% (2) partially agreed, stating they are informed but do not know the flow (D11) and their participation is on a case-to-case basis (<i>if necessary</i>) (D31)</li> <li>3% (1) indicated they did not participate in budget accountability-related activities</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>82% (31) confirmed that CSOs participated in activities related to budget accountability</li> <li>16% (6) partially agreed, with three respondents stating that CSO participation is only limited to the discussion of budget that has been allocated for them.</li> <li>3% (1) of the respondents stated that CSOs did not participate in budget accountability as <i>"they are not very empowered yet" (D15)</i></li> <li>Only in the budget allocated for them</li> </ul>
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>25% (9) of the respondents they participated in the decision-making process by <i>signing reports</i> (D5) and <i>voting or approving the budget</i> (D17)</li> <li>36% (13) noted being involved in discussions and monitoring activities, stating that they are recognized and given opportunities to participate. Additionally, one respondent mentioned that their participation is publicly displayed on the full disclosure board, making them "<i>always conscious even before we start if the activities we do would achieve the best and desired result.</i>" (D34)</li> <li>14% (5) received information from the LGU regarding budget through regular reports</li> <li>The other responses are not related to budget accountability.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>13% (5) of the respondents indicated that CSOs are included in the crafting of recommendations and addressing implementation issues. CSOs are also accountable for the PPAs and funds that were allocated to them.</li> <li>They processed and submitted liquidation papers to the accounting office for the fund requested for any project granted to the group. CSOs were called for meetings in order to monitor the status of the project if successful or not and find solutions (D19)</li> <li>82% (31) of the respondents indicated that CSOs are active members in the monitoring of the budget and the implementation of projects. They are also consulted to "express their ideas and recommendations on how the</li> </ul>

Categories/variables	Budget Accountability	
	CSO	LGUs
		process will be more efficient" (D6)
Recommendations	One response includes recommendatory elements, suggesting the need to inform the CSOs of the flow or process of budget accountability-related activities (D11)	Two responses include recommendatory elements, suggesting more CSO empowerment (D15) and improved administrative process in liquidating budget (D17)
Remarks	N/A	N/A
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.9 Executive Committee

Categories	Executive Committee	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	5% (25/497)	10% (51/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>76% (19) confirmed they participated in the Executive Committee meetings</li> <li>20% (5) partially agreed as respondents indicated that they are not always invited and are only included in select meetings. Additionally, their participation in decision-making should be in accordance with the sector-specific rules that they represent (D25)</li> <li>4% (1) of the responses are not relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>78% (40) of the respondents confirmed the CSOs participated in the Executive Committee</li> <li>18% (9) partially agreed with CSO participation in Executive Committees, but with inconsistent engagement. Two respondents also noted that the Executive Committee is rarely convened (D20, D36).</li> <li>2% (1) indicated that CSOs did not participate in executive committee-related activities</li> <li>The remaining responses are not related to CSO participation in the executive committee</li> </ul>
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>20% (5) of the respondents indicated they are involved in the decision-making and the creation or execution of the solutions</li> <li>56% (14) of the respondents affirmed that they participated in the committee and the discussions and provided inputs</li> <li>8% (2) of the respondents affirmed they received invitation or information about the conduct of the executive committee meetings</li> <li>The remaining responses are not</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>4% (2) of the LGUs' responses suggested CSO empowerment as they hold a signatory role (D37) in the committee and they actively participate in decision-making, including realignment of funds (D52)</li> <li>80% (41) of the respondents indicated CSO involvement, stating that they are regularly included in Executive Committee meetings (D3), submit recommendations through motions, and have opportunities to provide feedback and interact in deliberations</li> </ul>

Categories	Executive Committee	
	CSO	LGUs
	relevant to CSO's level of participation in Executive Committee activities	(D4) The remaining responses are not related to CSO's level of participation in the executive committee
Recommendations	One response included a recommendatory element as the respondent noted that he or she still needs to study the functions of the committee, suggesting the need for training, orientation, or other capacity development- related activity	Two respondents provided recommendations on improving administrative concerns, such as providing transportation services to CSOs and increasing their awareness on the conduct of the Execom activities
Remarks	N/A	N/A
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.10 Social Development Committee

Categories	Social Development Committee	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	8% (41/497)	12% (58/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>78% (32) confirmed their participation in the Social Development Committees</li> <li>12% (5) partially agreed due to to the inconsistency of the conduct of the committee meetings and their lack of knowledge</li> <li>2% (1) noted that they did not participate in committee</li> <li>The other responses are not relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>87% (51) confirmed the participation of CSOs in Social Development Committees</li> <li>10% (6) partially agreement due to the following reasons: the committee seldom convenes, lack of interest from CSOs, and the CSO participation depends on the specific areas where they are involved</li> </ul>
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>15% (6) of the respondents affirmed that they actively contributed to decision-making and creating solutions in the committee         <ul> <li>We are empowered to decide on certain activities but not in all activities (D7)</li> </ul> </li> <li>51% (21) of the respondents indicated involvement, primarily through providing feedback and participating in meetings and activities</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9% (5) indicated CSOs are empowered and highly involved in the committee as they serve as committee chairpersons or actively contribute to creating solutions.</li> <li>83% (48) cited CSO involvement in consultations for project prioritization and identification of programs, projects, and activities, where they provide recommendations for crafting the plans.</li> </ul>

Categories	Social Development Committee	
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>2% (1) respondent indicated that only information about the conduct of the committee meeting was received.</li> <li>The other responses are not relevant to the CSO's level of participation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5% (3) of the respondents mentioned that they notified and sent invitations to the CSOs</li> <li>The remaining responses are not relevant.</li> </ul>
Recommendations	Two responses included recommendatory elements on addressing the lack of knowledge (Technical) and for the CSO to also join the GAD Council (Administrative)	The responses of LGUs did not have recommendatory elements.
Remarks	Two respondents mentioned that the committees are not functional (D35) and they were not clustered into specific committees (D9)	
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.11 Economic Development Committee

Categories	Economic Development Committee	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	6% (33/497)	9% (44/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>97% (32) confirmed</li> <li>3% (1) partially agreed that the levels of participation of CSOs needed improvement, but the respondent did not elaborating on the details</li> <li>The remaining responses are not relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>84% (37) confirmed</li> <li>16% (7) partially agreed as respondents noted that the committee "<i>seldom convened</i>" and the CSOs do not participate regularly.</li> </ul>
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>18% (6) of the respondents noted their collaboration with LGU in the planning and implementation of livelihood projects</li> <li>58% (19) mentioned their active participation in the economic activities of the LGU         <ul> <li>Coop sector helps economic development of the LGU</li> <li>Coop sector helps economic development of the LGU</li> <li>contributing the Employment sector and boost economic</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>16% (7) of the respondents suggested CSO empowerment due to their participation in decision-making and their leadership positions (i.e. Chairperson and Vice Chairperson) in the committee         <ul> <li>From identification of problems on economy to solutions and prioritizing these solutions, the CSOs are called to participate (D3)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Categories	Economic Development Committee	
	CSO	LGUs
	<i>activities (D11)</i> The remaining responses are not related to CSOs' levels of participation in the committee.	<ul> <li>59% (26) affirmed CSO involvement in different activities such as the crafting of development plans, roundtable discussions, and regular meetings.</li> <li>9% (4) of the respondents notified the CSOs of the conduct of meetings and activities.</li> </ul>
Recommendations	The responses do not include recommendatory elements	Two respondents provided recommendations to address lack of knowledge of CSO (technical) and lack of budget (administrative).
Remarks	N/A	N/A
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.12 Physical Land Use Infrastructure Development

Categories	Physical Land Use Infrastructure Development	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	7% (34/497)	8% (38/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>88% (30) confirmed their participation in the physical land use infrastructure development committee</li> <li>9% (3) partially agreed, as the committee was only convened once and the committee needs to share technical knowledge with the CSOs to be able to improve participation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>89% (34) confirmed CSO participation in the physical land use infrastructure development committee</li> <li>11% (4) partially agreed as the committee is seldom conducted and only the official members are invited to participate</li> </ul>
Themes / Topics	• 6% (2) of the respondents noted active involvement by signing approved resolutions and addressing zoning violations.	• 8% (3) of the respondents noted that the CSOs played an active role in the crafting of the CLUP and other committee meetings and help leadership positions such as the Vice

Categories	Physical Land Use Infrastructure Development	
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>76% (26) of the respondents were invited to participate in the consultation, review of land use plans, assessment, and monitoring and evaluation of projects and activities</li> <li>The remaining responses are not related to CSOs' levels of participation in the committee.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Chairperson of the committee</li> <li>84% (32) of the respondents mentioned that CSOs provided feedback and recommendations as part of the consultation process</li> <li>3% (1) of the respondent confirmed that the CSOs were informed and encouraged to join the activity</li> </ul>
Recommendations	One respondent provided a recommendation on the need to share technical knowledge.	N/A
Remarks	One respondent indicated that the committee is not functional.	N/A
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.13 Environmental Management Committee

Categories	Environmental Management Committee	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	9% (45/497)	9% (44/497
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>96% (43) confirmed their participation in the committee</li> <li>4% (2) partially agreed, due to the lack of consultation and deliberation on environmental initiatives</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>89% (39) confirmed CSO participation in the committee</li> <li>9% (4) partially agreed, stating that the committee meeting is seldom conducted and the participation of CSOs depends on whether they have a direct concern in the matter (D43).</li> </ul>
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>9% (4) of the respondents noted their involvement in the creation of solutions and conduct of activities (e.g. clean up drives and tree planting programs)</li> <li>67% (30) involvement in the implementation, inspection, and monitoring of environmental activities</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9% (4) of the respondents noted that CSO representatives held leadership roles (Vice Chairperson), submitted proposals, and even passed resolutions for the review and endorsement of the council.</li> <li>80% (35) affirmed involvement through participation in meetings and planning sessions.</li> </ul>

Categories	Environmental Management Committee	
	CSO	LGUs
	The remaining responses are not related to CSOs' levels of participation in the committee.	• 5% (2) of the respondents affirmed notifying the CSOs of the environmental activities
Recommendations	No recommendations from the respondents.	One respondent mentioned the limited knowledge of CSO in environmental issues (D12), suggesting the need for capacity development initiatives.
Remarks	One respondent indicated that their participation in the committee is conditional on whether there are items for approval, not so much <i>"in the</i> <i>deliberation or preparations of the initiatives</i> <i>related to the environment committee." (D30)</i>	N/A
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.14 Institutional Development Committee

Categories	Institutional Development Committee	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	4% (19/497)	7% (33/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>89% (17) confirmed their participation in the committee</li> <li>5% (1) partially agreed, stating the participation is <i>"superficial"</i> (D13)</li> <li>The remaining response is not relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>85% (28) confirmed participation of CSOs in the committee</li> <li>15% (5) partially agreed, stating that the committee meetings or activities are seldom conducted, only a few CSOs are participating, and CSOs participate only when called or as needed.</li> </ul>
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>16% (3) of the respondents mentioned collaborating with different government agencies for the conduct of livelihood training and other programs</li> <li>68% (13) of the respondents affirmed attendance to consultations, meetings, and activities.</li> <li>The remaining responses are not related to CSOs' levels of participation in the committee.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>15% (5) of the respondents indicated the active role of CSOs in the leadership positions of the committee (e.g. Vice Chairperson), drafting of the provincial ordinances, and passing of resolutions.</li> <li>79% (26) of the respondents affirmed CSO participation in the council and board meeting, crafting of development plans, and discussion of recommendations.</li> <li>3% (1) of the respondents informed the CSOs about the meetings of the</li> </ul>

Categories	Institutional Development Committee	
	CSO	LGUs
		committee
		The remaining response is not related to CSOs' levels of participation in the committee.
Recommendations	No recommendations provided.	One response included a recommendatory element, indicating that the participation of the CSO members is affected by the lack of financial support for transportation
Remarks	N/A	N/A
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.15 Project Monitoring Committee

Categories	Project Monitoring Committee	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	9% (43/497)	12% (61/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>84% (36) confirmed their participation in the committee</li> <li>14% (6) partially agreed, stating that information dissemination and involvement of CSOs are limited to select activities.         <ul> <li>Im a member of the said com and we do physical monitoring but no more on the solution provision or planning activity (D32)</li> </ul> </li> <li>2% (1) did not confirm their participation as the committee is being <i>reorganized (D25)</i>.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>77% (47) confirmed CSO participation in the committee</li> <li>18% (11) Partially agreed as CSOs <i>"seldom join"</i> and not all CSOs participate</li> </ul> The remaining responses are not relevant.
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>2% (1) of the respondents indicated collaboration with LGU on its existing projects</li> <li>88% (38) of the respondents participated in inspecting and overseeing municipal government-funded projects. They are regularly consulted, invited, and engaged in activities across various committees,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>8% (5) of the respondents highlighted the leadership roles of CSO in the Committee (e.g. Vice Chairperson, Chairperson, and lead of field monitoring). CSOs also contribute to policymaking and its review.</li> <li>79% (48) of the respondents noted CSO involvement in the regular monitoring of programs and projects.</li> </ul>

Categories	Project Monitoring Committee	
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>ensuring that projects are implemented effectively.</li> <li>2% (1) of the respondents were only informed of the activities.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>They are also invited to present findings and recommendations during LDC meetings</li> <li>2% (1) of the respondents confirmed informing the CSO of the meeting, but they fail to participate due to their busy schedules</li> <li>The remaining responses are not relevant</li> </ul>
Recommendations	One respondent provided a technical recommendation to enhance learning of CSOs (D11).	N/A
Remarks	One respondent noted that the "Mayor did not issue appointments to members of the committee so committee ambivalent to proceed (D24)"	Four respondents noted that CSO participation in the committee meetings and activities is limited to select programs of LGUs ( <i>when</i> <i>invited</i> ) and whether their sector is included in the matters for discussion. and when they are invited.
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.16 Sanggunian Consultative Activities

Categories	Sanggunian Consultative Activities	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	8% (40/497)	9% (43/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>85% (34) confirmed their participation in the Sanggunian consultative Activities</li> <li>10% (4) partially agreed, indicating the inconsistency of the conduct of the activities. CSOs also participate only when they are invited.</li> <li>3% (1) of the respondents noted that the LGU never consulted with the CSO.</li> <li>The remaining response is not relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>70% (30) confirmed CSO participation in the Sanggunian Consultative Activities</li> <li>28% (12) partially agreed, as not all CSOs are attending even though they were invited. CSO participation also depends on the agenda of the activity or meeting.</li> <li>2% (1) did not confirm CSO participation in the conduct of the activities.</li> </ul>

Categories	Sanggunian Consultative Activities	
	CSO	LGUs
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>3% (1) of the respondents participated in policy making activities which include review of draft ordinances, submission of proposals for legislation, and conduct of policy consultations (D19)</li> <li>75%(30) of the respondents participated in different programs and activities, including committee hearings and federation meetings</li> <li>8% (3) confirmed receiving invitations to attend the Sanggunian consultative activities.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>7% (3) of the respondents highlighted the role of CSO in decision-making and policy making. CSOs are involved in the formulation of the Executive- Legislative Agenda (D39) and the approval of resolutions and ordinances (D11).</li> <li>81% (35) of the respondents affirmed CSO participation in sessions and consultations to provide recommendations. CSOs also "act as resource persons for subject matter that is related to the CSO's concern (D16)"</li> <li>The remaining responses are not related to CSOs' levels of participation in the activities.</li> </ul>
Recommendations	One respondent implied the lack of feedback on the suggestions provided by CSO and whether it was considered in the development of policies. This suggests improvements in communication and feedback mechanisms of LGUs (D8).	One response included recommendatory elements, referring to the lack of budget for the administrative and operational activities (e.g. training, meetings, etc) of the council. However, "the PLGU is not in the position to provide such fund to avoid undue influencë to its members. (D6)"
Remarks	N/A	Five respondents indicated that CSOs participation is conditional on the agenda of the meeting and the issue for discussion and whether they are invited to attend.
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C1.17 Procurement Process

Categories	Procurement Process	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	6% (25/497)	7% (34/495)

Categories	Procurement Process		
	CSO	LGUs	
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>80% (20) confirmed their participation in the procurement process</li> <li>12% (3) partially agreed, stating that their participation is inconsistent and limited to select contracts.</li> <li>4% (1) of the respondents indicated that they did not participate in the procurement process.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>79% (27) confirmed the CSO participation in the procurement process</li> <li>12% (4) partially agreed regarding CSO participation. While CSOs are invited as observers, <i>"the option to attend or not is with the invited CSOs (D22)"</i>. Other respondents noted that CSO representatives occasionally fail to attend the bidding process, and their participation in the procurement process is <i>"not that significant"</i> (D13).</li> <li>6% (2) of the respondents noted that CSOs did not participate in the process due to schedule problems and challenges</li> </ul>	
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>84% (21) of the participants confirmed involvement through the submission of proposals, participation as "observers", and giving feedback.</li> <li>The remaining responses are not related to CSO's levels of participation in procurement process</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3% (1) of the respondents described CSOs' role in the process as end-users, suggesting a more active role in procurement</li> <li>91% (31) of the respondents affirmed the involvement of the CSOs during the bidding process as participants or observers.</li> <li>The remaining responses are not related to CSO's levels of participation in procurement process</li> </ul>	
Recommendations	One respondent mentioned the distance of the CSO to the provincial capital, suggesting the need for transportation or logistical support Two respondents cited scheduling confict challenges as reasons for inability to at procurement-related activities. This respondents are commendatory element of improving the administrative process a ensuring timely scheduling of the activities.		
Remarks	N/A	N/A	
Link to Responses	Link	Link	

#### C1.18 Others

Categories	Others		
	CSO	LGUs	
Qualitative Response Rate	13% (66/497)	21% (106/495)	
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>94% (62) of the respondents confirmed their participation in other committees and activities</li> <li>6% (4) of the respondents partially agreed, stating that they are invited only occasionally (<i>"from time to time"</i>), receive limited information, and participate in <i>"random"</i> (D49) activities, rather than having a consistent role.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>93% (99) of the respondents confirmed CSO participation in other committees and activities</li> <li>6% (6) partially agreed, stating that CSOs participate in most LGU activities (not all). Their participation also depends on the concerns and PPAs.</li> <li>1% (1) did not confirm CSO participation in other activities due to problems related to schedule</li> </ul>	
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>2% (1) of the CSO respondents mentioned they hold tasks as "<i>Chieftain</i>", suggesting a more active role in leadership or decision making</li> <li>95% (63) of the respondents affirmed they participate as volunteers and members in different activities and boards (e.g. religious and municipal activities, Local Health committee, school board, anti-drug campaigns etc.)         <ul> <li>We are always involved and invited in almost all activities, projects and programs of the LGU through meetings, seminars, workshops, etc. (D38)</li> </ul> </li> <li>3% (2) of the respondents information and invitation to these activities, "but not really as participants" (D43)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5% (5) of the respondents confirmed that CSOs are actively creating solutions and are empowered to participate in the activities. CSOs are also described as partners in other sectors such as but not limited to food security, health, and climate change.</li> <li>94% (100) of the respondents confirmed the CSO participation in other activities by enumerating other committees and activities (e.g. Local Special Bodies, health council, peace and order council, anti-drug abuse council, and local festivities)         <ul> <li>CSOs are also described as having "Active participation in preserving socio-cultural practices and disciplines. (D10)"</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Recommendations	<ul> <li>Three responses have the following recommendatory elements:</li> <li>Administrative: Regular Conduct of Consultation Activity and CDC General Assembly (D56)</li> <li>Policy: Involvement of CSO in the policymaking culture and the arts</li> <li>Technical: Addressing the CSOs' lack of knowledge</li> </ul>		
Remarks	N/A	Three respondents indicated that CSO participation is conditional, which depends on whether they have concerns regarding the issue raised or if the LGU programs or activities are	

Categories	Others	
	CSO	LGUs
		also related to their PPA
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### **C2 Enablers and Hindrances**

Categories	Enablers and Hindrances <sup>12</sup>		
	CSO	LGU	
Qualitative Response Rate	89% (444/497)	91% (449/495)	
Enablers	<ul> <li>271 (61%) of the respondents identified enablers to their participation.</li> <li>25% (67) of the respondents alluded to more abstract outcomes as enablers of their participation in LDC and other activities such as implementation and monitoring. <ul> <li>They participate to have a <i>"voice"</i> in the council / meetings (D235) or be a <i>"contributor to nation building (D45)."</i></li> <li>47% (127) of the respondents identified administrative-related mechanisms and processes such as the provision of early notice of meetings, orientation and advocacy activities, and provision of funds to CSOs <ul> <li><i>"it is helpful because we are informed about the things that are being discussed in the ldc and it will affect the level of our participation if we do not form (D42)"</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>10% (28) of the respondents indicated a strong partnership or relationship with</li> </ul></li></ul>	<ul> <li>51% (230) of the respondents identified the following enablers to CSO participation:</li> <li>47% (107) respondents cited administrative resources enabling CSO participation through effective communication and partnership as key enablers "<i>They attend the activities, and they are well informed</i>" and provision of incentives and allowances to CSO members.</li> <li>26% (59) alluded to more abstract outcomes, CSOs are actively participating in the LDC activities and they "<i>feel that their views are heard</i>" (D411), have the commitment to help (D74), and even a "<i>Sense of bayanihan</i>" (D17).</li> <li>16% (36) of the respondents indicated that training, workshops, and other capacity development programs conducted by LGUs help enable CSO participation.</li> <li>16% (36) of the respondents indicated that CSO participation was institutionalized through policy, guidelines, and accreditation processes</li> </ul>	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Each response was assessed whether it included enablers, hindrances, or both components that can explain the level of CSO participation in LDC.

Categories	Enablers and Hindrances <sup>12</sup>		
	CSO	LGU	
	<ul> <li>LGU as an enabler of their participation <ul> <li>"City mayor listening to suggestions/comments of CSO (D97)"</li> <li>"Recognition of LGU of their presence (D413)"</li> </ul> </li> <li>16% (42) of the respondents participated to seek knowledge and opportunities to learn new skills and ideas</li> <li>3% (8) identified policy-related enablers. Few of the respondents attributed its participation as a result of being an accredited organization (D398, D400, D403)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that enabled the participation of CSOs</li> <li>14% (33) of the respondents indicated having a good relationship with LGUs and continued support as enablers of CSO participation <ul> <li><i>"Our CSO, they are very active because there are many activities, and our mayor is very personable, people can see him, he listens to their concerns (D506)."</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Hindrances	185 (42%) of the respondents identified the following hindrances:	<ul> <li>307 (62%) of the respondents identified the following hindrances:</li> <li>79% (244) indicated administrative</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>90% (166) identified administrative-related hindrances such as conflict in schedule, transportation costs, lack of budget, and delays in communication. Respondents also mentioned late notices and communications affect their participation         <ul> <li>"Late notices of meetings, conferences and sessions. Important to send out advance notices for availability."</li> <li>"Sometimes although we are present, we are not that active because the documents are late. "</li> </ul> </li> <li>5% (9) of the respondents indicated limited knowledge and lack of training/orientation on their responsibilities (D68) as hindrances to their participation. One response mentioned they "lack of knowledge on how to approach the right agencies (D133)"</li> <li>3% (5) of the respondents indicated political-related hindrances such as "being overwhelmed with the presence of the highest official (D8)", weak working relationships with LGUs (D124), or they find their involvement is entirely dependent on LGU invitations (D302).</li> <li>2% (3) of the respondents attributed</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>barriers such as the busy schedule of CSOs, lack of personal benefits/budget for its members, and lack of effective communication efforts and mechanisms.</li> <li>40 (13%) of LGU respondents noted that CSO's lack of technical knowledge and skills hinder them from participating. Few respondents also referred to the lack of proactivity of CSOs during meetings. <ul> <li><i>"Other CSOs are shy to participate and speak their opinion during MDC meeting" (D61)</i></li> <li><i>"shyness is often observed as one of the hindrances in their participation. we still need to build their confidence for them to actively participate in the ldc."</i> (D367)</li> </ul> </li> <li>8% (25) of the respondents cited the lack of policies, guidelines, and basis for grants or honorariums for CSOs (D226, D452) and restrictive COA regulations hinder CSO participation (D41).</li> <li>5% (16) of the respondents identified several political factors that hinder CSO participation such as lack of interest from elected officials to engage CSOs (D333), lack of trust in government(D433), political interference (D447) and dynamics, and</li> </ul>	

Categories	Enablers and Hindrances <sup>12</sup>		
	CSO	LGU	
	<ul> <li>their lack of participation to policy-related hindrances, including having "<i>unclarified roles and responsibilities of LDC member (D207)</i>"</li> <li>1% (2) of the respondents alluded to more abstract reasons for their limited/lack of participation, including the lack of commitment, transparency and accountability.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>bias in CSO accreditation (D435).</li> <li>1% (4) of the respondents attributed the lack of CSO participation to more abstract hindrances such as lack of commitment and accountability on the part of the CSOs (D336)</li> </ul>	
Remarks	Two respondents used the word "Sacrifice" to describe attendance to meetings: "I will sacrifice to be able to attend the meeting even though I have a lot of work,,, time management". (D20)N/A		
Link	Link	Link	

### C3 Local Government Units' Needs C3.1 Policy

Categories	Policy <sup>13</sup>	
	CSO	LGU
Qualitative Response Rate		63% (310/495)
Types of Support Needed		<ul> <li>4% (13) of the respondents alluded to more policy outcomes, emphasizing the need for policies that ensure CSO participation, without specifying concrete measures         <ul> <li>"Promulgate policies that would directly obliged CSOs to engage meaningfully in the spirit of participative governance." (D244)</li> <li>Set guidelines increased CSO participation (D246, D274)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>36% (110) of the respondents emphasized the need for clear administrative guidance to support CSO participation. The needs varied:         <ul> <li>Guidance on preparation of LDC resolutions and institutionalization of support mechanisms such as the CSO desk, people's council, and honorarium</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Respondents who only indicated the words "National", "Regional", "Local" were excluded from the analysis, as these responses did not directly answer the question on what would enable the LGU to expand and deepen its LDC-related work.

Categories	Policy <sup>13</sup>	
	CSO	LGU
		<ul> <li>Streamlining policies from national to local, to avoid <i>"duplicity"</i> (D4)</li> <li>Clear policies and guidance to CSOs on their participation, including <i>"carrying out the programs of their respective purposes and advocacies. (D9)"</i> and having a "<i>legal bases [basis] for the activities that they would [will] conduct. (D8)"</i> and,</li> <li>Conduct of proper consultation</li> <li>14% (41) identified capacity development interventions, focusing on orientation, knowledge-building, and participatory planning with CSOs to help them understand their roles and <i>"be an active member of the LDC"</i> (D126). Many respondents also highlighted the need for CSOs to be</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>trained regularly.</li> <li>19% (58) of the respondents identified the need for organizational resources, such as but not limited to the creation of a CSO Office with enough staffing personnel, reliable data and active research team, and provision of reimbursement for expenses and incentives. Select respondents mentioned the need for a policy to "streamline the requirements for the grant of financial assistance (D180)"</li> <li><i>"A national policy on minimum allowance and honorariums. Sometime [Sometimes] when we provide honorariums, it is questioned by COA. With a national policy in place, it will streamline the process of encouraging CSOs. (D255)"</i></li> </ul>
		The remaining responses (28%) did not specify policy needs of LGUs. Responses varied from confirmatory statements to unrelated and unclear responses.
Remarks		N/A
Link to Responses		Link

#### C3.2 Technical

Categories	Technical	
	CSO	LGU
Qualitative Response Rate		74% (364/495)
Types of Support Needed		• 3% (10) of the respondents referenced abstract outcomes such as the need for <i>"cooperation"</i> , <i>"continuing program to</i>

Categories	Technical	
	CSO	LGU
		<ul> <li>empower the CSO", and "sustaining their participation"</li> <li>6% (23) of the respondents indicated the need for administrative guidance, such as support in data analysis to help identify issues and solutions, benchmarking new or best practices from other LGUs on how to improve involvement of CSOs, and preparation of resolutions and plans.</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>A majority 75% (271) of the respondents highlighted the need for capacity development to strengthen both the CSOs and local government units.         <ul> <li>For the CSOs, training or orientation on</li> <li>issue identification, solutions, and prioritization are necessary to know the "technical know-how" of projects</li> <li>For LGUs, Training on data analysis and management, including updates on new technologies to enhance governance processes.</li> <li>Few respondents noted the need for the national government to share technical expertise with local government units or for LGU to have "exposure to more successful projects/ LGUs with high CSO participation or model sites" (D187).</li> </ul> </li> <li>5% (19) of the respondents pointed to the need for corganizational resources such as investment in technologies to facilitate meetings and better communication, access to resource speakers for capacity development activities, and utilization of software programs for planning, monitoring, and implementation.</li> </ul>
		The remaining responses (11%) did not specify technical needs of LGUs. Responses varied from confirmatory statements to unrelated and unclear responses.
Remarks		One respondent highlighted the disparity in capacities among CSOs
		• "Since the current provincial administration involves even barangay-based CSOs, there is a disparity between barangay- based and larger province-wide CSOs. (D186)"
Link to Responses		Link

#### C3.3 Administrative

Categories	Administrative	
	CSO	LGU
Qualitative Response Rate		68% (339/495)

Categories	Administrative	
	CSO	LGU
Types of Support Needed	CSO	<ul> <li>LGU</li> <li>1% (5) of the respondents emphasized the importance of ensuring consistent engagement with CSOs to "create [build] camaraderie" and establish a "uniform direction"</li> <li>4% (12) of the respondents identified improving coordination with different departments, streamlining processes, clarifying mandate and source of logistical assistance, and reduction of excessive reporting requirements as administrative-related needs to deepen its participatory LDC-related work.</li> <li>12% (40) of the respondents suggested the capacity development of both CSO and LGU staff, with one respondent highlighting that "Knowledge on administration and financial management are necessary for effective office operations" (D160).</li> <li>LGUs need upskilling of staff and "Continuous professional development for staff in areas such as participatory governance, conflict resolution, data management, and leadership is essential. (D308)"</li> <li>For CSOs, additional training budget was noted as well as the need for CSO profiling and identification of interests and strengths (D46)</li> <li>70% (240) of the respondents identified organizational financial resources that can support the operations of LGUs.</li> <li>Many respondents (61 out of the 240) specified the need for more, skilled staff to help with the increasing workload of LGUs</li> <li>Similarly, respondents (99 out of the 240) highlighted the need for financial resources to support LGU operations and the implementation of the programs and activities of the CSOs. "If there is a budget for the purpose of programs and activities of the CSOs."</li> </ul>
		One respondent provided a comprehensive response stating that "Adequate human resources ensure that there are <b>skilled personnel to</b> <b>facilitate engagement, manage processes, and provide technical</b> <b>support to stakeholders.</b> Meanwhile, financial resources allow us to <b>fund essential activities, such as capacity-building programs,</b> <b>outreach initiatives, logistical support, and communication efforts.</b> Together, these resources create a strong foundation for inclusive participation, ensuring that all stakeholders, especially marginalized groups, can effectively contribute to LDC-related work. (D143)" The remaining responses (13%) did not specify administrative needs of LGUs. Responses varied from confirmatory statements to unrelated
		and unclear responses.

Categories	Administrative	
	CSO	LGU
Remarks		N/A
Link to Responses		Link

#### C3.4 Political

Categories		Political		
	CSO	LGU		
Qualitative Response Rate		48% (239/495)		
Types of Support Needed		<ul> <li>10% (24) identified the need for political neutrality, political harmony, public trust, and respect between LGU representatives and CSOs, without specifying measures and interventions</li> <li>11% (25) of the respondents indicated communication-related improvements that can improve their work in LDC such as expanding public access to information and promotion of CSO accreditation, "matching" CSO and political agenda to encourage more participation, and ensuring feedback and levelling off political differences</li> <li>In addition to developing relationships with the CSOs, 3% (8) of the respondents specified opportunities to learn from other LGUs on how to deepen its LDC-related work         <ul> <li><i>"I think it is important to learn from the best practices of politicians or leaders who excel in participatory governance. Naga and Pasig are there, networking with them will help. (D70)"</i></li> <li><i>"Provide avenue or opportunity for knowledge and resources sharing and support (D100)"</i></li> <li><i>"the best practices of other LGU-CSOs might be of help in our LGU (D161)"</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>41% (98) of the respondents emphasized the need for organizational resources that can facilitate access to projects, funding, and support from other government agencies.</li> <li>According to LGUs, the need for stronger political relationships can "help meet other needs" (D9). It will help CSOs "have more benefits", " access technical and financial support from other neeties or agencies", and "expand the sphere of influence" (D81, D113)</li> <li>Overall, "More network means more access to more</li> </ul>		

Categories	Political		
	CSO	LGU	
		resources" (D59)	
		The remaining responses (35%) did not specify the political needs of LGUs. Responses varied from confirmatory statements to unrelated and unclear responses.	
Remarks		N/A	
Link to Responses		Link	

#### C4 Participatory Governance Metrics C4.1 CSO accreditation and LDC membership selection satisfy the requirements of the national guidelines.

Categories	Statement 1: CSO Accreditation Satisfy Requirements		
	CSO	LGUs	
Qualitative Response Rate	0.6% (3/497)	45% (223/495)	
Confirmatory Statements	Three respondents confirmed that the CSO accreditation satisfies the requirements. The CSO accreditation was implemented with the assistance of the CSO Desk officer and the Sangguniang bayan	<ul> <li>80% (179) confirmed that their respective CSO accreditation and LDC selection satisfy the requirements of the national guidelines. Requirements are submitted, screened, and finalized with a Sangguniang Panlalawigan (SP) resolution</li> <li>13% (29) of the respondents partially agreed, citing that the selection process is influenced by political leaders and the requirement for women participation as per the Magna Carta of Women is not met.         <ul> <li>One respondent also noted that "The timeline for accreditation is too short. The requirement that they have to be accredited prior to LDC membership is not usually satisfied. (D179)"</li> <li>3% (7) of the respondents indicated that their respective CSO accreditation and LDC selection does not satisfy the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Categories	Statement 1: CSO Accreditation Satisfy Requirements		
	CSO	LGUs	
		requirements of the national guidelines due do issues relating to documentation, lack of proper selection process of LDC members, and outdated records of CSOs	
Recommendations	The responses from the CSOs do not have recommendatory elements	<ul> <li>17 responses included recommendatory elements.</li> <li>76% (13) of the respondents noted administrative concerns <ul> <li>Respondents highlighted the lack of data and CSO inventory at the LGU level.</li> <li>There is a need for stronger support from DILG and complete understanding of national guidelines and requirements, as many CSOs are still not fully informed.</li> <li>Additionally, compliance with requirements takes time to comply, suggesting the need to streamline processes and requirements (D136).</li> </ul> </li> <li>12% (2) of the respondents noted instances where CSOs were favored based on political affiliations. The selection process for LDC membership was seen as politically influenced with some political leaders choosing which CSOs could participate.</li> <li>12% (2) of the respondents raised policy-related recommendations, pointing to inconsistent implementation of the guidelines, as some policies were not followed due to unfavorable local conditions affecting their execution. One respondent also noted the lack of proper process for LDC members for LDC members selection.</li> </ul>	
Remarks	N/A	Four respondents noted that the requirement on women participation according to the Magna Carta for Women was not met.	
Link to Responses	Link	Link	

## C4.2 LDC-CSO members are clearly informed about the different ways of participating in the LDC, including its committees and other consultative activities.

Categories	Staten LDC-CSO members are	nent 2: CLEARLY INFORMED
	CSO	LGU
Qualitative Response Rate	33% (162/497) of the respondents provided qualitative responses	42% (207/495) of the respondents provided qualitative responses
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>Of the 162 respondents:</li> <li>72% (117) provided confirmatory statements</li> <li>23% (37) partially agreed.</li> <li>4% (7) negated the statement</li> <li>1% (1) provided an irrelevant response</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Of the 207 respondents:</li> <li>65% (134) provided confirmatory statements</li> <li>27% (55) partially agreed</li> <li>5% (11) negated the statement</li> <li>3% (7) provided an irrelevant response</li> </ul>
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>The responses are further categorized based on the following:</li> <li>72% (116) of the respondents noted CSOs are clearly informed</li> <li>15% (24) of the respondents raised the need for more details / depth. Sample responses include "We were informed but needed to be more detailed, including specific processes or procedures." and "Sometimes there are information that need detail knowledge especially if it is highly technical"</li> <li>Responses can be found in cells D127 and D145 in this link.</li> <li>3% (5) of the respondents indicated that they were not informed</li> <li>9% (15) of the respondents provided unclear or irrelevant responses</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The responses are further categorized based on the following:</li> <li>70%(144) of the LGU respondents noted that CSO members are clearly informed of their ways of participation. Several respondents specified the conduct of orientation as the mechanism to disseminate information to CSOs on their functions, committees, and other activities</li> <li>25 (12%) of the respondents mentioned that information is provided or the CSOs are aware, but they do not fully understand the information due to lack of capacity and limited or inconsistent participation.</li> <li>2% (4) of the respondents indicated that the CSOs were not informed</li> <li>16% (34) of the respondents provided unclear or irrelevant responses</li> </ul>
Recommendations	<ul> <li>Of the 162 respondents, 21% (34) responses included recommendatory elements</li> <li>85% (29) respondents mentioned the use of / need for communicated-related interventions such as providing advance notices and improving awareness of CSOs through info dissemination.</li> <li>6% (2) of the respondents indicated policy barriers such as having too many requirements for the accreditation process, which may be inferred as a</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Of the 207 respondents, 23% (47) of the responses have recommendatory elements</li> <li>53% (25) respondents identified administrative-related recommendations Issues pertaining to logistics, and financial constraints hinder the CSOs from participating and receiving information. However, mechanisms such as exhausting all forms of communication platforms and sending out invitations ahead of time help CSOs participate in meetings and</li> </ul>

Categories	Statement 2: LDC-CSO members are CLEARLY INFORMED		
	CSO	LGU	
	<ul> <li>barrier to receiving information, and the lack of detailed processes and procedures</li> <li>6% (2) of the respondents alluded to more abstract outcomes of increased participation and strengthening the voice of the CSO</li> <li>3% (1) of the responses indicated the need for technical knowledge to understand the details</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>activities</li> <li>40% (19) recommended further training for CSOs to enhance knowledge, skills, and confidence</li> <li>4% (2) recommended protocols for participation of CSOs in LDC and clarification of their tasks and responsibilities as members</li> <li>2% (1) of the responses alluded to more abstract outcomes of strong CSO participation</li> </ul>	
Remarks	6 respondents mentioned that information and participation are on a case-to-case basis: "Our organization is not fully informed. Sometimes we are invited, sometimes not." (Cell D111 in this) 12 respondents mentioned that information is obtained from the CSO Conference / Orientation.	• 26 LGU respondents mentioned CSOs are informed, but are not "proactive" (Cell D147), "highly technical" (Cell D118), "Fully committed" (Cell D204).	
	<ul> <li>3 responses mentioned participation in sectoral/committee meetings and the lack of designation to the sub-committees</li> <li><i>"DIFFERENT COMMITTEES ARE BEING PRESENTED AND WE SELECT WHAT SECTOR THE ORG. CAN PARTICIPATE (D17)"</i></li> <li><i>"we qualified as member of PDC but we were not assigned to sub committees where we can contribute better (D24)"</i></li> <li><i>"Our group can be a member of any committee because we are all around no matter which sector, case, there was no formal designation in which comm. We are participants!</i> (D128)"</li> </ul>		
Link	Link	Link	

# C4.3 The LGU sufficiently communicates the different ways of participating in the LDC, including its committees and other consultative activities, to all interested CSOs.

Categories	Staten LGU SUFFICIENTLY COMM	nent 3: IUNICATES how to participate
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	31% (155/497)	38% (190/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>70% (109) of the respondents confirmed that the LGU sufficiently communicates the different ways of participating in the LDC</li> <li>21% (33) of the partially agreed, citing that the information dissemination is not regular, timely, and comprehensive (i.e. only for select activities)</li> <li>3% (5) of the respondents noted that the LGU did not sufficiently communicate the different ways of participating in the LDC</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>77% (146) of the respondents confirmed that they sufficiently communicated the different ways of participating in the LDC.</li> <li>11% (21) of the respondents partially agreed, citing inconsistency in the information dissemination</li> <li>3% (5) noted that they did not sufficiently communicate the different ways of participating in the LDC</li> </ul>
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>62% (96) of the respondents further affirmed that the information provided was clear, timely, and sufficient. Different communication channels (e.g. group chats, online meetings) were established to facilitate information dissemination. Many respondents noted that they receive communications from the LGUs through different platforms or mechanisms, such as meeting invitations, event updates, letters, public announcements, and even memorandum</li> <li>However, 4% (6) of the respondents reported gaps in information dissemination, noting that not all details are well disseminated. While they are informed about LDC quarterly meetings, other relevant updates are sometimes not communicated</li> <li>2% (3) of the respondents mentioned delays in receiving information</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>52% 99 of the respondents affirmed that they provided clear and sufficient information. The LGU respondents mentioned ensuring CSOs are informed by conducting pre-activity meetings and sending timely invitations to activities.         <ul> <li>Regular communication is maintained through various channels, including social media, letters, and face-to-face meetings</li> <li>Some LGUs have dedicated offices responsible for maintaining a clear line of communication with CSOs</li> <li>One respondent emphasized that "All forms of communication are exhausted for information" (D126)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Recommendations	15 responses included recommendatory	14 responses included recommendatory

Categories	Statement 3: LGU SUFFICIENTLY COMMUNICATES how to participate		
	CSO	LGUs	
Remarks	<ul> <li>elements. Of those who provided recommendations,</li> <li>60% (9) of the respondents raised administrative concerns, highlighting the lack of detailed guidance and advance notices for meetings and activities. Respondents also noted insufficient information about the agenda and the extent of their involvement</li> <li>27% (4) of the respondents expressed the need for capacity-building programs to help them understand how to contribute better to the entire process (D24) <ul> <li><i>Comparticipation has been on a limited capacity because we were not aware as to the different ways that we can participate and areas were we can contribute to the work of governance (D98) "</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>13% (2) of the respondents alluded to more abstract barriers, stating that they did not feel highly encouraged to participate.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>elements. Of those who provided recommendations,</li> <li>79% (11) suggested administrative-related improvements, focusing on exhausting and sustaining information dissemination through multiple channels. <ul> <li>Respondents recommended using various media, ensuring timely distribution of communication letters, and exhausting all available means to reach CSOs</li> <li>Some noted that while LGUs communicate effectively, certain CSOs are difficult to reach or struggle to attend meetings due to financial constraints</li> <li>The lack of proper office and designated contact persons also poses a challenge</li> </ul> </li> <li>21% (3) of the respondents highlighted the need for orientation programs, especially for new CSO members. While CSOs receive communication from LGUs, "some take time to fully understand their roles in relation to the conduct of the activities (D159)"</li> </ul>	
	communicated to those who are qualified and invited.	the different ways of participating in the LDC is limited to CSOs that "are relevant to the agenda" or the members elected to represent their organization in the council. Moreover, the LGUs noted that some CSOs choose not to participate if the subject of deliberation does not align with their interests (D190).	
Link to Responses	Link	Link	
## C4.4 The LDC has clear protocols for CSO members to access data and information relevant to their participation.

Categories	Statement 4: LDC has CLEAR PROTOCOLS for accessing data <sup>14</sup>	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	27% (136/497)	31% (159/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>73% (99) of the respondents confirmed that the LDC has clear protocols for CSO members to access data</li> <li>15% (20) partially agreed that CSOs do not have sufficient access to information and data. Many reported having limited knowledge of proceedings, with only an initial orientation provided during their first year of engagement.</li> <li>10% (13) of the respondents mentioned that either there are no protocols in place or they are not provided with information regarding the protocols.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>81% (129) of the respondents confirmed that the LDC has clear protocols for CSO members to access data. The respondents mentioned different mechanisms from the conduct of briefing, orientation, assistance of CSO Desk, and the dissemination of LDC documents which can be accessed anytime.</li> <li>8% (13) of the respondents partially agreed regarding having clear protocols to access data, citing gaps in clarity and limitations in data availability. Few respondents noted that information was not always well explained, while others pointed out that access depended on the type of information requested. One respondent mentioned that while there is no specific protocols for data access, CSOs can still obtain information, suggesting the lack of consistency and structure</li> <li>4% (7) of the respondents indicated that there are no protocols in place for CSO members to access data</li> </ul>
Recommendations	<ul> <li>14 responses included recommendatory elements.</li> <li>79% (11) of the respondents suggested administrative improvements to address concerns about delayed access to data and information. One respondent emphasized the need for more time and effort in disseminating detailed information, as some critical details remain inaccessible, with only summaries being presented.</li> <li>14% (2) of the respondents indicated uncertainty about their roles and responsibilities. Limited knowledge of</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Five responses provided administrative and technical-related recommendations</li> <li>60% (3) highlighted improvements in administrative processes, noting that information is often not well explained or miscommunicated, leading to confusion about where to obtain relevant data. They suggested improving awareness and dissemination strategies to address this gap.</li> <li>40% (2) raised technical concerns, stating that while CSOs know where to</li> </ul>

<sup>14</sup> Responses containing "clear" and "no issues" were further removed from the list.

Categories	Statement 4: LDC has CLEAR PROTOCOLS for accessing data <sup>14</sup>	
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>meeting proceedings further restricts their ability to participate meaningfully, suggesting a need for training and orientation programs.</li> <li>7% (1) of the respondents raised a policy-related concern, stating that the LDC rules <i>"seems to be lacking"</i> without elaborating on the details.</li> </ul>	access information, they lack the knowledge and capacity to ask the right questions during deliberations and meetings. They emphasized the need to increase CSO understanding through capacity-building activities.
Remarks	Five respondents indicated that their access to data is often conditional on different reasons, noting that information requests require approval from the authorized personnel, and access is granted based on the nature of the need. One respondent mentioned that requests must follow a formal protocol, such as submitting a written letter.	Four respondents pointed out that CSO access to data is subject to committee discretion, with certain sensitive information restricted from public disclosure. Few respondents emphasized the need for compliance with data privacy regulations and adherence to procedural requirements before releasing the information requested by CSOs.
Link to Responses	Link	Link

# C4.5 CSO participation in the LDC (including its committees and other consultative activities) is sufficiently supported by LGU resources, e.g., funding, facilities, technologies, and human resources.

Categories	Statement 5: CSO participation is SUFFICIENTLY SUPPORTED by LGU Resources	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	35% (174/497)	42% (208/495)
Confirmatory Statements	• 55% (95) confirmed that CSO participation is sufficiently supported by LGU resources, through the provision of assistance to support members and their activities.	• 48% (100) confirmed that they provide support to CSO participation in LDC, such as the allocation of financial resources and honorarium for CSO's activities and attendance in different meetings
	• 31% (54) partially agreed, acknowledging that while LGUs provide facilities, technology, and human resources, financial support is incomplete or limited (D14). Few respondents explained that the lack of honorariums or stipend lead to non- participation in meetings and activities.	<ul> <li>43% (89) of the respondents partially agreed, acknowledging that while some support exists, it is inconsistent and contingent on CSO needs and budget availability. One respondent noted the lack of guidelines on the provision of support to CSOs.</li> <li>8% (17) of the respondent a side d that</li> </ul>
		• $8\%$ (1/) of the respondents noted that

Categories	Statement 5: CSO participation is SUFFICIENTLY SUPPORTED by LGU Resources	
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>11% (20) of the respondents stated that there are no available funds or initiatives specifically dedicated to supporting CSO participation</li> <li>The remaining responses (3%) are not relevant.</li> </ul>	CSO participation in LDC is not sufficiently supported by LGU, stating that <b>tight budgets and COA</b> <b>regulations</b> prevent CSOs from securing and accessing the necessary financial support. The remaining responses (1%) are not relevant.
Recommendations	<ul> <li>46 responses included recommendatory elements. Of those responses,</li> <li>42 respondents raised administrative-related recommendations, citing the lack of budget allocation, office space, and sufficient staffing to support their operations. One respondent also mentioned the lack of information, suggesting the need to improve LGU-CSO communication</li> <li>Three respondents raised technical concerns, stressing the need for LGU to support CSO training and other capacity-building interventions</li> <li>Two respondents alluded to broader concerns, acknowledging that while support exists, improvements are necessary. One noted that no funding is provided to "deepen CSO as effective partners of the city in local governance" (D101)</li> <li>One policy-related recommendation pointed out that although LGUs allocate budgets for CSO programs, there is no clear protocol on how to access these funds, which falls under the department heads' jurisdiction (D67).</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>72 responses included recommendatory elements.<sup>15</sup> Of the responses with recommendatory elements,</li> <li>65 respondents raised administrative-related recommendations. A few respondents suggested increasing budget allocations and financial support for CSOs, including allowances and improved facilities, to better encourage participation.</li> <li>O One respondent noted that the <i>"the budget of the LGU is small so there are times that other programs for CSOs are not implemented. (D9)"</i></li> <li>Two respondents highlighted the administration's lack of knowledge on what they should do so that CSOs can participate more in LDC (D69). The other recommended more training programs to improve CSO skills and understanding of government processes,</li> <li>Six respondents raised policy-related concerns. Few respondents noted the lack of a dedicated budget allocation for CSOs and the absence of clear national policies that would allow LGUs to provide financial support without violating COA regulations. While some LGUs allocate budgets for CSOs, disbursement is restricted, particularly for travel expenses, due to COA rules     <ul> <li><i>We need a national policy so</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>15</sup> One response included both policy and administrative-related recommendations.

Categories	Statement 5: CSO participation is SUFFICIENTLY SUPPORTED by LGU Resources	
	CSO	LGUs
		that we can support LG, so that we don't violate the COA. As of now what we have done in LDC is just to encourage CSOs, we are giving a transportation allowance. Lack of support in funding. (D155) LGU provided enough budget for CSOs but some could not be disbursed for their travelling expenses due to COA rules and regulations (D102)
Remarks	Three respondents stated that participation depends on budget availability, where requests for support are granted only if funds are available. Additionally, they noted that the LDC first studies and approves the proposals before resources are allocated.	Two respondents emphasized that CSOs must formally submit their requests, which are then reviewed before the allocation of funding or support.
Link to Responses	Link	Link

### C4.6 The LDC has clear mechanisms to inform CSO members on the status of their issues raised and suggestions provided.

Categories	Statement 6: LDC has CLEAR MECHANISMS to inform CSO on STATUS OF ISSUES <sup>16</sup>	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response	29%	34%
Kate	(146/497)	(170/495)
Confirmatory Statements	• 66% (97) of the respondents confirmed that the LDC has clear mechanisms to inform them on the status of issues. Respondents highlighted the presence of feedback mechanisms, effective LGU-LDC communication with CSOs, and opportunities for CSOs to ask questions and participate in deliberations during meetings.	• 79% (134) of the respondents confirmed that the LDC has clear mechanisms to inform CSOs on the status of their issues. The respondents highlighted the implementation of varied communication channels that allow CSOs to voice concerns during meetings and receive formal and informal responses from the LGU. Feedback mechanisms include updates on addressed issues, complaint and

<sup>16</sup> Responses containing only "clear" and "no issues" were further removed from the list.

Categories	Statement 6: LDC has CLEAR MECHANISMS to inform CSO on STATUS OF ISSUES <sup>16</sup>	
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>However, 18% (26) partially agreed, noting that while mechanisms exist, they are limited and sometimes unclear. Few respondents mentioned experiencing delays in receiving information, while others raised that explanations were too generic and lacked specific details.</li> <li>12% (18) of the respondents indicated that they did not receive feedback or reports on issues raised. Few respondents noted that no clear mechanism exists or that they were not made aware of any process for receiving updates.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>suggestion boxes in the municipal hall, and the option for CSOs to submit letters or resolutions to the LCE and Sanggunian.</li> <li>13% (22) of the respondents partially agreed, stating that while CSOs receive responses, there is no clear and concrete mechanism. They noted that issues were simply directed to the person in charge, and the consistency of feedback depends on fund availability.</li> <li><i>"Although information and responses were accorded to the CSOs, a clear and concrete mechanism has yet to be established (D117)"</i></li> </ul>
	The other remaining responses (3%) are not relevant.	<ul> <li>4% (6) of the respondents did not noted that the LGU lacks a clear mechanism for informing CSOs about the status of their issues.</li> <li>The other remaining responses (5%) are not relevant.</li> </ul>
Themes / Topics	<ul> <li>27 respondents affirmed receiving clear and sufficient information. One respondent mentioned that "the mechanisms are clear, that is why we are able to attain the information needed (D27)". Few respondents emphasized that they are well-guided and informed, especially when there is a designated person that ensures proper information dissemination.</li> <li>Eight respondents noted the lack of feedback, stating that there are no follow-ups on issues raised, and one respondent did not receive responses on a submitted PPA proposal.</li> <li>Four respondents pointed out the lack of detailed information and delays in information dissemination.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>45 respondents further affirmed that they provided clear and sufficient information to CSOs. Different mechanisms such as meetings, the CSO desk, and direct engagement with LGUs were adopted. CSOs are kept informed about the status of their accreditations and those with seats in LDC committees receive committee reports and meeting journals. The LGU also communicates directly with concerned CSOs regarding solutions and actions taken on their issues.</li> <li><i>"During meetings, when the CSO raised concerns, they were immediately given feedback or the LGU may provide them assistance. (D138)."</i></li> <li>One respondent noted the lack of information, while one respondent cited the lack of feedback. No details</li> </ul>

Categories	Statement 6: LDC has CLEAR MECHANISMS to inform CSO on STATUS OF ISSUES <sup>16</sup>	
	CSO	LGUs
		were provided.
Recommendations	<ul> <li>15 responses included recommendatory elements.</li> <li>10 respondents emphasized the need for more proactive follow-ups. They mentioned that CSOs often need to ask questions or do follow-ups to obtain information, as LGU feedback is not provided regularly.</li> <li>Four respondents called for clearer and more detailed explanations when it comes to informing CSOs on the status of their issues. Few respondents noted that the information provided to CSOs is <i>"sometimes too broad for the CSOs to understand immediately (D67)"</i>.</li> <li>One respondent alluded to a more abstract outcome, recommending that <i>"There is a need to increase or give more voice to the CSO in the LDC (D29)."</i></li> </ul>	<ul> <li>11 responses included recommendatory elements.</li> <li>Eight respondents indicated the need for improvements in following up and disseminating information to CSOs. While CSOs receive information, they often do not get responses or timely follow-ups on their concerns. Feedback mechanisms exist but are not consistently implemented. One respondent explained that "not all issues can be addressed by the LGU because of insufficiency of funds and prioritization when it comes to the concerns of the CSO (D131)." Similarly, while the LDC gives information to the CSOs, limited budget prevents CSOs from responding effectively (D132).</li> <li>Two respondents mentioned the need for national guidelines (i.e. a format) on how to establish the mechanisms on information dissemination to CSOs.</li> <li>One respondent provided a technical recommendation, stating that not all CSOs understand how to propose</li> </ul>
		need for capacity-building initiatives.
Remarks	N/A	N/A
Link to Responses	Link	Link

## C4.7 There are defined opportunities for the LDC-CSO members to formally raise their own agenda, feedback, and grievances

Categories	Statement 7: DEFINED OPPORTUNITIES for LDC-CSOs to FORMALLY RAISE agenda, feedback, and grievances exists	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response	28%	36%

Categories	Statement 7: DEFINED OPPORTUNITIES for LDC-CSOs to FORMALLY RAISE agenda, feedback, and grievances exists	
	CSO	LGUs
Rate	(139/497)	(178/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>76% (105) of the respondents confirmed that there are defined opportunities for CSOs to formally raise agenda, feedback, and grievance. The mechanisms vary from meetings, open forums, and feedback forms (after meetings) to allow CSOs to voice their concerns and suggestions. Moreover, the respondents noted that LGUs listens to their problems and provide responses their suggestions</li> <li>18% (25) of the respondents partially agreed, stating that while meetings are conducted, they did not receive feedback and reports or documentation. Few respondents mentioned that the mechanisms are not formally established or not conducted regularly.</li> <li><i>"There is an opportunity but it is not formally established. It is part of the individual effort to refer back to the office concerned" (D88)</i></li> <li>One respondent noted that CSO plans and proposals are not entertained during meetings due to time constraints.</li> <li>4% (5) of the respondents indicated that there are no opportunities for CSOs to formally raise agenda, feedback, and grievances.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>85% (152) of the respondents confirmed that there are opportunities for CSOs to formally raise agenda, feedback, and grievance. CSOs can raise their concerns and suggestions, citing that "their concerns also get to be taken up in the agenda of the council meetings (D114)". CSOs can also directly communicate with the CSO desk and LGU personnel and discuss their concerns.</li> <li>10% (17) of the respondents partially agreed, pointing out that while CSOs are informed and allowed to participate, they are "passive in participation".         <ul> <li>Their concerns were also not considered due to the lack of resources</li> </ul> </li> <li>4% (7) of the respondents indicated that there are no defined opportunities for CSOs to formally raise agenda, feedback, and grievances.</li> <li>The remaining responses (1%) are not relevant.</li> </ul>
Recommendations	<ul> <li>10 respondents provided the following recommendations</li> <li>Five respondents emphasized the need for better reporting and structured discussions (i.e. dissemination of reports after meetings)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Six respondents provided recommendations related to administrative improvements</li> <li>One respondent noted the need for documentation "for the council to take cognizance of the concern"</li> <li>Few respondents highlighted</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Two respondents indicated knowledge</li> </ul>	difficulties in funding and scheduling

Categories	Statement 7: DEFINED OPPORTUNITIES for LDC-CSOs to FORMALLY RAISE agenda, feedback, and grievances exists	
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>gaps, noting that "due to little knowledge of the proceedings some CSOs are not bringing up agenda or concerns regularly (D20)". One respondent noted that the discussions are "not easily understood and it needs a feedback mechanism"</li> <li>One respondent pointed out that politics influence the process of whether CSOs can formally raise their agenda, feedback, and grievances (D14).</li> <li>One respondent alluded to abstract outcomes CSOs becoming "more independent" and having a voice.</li> <li>One respondent highlighted the need for clearer processes for CSO participation during the conduct of committee meetings.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that limit CSO participation, where instances occur that CSOs are unable to attend due to these limitations.</li> <li>One respondent mentioned that the agenda is already set prior to the LDC, suggesting that CSOs may not be able to raise their agenda and concerns. Lastly, while CSOs can raise issues, the channels are <i>"irregular and not fixed"</i></li> </ul>
Remarks	<ul> <li>Three respondents noted that the opportunities to formally raise agenda, feedback, and grievances are conditional, depending on whether their input is needed, political dynamics, or the relevance of the issue being discussed</li> <li>Two respondents indicated a lack of willingness among CSOs, suggesting that few CSOs need to be more proactive in voicing concerns. They noted that most CSOs do not speak up, and when they do, their concerns are simply noted without further action. Lack of willingness (D17, D131)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Four respondents mentioned that issues and concerns can only be raised under certain conditions and if CSOs are "not involved in politics"         <ul> <li>"It is needed that you are not involved in politics (whether barangay or municipality) (D58)"</li> </ul> </li> <li>Two respondents cited a lack of capacity, explaining that while CSOs raise concerns, these are not considered due to lack of resources. Moreover, one respondent mentioned that "CSOs are not confident", suggesting challenges in raising issues and concerns.</li> <li>Four respondents pointed to a lack of willingness among CSOs, stating that while there are existing mechanisms to communicate concerns, some CSOs are hesitant to use them. Respondents noted that CSOs are shy, passive, or lack volunteerism.</li> <li>"CSOs can raise their concerns/agenda/feedback and/or grievances with the LDC Secretariat or directly to the LCE regardless of political standing. However,</li> </ul>

Categories	Statement 7: DEFINED OPPORTUNITIES for LDC-CSOs to FORMALLY RAISE agenda, feedback, and grievances exists	
	CSO	LGUs
		<ul> <li>some CSOs are not confident to do so. (D119)"</li> <li>There is, but most people are shy to come out with an issue or attitude (D7)</li> </ul>
Link to Responses	Link	Link

# C4.8 The LDC processes (in the council, committees, and other consultative activities) are effectively inclusive of different civil society sectors and agendas.

Categories	Statement 8: LDC processes are EFFECTIVELY INCLUSIVE	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	29% (142/497)	32% (160/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>76% (107) of the respondents confirmed that LDC processes are effectively inclusive.         <ul> <li>CSOs are called to participate in various government councils (e.g. LHB and NDRRMC</li> <li>Few respondents indicated that sectors are well represented and present in the LDC composition. Moreover, one respondent mentioned that the LDC regularly creates sufficient opportunities for participation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>15% (21) of the respondents partially agreed. One respondent mentioned that while LDC processes are inclusive, how the agenda is set and discussed are sometimes ineffective. Others cited scheduling conflicts, while others noted that not all sectors are invited to participate in the LDC.</li> <li>4% (6) of the respondents negated the statement, stating that the LDC</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>82% (131) of the respondents confirmed that the LDC processes are effectively inclusive as CSOs are well represented in LDC and other Local Special bodies, they are involved in the formulation of the agenda and development plans. Few respondents also pointed out that the CSOs represented different sectors (e.g. social and economic sectors)</li> <li>14% (23) of the respondents partially agreed, citing that there are areas that can still be improved such as expanding the representation to other sectors, increasing reach (i.e. only those accredited or directly involved are included), and ensuring that the processes are streamlined and conducted regularly.</li> <li>1% (1) of the respondents indicated that the LDC processes are not effectively inclusive due to the insufficient number of CSOs.</li> </ul>

Categories	Statement 8: LDC processes are EFFECTIVELY INCLUSIVE	
	CSO	LGUs
	processes are not inclusive since the <i>"LGU sets the agenda"</i> and the LGU does not implement inclusive processes at all. The remaining responses (5%) are not relevant.	
Recommendations	<ul> <li>Four responses included recommendatory elements.</li> <li>Two respondents mentioned the need for better scheduling and information dissemination, citing that the lack of information and conflicts prevent them from attending meetings.</li> <li>One respondent mentioned that CSO needs to be capacitated on this aspect, without elaborating on the details</li> <li>One respondent expressed that the LGU sets the agenda, suggesting the non-inclusivity of LDC processes</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>13 responses included recommendatory elements.</li> <li>10 respondents suggested improved coordination, communication, and funding. Due to financial constraints, LGUs only invite select CSOs to their activities. One respondent also noted that there is only one functioning committee, which may suggest limited CSO engagement and inclusivity.</li> <li>Two respondents pointed to technical gaps. These include the lack of proper LDC processes and how accreditation-related requirements limit their participation <ul> <li><i>"Some CSOs are not accredited which limits their participation (D70)."</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>One respondent mentioned that CSO members are hesitant to participate in the processes due to the lack of knowledge or information about the topic, suggesting the need for activities that can increase awareness and understanding.</li> </ul>
Remarks	Two respondents identified lack of willingness among CSO members, particularly due to members who " <i>do not speak during meetings</i> " (D58, D59) One respondent indicated that the inclusivity depends on how proactive the CSOs are in voicing their concerns (D68).	Two respondents highlighted that inclusion depends on the relevance of the activity (i.e. Only CSOs directly involved in a specific sector or activity are included) and the decision of the holding committee or the committee in charge. Two respondents indicated that while CSOs are invited, they are hesitant to participate and voice
Link to Responses	Link	their concerns.

Categories	Statement 9: AUTONOMY AND FAIRNESS IN SHARING OF POWER	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	29% (143/497)	35% (171/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>74% (106) of the respondents confirmed that there is autonomy and fairness in sharing of power among LDC-CSO members. Additionally, the respondents noted that they are treated fairly and with respect, ensuring that all concerns are treated in the same way.</li> <li><i>"There is safety , openness and fairness in the LDC meetings and discussions . Govt leaders and CSO members are empowered to speak and suggest" (D39)</i></li> <li>17% (25) of the respondents partially agreed, citing that the agenda of LDC meetings and data are already prepared without prior consultation. One respondent noted that CSO participation in CDC meetings is more about compliance, as their concerns are heard but not always acted upon. Another concern was the lack of strong CSO representation within the LDC, with respondents stating that CSOs are not yet powerful enough to ensure fair participation.</li> <li><i>"Being able to voice out but not taking action just becomes compliance during CDC meetings (D131)."</i></li> <li><i>"The CSO is not yet strong enough to give a fair voice to the LDC. The number or participation is still insufficient. (D31)"</i></li> <li>5% (7) indicated that there is no autonomy and fairness in sharing of power due to the following reasons: the CSOs are dependent on the decision of the administration (D127), improvement in the treatment and appreciation of the roles of CSOs in local governance (D84), and the lack of seminar / discussion with LGU</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>77% (132) of the respondents confirmed that there is autonomy and fairness in sharing of power among LDC-CSO members. The respondents provided reasons that CSOs can freely express their issues and concerns, provide feedbacks, proposals, and solutions to the LGU, and are provided with the "same rights as the regular members (LGU department heads) (D112)"         <ul> <li>"LDC/CSO members are always given the opportunity to speak and raise their concern and strongly participate in the govt [government] activities (D46)"</li> </ul> </li> <li>13% (22) of the respondents partially agreed, noting that while some opportunities for autonomy and fairness exist, knowledge gaps, limited CSO assertiveness, and inconsistencies in participation prevent CSOs from fully exercising their role in local governance.         <ul> <li>"In general, they are given autonomy and fairness that there is no autonomy and fairness in sharing of power, noting that the "government overpowers the CSOs (D54)" and there is no equality between LGU and CSOs.</li> <li>"It seems that this is not a priority for now as the Local Chief Executive does not support the People's Council. Hopefully the DILG would be more aggressive in enjoining LGUs to establish People's Councils. (D121)"</li> </ul></li></ul>

## C4.9 LDC CSO members are enabled to exercise autonomy and fairness in the sharing of power vis-à-vis the government counterparts.

Categories	Statement 9: AUTONOMY AND FAIRNESS IN SHARING OF POWER	
	CSO	LGUs
	regarding this topic (D43).	The remaining responses (7%) are not relevant.
	The remaining responses (4%) are not relevant	
Recommendations	<ul> <li>13 respondents provided recommendations</li> <li>Four respondents emphasized the need for better information dissemination and agenda-setting processes. Respondents called for more consultations before meetings to ensure that CSO concerns are considered in agenda formulation</li> <li>Four respondents raised needs for capacity-building of CSOs. Respondents suggested seminars and training programs to equip CSOs with the tools needed for meaningful participation.</li> <li>Three respondents indicated political concerns and challenges, suggesting power imbalances between LGUs and CSOs. Another pointed out that CSOs are often treated as secondary stakeholders rather than equal partners in governance, calling for a shift in how they are perceived within the local bureaucracy (D84).</li> <li>One respondent raised a specific and sectoral policy concern, calling for improved implementation of the policies relating to the youth (i.e. Sangeuniang Kabataan and the LYDC).</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Four respondents provided recommendations.</li> <li>One technical recommendation pointed out that CSO knowledge gaps hinder their ability to exercise autonomy and fairness, suggesting the need for capacity-building initiatives</li> <li>Two respondents alluded to broader concerns about empowerment, emphasizing that while CSOs are involved, they do not always feel empowered <i>"there is still a need for them to really feel empowered. (D95)."</i></li> <li>One administrative recommendation called for greater support for the People's Council</li> </ul>
Remarks	Six respondents noted that the autonomy and fairness in sharing of power is conditional on the topic and the urgency of the need. One respondent highlighted the lack of willingness of CSOs. • <i>"We need to be more assertive as we</i> <i>are given the opportunity, we might</i>	Five respondents indicated that the autonomy and fairness in sharing of power is conditional. Respondents highlighted that CSO influence depends on factors such as their vision and mission alignment with the LGU, the approval of the mayor, whether CSO concerns and issues are addressed, and their level of interest.

Categories	Statement 9: AUTONOMY AND FAIRNESS IN SHARING OF POWER	
	CSO	LGUs
	just have been timid instead of assertive" (D86)	One respondent highlighted the lack of willingness of CSOs, specifically that "CSOs are not too expressive(D59)."
Link to Responses	Link	Link

# C4.10 The LDC processes efficiently provide information to its CSO members, including the CSO directory, meeting agenda and minutes, drafts of policies, plans, and reports, among other relevant documents.

Categories	Statem LDC process EFFICIEN	ent 10: TLY provide information
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	31% (154/497)	35% (175/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>70% (108) of the respondents confirmed that information is efficiently provided, stating that the LDC quickly and smoothly disseminated details about meetings, plans, and activities. The respondents noted that they received copies of agendas and plans in advance and they also emphasized that the timely release of information enabled them to take action effectively.</li> <li><i>"All of us can easily take action because the LDC is also quick to release information just like what we are doing now. (D62)"</i></li> <li>22% (34) of the respondents partially agreed, citing gaps in information they needed, while others pointed out that reports, minutes, and feedback on discussions are not consistently provided. Additionally, one respondent raised that the CSO directory lacks continuous updates and necessary details.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>84% (147) of the respondents confirmed that information is efficiently provided. The respondents noted that information is regularly communicated during meetings, and CSOs are free to inquire about issues at any time. They also mentioned that LDC processes ensure the timely dissemination of essential documents, such as the CSO directory, meeting agendas, minutes, draft policies, and reports. One respondent noted that that information is proactively shared without the need for CSOs to request it.</li> <li><i>"Efficient provision of information even without the CSOs requesting the information necessary for them to perform their functions in the LDC (D14)."</i></li> <li>10% (18) of the respondents partially agreed, pointing out that while information is communicated, not all necessary documents are provided. Few respondents noted delays in sending meeting notices and materials, often due to competing responsibilities of staff.</li> </ul>

Categories	Statement 10: LDC process EFFICIENTLY provide information	
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>4% (6) of the respondents indicated that they did not receive timely information, reports, or advance copies of plans. One respondent also mentioned the absence of an updated CSO directory.</li> <li>The remaining responses (4%) are not relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>can't send timely communication and notices for meetings (D157)."</li> <li>"Some delays sometimes happened as people assigned therein have also [also have] other important functions to attend to (D78)."</li> <li>2% (4) of the respondents noted that they did not provide timely information. One respondent attributed delays to a lack of manpower in the LDC secretariat.</li> <li>"The lack of manpower vis-a- vis with the workload of the LDC secretariat is a hindrance in the timeliness of the communication and information processes (D122)."</li> </ul>
		The remaining responses (6%) are not relevant.
Themes/Topics	<ul> <li>60 respondents further affirmed that the information provided was clear and sufficient</li> <li>Three respondents noted a lack of feedback, stating that while invitations are sent, there are no follow-ups or reports on meeting outcomes         <ul> <li>"They only send letters but invitation, no feedbacks on reports on on what transpired (D3)"</li> </ul> </li> <li>Five respondents found the information insufficient</li> <li>Four respondents raised concerns about untimely information dissemination, noting that while information is shared, it is often given on short notice.         <ul> <li>"Information is provided; however, they are sometimes given with little notice. (D117)"</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>28 respondents further affirmed that that the information provided was clear and sufficient</li> <li>Three respondents noted late communication due to the amount of workload <ul> <li>"Being so busy, sometimes I can't send timely communication and notices for meetings (D156)"</li> <li>"The lack of manpower vis-avis with the workload of the LDC secretariat is a hindrance in the timeliness of the communication and information processes (D122)"</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Recommendations	<ul> <li>18 respondents provided recommendations.</li> <li>15 respondents raised administrative- related concerns, emphasizing the</li> </ul>	Seven respondents provided administrative- related recommendations <ul> <li>Additional support is needed to ensure</li> </ul>

Categories	Statement 10: LDC process EFFICIENTLY provide information	
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>need for better organization and clearer communication.         <ul> <li>Recommendations included enhancing the CSO directory with more details, ensuring timely and transparent dissemination of information, and providing advance notice for meetings.</li> <li>Few respondents also suggested improvements in feedback mechanisms to ensure CSOs receive follow-ups on discussions and decisions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>One technical recommendation highlighted the need for capacity-building initiatives, as CSOs "struggle with terminologies" (D40).</li> <li>Two respondents provided general calls for improvement, stating that CSO participation and information-sharing</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>that CSO-related matters are addressed.</li> <li>The respondents also emphasized the importance of timely distribution of meeting materials, suggesting that the agenda and minutes should be delivered in a timely manner.</li> </ul>
	need further enhancement but without providing further details.	
Remarks	Five respondents noted that the provision of information to CSOs is conditional. The respondents stated that the ease of access depends on the situation or document type, while others noted that information is shared only when deemed necessary. One respondent also noted that they needed to request for the information before it was provided.	Seven respondents noted that the provision of information is conditional on whether the CSO requested copies of the materials and type of document (not all documents are given to the CSO)
Link to Responses	Link	Link

### C4.11 CSO members clearly influence the LDC's agenda, plans, and policies.

Categories	Statement 11: CSO members CLEARLY INFLUENCE LDC agenda	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	31% (154/497)	35% (174/495)

Categories	Statem	ent 11:
	CSO members CLEARLY INFLUENCE LDC agenda	
	CSO	LGUs
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>68% (105) of the respondents confirmed that they clearly influence the LDC agenda. CSO members are given opportunities to voice their opinions, provide feedback, and participate in planning workshops to identify priority programs and projects. Respondents also emphasized that the LDC actively considered their suggestions, feedback, and issues, fostering a strong partnership and participatory governance where CSOs have a clear and confident voice.         <ul> <li><i>"The partnership exist</i> <i>[exists] hence the views and</i> <i>opinions of CSO are well</i> <i>taken by the LDC. A very</i> <i>good result or participatory</i> <i>governance (D38)"</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>22% (34) of the respondents partially agreed, pointing out that CSO influence is conditional and selective. One respondent noted that the LDC "cherry-picks" the agenda, plans, and policies proposed by the CSOs (D14), while others mentioned that not all CSOs are regularly consulted, and in some cases, plans are drafted without their input. One respondent stated that the "CSO only follows the good intentions of the LGU (D34)" rather than influencing the agenda themselves.</li> <li>6% (9) of the respondents indicated that CSO members do not influence the agenda, stating that they are not prioritized, are excluded from discussions on proposed PPAs, and are not consulted about the agenda.</li> <li>The remaining responses (4%) are not relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>63% (108) of the respondents confirmed that CSO members clearly influence the LDC agenda, stating that they have the "same level of participation as other members". CSOs are also frequently consulted on issues and concerns, and sometimes serve as committee chairpersons. Respondents emphasized that CSOs are consistently given opportunities to voice concerns, propose agenda items, and contribute solutions. One respondent noted that CSOs even serve as co-proponent for PPAs         <ul> <li><i>"Each PPA proponent were [was] assigned a CSO coproponent (D80)."</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>19% (32) of the respondents partially agreed, noting that while CSOs can propose items for discussion, their influence is limited to select areas and depends on their knowledge and expertise. One respondent mentioned that CSOs can vote but do not have the power to sway majority decisions.         <ul> <li><i>"Cso can vote but could not influence the entire body where majority must prevail (D12)."</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>10% (17) of the respondents indicated that CSO members do not influence the LDC agenda as CSOs <i>"constitute only a minority of the whole body (D164)"</i> and as such, <i>"they do not influence but they only provide additional agenda (D155)"</i></li> <li>The remaining responses (9%) are not relevant.</li> </ul>
Themes/Topics	• 16 respondents affirmed that they play a big part in the LDC's planning and policy formulation. They also indicated a strong partnership with LGU, citing involvement in all decision-making phases	• 36 respondents also highlighted the role of CSOs in decision-making, affirming that they are <i>"indispensable part of local institution (D45)"</i> . LGUs also ensure that CSO priorities are integrated into decision making
	• "Yes since cso is part in every	processes. They are seen as key

Categories	Statement 11: CSO members CLEARLY INFLUENCE LDC agenda	
	CSO	LGUs
	planning and decision making phases in the LGU (D95)." • "CSO's are represented in LDC and have an equal voice in the council (D84)."	stakeholders in planning and project development, alongside other LDC members, who have <i>"have equal influence on the agenda,</i> <i>plans, and programs. (D134)"</i>
	<ul> <li>40 of the respondents confirmed the regular involvement of CSOs in consultations where they are asked to provide inputs to agenda-setting and planning of activities. They noted that the LDC seeks to listen to their concerns and opinions.</li> <li><i>"All members are given opportunities to voice out their opinions and their doubts are clarified (D18)"</i></li> <li><i>"LDC and CSO usually brainstrom [brainstorm] with members (D64)"</i></li> </ul>	<ul> <li>97 respondents highlighted CSO involvement, with CSOs' issues, concerns, and recommendations regularly taken into account. Respondents noted that CSO suggestions are not only heard but acted upon.         <ul> <li>"CSOs are free to give their stand on issues, these are heard by the LDC and act on matters thereof. (D139)"</li> </ul> </li> <li>Five respondents confirmed that CSOs are well-informed, who received copies of the minutes and agenda every meeting.</li> </ul>
Recommendations	<ul> <li>Four respondents provided recommendations</li> <li>One respondent recommended that CSO participation can be reported during General Assemblies (GA), stating that CSO participation is limited in planning and nearly absent in agenda-setting and policy formulation.</li> <li>One political-related recommendation indicated power imbalances, stating that Punong Barangays hold the highest membership percentage, effectively "monopolizing voting power (D148)"</li> <li>One technical-related recommendation emphasized the need for training all CSO members on organizational processes, ensuring they fully understand governance structures</li> <li>One policy-related recommendation called for stronger enforcement of CSO rules and neuticipation requirements</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Three respondents provided recommendations</li> <li>Two respondents noted that CSOs need more knowledge, suggesting capacity-building initiatives such as seminars and orientation on their roles in contributing to local governance.</li> <li>One respondent alluded to broader challenges, stating that CSO participation remains low, without providing further details.</li> </ul>

Categories	Statement 11: CSO members CLEARLY INFLUENCE LDC agenda	
	CSO	LGUs
Remarks	<ul> <li>Five respondents described their influence as conditional, stating that they are only considered when their sector or demographic is directly affected by the agenda (D67). One respondent noted that their participation is limited to relevant projects or when "if it concerns the CSO"</li> <li>One respondent pointed to a lack of proactivity among CSOs, stating that CSO initiative is lacking.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>12 respondents noted that CSO influence is conditional, stating that while CSOs can contribute to discussions, their impact depends on LGU budget, the "validity and weight of their concerns (D9)", and alignment with general plans. Additionally, while CSOs can vote, they do not have the power to influence the entire body, as majority rule prevails in decisionmaking.         <ul> <li>"As long as it is appropriate to the general plan, they are heard (D21)"</li> </ul> </li> <li>Three respondents indicated that CSOs are not "proactive" in agenda preparation, and their influence varies depending on the complexity of the issues being discussed. One respondent noted that CSOs act more as "observers" (D118).</li> </ul>
Link to Responses	Link	Link

## C4.12 CSO participation in the LDC, including its committees and other consultative activities, enable more effective local plans, policies, and services.

Categories	Statem CSO participation ENABLES more CSO	e effective lans, policies, and services LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	29% (144/497)	33% (163/495)
Confirmatory Statements	<ul> <li>67% (97) of the respondents confirmed that their participation enabled more effective plans, policies, and services, as they bring firsthand knowledge of local issues and collaborate effectively with LGUs to align programs. Respondents also noted visible service improvements due to their participation. Moreover, CSOs are also consulted on LGU plans.</li> <li><i>"CSO participation contributed a lot because they"</i></li> </ul>	<ul> <li>75% (123) confirmed that CSO participation enabled more effective plans, policies, and services.         <ul> <li>CSO participation improved local planning, as they represented diverse and various sectors and provided critical insights on their needs.</li> <li>One respondent noted that CSOs better understand their community's needs, highlighting that they "have</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Categories	Statement 12:	
	CSO participation ENABLES more effective fails, poncies, and services	
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>understand and collaborate their own program with the LGU program (D20)"</li> <li>13% (18) of the respondents partially agreed, stating that CSO participation is still limited. One respondent noted that while they participate in planning discussions, they are excluded from committee-level deliberations and final decision-making. <ul> <li>"Minimum level of participation is exercised by CSOs because they have not been involved in committee level discussions only in plenary (D18)"</li> </ul> </li> <li>6% (9) of the respondents did not agree with the statement. Few respondents noted that LGUs dominate the planning process, with policies and programs already decided before the conduct of the LDC meetings (D24, D32).</li> <li>The remaining responses (14%) are not relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>the proper information and experience regarding their respective committees " <ul> <li>One respondent also highlighted that CSO scrutiny of government programs helps refine and improve policy implementation. "The more that there are people who will check and scrutinize the programs, it become more refined and implementable-ready (D53)"</li> <li>12% (19) of the respondents partially agreed, stating that while CSOs provide inputs, their participation is not always guaranteed. CSO participation is often conditional, limited to priority projects, or dependent on LGU discretion. Some noted that top-down decision-making limits CSO involvement, and in technical discussions, CSO suggestions are sometimes overruled by experts. Additionally, not all CSOs actively participate</li> <li><i>"Since most of the plans are top-down, CSOs have less influence on the plans. But I believe that if the citizens had more space to participate, the plans, policies and services would have been better (D55)"</i></li> <li>3% (5) of the respondents did not confirm the statement, stating that CSOs have little direct involvement or influence due to low participation and an imbalance in representation—as Barangay Captains hold more voting power than NGOs in some councils (D34).</li> </ul></li></ul>

Categories	Statement 12: CSO participation ENABLES more effective lans, policies, and services	
	CSO	LGUs
Themes/Topics	<ul> <li>15 respondents highlighted their roles in strengthening the decision-making process, primarily through policy improvements and service enhancements. They contributed by recommending new policies and refining plans of the LGUs.         <ul> <li>"CSO participation offers a wide coverage of services where govt [government] lacks info and projects. CSO helps in the revising plans and policies (D36)."</li> </ul> </li> <li>35 respondents emphasized their active involvement. They are regularly consulted for their inputs and proposals to further improve LGU's plans and services. One respondent noted that CSOs help articulate the real needs of their constituents         <ul> <li>"CSOs help because they are able to express the real needs of their constituents and thus improve plans, policies and services (D35)."</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>32 respondents also noted that CSOs play a key role in local planning and decision-making (including formulation of policies and ordinances)         <ul> <li>"CSOs are part in planning sessions, some activities are done in partnerships with CSOs, some of the ordinances are lobbied by CSOs (D136)"</li> </ul> </li> <li>80 respondents emphasized CSO involvement, describing CSOs as a "sounding board" for community concerns, providing on-the-ground perspectives that help shape LDC actions and policies.         <ul> <li>"As representatives of different sectors, they are the ones who has [have] the on the ground experiences regarding the concerns that need the LDC's actions (D48)"</li> <li>"Because they can provide an actual picture of whats [what is] happening in their communities (D64)"</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Recommendations	<ul> <li>Seven respondents provided recommendations</li> <li>Three respondents emphasized the need for deeper collaboration, calling for more involvement, participative action, and stronger engagement from CSO members. The respondents did not elaborate on the details.</li> <li>Two respondents suggested administrative-related recommendations, particularly to address difficulties in accessing LGU documents and lack of timely information dissemination</li> <li>One respondent pointed to technical gaps, noting that CSOs sometimes lack the knowledge, suggesting capacity-building initiatives.</li> <li>One policy-related recommendation highlighted the need for clearer guidelines and documentary</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Three respondents provided recommendations</li> <li>Two respondents alluded to abstract outcomes, calling for more active CSO participation</li> <li>One technical-related recommendation noted that CSOs sometimes struggle to present their ideas, as technical experts often dominate discussions, indicating the need to enhance knowledge and skills of CSOs</li> </ul>

Categories	Statement 12: CSO participation ENABLES more effective lans, policies, and services	
	CSO	LGUs
	requirements to support proposed projects, ensuring that CSOs can comply with necessary documentary requirements prior to the approval of PPAs (D90).	
Remarks	Two respondents described their participation as conditional, stating that they engage only when the issue directly concerns their sector or when their input is needed by the LGU.	Two respondents indicated that CSO participation is conditional, where their participation is on a "case-by-case" basis or if it is included in the priority projects of the LGU.
		Three respondents pointed to a lack of proactivity and willingness among CSOs, noting that some rarely speak during meetings "we don't hear their voices too much (D51)". One respondent noted that while "LDC provides equal opportunity to all, but some are not that proactive (D117)"
Link to Responses	Link	Link

### C4.13 The LDC-CSO members are satisfied with their participation in the LDC.

Categories	Statement 13: LDC-CSO Members are SATISFIED with their participation in the LDC	
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate	34% (168/497)	35% (173/495)
Confirmatory Statements	• 74% (124) of the respondents confirmed that they are satisfied with their participation, stating that they feel recognized as important stakeholders and valued as part of LDC. The respondents highlighted that their participation allowed them to raise grievances, stay informed about plans, and contribute to decision-making. Few respondents also appreciated the assistance provided and emphasized that their engagement has helped them learn and gain valuable insights for their organizations.	<ul> <li>72% (125) of the respondents confirmed that CSOs are satisfied with their participation, as the LGU provides them an opportunity to raise concerns, voice opinions, and collaborate with government partners. Interestingly, many of the respondents attributed CSO satisfaction with their continued participation / attendance in meetings, workshops, and project- related activities.</li> <li><i>"Continued participation manifests their satisfaction (D87)"</i></li> </ul>

Categories	Statement 13: LDC-CSO Members are SATISFIED with their participation in the LDC	
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>"We are satisfied because the LDC and LGU have provided assistance in terms of resources (representation, venue, honoraria, etc.). Also, we are given the opportunity to express our recommendations and suggestions as there were [was] fairness observed. (D153)"</li> <li>17% (29) of the respondents partially agreed, identifying areas for improvement. The respondents out the need for additional funding and support, while others noted that while their concerns are acknowledged, not all requests are accommodated, and opportunities to participate in the LDC remain limited for some CSOs</li> <li>5% (8) of the respondents indicated that they are not satisfied, stating that "CDC functions are not fully realized (D152)", they are not invited to participate in LDC activities, and that the CSO is "not yet strong (D161)"</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>"Their perfect attendance in almost all meetings, gatherings, activities is a clear manifestation that they are satisfied with their participation in the PDC (D96)"</li> <li>"In their attendance to such activities, we know that they are satisfied.(D158)"</li> <li>14% (24) of the respondents partially agreed that CSOs are satisfied with their participation, stating that there are exceptions where CSO concerns are not addressed. The respondents also mentioned that few CSO members are unaware of their roles or rights. Others noted that while complaints are heard, not all are acted upon, leading to some dissatisfaction.</li> <li>They are satisfied, but sometimes have concerns that cannot be addressed (D42)</li> <li>2% (4) of the respondents indicated that CSOs are not satisfied with their participation, citing issues such as unfulfilled promises, lack of decisionmaking influence, lack of information received, and CSOs feeling forced to attend meetings rather than actively participating.</li> <li>"Disagree because other CSO members are forced to attend (D171)"</li> </ul>
		The remaining responses (12%) are not relevant.
Themes/Topics	<ul> <li>Nine respondents also mentioned that they feel valued in decision-making (<i>"we are given importance in decision making"</i>), accountable as part of government projects, and empowered through their collaboration with LGUs and national agencies. They affirmed that they have a voice and influence in the LDC (<i>"We have enough power and voice in decision making"</i>)</li> <li>76 respondents highlighted strong</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Four respondents emphasized that CSOs feel empowered because their voices are heard and their proposals are implemented,</li> <li>54 respondents highlighted that CSOs are regularly consulted, actively involved in discussions, and their grievances are addressed. The LGU respondents affirmed consistent CSO participation in meetings, noting that they receive invitations and their</li> </ul>

Categories	Statement 13: LDC-CSO Members are SATISFIED with their participation in the LDC	
	CSO	LGUs
	<ul> <li>involvement in LDC activities, stating that they actively participate in discussions. One respondent emphasized that they learn from their participation and share knowledge within their communities.</li> <li>Seven respondents further affirmed that they feel well-informed about programs, policies, and even funding opportunities.</li> </ul>	concerns are taken into account.
Recommendations	<ul> <li>18 respondents provided recommendations</li> <li>Ten respondents provided administrative-related concerns, pointing out insufficient financial support or budget allocation for CSO activities</li> <li>Six respondents provided abstract recommendations, suggesting improvements in their participation, strengthening their role in LDC meetings, and giving them a stronger voice in decision-making</li> <li>Four respondents requested training programs and seminars to better understand policies and governance processes. One respondent raised the need for financial support for capacity- building interventions</li> <li>One CSO emphasized the need for continued LGU support, without elaborating on the details.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>13 respondents provided recommendations</li> <li>Eight respondents provided administrative-related recommendations, noting the lack of feedback forms, budget (e.g. honoraria), and manpower to further enhance CSO satisfaction. Few respondents pointed out the absence of a feedback mechanism to assess CSO satisfaction, with one respondent suggesting that CSOs can <i>"anonymously respond to a survey to ascertain their levle [level] of satisfaction in dealing with the LGU. (D124) "</i></li> <li>Three respondents emphasized the need for additional capacity-building activities to further empower CSOs in government activities and strengthen their participation.</li> <li>Two respondents raised political-related recommendations, noting that certain organizations might be excluded due to political issues. One respondent highlighted the need for strong political will from the LCE.</li> </ul>
Remarks	One respondent noted that their participation depends on the issue at hand and further suggested that consultation is limited. One CSO acknowledged that while they appreciate the opportunity to participate, they need to be more " <i>empowered and more</i> <i>assertive (D105)</i> "	

Categories	Statement 13:	
	LDC-CSO Members are SATISFIED with their participation in the LDC	
	CSO	LGUs
Link to Responses	Link	Link

## C4.14 In my capacity under my LGU office, I am satisfied with our LDC's participatory practices.

Categories	Statement 14:	
	I am SATISFIED with our I	LDC's participatory practices
	CSO	LGUs
Qualitative Response Rate		37% (181/495)
Confirmatory Statements		• 74% (134) of the respondents expressed satisfaction with LDC participatory practices, stating that they effectively fulfill its role as Secretariat, CSO concerns are addressed and accomplished, and the LGU maintains transparency by engaging CSOs and other organizations. Many respondents emphasized that the LDC is active, projects are successfully implemented, and CSOs are given opportunities to participate in governance.
		• 18% (33) of the respondents partially agreed, suggesting that regular LDC meetings should be better structured and regularly scheduled, CSOs should be more engaged, and a more diverse range of CSOs should be included (beyond the usual TODAs and HOAs) (D42). Few respondents pointed out that CSOs sometimes lack the confidence or knowledge to participate effectively, leading to non-participating in meetings
		• 3% (6) of the respondents indicated that they were not satisfied, stating that policy implementation is weak, participation is not yet fully realized, and LDC meetings are not conducted regularly. Few respodents expressed

Categories	Statement 14: I am SATISFIED with our LDC's participatory practices	
	CSO	LGUs
		that LDC members need more training and capacity-building to ensure meaningful participation.
		The remaining responses (4%) are not relevant.
Themes/Topics		• 6 respondents further affirmed that they have strong collaboration with CSOs and their participation enhances the implementation of programs and service delivery.
		• 20 respondents also mentioned that CSOs are involved in the LDC activities, with CSOs expressing concerns and contributing to discussions. One respondent indicated that they listen to the opinion of the CSO members.
Recommendations		21 respondents provided recommendations
		• Nine respondents recommended the need for timely scheduling of meetings, while others noted that budget limitations hinder program implementation. One respondent mentioned that CSOs should notify the LGUs about leadership changes within their organizations, indicating the need for better communication.
		• Six respondents called for more capacity-building activities to address knowledge gaps and enable CSOs "to be more efficient in their task."
		• Two respondents suggested a clearer delineation between civil society and business sectors and stronger policy implementation to ensure effective participation.
		• Four respondents raised the need for more improvement without elaborating on the details.
Remarks		One respondent noted that One respondent

Categories	Statement 14: I am SATISFIED with our LDC's participatory practices	
	CSO	LGUs
Link to Responses		noted that some CSOs fail to attend meetings despite multiple invitations <ul> <li><i>"There are some CSOs that don't attend the meetings no matter how many times they are invited, but they don't provide any reason for not being able to attend. It's as if they are disconnected (D162)."</i></li> </ul>

### **C5 Concluding Notes**

Categories	Concluding Notes	
	CSO	LGU
Qualitative Response Rate	64% (317/497)	46% (226/495)
Type of Response	<ul> <li>16% (51) of the respondents showed appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the survey and its content that highlights CSO participation. One respondent recommended that the survey be conducted with other Local Special Bodies (e.g. Local Health Board, Local School Board, LDRRMS, and the Local Anti Drug Abuse Council). It was also suggested that the survey should be conducted face to face because "some of the city gov't staff are watching us answer the survey and makes us feel unsafe giving our fullest honest answer. (D27)"</li> <li>10% (33) of the respondents alluded to more abstract outcomes, such as continuing the work to allow CSO's voice to be heard by government, improving CSO's participation, and highlighting the role of CSOs and their insights in facilitating the mission and goals of the community</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>11% (27) of the respondents recommended that the survey be conducted face-to-face for better clarity and engagement. Few noted that while the survey was beneficial, it was conducted on short notice, making scheduling a challenge. Face-to-face meetings were preferred over online sessions due to internet connectivity issues, emphasizing the need for more manageable timeframes and scheduling at convenient hours to improve participation.</li> <li>6% (15) of the respondents expressed broader aspirations for CSO participation and collaboration. Few called for improvements in CSO empowerment, but did not specify concrete measures.</li> <li><i>How I desire that there's a more pro-active, more engaging, and more collaborative efforts to ensure</i></li> </ul>

Categories	Concluding Notes	
	CSO	LGU
	<ul> <li>12% (38) of the respondents mentioned political factors. Many affirmed strong collaboration between CSOs and LGUs and expressed gratitude for the support provided by the government. One respondent further suggested that CSOs should have "equal power and acknowledgement" in the planning and implementation of local programs and policies.</li> <li>Administrative concerns were the most frequently mentioned. 39% (125) of the respondents emphasized the need for incentives and budget allocations to support transportation, allowance, and other logistical needs of CSOs. Additionally, proper institutional mechanisms such as having a CSO Desk, clear information dissemination processes, and a directory of CSOs and services were identified as necessary to strengthen coordination and engagement.</li> <li>9% (30) of the respondents indicated the need for more capacity-building programs, focusing on orientation of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems</li> <li>4% (13) of the respondents recognized the need for stronger guidelines and enforcement mechanisms to enhance CSO engagement. The LGU, in coordination with LGU, should actively encourage and guide CSOs to seek accreditation. The respondent stressed the importance of increasing the number of accredited CSOs in the council and ensuring that LDCs meet the madated percentage of CSO participation. One respondent also called for a policy on monitoring and evaluation that ensures LGU's adherence to CSO participation requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>the active participation of CSO in nation building (D4)</li> <li>4% (9) of the respondents affirmed their recognition and support for CSOs as partners in governance. However, few emphasized that CSO participation depends on the strong political will of the Local Chief Executive (LCE) and their participation is limited to being voluntary in nature as "bantay", "gabay", "kaagapay" of the government (D241).</li> <li>39% (97) of the respondents highlighted key challenges related to human and financial resources and information dissemination.         <ul> <li>Respondents called for advanced notification of CSOs regarding activities to ensure better attendance and engagement.</li> <li>They also emphasized the need for budgetary support for People's Councils and CSO-related programs, particularly for assistance in holding regular meetings. Few further suggested the creation of a local policy to provide honorariums for CSOs attending LDC meetings</li> <li>Others also recommended the institutionalization of the CSO Desk, which would serve as a centralized mechanism for CSO coordination and communication.</li> </ul> </li> <li>19% (49) of the respondents suggested the need for more capacity-building programs, such as training and seminars to improve CSO knowledge on their functions and the accreditation process. Respondents also proposed organizing a CSO National Summit to facilitate experience-sharing and best practices and the provision of reference materials or protocols to better assist CSOs in their functions.</li> <li>In terms of policy, 12% (31) called for</li> </ul>

Categories	Concluding Notes	
	CSO	LGU
	• The remaining responses 10% (32) are confirmatory statements, expressing satisfaction and appreciation for the existing level of CSO participation in LDCs ( <i>"We are happy members of the LDC"</i> ). Many encouraged continuing the progress made in LGU-CSO collaboration	<ul> <li>institutionalizing financial support for CSO participation through local policies and streamlining the implementation and timely release of the accreditation-related policies.         <ul> <li>There should be a</li> <li>Memorandum Circular tobe passed/release [released] allowing the CSOs to have incentives during their CSOs involvement meetings. (such as traveling expense and other related therefore) (D9)</li> </ul> </li> <li>The remaining responses 9% (23) are confirmatory statements, affirming the importance of CSO participation in governance and service delivery. CSOs should be accommodated as they are the ones who have "direct access to the people they represent and are well informed of their needs (D67)."</li> </ul>
Remarks	N/A	N/A
Link to Responses	Link	Link

#### C6 Enumerators' Observations

Categories	OVERVIEW	
	CSO 33% (166/497)	LGU 33% (165/495)
Type of Observation	<ul> <li>12% (25) of the enumerators pointed out that the CSO respondents reiterated the need for several program and policy improvements, including infrequent invitations to LGU meetings, lack of collaboration, and absence of institutional and administrative support (e.g. CSO desk, honoraria, travel allowance).</li> <li>One enumerator noted that the respondent indicated a power imbalance between LGU and CSO, with LGU leading the decision-making process.</li> <li>Few respondents called for improving</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6% (12) of the enumerators stated that the LGU respondents acknowledged the need for improvements to improve CSO participation.</li> <li>These include financial support for CSOs to address the lack of allowances and travel support, which was cited as a barrier to CSO participation in LDC activities and meetings.</li> <li>Many respondents recommended the conduct of training programs and seminars to enhance CSO capacity, as well as the strengthening of the CSO</li> </ul>

Categories	OVERVIEW	
	CSO	LGU
	33% (166/497)	33% (165/495)
	communication and coordination as well as establishing a clear legal basis for fund disbursement to ensure financial support for CSOs	<ul> <li>Desk to improve coordination with the CSO members</li> <li>One respondent noted concerns regarding the aging membership of CSO representatives (D57)</li> </ul>
	of the CSO respondents in their observations. One respondent specified that the CSO respondents were unaware of the need for accreditation and a CSO directory, suggesting a gap in information dissemination. Others acknowledged learning from the survey, expressing the need for more CSO involvement and hope that their concerns would be forwarded to the national level for action. • <i>"They must really involved at all</i>	<ul> <li>3% (7) of the enumerators mentioned that the LGU respondents acknowledged the importance of the survey, noting that its results could directly impact CSO involvement and their working relationships with the CSOs. One respondent raised clarifications about the purpose of the survey and how it would benefit the LGU.</li> <li><i>"The survey they had accomplished should be given importance because</i>"</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>activities if the LGU, not only for the requirements (D98)"</li> <li>"They manifested hope, that through this survey all concerns and suggestion will be forwarded to the National level (D186)"</li> <li>50% (106) of the enumerators mentioned respondent-related factors that affected the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>their answers to the survey will surely have an effect in their involvement to their Local Development Councils (D33)"</li> <li>"They're so hopeful that the survey would bring positive change [to] both LGU and CSO in their municipality (D76)".</li> </ul>
	administration of the survey.	46% (96) of the enumerators included respondent-related factors in their observations
	<ul> <li>Many of the enumerators noted the tendency among respondents to consult other participants and share or discuss their answers instead of providing their own inputs. Few respondents were also observed being coached by more senior attendees, potentially influencing their responses and may have impacted the authenticity of the data collected.         <ul> <li><i>"Participants appeared to be copying answers, as some were observed consulting individuals in the background rather than providing their own input. (D104)"</i></li> <li><i>"There was a noticeable tendency for many to simply echo others by responding with 'the same,' which suggests possible bias or a lack of confidence in their individual perspectives. (D28)"</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Many of the enumerators raised that many respondents consulted each other before answering, with few participants echoing others' answers or sought the guidance of higher-ranking officials. One respondent stated "<i>Kung ano ang sagot ni Vice</i>". The enumerators indicated that the presence of high-ranking officials, including a mayor in one session, may have influenced the responses         <ul> <li>"Most of their answers are being consulted with each other and they talk or look at each other before they answer the questions in the survey (D24)"</li> <li>"Some responses, however, appeared influenced by bias or indicated a tendency to mirror others' answers, suggesting possible alignment</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Categories	OVERVIEW	
	CSO	LGU
	33% (166/497)	33% (165/495)
	<ul> <li>"They are being coached by someone with their answers. (D55)"</li> <li>"The CSO survey exhibited some bias, as two participants were observed asking each other for answers, which may have influenced the authenticity of their responses. (D180)"</li> <li>According to the enumerators, many respondents were busy with other responsibilities, such as attending meetings, fieldwork, or simultaneous events, making it difficult for them to focus fully on the survey.</li> <li>"one participant ask [asked] if she can answer the survey all by herself and continued in another time, since the Mayor was calling her in the other room (D47)"</li> <li>"One of the participants were in the office and one was in the field because he was attending an event (D203)"</li> <li>The enumerators also mentioned technological limitations among select participations and the elderly. Many respondents struggled with technology, requiring assistance from others to encode their responses. Many were facilitated by LGU staff since they did not know how to access or use computers.</li> <li>"All of them are seniors citizens so they need others to act as their secretaries and encode their answer (D45)"</li> <li>"They are also facilitated by LGU since they do not know how to access and use computer because they are seniors (D81)"</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>rather than independent viewpoints in certain questions. (D31)"</li> <li>Many responses from the enumerators included mentioning that the respondents appeared uneasy, fidgety, or confused and struggling to answer the survey. One respondent even consulted their boss on what to write (D7).</li> <li>Few enumerators also noted how other respondents were cooperative and took the time to provide thorough responses.</li> <li>The enumerators raised that several respondents completed the survey while working (with few respondents answering the questionnaires in their offices [D50]), answering calls from their offices and juggling their tasks. Few were even in a rush to finish the survey due to upcoming meetings,</li> <li>"They did not bother asking questions. They are in working mode and in their respective working cubicle area while answering the survey form (D45)"</li> <li>"Despite their commitment to providing accurate answers, the demand of their daily work created a sense of urgency to complete the survey efficiently (D132)"</li> <li>One respondent expressed worries about whether their "boss would know the answers to the statements (D12)"</li> <li>44% (92) of the enumerators raised survey administration-related observations.</li> <li>Few respondents preferred in-person interviews as it allows them to better explain their responses and their work.</li> <li>Few respondents were only informed of the survey on the same day, leading to delays in starting the survey.</li> </ul>

Categories	OVERVIEW	
	CSO	LGU
	33% (166/497)	33% (165/495)
	<ul> <li>36% (77) of the respondents highlighted challenges and coordination relating to survey administration, primarily due to technical issues (e.g. internet, audio, video), scheduling coordination, and influence of LGU presence on CSO responses.</li> <li>Lack of internet access and form resubmission requirements created delays and inefficiencies in survey administration. Last-minute coordination caused difficulties (e.g. delayed start of the survey), as few respondents were only informed on the day of the survey.</li> <li>Many enumerators observed that CSO respondents appeared hesitant or anxious, particularly when LGU staff were present during the survey. The respondents were also concerned about anonymity and whether their responses would reach their superiors (D174), making them defensive or cautious in answering.</li> <li><i>"I feel parang pinangungunahan niya kunti ang mga CSO members as I observed.I can feel that some respondents were ince the LGU staff was there (D66)"</i></li> <li><i>"I feel that some of them are anxious with the presence of the LGU Staff , that which I think it would affect the quality of the survey (D75)"</i></li> <li><i>"However, concerns about anonymity affected their willingness to provide completely truthful responses (D133)"</i></li> </ul>	Availability of the respondents was also an issue for select enumerators. • Few respondents struggled with poor internet access, power interruptions, and weak signal reception. Issues with the forms, lack of laptops/devices, and difficulties in encoding answers were also reported by the enumerators.
	after I read the informed consent about Data Privacy Act (D153)"	
	One enumerator recommended that the sessions for LGU and CSO representatives be conducted	

Categories	OVERVIEW	
	CSO	LGU
	33% (166/497)	33% (165/495)
	separately in the future (D25).	
Region-specific Observations	There are regional variations in the challenges and LGUs and CSOs, themes include response bias, leg processes, and issues relating to LGU-CSO Dynam	observations noted by the enumerators. Across gal and financial concerns, unfamiliarity with nics
	Region I: The presence of the mayor during the survey may have influenced participants' willingness to speak freely. To prevent response bias, the numerator suggested that future surveys must have separate sessions for LGU and CSO representatives.	Region 3: Concerns were raised regarding the frequency of CSO's LDC participation, specifically on the access to funds of the organizations from the rural areas. The respondent also raised concerns regarding the aging CSO membership, suggesting sustainability challenges.
	Region III: The respondents were anxious while answering certain survey items (1.8 - Years of CSO membership and respondent attending in LDC)	Region 7: The enumerator included the respondents' concerns about budgeting. Specifically, the LGU received an Audit Observation Memorandum (AOM) from the Commission on Audit (COA) regarding the
	Region 8: A DILG representative suggested to the enumerator the need for legal frameworks such as circulars or memoranda to guide the disbursement of funds for CSOs	CSO's transportation budget. Region IV-A: According to the enumerator, the LGU respondents had to consult one another on
	Region 9: Participants became cautious and looked at each other whenever the word "budget" was mentioned Region 10: Respondents appeared uneasy about specific survey items (1.13-CSO directory, Conference, invitations on accreditation, timely release of Certificate of Accreditation)	questions regarding the existence of a CSO desk (1.17) and People's Council (1.18) NCR: In response to 1.9.a and 1.9b [Data Gathering and Data Analysis], the respondents stated that CSOs should take greater initiative in these areas rather than relying solely on local officials " as they are the ones who knew about the actual situation of a specific group (D20)." For 1.9h [Budget Accountability], One
	Region 13: Participants were unsure or uncertain about multiple survey items (1.7 [Start Year of Membership] and 1.12 [Enablers and Hindrances])	respondent also suggested that CSOs should be accountable for presenting accomplishments, which could be a "ground on reapproval of CSO accreditation (D20)."
	CAR: Participants were not aware of the CSO directory and accreditation processes, indicating a gap in information and accessibility.	Region 5: A former Vice Mayor participated in the survey, and the respondents mirrored their answers to align with his responses (e.g., " <i>Kung</i> <i>ano ang sagot ni Vice</i> "- <i>D93</i> ), raising concerns about response independence and bias. The enumerator noted the need for a "neutral
	NCR: The enumerator mentioned that the CSOs were unfamiliar with some governance terms,	environment" for the conduct of the survey to ensure that the insights remain objective

Categories	OVERVIEW	
	CSO	LGU
	33% (166/497)	33% (165/495)
	but they were also very participative. One respondent noted that feedback is acknowledged but ultimately ineffective, as decisions remain controlled by LGUs, stating that "wala namn magagawa kapag sila na and nagdecide" (D24)	

\*NOTHING FOLLOWS FOR ANNEX C\*