

Participatory Governance in Agriculture and Fisheries Development: An Evaluation Study on PCAF's Consultative Bodies

Final Evaluation Report



**PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE IN AGRICULTURE
AND FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT: AN EVALUATION
ON PCAF'S CONSULTATIVE BODIES**

Final Evaluation Report

**An Evaluation Study Prepared for the Philippine Council
for Agriculture and Fisheries**

By:

**Development Academy of the Philippines
October 2016**

Development Academy of the Philippines
DAP Building, San Miguel Avenue, Ortigas Center, Pasig City
Phone: (632) 631-0921 to 30 / Fax: (632) 631-2123
E-Mail: academy@dap.edu.ph
www.dap.edu.ph

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------------|
| <i>Acknowledgment</i> | <i>iii</i> |
| <i>Executive Summary</i> | <i>iv</i> |
| <i>List of Tables and Figures</i> | <i>x</i> |
| <i>Acronyms and Abbreviations</i> | <i>xi</i> |
| | |
| Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| A. Study Background and Significance | 1 |
| B. Study Objectives..... | 2 |
| C. Scope and Limitations | 3 |
| D. Study Methodology..... | 5 |
| | |
| Chapter 2: THE AGRI-FISHERIES CONSULTATIVE BODIES | 11 |
| A. National Agricultural and Fisheries Council | 11 |
| B. National Sectoral Committees..... | 15 |
| C. Agricultural and Fishery Councils..... | 18 |
| | |
| Chapter 3: FUNCTIONS AND OPERATING PROCESSES OF THE CONSULTATIVE BODIES | 22 |
| A. Mandate Review..... | 22 |
| 1. Institutional Mandate and Core Functions..... | 22 |
| 2. Sectoral Role and Contributions..... | 22 |
| B. Institutional Roles | 25 |
| C. Operational Linkages | 28 |
| | |
| Chapter 4: THE AFCs AND ITS CURRENT PRACTICES..... | 33 |
| A. Results of the AFC Profile Survey..... | 33 |
| B. Focus Group Discussions (for local AFCs)..... | 38 |
| | |
| Chapter 5: EVALUATION RESULTS..... | 48 |
| A. Framework | 48 |
| 1. The Logical Framework..... | 48 |
| 2. The Balanced Scorecard..... | 50 |
| 3. The Integrated Model..... | 52 |
| B. Assessment..... | 53 |
| a. Customer Perspective..... | 53 |
| b. Business Process Perspective..... | 54 |
| c. Learning and Growth..... | 56 |
| d. Financial Perspective..... | 58 |
| | |
| Chapter 6: STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 59 |
| | |
| APPENDICES | 84 |
| Appendix A – AFC Profiling Survey | |
| Appendix B – Performance Assessment Through FGDs | |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP) Study Team wishes to acknowledge the cooperation and hospitality of several individuals and entities that made this Evaluation Study on PCAF's Consultative Bodies, particularly in the conduct of focus group discussions (FGD) and profile survey, possible. Particularly, the team is thankful to the following:

- PAFC Coordinators who facilitated the dissemination, retrieval, and encoding of the AFC Profile Survey
- RAFC and PAFC Chairpersons and their respective coordinators with whom we channeled the communication and facilitated coordination and logistical arrangements for the conduct of the FGDs;
- PCAF project focal person, Mr. Cyril Soliaban for his endearing patience in coordinating with the DAP team and in facilitating project requirements; and,
- All the key informants and attendees of the FGDs for provincial, regional, and national-level consultation meetings.

To everyone, our deepest gratitude; to all those whom we failed to mention, our apologies and our thanks as well.

To the readers and potential users of the study and its results, please request permission from PCAF, when quoting excerpts from the study especially if the names of the key informants shall be cited. The study values professionalism, respects the privacy of the informants, and upholds confidentiality on the information provided to the team.

Comments, suggestions, or critique are most welcome. However, these must be communicated and coursed through the DA-PCAF and/or the DAP so that appropriate explanation or clarification can be made. If the study shall be reproduced in part or in full, permission must be sought from the DA-PCAF.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In-synch with democratic governance and participatory development principle and to ensure that the development programs of and for the agriculture and fisheries (A&F) sector are reflective of its stakeholders' demands and could address their needs, this qualitative evaluative study on the local (municipal, provincial/cities, and regional levels) A&F consultative council network, the National Sectoral Committees and the National Agricultural and Fisheries Council (NAF Council) was conducted nationwide from October 2015 to October 2016.

The conduct of the study was apt and timely since the new Duterte Administration encourages the A&F sector development, streamlines government organizations, simplifies bureaucratic operations and processes without sacrificing relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, positive impact, and sustainability.

The study's general objective was to assess the performance of the Philippine Council for Agriculture and Fisheries (PCAF) consultative bodies in fulfilling their mandate. Specifically, the study was aimed to:

- (1) profile the PCAF consultative bodies to establish information as basis for evaluation;
- (2) assess the consultative bodies' performance in terms of their outputs and, to a certain extent, determine the outcomes of certain policies and their over-all contribution to PCAF's mandate in terms of: (a) increasing the CBs' participation in shaping agriculture and fishery policies at the national, regional, provincial, and municipal levels; (b) influencing the DA policy decisions and related local government agencies (LGAs) in terms of programs/projects development, budget prioritization, and regulatory measures for the country's agriculture and fisheries development; and (c) enhancing the transparency and promoting accountability in the formulation and implementation of agriculture and fishery policies, programs, and projects; and,
- (3) recommend strategies and measures to enhance the performance and contribution of the consultative bodies in the development of the agriculture and fisheries sectors.

Triangulated data-generation tools used in this study were: (1) documents review and analyses to assess the policies and programs or projects promulgated and implemented by the consultative bodies in the agriculture sector together with their partners; (2) focus group discussions (FGDs) with multi-level stakeholders as both policy/program implementers and beneficiaries; and, (3) direct observation by the DAP Research Team. Also, a Profiling Survey was conducted to augment or supplement the existing PCAF database and to accommodate the suggestions and recommendations of the respondents as part of the assessment and analyses for this study.

Review and analyses of documents show that the AFC network and the sectoral committees (SCs) at various levels of governance were established in 1987, and these were mandated to engage all major stakeholders in the decision-making for the agriculture and fisheries sectors. The network has undergone major structural and organizational changes since 1987, leading to the consolidation of functions under the National Agricultural and Fisheries Council (NAF Council), and supported by the Philippine Council for Agriculture and Fisheries (PCAF).

Specifically, the following are the AFCs' and the differently-leveled SCs' mandated functions and responsibilities:

- (1) to conduct public consultations to engage the public (agribusiness and civil society) and other agencies in the deliberation of issues affecting their respective sectors and in the development of policies, plans, and programs geared at the A&F sector development;
- (2) to coordinate and advocate for the: (a) identification and endorsement to appropriate agencies the plans and programs for the A&F sector (including sector agenda for the legislative bodies; (b) to assist the DA in mobilizing, coordinating (unifying), and monitoring the contributions of different agencies to the A&F modernization; (c) to provide information and feedback to the public regarding issues, plans and programs, and projects discussed at higher levels; and, (d) to promote consensus on and support for programs and projects for the A&F modernization;
- (3) to review the programs and budgeting for the DA and its attached agencies, and LGUs; and,
- (4) to assist the DA/LGUs in the monitoring and evaluation of plans and programs, and in the setting up of a feedback mechanism.

With the rationalized and expanded functions of PCAF and the transition to the Duterte Administration, the results of this evaluative study could be used to accomplish the following: (1) clarify PCAF functions and mandate in pursuing participatory governance; (2) define principles and guidelines for the creation and organization of the consultative bodies, including linkages for external coordination; and, (3) formulate operating guidelines, key performance areas, and internal management system.

For the AFC Profiling Survey, data collection efforts targeted 80 provinces and about 1,600 municipalities/cities. The survey covered securing basic demographic information on AFC officers (e.g., names, position and number of terms served in the AFC, age, educational attainment, profession, and contact details), organizational practices, institutional linkages, policy issuances, and programs/projects implemented. The AFC Profile Survey generated a response rate of 10% owing to some unavoidable and intervening circumstances such as the campaign for the 2016 national and local elections.

As regards the focus group discussions (FGDs), local-level FGDs were conducted from January to March 2016 at the regional (with representatives from selected provinces) and provincial (with representatives from selected municipalities) levels. For the regional FGDs, provinces were selected based on poverty incidence. At the provincial level, municipalities/cities were selected based on income-class groupings. In addition, three (3) FGDs at the national level were conducted with representatives from the PCAF Secretariat, government, and private sector representatives from the NSCs and the NAF Council.

Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability served as the points of inquiry and indicators in pursuing the FGDs.

Relevance refers to the extent to which initiatives are responsive to the priorities and needs of the target beneficiaries. To be relevant, the AFCs must be able to reach out to and engage

sectoral constituents (customers). This is manifested in the inclusivity of participation in council activities, either by representation/membership in the sectoral committees or the council itself, or through participation in public consultations.

On the **relevance** indicator, the following specific evaluation findings emerged from the FGDs:

- (1) Disenfranchisement of non-organized A&F stakeholders because it is stipulated that representation in the AFCs and the SCs should come from nation-wide and LGU-wide organizations;
- (2) Local A&F priorities are neglected because the composition of and representation in the local AFCs followed the national-level configuration which are clustered by products, namely: (a) food staples, (b) fruits and vegetables, (c) poultry, livestock, and feed crops, (d) fisheries and aquaculture, (e) farm mechanization, (f) commercial crops, (g) international trade, and (h) climate change, to the detriment of the areas with various commodity mix or with only one product in the whole area (e.g., pili nuts which is a priority product of the Bicol Region, and not in other areas of the country);
- (3) Unequal sector value chain representation because it was pointed out that most AFCs were dominated by producers which were categorized accordingly: (a) commodity producers (crops, livestock, aquaculture and fisheries), (b) value chain stage participation (inputs suppliers, producers, post-harvest processors, traders, wholesalers, retailers), and (c) supporting and related industries (finance, technology provider, transportation, machinery and equipment, etc.; whereas, the majority skilled agricultural workers who seem to be knowledgeable and familiar with the critical issues of the A&F sector did not have stable representation;
- (4) Unspecified representation from the government sector at the AFC local levels unlike at the national level wherein the government offices have seats, with their respective heads of agencies as the nominees; but, at the National Sectoral Committee level, which serves as the *de facto* operating arm of the NAF Council, there are no specifications on what agencies and which offices within the agencies should sit as representatives. At the local levels, the lack of clarity on representation is apparent with the statement "government representatives." Consequently, agency representatives change frequently and oftentimes those that claim to be government representatives lacked the authority to commit their office to support the initiatives promulgated by the committee or council.

As to **effectiveness**, (referring to the extent to which an initiative attains its objectives) the AFCs and sectoral committees (SC), ideally, must be able to listen to, process, and translate the voices heard and the inputs provided during public consultations into policies, plans, and programs that are responsive to the sector. Evaluation findings, however, show ineffectiveness owing to:

- (1) Lack of staff work before critical issues (such as identifying inter-sectoral linkages) are deliberated in meetings, thus, most of the meetings end up in crafted resolutions that call for assistance from other government agencies; and the lack of staff work also

weakens the impetus for initiatives referred by the AFC to other offices, whether at the same or at higher levels of governance.

- (2) Limited engagement by the AFC in the critical stages of the A&F project life cycle – implementation, monitoring (progress according to planned specifications, schedules, budgets), outcome monitoring (completion of project outputs), and results/impact evaluation (improvements in original problem situation) – because the AFCs were found engaged only in output monitoring, i.e., in verifying whether outputs were actually delivered. Further, the AFC were not involved in determining whether such outputs complied with design specifications, and they were not tasked as well to determine whether the project outputs were actually generating benefits for the targeted beneficiaries.
- (3) Weak institutional leverage because the AFCs' role remains purely recommendatory in nature since they have no mandated authority to ensure inclusion of their suggestions in the development plans of agencies at their respective levels; unlike other consultative bodies (e.g., Local Development Councils) which are mandated to identify and pursue development initiatives. The AFC, however, is not represented in all the LDC, although, there has recently been a Joint Memorandum between the DILG and DA, but not all LGUs, however, have complied with the memorandum.

The **efficiency** indicator measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. Efficiency is measured at the process level. To be efficient, AFCs and SCs should have well-defined guidelines and standard operating procedures in carrying out their mandated functions and activities. Some weaknesses in the operating practices of the consultative bodies were, however, gleaned from the FGDs:

- (1) Agenda setting was found to be the discretion of the Chair. It appeared that there was no standard protocol for issues/agenda to be proposed for deliberation and processed prior to the actual meeting (e.g., the concept of a “motion or resolution” under parliamentary procedures). Also, the participants identified the need for training on how to organize and manage meetings (e.g., parliamentary procedures, rules of order) to enhance the efficiency and quality of meetings.
- (2) Unsynchronized (and delayed) inter-level coordination such as scheduling of meetings when issues deliberated at the provincial level cannot be deliberated immediately at the higher regional level just because the meeting of the regional-level AFC was scheduled ahead of the provincial-level AFC meetings. In such case, important issues cannot be acted or elevated upon immediately to the national level.
- (3) Inadequate resources hinder the AFCs to conduct sectoral consultations. The local sectoral committees (LSCs) have a key role in engaging A&F stakeholders in the discussion and resolution of sector-specific issues and concerns, but because resources are limited, the sectoral consultations were found to be taken up in AFC plenaries where there is inadequate time for in-depth discussions.

As to the **impact** (changes produced by a development intervention on the local social, economic, environmental, and other indicators) of the AFCs and SCs, FGD results reveal that these have marginal influence on the policy formulation and development planning for the sector. The lack of technical staff work and non-representation in the planning bodies render

the AFCs unable to shepherd their initiatives through the project planning, programming, and budgeting processes in the government bureaucracy.

Also, the AFC representatives pointed out that resolutions endorsed to sector agencies are largely unacted upon. Likewise, the AFC members are frequently surprised to learn about sectoral projects being implemented within their communities that did not pass through Council review and deliberations. Frequently, AFCs are bypassed even in the selection of beneficiaries for national-level projects implemented within their area of jurisdiction.

Sustainability is concerned with whether the benefits of an initiative will continue to be generated even after seed funding has been withdrawn.

In the case of the consultative bodies, the sustainability factor would have to address the continuity of the institutions themselves. But the lack of resources and funding support to carry out even the mandated function of consulting the sector's stakeholders cannot be conducted. Volunteers have to use personal resources to attend meetings and other AFC activities. This situation effectively disenfranchises struggling small farmers/fisheries organizations and favors bigger and more successful groups and individuals who have the resources to attend the AFC activities.

Furthermore, succession planning cannot be guaranteed since the majority (60%) of the AFCs and SC members are in their senior age (51 years old and older) as shown by the result of the profiling survey. This is compounded by the data that the younger generations are taking less interest in agriculture, and therefore, only a smaller pool of younger candidates/representatives can be mobilized to continue the mandated AFC work. It is imperative that younger representatives be recruited to ensure continuity of the consultative organizations.

Based on the above-cited findings, it is concluded that there is a need to strengthen the consultative bodies through government support and processes imperatives so that the AFCs and the SCs will be able to discharge their respective mandated functions and duties as decision-making conduits not only for the DA, but for the LGUs, other line government agencies, and even the private sector which has also a stake in the country's A&F sector development.

On that note, the following specific recommendations are forwarded: (1) review representation/membership of the consultative bodies; (2) re-define functions and internal linkages; (3) establish internal rules and procedures; (4) synchronize calendar of activities; (5) establish both vertical and horizontal linkages; and (6) expand the roles and participation of the AFCs in monitoring and evaluation of the A&F development activities, projects, and programs; (6) strengthen staff support; and, (7) initiate supporting strategies.

Furthermore, it is recommended that:

- (1) a mechanism for the granting of incentives (e.g., inclusion in the Good Housekeeping criteria as recognition of AFC importance in local development of the sector and in the requirements for qualifying the LGU for the local level performance-based bonus or PBB) to encourage the LGUs in recognizing the role of the AFCs in policy-making, planning, and preparing budgets at the local level be developed;
- (2) the existing recognition system developed by the PCAF to highlight best practices be strengthened;
- (3) a management system and manual of operation that will ensure continual improvement among AFCs and the consultative bodies be crafted and adopted;
- (4) a technical staff complement at all levels to provide complete technical support (policy-making process) to the consultative bodies be provided; and,
- (5) advocacy activities (e.g., holding of caravans and roadshows) be conducted to emphasize that the consultative bodies are vitally important in the development of the A&F sectoral agenda and plans both at the local and the national levels such as the crafting of the Philippine Development Plan for the agriculture sector.

(For the complete copy of the report, send us a request at pcaf.da@gmail.com or through the [Contact Us](#) section of PCAF website.)