



Governance Challenges to Sustain  
Community-Driven Natural Resource Management

Linda M. Peñalba

Associate Professor, Institute of Agrarian and Rurban Development Studies  
College of Public Affairs, University of the Philippines, Los Baños

Parallel Session on Making Decentralization Work:  
Experiences and Lessons in the Last Ten Years (2 )  
44<sup>th</sup> Philippine Economic Society Annual Meeting  
21-22 November 2006

*Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas Assembly Hall*

Disclaimer: The views expressed in this paper are solely those of the author. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Philippine Economic Society, its Board of Directors, or its Annual Meeting Committee. Neither do they represent the views of the author's institution.

# **Governance Challenges to Sustain Community-Driven Natural Resource Management**

**Linda M. Peñalba**

## **Abstract**

Adoption of good governance system, inclusion of the poor and vulnerable groups and participatory decision-making are among the strategies employed to maximize and ensure sustainability of project benefits. In line with these strategies, the government pursued the Community-based Resource Management Project, a community-driven natural resource management (NRM) initiative in lower income class municipalities to address poverty and environmental degradation problems.

With project assistance, local government units (LGUs) were able to set-up good governance systems and procedures while participating communities were organized, trained and provided alternative non-resource extractive livelihood options to become effective NRM partners. However, there are foreseen problems that may constrain the sustainability of these initiatives after project pull-out.

The inability of low income LGUs to provide the necessary NRM maintenance funds; people's poverty that limits their ability to volunteer their services for NRM maintenance; the vulnerability of some law enforcement groups to resist political pressures; and the persistence of some negative socio-cultural traits are governance challenges that have to be overcome to sustain community-driven natural resource management initiatives.

To improve LGU's capability to finance NRM maintenance, the national government should allot a natural resource conservation funds from the general appropriations, allocate additional budget to LGUs that maintain NRM projects or establish rural community-enterprises (RCEs) that will be operated by the LGU and the community. The organizations of LGUs and the DILG can play a critical role to ensure that participating LGUs comply with effective governance procedures.

## **1. Introduction**

Among the critical concerns in the implementation of development projects are to maximize project benefits, make it inclusive and sustain the gains it generated particularly after the termination of external support. The strategies adopted by development practitioners to address these concerns are institution of good system of governance, inclusion of poor and vulnerable sectors and adoption of participatory decision-making processes. This policy environment promotes active participation of the local government unit (LGU) and the community concerned in the various aspects of project design and implementation. It is believed that active stakeholders' participation will enable them to develop a sense of project ownership and therefore concern for its maintenance and continued operation.

LGUs that have political jurisdiction over the particular project area play a crucial role to ensure sustainability of project gains. This role was highlighted with the

devolution of extension service delivery and natural resources management (NRM), from the central government to the LGU. Under the Local Government Code of 1991 (LGC), the LGUs were granted autonomy and are considered as effective partners of central government in the attainment of national goals. LGUs are expected to share with the national government the responsibility in the management and maintenance of ecological balance within their territorial jurisdiction (Sec.3, LGC). Furthermore, LGUs shall enjoy genuine and meaningful local autonomy...more responsive and accountable local government structure... more powers, authority, responsibilities, and resources to enable them to attain their fullest development as self-reliant communities.

To ensure that decentralization can contribute to the continuing improvement of the performance of LGUs and the quality of community life, the national government is expected to: 1) consult with appropriate LGUs, non-governmental organization (NGO) and people's organizations (POs), and other concerned sectors of the community on projects that will be implemented within their jurisdiction; 2) enhance capabilities of LGUs by providing them with opportunities to participate actively in the implementation of national programs and projects; and 3) extend adequate technical and material assistance to less developed and deserving LGUs. LGUs are encouraged to solicit private sector participation in local governance, particularly in the delivery of basic services to ensure the viability of local autonomy as an alternative strategy for sustainable development (Sec.3, LGC).

Various strategies have been tried to operationalize the concept of participation, inclusion and good governance. The most recent development paradigm introduced by the donor community is the so-called community-driven development (CDD). CDD is the most recent variant of the community-based strategy and is believed to be among the fastest-growing mechanisms for channeling external development assistance (Mansuri and Rao, 2004).

The *World Bank's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper Sourcebook* (Dongier et al., 2001) views CDD as a mechanism for enhancing sustainability, improving efficiency and effectiveness, allowing poverty reduction efforts to be taken to scale, making development more inclusive, empowering poor people, building social capital, strengthening governance, and complementing market and public sector activities (Mansuri and Rao, 2004).

In the Philippines, a recently completed NRM project, the Community-based Resource Management Project (CBRMP), adopted the CDD framework. It was initiated by the national government and implemented by a project management office in partnership with the LGUs and the communities/POs. The project aimed at improving the capacity of LGUs to reduce rural poverty and environmental degradation in the target areas through the implementation of locally-identified NRM and livelihood projects.

Under the current development policy environment, the LGU and the community are expected to play significant role in support service delivery and NRM. Guided by the principles of devolution and convergence, these major stakeholders are expected to actively participate in the various phases of project implementation particularly when the social and physical infrastructures have been turned-over and they assumed full responsibility for their operation and maintenance.

Therefore, it is important to assess LGU capabilities and understand factors that constrain effective governance to determine what can be done for LGUs to overcome governance challenges and demonstrate their capability to perform their devolved functions and qualify/avail of development assistance. The questions commonly asked are: 1) Do the LGUs and communities have the technical and financial capabilities to plan and implement NRM projects?; 2) Do they have the political will to formulate and implement environmental policies and laws as well as the ability to resist social pressure from various interest groups?; and 3) Are they willing to institute good system of governance and to allow real community participation?

This paper presents some of the key concepts in governance and community-driven development, performance of LGUs that participated in CBRMP, the challenges they face and the recommendations to enhance the sustainability of project gains. Data and information used in this paper were drawn from CBRMP evaluation reports, survey/interview of LGU officials and project staff from selected project municipalities and internet resources.

## **2. Definition/Explanation of Key Concepts**

A brief explanation of some of the key concepts used in this paper is herein presented to have a common understanding and put the analysis in proper perspective.

### *A. Governance*

Broadly defined, governance involves the complex array of mechanisms, processes, relationships and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise rights and obligations and mediate differences (UNDP, 1997).

Sound governance refers to effective management of public resources in response to the critical needs of society. There are three domains of governance that contribute to achieving sustainable development. This includes the state (political and governmental institutions), civil society organizations (CSOs) and the private sector.

Strengthening the enabling environment for sustainable development depends not only on a state that governs well and on a private sector that provides jobs and income, but also on civil society organizations that facilitate political and social interaction and that mobilize various groups in society to participate in economic, social and political activities (UNDP, 1997). CSOs not only provides important check and balance on government power and private sector operations, but also contributes to their strengthening. Therefore, an active CSO is critical to the operation of a good system of governance. Among the roles that an active CSO can play are:

- ✓ help monitor the environment, resource depletion, pollution and social abuses
- ✓ contribute to economic development by helping to distribute the benefits of economic growth more equitably within society
- ✓ offer opportunities for individuals to improve their standards of living

- ✓ channel people's participation in economic and social activities and organize them into more potent groups to influence public policies
- ✓ mitigate the potentially adverse effects of economic instability,
- ✓ create efficient mechanisms for allocating social benefits
- ✓ provide a voice for poorer groups in political and government decision-making
- ✓ serve as means for protecting and strengthening cultural and religious beliefs and values, and
- ✓ help people to overcome market failures and weaknesses through cooperatives, for example, which help some groups in society by uniting them into organizations through which they can obtain greater strength in market transactions.

A good system of governance is characterized by the presence of governance institutions that promote inclusion, efficiency and interactive participation as well as decision-making systems and processes that uphold accountability and transparency (Appendix A). The procedures and methods of decision-making should be transparent so that effective participation is possible. Those who are chosen to make decisions in government, business and CSOs should be accountable to the public, as well as to institutional stakeholders. Governance institutions should be efficient and effective in carrying out their functions, responsive to the needs of people, facilitative and enabling rather than controlling, and operate according to the rule of law. One of the great challenges for all governance institutions is to engender and command the respect of the people they serve. These institutions should be tolerant of diverse perspectives, provide equitable access to opportunities and be service-oriented (UNDP, 1997). All institutions and organizations of governance should:

- ✓ ensure gender equality and the participation of women in decision-making at all levels;
- ✓ develop the resources and methods for improving their own processes and procedures, for sustaining effective elements of their own structures, and for using and strengthening indigenous mechanisms through which people can cope effectively with problems; and
- ✓ mobilize resources for common or shared purposes, to identify and take ownership of solutions to national social problems, and to be creative in developing new mechanisms for dealing with rapidly changing problems and challenges over time.

#### *B. Public Participation*

Public participation is a basic element of effective governance. It is a mechanism for obtaining information on local conditions, needs, preferences, and attitudes that can guide LGUs in improving accessibility and acceptability of programs and services. It also fosters a sense of ownership and commitment to the outcomes of the policy implementation process and could save costs by minimizing or eliminating the need to create an institution that will monitor, implement and regulate the processes/services.

Active public participation is often difficult to achieve because: 1) there seems to be a gap between the facilitator and the development practitioners and the public in general; 2) the system of eliciting public participation is not appropriate; and 3) the public lacks the willingness to cooperate and participate. Several ways of improving public participation are suggested (UNDP, 1997):

- ✓ use non-technical terms when discussing policy problems, alternative solutions and their possible consequences to minimize the knowledge gap between the development practitioners and the community and encourage active community participation
- ✓ involve the public from the initial stages of policy-making and take into account their attitudes and opinions in designing appropriate policies and policy measures;
- ✓ involve all organizations and structures (e.g. church, clubs and POs) to get a broad representation of all sectors of society
- ✓ train community workers to develop their participatory skills and include ‘Civics’ to school curricula to deepen people’s understanding of the concept
- ✓ adopt participation methods such as radio and television talk shows, citizen representation in policy-making bodies, referenda, and questionnaire surveys which are considered more appropriate than traditional methods such as public hearings; and
- ✓ document and publicize the opinions and suggestions of the participating public to inform others about the outcome of the participation process

The literature describes several forms of participation from passive to active participation (Appendix B). The extent of people’s participation ranges from mere information recipient without mechanism to respond to suggestions up to taking initiatives to change systems independent of external initiatives. Participation “in information giving” and “by consultation” seem to differ only in terms of the methods of information gathering used (i.e. interview, focused group discussion) but in either case, the people only served as information source. On the other hand, functional participation differs from interactive participation in terms of the people’s point of entry in the participation process. In functional participation, people are involved after plans and decisions have been made while in interactive participation, people are involved from the start of the planning and decision-making processes. Community-driven NRM encourages interactive participation.

### *C. Community-Driven Development*

Community-driven development is a strategy that gives control of decisions and resources to community groups and treats poor people as assets and partners in the development process (Appendix C). These groups often work in partnership with demand-responsive support organizations and service providers, including elected local governments, the private sector, NGOs, and central government agencies. It is a way to provide social and infrastructure services, organize economic activity and resource management, empower poor people, improve governance, and enhance security of the

poorest (Dongier et.al. 2001). It relies on the community to use their social capital to organize themselves and participate in development processes (Mansuri and Rao, 2004).

Dongier et.al (2001) further stated that support to CDD usually includes strengthening and financing inclusive community groups, facilitating community access to information, and promoting an enabling environment through policy and institutional reform. Well-designed CDD programs build positive social capital, can be inclusive of poor and vulnerable groups, and can provide greater opportunity to voice their concerns both in their community and with government entities. Experience demonstrates that by directly relying on poor people to drive the development process, poverty reduction efforts can be more responsive, more inclusive, more sustainable, and more cost-effective than traditional centrally-led programs.

CDD is a means of mobilizing the community not only for economic gains but also for social and political interactions. Market- and state-run activities can be effectively complemented by community-driven solutions that engage CBOs, local governments, NGOs, and the private sector. Local groups can be tapped to provide key goods and services and governments can support immediate poverty reduction by efficiently building human and physical assets at the local level (Dongier et.al. 2001).

The explicit objectives of CDD are to: 1) reverse power relations to promote equity and empowerment by giving poor people greater access to and control of resources; 2) improve the delivery of public goods and services, and 3) strengthen the capabilities of the citizenry to undertake self-initiated development activities (Mansuri and Rao, 2004).

### **3. The Community-Driven Natural Resource Management Approach: The CBRMP Experience**

Under the CDD approach, broad sets of arrangements between key actors are possible, namely: a) partnership between the community and the local or the municipal governments; b) partnership between the community and the private support organizations such as NGOs or the private sector; and c) direct partnership between the community and the central government (Dongier et.al. 2001). CBRMP adopted a combination of these arrangements. The project was initiated and funded by the central government through the Department of Finance (DoF), implemented by the Municipal Development Fund Office (MDFO) through the project management office (PMO) and the LGU in partnership with the community. Public funds for the project were supplemented by external borrowings and were provided to the participating LGUs through a mix of grant, loan and equity, the proportion of which depends on the municipality's income class. This eight-year project covered 81 municipalities in four regions (Regions 5, 7, 8 and 13).

The LGU was tasked to manage the project, mobilize the partner communities and seek the technical assistance of regional line agencies. Private sector participation in project implementation was very minimal considering the limited business opportunities

and market potentials during the initial stage of the project. CSO involvement, on the other hand, can be generally classified as reactionary because of the low level of organization and awareness among the community residents. Most of the POs were organized by the project and have not yet attained the desired level of organizational maturity to represent the community and leverage for the benefit of its members.

The fundamental concept of community-driven NRM is that effective management of natural resources is key to poverty reduction and that overexploitation could lead to serious environmental degradation and decline in farm productivity and income that could further worsen poverty situation. In line with this principle, CBRMP pursued programs to address the social (attitudinal), economic and environmental concerns. The activities undertaken aimed to: 1) rehabilitate degraded coastal and upland areas; 2) provide alternative livelihood options; 3) establish social and physical infrastructures in support of economic and environmental goals; 4) build the capacity of the LGUs and the partner POs; and 5) disseminate information on appropriate upland and coastal resources management technologies.

Institution of a good system of governance by the LGUs was also given emphasis. Likewise, community organizing and social preparation that focus on community participation and environmental awareness building were among the major activities undertaken by the project. The project had a slow start because it took sometime to set-up the necessary organizations, systems and procedures considering the diverse organizational and management biases of the institutions and groups involved in the project. Notwithstanding the operational constraints, the project is said to have successfully attained its goals.

#### *A. Project Outcomes*

Project accomplishments were evaluated by assessing the changes in physical and environmental condition of upland and coastal resources, the socio-economic condition of participating community members and the adoption of good governance practices by the participating LGUs. Reports show that towards the end of the project period, there were indications that social and economic condition of the farmers and fisherfolks improved, POs in support of CD-NRM were organized, people were provided training to develop their skills and inform them about appropriate environmental technologies and alternative livelihood options (Appendix D).

Massive information and education campaigns on appropriate technology and environmental conservation together with the cooperation of the stakeholders in campaigns against illegal fishing/logging as well as the mangrove and upland reforestation and FSMR establishment also yielded significant results. Marked improvements in forest cover, biodiversity, water yield and condition of fish sanctuaries were noted. Likewise, decrease in soil erosion and the number of environmental law violators were also observed, an indication that people were beginning to apply resource management measures and realize the consequences of being recalcitrant resource users.

The governance capability of LGUs was assessed by analyzing the mechanisms instituted in connection with community-driven NRM against the characteristics of a good system of governance contained in UNDP (1997). Results of this analysis show

that the Project's emphasis on good governance yielded positive results. It was observed that participating LGUs were capable of instituting good system of governance. With the Project's assistance, these LGUs shifted from the traditional, often autocratic system to one that promotes participatory decision making process, equity, empowerment, political and economic inclusion, transparency and accountability.

Among the mechanisms instituted by the LGUs to carry out their commitment to good governance were: multi-stakeholder (e.g. indigenous peoples, farmers, fisherfolks, women, LGU official) involvement in project management committees; posting of accomplishments, financial and technical reports; institution of cost-recovery, resource mobilization and generation mechanisms; preparation of sustainability plan and strengthening of linkages with other institutions (Appendix E).

### *B. Governance Challenges*

The basic principles of CDD are consistent with the characteristics of good system of governance as defined in UNDP (1997). Hence, project implementation should have proceeded smoothly. However, coordination and mobilization problems were encountered primarily because of limitations in the capability of project implementers.

The governance challenges in community-driven NRM were actually encountered at two stages of the project: first, during the project implementation phase when efficiency, transparency, accountability and broad community participation were critical to effective project management, and secondly, after project termination when external support was terminated and the LGU had to lead the community in sustaining project gains.

According to good governance principles, the ability of key players, namely: the civil society/community; the central government/PMO and the LGU itself, to perform their functions during the entire course of project implementation is critical to effective project governance. However, governance challenges were encountered because social, economic and political institutions were weak, LGU capability was limited and people's socio-economic condition constrained them to participate actively in all NRM-related activities (Appendix F).

#### *1. Socio-economic Condition of Community Members*

People's poverty, limited knowledge about environmental conservation and limited income generating opportunities and their consequent impacts on the sustainability of NRM efforts are real problems that LGUs face. Community participation was good while the people continue to be paid wages for NRM maintenance. However, when the external financial support was terminated, community mobilization became a difficult task.

The low level of organizational development of partner POs made it difficult to mobilize them. These POs were expected to undertake NRM and livelihood activities as well as participate in infrastructure and community development. However, because most of the partner POs were either newly organized or rehabilitated by the project, organizational and financial management systems and procedures were not yet in place and people's cooperation was weak. Information, education and capacity-building

programs were put-up to address people's low level of empowerment and organizational maturity. Furthermore, because the people had difficulty comprehending the link between effective NRM and socio-economic improvement, it took sometime to convince them to shift to more conservative agroforestry systems.

PO members' attendance in community meetings/ seminars was also limited by the fact that they give priority to work outside the project to meet their day-to-day subsistence needs rather than work on NRM wherein compensation payment is usually delayed. Long-term planning is not part of their priority.

Another factor that the project had to address was the persistence of negative socio-cultural traits (e.g. dole-out mentality, wait-and-see attitude) among the community members. The project tried to deal with this problem by restricting livelihood assistance to those who participated in NRM activities and a series of values reorientation seminars. Counteracting the disinformation made by groups opposed to the project (e.g. illegal loggers/dynamite fishers) were additional burdens that had to be addressed by project implementers.

## 2. *LGU Capability and Political Will*

The LGU's ability to take-on project leadership was constrained by its limited experience in the management of large development projects and participatory decision-making, limited financial capability to pursue projects without external assistance and the LCE's limited term of office. Moreover, many participating LGUs were not familiar with the financial management system adopted by the PMO. Many LGUs also suffer from lack of trust and confidence by other sectors on their political will and commitment to pursue NRM and enforce environmental laws. The perception that local government officials are only concerned with protecting their vested interests limits their ability to mobilize the CSO and the private sector and constrain their fund sourcing efforts.

The participating LGUs were able to overcome the governance challenges during the project implementation phase. The LGUs with the help of the PMO and the regional line agencies, for its part, instituted mechanisms to meet good governance standards in implementing community-driven development. Greater challenges were encountered when external assistance was terminated and the LGU encountered difficulty in raising funds to support NRM and livelihood projects.

The LGUs' inability to provide funds to NRM maintenance is also a reality that should be considered when estimating project budget. In fact, the financing requirement to improve people's access to basic services, provide income generating opportunities and sustain NRM activities are tremendous and beyond the capability of LGUs. Even in the most optimistic scenario, public funds will not be enough to support such programs. This is particularly true under CBRMP which is focused on lower income class municipalities (i.e. class 4-6). The participating LGUs who belong to the lower income class cannot be expected to draw from its meager development funds to be used for NRM maintenance.

Furthermore, it will take some time before LGUs can generate revenues from tree plantations established by the project and collect amortization payments from PO loans. It is, thus, important to leverage public and private financing sources to ensure

availability of funds to maintain NRM projects and sustain livelihood and PO support. The LGU and the community can put-up rural community enterprises (RCEs) such as eco-tourism development to generate funds that can be plowed back to NRM maintenance activity. The private sector can also be mobilized to invest in support service delivery projects that can create jobs for the people and market for their products. Increase in people's income and assurance of government support will provide greater opportunity for PO growth and development and therefore, sustainability of project gains.

It should be noted that governance largely depends on the management style of the local chief executive (LCE) that determines his development priorities and how the LGU development funds are allocated. Likewise, the influence of politics cannot be underestimated. The LGU officials' limited term of office can disrupt the continuity of program activities. Reorientation of new LGU officials who replace those who have learned to adopt good governance procedures but whose term had expired was a major undertaking that affected project progress.

The POs have a big role to play in ensuring the sound governance of community-driven NRM. A strong PO can exert pressure on the LGU officials to support community-driven NRM activities, effectively perform its civic functions and contribute towards the attainment of community-driven NRM goals

#### **4. Conclusions and Recommendations**

##### *A. Conclusions*

1. Effective governance of community-driven NRM initiatives largely depends on the LCE's management style and political will, the people's socio-economic condition and level of empowerment, the private sectors' willingness to do its share and perform its social duties and the central government's capability to provide needed technical and financial support.
2. The LGUs are capable of instituting good system of governance but the problem is how to sustain its practice given the social, financial and political challenges they face. This situation implies that LGU involvement and adoption of community-driven approach are no assurance of sustainability if they were not financially able and technically prepared. Support from the national government (DILG) as well as the LGU organizations (ULAP, LMP) are needed to ensure that the LGUs institutionalized good system of governance and to prevent them from slipping back to top-down, autocratic or non-transparent and non-accountable ways.
3. The biggest problem that LGUs face is how to finance NRM maintenance and livelihood and PO support after the project period when external financial support has been terminated. This is a real concern since the community-driven CBRMP participants belong to the lower income class municipalities and have meager development funds to spare. While they

are expected to get a share from the revenues that will be generated from the tree plantation and agroforestry farms, it will take sometime before such revenue is realized. Meanwhile, LGUs and POs have to invest in NRM maintenance to ensure that project gains are sustained and future earnings will be realized.

*B. Recommendations*

1. To ensure that LGUs and POs continuously adopt good governance practices, the following courses of action are recommended:
  - (i) encourage LGU organizations (i.e. DILG, ULAP, LMP, etc.) to design programs that will reorient and train LGU officials and personnel on sound governance practices;
  - (ii) tap these organizations to monitor the LGU's performance and ensure that good governance systems and procedures are institutionalized;
  - (iii) the appropriate government agencies and LGUs should link with NGOs and academic institutions in developing capacity building and IEC programs on community-driven NRM; and
  - (iv) include a video production that dramatizes environmental disaster as a consequence of overexploitation of natural resources among the IEC materials and present a documentation of economically viable alternative livelihood options that are compatible with sustainable natural resource management. These presentations can effectively emphasize the doctrine that effective natural resource management is key to poverty reduction and that its overexploitation could threaten their very lives and sources of livelihood.
  
2. To hurdle the financial challenges that LGUs and POs face particularly after project termination, the following steps are recommended:
  - (i) set-up RCEs (e.g. ecotourism projects) that can generate revenues for NRM maintenance and other related activities;
  - (ii) in project planning and budgeting, include allotment for post project maintenance activities and consider the LGUs' financial capability to shoulder such expenses; and
  - (iii) in line with government's environmental conservation efforts, LGUs that are maintaining NRM projects should be provided additional budgetary allotment. A conservation fund can be set aside by the government for this purpose and appropriate mechanisms for its allocation can be formulated.

The national government through its various agencies (e.g. DENR, DILG and DSWD) and the organizations of LGUs have a critical role to play in enhancing people empowerment and improving the governance capability of LGUs towards effective

natural resource management and the full realization of the intent of the Local Government Code.

**Appendix A**  
**Box 1. Characteristics of good system of governance**

***Governance institutions:***

- effective and efficient in carrying out their function
- responsive to the needs of people
- facilitative and enabling rather than controlling
- operate according to the rule of law
- engender and command the respect of the people they serve
- tolerant of diverse perspectives
- provide equitable access to opportunities
- service-oriented
- ensure gender equality and women participation in development management
- develop resources and methods for improving process and procedures to sustain its programs and structures
- strengthen indigenous mechanisms through which people can cope effectively with problems

***Procedures and methods of decision-making:***

- Transparent
- Accountable
- Makes effective participation possible

*Source: UNDP, 1997*

## Appendix B

**Table 1. A typology of people's participation in natural resources management.**

Forms of participation	Characteristics of each type of participation
<b>Passive participation</b>	People are told what is going to happen or has already happened. The administration or project management makes announcements without the mechanisms to respond to suggestions. The information shared belongs to management.
<b>Participation in information giving</b>	People participate by answering questions posed by project management using questionnaire surveys or similar approaches. No opportunity for stakeholders to influence proceedings exists, as the findings of the research or project design are neither shared nor checked for accuracy.
<b>Participation by consultation</b>	Stakeholders are consulted and external agents listen to the views expressed. These external agents define both problems and solutions and may modify these in light of stakeholders' responses. Consultative processes do not offer any share in decision-making and project managers or administrators are under no obligation to take views on board.
<b>Participation for material incentives</b>	People participate in return for food, cash or other material incentives. This is called participation, yet those involved have no stake in prolonging activities when the incentives end.
<b>Functional participation</b>	People participate by forming groups to meet pre-determined objectives related to the project, often involving the development or promotion of externally-initiated social change. Such involvement does not tend to be at early stages of project cycles or planning, but rather after major decisions have been made. These institutions tend to be dependent on external assistance, but may become independent in time.
<b>Interactive participation</b>	People participate in joint analysis that leads to the creation of new local groups or the strengthening of existing ones. These groups take control over local decisions so that people have a stake in maintaining structures or practices. It tends to involve interdisciplinary methods, and systematic and structured learning processes.
<b>Self-mobilization/ active participation</b>	People participate by taking initiatives independent of external institutions to change systems. Such self initiated mobilization and collective action may or may not challenge existing distributions of land or assets and power.

*Source: Pimbert, M.P. and J.N. Pretty (1994), Brown et al. (2001).*

**Appendix C**  
**Table 1. Outcomes of community-driven NRM interventions.**

<b>CD-NRM Aspects</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b>1. Physical</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improvement in forest cover</li> <li>• establishment of buffer zones</li> <li>• conversion of denuded and degraded lots into productive agro-forestry farms</li> <li>• establishment of FSMR and mangrove reforestation areas</li> <li>• construction/rehabilitation of small-scale infrastructure (trails)</li> </ul>
<b>2. Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase in farmer's/fisherfolks' income</li> <li>• diversification of income sources</li> <li>• creation of on-resource extractive income generating opportunities</li> </ul>
<b>3. Environmental</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• decrease in soil erosion</li> <li>• increase in water yield</li> <li>• increase in biodiversity</li> <li>• improvement in fish sanctuary condition</li> </ul>
<b>4. Social and equity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• establishment of POs</li> <li>• issuance of tenurial security instruments</li> <li>• signing of co-management agreement between LGU/PO and DENR</li> </ul>
<b>5. Governance capabilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• institution of effective management systems (e.g. financial, M&amp;E)</li> <li>• adopted participatory planning and decision-making processes</li> <li>• set-up transparency and accountability measures</li> <li>• strengthen linkages with regional line agencies</li> <li>• extended technical and financial support to POS</li> </ul>

## Appendix D

### Box 2. Attributes of the community-driven development approach

The attributes of community-driven development can be summarized as follows:

- Complements market and public sector activities
- Enhances sustainability of benefits and processes
- Improves efficiency and effectiveness of support service delivery
- Allows poverty reduction efforts to be taken to scale
- Makes development more inclusive of the interests of poor people and vulnerable groups
- Empowers poor people, builds social capital, and strengthens governance
- May be initiated by a national government but detailed planning and implementation are done by the community
- Give control of decision and resources to community groups
- Treats people as partners (not mere targets in the development process)

*Source: Dongier et.al, 2004.*

**Appendix E**  
**Table 1. Mechanisms instituted by LGUs in the implementation of community-driven natural resource management.**

<b>Indicators of good governance</b>	<b>Mechanisms instituted by LGUs</b>
1. Participatory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ PRAs</li> <li>✦ stakeholders' meetings</li> <li>✦ participatory planning, implementation and law enforcement</li> <li>✦ NGO/private sector involvement</li> </ul>
2. Sustainable Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ sustainability plans</li> <li>✦ MENRO/MAENRO</li> <li>✦ partnership agreements with NGAs</li> <li>✦ tenurial security instruments</li> <li>✦ co-management agreement</li> <li>✦ resolutions and ordinances</li> <li>✦ law enforcement units</li> <li>✦ allocation of funds</li> <li>✦ resource mobilization capability</li> </ul>
3. Legitimate and acceptable to the people; operates by rule of law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ MOA</li> <li>✦ regular meetings</li> <li>✦ multi-sectoral PMBs</li> <li>✦ SB resolutions re-environmental laws, fines and Bantay Dagat/ Bantay Gubat operations</li> <li>✦ brings violators to court</li> </ul>
4. Transparent and Accountable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ open-bidding</li> <li>✦ posting of accomplishments, activities and financial transactions</li> <li>✦ standards and guidelines in the appointment of project staff and sub- contracting</li> <li>✦ collection of loan repayment from POs</li> <li>✦ amortized LGU loans</li> </ul>
5. Promotes equity and equality; tolerates and accepts diverse perspectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ multi-stakeholder participation</li> <li>✦ tenurial security instruments</li> </ul>

<b>Indicators of good governance</b>	<b>Mechanisms instituted by LGUs</b>
6. Able to develop the resources and methods of good governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ participatory planning</li> <li>✦ transparency and accountability measures</li> <li>✦ implementation plan</li> <li>✦ installed M&amp;E system</li> <li>✦ law enforcement units (Bantay Dagat/Bantay Gubat)</li> <li>✦ cost-recovery measures</li> <li>✦ resource mobilization/generation</li> <li>✦ support service delivery (agricultural extension service, credit and marketing assistance)</li> <li>✦ interagency collaboration and convergence</li> </ul>
7. Promotes gender balance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ gender and development program</li> </ul>
8. Able to mobilize resources for social purposes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ allocated funds for livelihood, community organizing and skills development of POs</li> <li>✦ fund sourcing</li> </ul>
9. Efficient and effective in the use of resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ planning and budgeting exercises</li> <li>✦ target-oriented manpower and financial resource allocation</li> <li>✦ Work and Financial Plan</li> </ul>
10. Strengthens indigenous mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ appointment of indigenous community representative to project management committees</li> </ul>
11. Engenders and commands respect and trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ LCE led arrest of violators</li> <li>✦ punishment for violators</li> <li>✦ support for law enforcers</li> </ul>
13. Enabling and facilitative/regulatory rather than controlling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ interagency collaboration (NGA, LGU, PO/Community)</li> <li>✦ support service delivery</li> <li>✦ M&amp;E system</li> <li>✦ flexible and responsive project organization</li> </ul>
14. Able to deal with temporal issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ flexible and responsive procedures to keep up with changing social, economic and political environment</li> </ul>
15. Service-oriented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✦ technical services to POs/community - financial and PO management</li> <li>✦ environmental technology transfer</li> <li>✦ IEC</li> </ul>

## Appendix F

### Box 3. Governance challenges to sustain community-driven NRM gains.

1. Limited capability and low level of maturity of civil society organization
  - Most POs are newly organized, have not yet attained desired level of organizational development and not yet capable to sustainably manage organizational system
  - Low resiliency level and limited financial management capability
  - Lack of potential leaders
  - Negative socio-cultural traits (e.g. people's dole-out mentality, wait and see attitude)
2. People's poverty and limited income-generating opportunities
  - People give priority to income-generating rather than voluntary community-development activities
  - People have limited financial capability to support CSOs
  - Limited availability of alternative non-resource extractive livelihood opportunities
3. Limited skills and competence of LGU personnel in the management of large projects
  - Development projects are traditionally implemented by NGAs-LGUs role largely limited to coordination
  - Limited project management experience of LGU personnel because of LGUs' limited financial capability to sustainably support comprehensive development projects
  - Limited capability of LGU staff to carry-out NRM related activities since NRM are traditionally undertaken by national government
4. Limited financial resources of LGUs that can be used to sustain NRM activities and employ CO workers who will supervise the communities and facilitate conduct of PO strengthening and CO enhancement activities
5. Pressure from environmental law violators and LCEs' political allies that put to test the LGU officials' political will to enforce environmental laws
6. Limited funds to support Bantay Dagat and Bantay Gubat operation
7. Limited knowledge by LGU staff of NRM laws particularly on forestry and fishery and limited experience in environmental law enforcement
8. Perception of many NGAs that LGU officials lack the political will and capability to undertake NRM projects and have vested interests that run in conflict with the NRM goals
9. Limited appreciation by LGU officials of community-driven development procedures and inability of barangay units and CSOs to perform their tasks such that some officials resort to the usual top-down planning and policy formulation processes
  - many barangay units are not able to prepare Barangay development plans
  - many CSOs collapse if external support is withdrawn
10. Limited financial capability of NGAs that constrain the provision of technical support to LGUs
  - LGUs have to provide for the traveling expenses of NGA technicians

## References

- UNDP. 1997. “Reconceptualising Governance.” Discussion paper 2. Management Development and Governance Division, Bureau for Policy and Programme Support, United Nations Development Programme, New York.
- Dongier, P., J.V. Domelen, E. Ostrom, A. Rizvi, W. Wakeman, A. Bebbington, S. Alkire, T. Esmail, and M. Polski. 2001. “Community-Driven Development.” In *A Sourcebook for Poverty Reduction Strategies. Volume 1: Core Techniques and Cross-Cutting Issues*. J. Klugman, ed. Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 301–332. [[www.worldbank.org/poverty/strategies/chapters/cdd/cdd0427.pdf](http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/strategies/chapters/cdd/cdd0427.pdf)]
- Philippines, Republic of the. 1991. *The Local Government Code*. Book I.
- Mansuri, G. and V. Rao. 2004. “Community-Based and -Driven Development: A Critical Review.” *World Bank Research Observer* **19** (1).
- Pimbert, M.P., and J.N. Pretty. 1994. “Participation, People, and the Management of National Parks and Protected Areas: Past Failures and Future Promise.” In *Trade-off Analysis for Participatory Coastal Zone Decision-Making*. K. Brown, E. Tompkins, and W.N. Adger, eds. Norwich, U.K.: University of Anglia.