

Center for Governance
2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT

I. Project Information

Project Code: CLPWL
Project Title: Basic Course on Project Development and Management
for Local Government Units (LGUs) – Public Offering
Project Start: July 1, 2017
Project End: September 15, 2017
Project Price: PHP 576,000.00
Client Organization: Various Local Government Units

II. Project Team

Project Manager: BERNADETTE D. RODRIGUEZ
Team Members: MICHELLE N. BELGA
CLESA V. CORONA
Supervising Fellow: IMELDA C. CALUEN
Consultants/ Resource Persons: LAARNIE W. CAPISTRANO
REY O. MACALINDONG
CLEMENT L. RASUL
JANSEN M. MAYOR
GILBERT E. LUMANTAO
ALVIN P. PRINCIPE

III. Project Details

Project Description: The Basic Course on Project Development and Management for Local Government Units (LGUs) is a four-day live-out training designed to improve and strengthen project planning and management skills of LGU officers and technical staff involved in project development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Project Objectives: At the end of the training, the participants would have:

1. articulated the different phases and stages of the project cycle;
2. applied relevant tools, techniques and approaches to planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of programs and projects; and
3. drafted elements of project proposal addressing priority LGU concern.

Project Type: Training
Project Beneficiary: Local Government Units
Regional Coverage: Nationwide

IV. Project Accomplishments

Key Activities Implemented:

Basic Course on Project Development and Management for LGUs 15-18 August 2017 PAR
COSMO-PAR, F4, REV.1

Center for Governance
2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT

- Finalization of the Training Design
- Development of course promotional materials
- Marketing of the course to LGUs
- Invitation and Confirmation of participants
- Identification of Resource Persons/Technical Experts
- Development of Presentation Materials
- Conduct of Meetings with the training team and Resource Persons
- Preparation of Supplies, Materials, and other Logistical Requirements
- Conduct of the training
- Development of Project Accomplishment Report

Major Outputs:

1. Training Design

The training design was comprised of eight (8) sessions and three (3) workshops. After the faculty meeting with the training team members from the Local Governance and Development Office (LGDO) and the resource persons, Mr. Rey O. Macalindong and Mr. Clement L. Rasul, and upon the approval of MD Imelda C. Caluen, the following changes were made on the draft training design:

- The schedule of the session on Project Cycle Management Overview was changed from 1:00-2:00PM to 1:00-3:00PM, as well as the schedule session on Project Identification from 2:00-6:00PM to 3:00-6:00PM to give more time for the discussion on the Project Cycle Management Overview.
- Moving of the schedule of Mr. Gilbert Lumantao's session on Project Risk Management from August 17 to August 18 in the afternoon and to have a specific session on Important Assumptions right after the discussion on logframe in the morning. Initially, Mr. Lumantao's session on Project Risk Management was scheduled right after the workshop on logframe preparation on Day 3.
- Moving of the workshop on the preparation and refinement of logframe and its presentation and critiquing from Day 4 (18 August 2017) to Day 3 (17 August 2017) so that Day 4's focus will be on the session on Project Implementation Planning.

The course was designed in such a way that every session would complement each other and that they eventually served as inputs for the three workshops.

The sessions and workshops were designed to fit the four-day training, as detailed below:

DAY 1 (Tuesday)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Session 1: Rationale and Context for Project Development• Session 2: Project Cycle Management Overview• Session 3: Project Identification
DAY 2 (Wednesday)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project Identification (continuation)• Workshop 1: Preparation of Problem Tree/Root Cause Analysis• Presentation and Critiquing of Outputs• Session 4: Project Designing
DAY 3 (Thursday)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project Designing (continuation)• Workshop 2: Preparation of Project Logframe• Important Assumptions (Logframe)

Center for Governance
2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workshop 3: Refining of Project Logframe• Presentation and Critiquing of Logframe
DAY 4 (Friday)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Session 5: Overview of Project Implementation Planning• Session 6: Project Organization and Management• Session 7: Project Risk Management• Session 8: Considerations in Project Proposal Writing and Packaging

2. Conduct of Training

The Basic Course on Project Development and Management for Local Government Units (LGUs) was conducted on August 15-18, 2017 at the OD Corpuz Hall 1 and Virata Hall, DAP in Pasig City. Some forty-eight (48) representatives from twelve (12) LGUs composed of the provinces of Bataan, Catanduanes and La Union; the cities of Baybay, Leyte; Caloocan, Manila, Muntinlupa, Pasay; and municipalities of Angono and Baras Rizal; Bula, Camarines Sur; and Maydolong, Eastern, Samar.

Below are the highlights of each session and workshop:

Session 1: Rationale and Context for Project Development

In Ms. Laarnie W. Capistrano of the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA)'s discussion on the planning, programming and implementation process framework, she gave emphasis on the Results Matrix – how the inputs and activities should be implemented, what outputs should be produced, the short and medium-term outcomes expected from the investment and its long-term impacts. These, according to her, become the indicators, baseline information and targets under the Planning Cycle. Under the budgeting cycle, she shared, the national government conducts budget preparation, authorization and implementation for the identified program-projects and are, then, subjected to national government program-project appraisal and approval.

In the overview of the Investment Coordination Committee (ICC) Appraisal and Approval Process, she discussed the background of EO 230, the roles and responsibilities of the ICC, the ICC Organizational Structure, the coverage of the ICC review and approval, and the ICC policies, coverage of project appraisal (financial, economic, technical, environmental, institutional and social), the Project Evaluation Report, which, details the result of NEDA Secretariat evaluation of the project, and the preliminary report.

She then provided the participants with an overview on *Ambisyon Natin 2040*, which, outlines what Filipinos want to be, want to have, and want to do and envisions to attain "*Matatag, Maginhawa at Panatag na Buhay*" wherein by 2040, she explained, the Philippines will be a prosperous, predominantly middle-class society where no one is poor and the peoples will live long and healthy lives, be smart and innovative and live in a high-trust society; Sustainable Development Goals 2030; and Philippine Development Plan 2017-2022, which, highlights national aspirations and goals for the next six years. She then connected this topic to the 2017-2022 Public Investment Program (PIP) which contains the priority programs and projects contributing to the societal goal and outcomes spelled out in the Philippine Development Plan and Results Matrix.

Finally, Ms. Capistrano discussed the Project Development Cycle (PDC) from a macro-level perspective which runs through the three principal phases: Pre-Investment Phase, Investment Phase and Post-Investment Phase.

Session 2: Project Cycle Management Overview

Basic Course on Project Development and Management for LGUs 15-18 August 2017 PAR
COSMO-PAR, F4, REV.1

Center for Governance
2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT

Mr. Rey O. Macalindong explained the key concepts and principles of project planning, project implementation and control, and project operation and how these link to monitoring and evaluation (M&E). He also discussed the project implementation problems, issues, and difficulties, and how these can be addressed by M&E.

Session 3: Project Identification

In this session, Mr. Rey O. Macalindong identified the major activities in each of the three phases of the Project Cycle Management as well as the outputs, inputs, appropriate tools and techniques for each phase. When selecting the tools and techniques, he informed the participants of the key principles to consider.

The first part of the session focused on the discussion on Situation Analysis in which the participants were taught of the importance and usage of the key tools and techniques in the situation analysis stage – Dashboard, Data Map, Pareto Analysis, Segmentation Technique, Rapid Appraisal Technique, Most Significant Change (MSC), Problem Analysis, SWOT Analysis and Stakeholder Analysis Matrix. In this stage, he stressed that it is important to identify who should be doing the situation analysis and determine when this should be undertaken, its duration and the implications if not done correctly. After the discussion, the participants were asked to prepare their own dashboard based on their LGU's key performance indicators (KPIs) and to do a Pareto Analysis using the metacards and easle sheets provided. The participants then presented their outputs followed by Mr. Macalindong's critiquing.

He emphasized the patterns, insights and lessons when using the tools for analysis as well as the presentation tools and techniques. Say for example, when doing a problem analysis, he reminded the participants to be sure that they have complete data – both primary and secondary sources, watch out for vague statements, avoid judgmental statements or criticisms, beware of solutions masquerading as problems, show where the problems occur, and complement problem analysis with other approaches/tools.

In the second part of the session, Mr. Macalindong centered on Problem Analysis. He emphasized the importance of coming up with a correct Problem Statement as it increases the likelihood of being able to identify the correct intervention that will directly solve the problem. When constructing the problem statement, he reminded the participants to avoid using the terms 'lack of', 'inadequate' and other related terms, sweeping statements, generalizations and value laden terms, and to describe the problem as they see them (phenomenological approach). He also enumerated and discussed the different Root Cause Analysis Techniques as well as tips when using them. Towards the end of the session, the participants were asked to construct their Problem Tree followed by the presentation and critiquing of their outputs.

Session 4: Project Designing

Mr. Rey O. Macalindong introduced the Logical Framework Matrix or Logframe to the participants and provided its background, key concepts and principles. When constructing the logframe, he stressed the five key questions to consider – for the first column, 'What are we trying to accomplish and why?' (*Objectives*); for the second column: 'How will we measure success?' (*Indicators*); for the third column: 'How do we validate the accomplishments / achievements?' (*Means of Verification*); for the fourth column: 'What other conditions must exist?' (*External factors*); and lastly, 'What do we need?' (*Resources*).

Mr. Clement L. Rasul resumed Mr. Macalindong's session on logframe in the training's Day 4 and provided some samples for the participants to further grasp the topic. He provided a sample of a Problem Tree Analysis and Objectives Tree and showed how these are relevant in the construction of a logframe. The participants were then given the time to prepare their own logframe based on the Problem Tree that they

Center for Governance
2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT

prepared during Mr. Macalindong's session. He then lectured on logframe's important assumptions and stressed to the group its difference from project risks that will be discussed on the last day of the training after the session on Project Implementation Planning (PIP).

After the lecture, the participants were given the time to refine their logframes in preparation for the Presentation and Critiquing of their outputs in the afternoon.

Presentation and Critiquing of Project Logframe

A total of seven (7) groups of participants from different LGUs presented their logframes as well as their problem and objectives tree.

The LGU of Manila identified high volume of waste disposal in sanitary landfill as its main problem and proposed a project for households' practice of segregation and recycling.

Similarly, Ligao, Baybay and Oroquieta City found large volume of solid waste on streets and open spaces as the common problem in their LGUs and therefore proposed a project aimed at making the residents practice proper waste disposal.

For the provincial government of Bataan and La Union, they noted that their main problem was high vehicle accident cases and would like to improve their province's road design and condition to address this concern.

The city governments of Muntinlupa, Caloocan and Pasay observed that the increasing number of informal settlers in their localities is now becoming a huge problem. Thus, it was proposed by these LGUs that housing units be provided to the informal settlers living in their cities' danger areas so that they may have their own decent housing.

Lastly, for the municipality of Baras, Rizal, the high number of underweight pre-school children was recognized as its key problem and endeavors to address this through a project for the full immunization of pre-school children. Comments and suggestions were provided by the selected panel members (DAP directors, MR. Alvin P. Principe and Mr. Gilbert E. Lumantao and the course's resource persons, Mr. Rey O. Macalindong and Mr. Clement L. Rasul) so that they may improve their outputs when they present them to their respective LGUs.

Session 5: Overview of Project Implementation Planning

Mr. Jansen M. Mayor discussed the overview of the Project Implementation Planning, which covered the Uses of Project Implementation Plan (PIP), the link between logframe and PIP, the steps in preparing PIP, the PIP tools and techniques and project costs estimation. He specifically emphasized that it is during the project design stage that the project scope, target groups, targets, interventions, durations and cost requirements of the proposed project must be clearly defined in preparation of the Project Implementation Plan, which, basically outlines the activities, resources, schedule or duration and cost requirements. He also explained how the logical framework becomes the springboard in planning activities. The participants were then taught of the construction of the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS); sequencing activities through the Precedence Diagramming Method; estimating activity duration through compression; developing schedules through milestone charts and Gantt charts; estimating activity resources through an expert judgment, use of published estimating data, bottom-up estimating, and use of a Project Management Structure; and estimating budget. This was done through an activity asking the participants to prepare their own PIP with resource and budget estimate.

Session 6: Planning Project Organization and Management

Center for Governance
2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT

Mr. Jansen M. Mayor discussed what a Project Management Office (PMO) is, how a PMO is set up, PMO Composition and the current trends and approaches in PMO. When setting up a PMO, he underscored the things to consider – Scope of work, PMO Options, Principles of organization, Legal requirements, and Frame conditions. In the scope of work, Mr. Mayor, reminded the participants to make sure the following are ensured in setting up the structure – a) form follows functions, b) Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) leads to Organization Breakdown Structure (OBS), and c) Gantt Chart outlines the Terms of Reference (TOR) of project staff.

Apart from explaining the differences among projects, programs, and portfolios, he also discussed the different principles of organization (structure formation), namely: continuous chain of command, unity of command, and short chain of command. The frame conditions or 'given realities' that a project organization will encounter during project implementation – policy deficiencies' change or shift in policy, bureaucratic inefficiency, and cultural limitations, were also highlighted. An activity was then conducted asking the participants to discuss within their groups how they would structure their PMO by creating a wireframe of their structure through the given meta cards.

Session 7: Project Risk Management

Mr. Gilbert E. Lumantao started his session by asking the participants to write down in the meta cards provided what they perceive as 'risks'. He provided the different definitions of risks and uncertainties and discussed the four different types of uncertainties – the known unknowns, 'stochastic' or possible event; the unknown knowns, 'aleatory', or variability; the knowable unknowns, 'epistemic' or ambiguity; and the unknowable unknowns, 'ontologic', or blind spots. Aside from discussing the risk management principles, framework and process, and other terminologies used in risk management, he also distinguished qualitative risk analysis from quantitative risk analysis, followed by an exercise in which the participants were asked to accomplish the risk identification form for them to identify uncertainties which may affect the accomplishment of their project objectives. He then discussed other concepts such as likelihood, consequence and evaluation criteria in preparation for the next exercise. Towards the end of the session, the participants were asked to evaluate the risks they have identified earlier based on the sample criteria that Mr. Lumantao has provided and to accomplish their project risk register.

Session 8: Considerations in Project Proposal Writing and Packaging

Mr. Alvin P. Principe provided some practical tips in preparing project proposal, enumerated and discussed the elements of a suggested project proposal outline as well as the criteria in evaluating a project proposal.

He noted that it is becoming a common practice to prepare and submit a project proposal to comply with the requirements of funding agencies, and usually, compliance is rewarded with approval. According to him, there is nothing wrong with this scenario especially when the proposals are well-packaged and well-planned. However, he stressed that there is terribly wrong with this situation when the proposals are simply a collection of unrelated sections and paragraphs consolidated into a project proposal. When funds are granted, he shared, the project already faces issues even before it starts.

He also emphasized that the different parts of a proposal conveys information that will help the decision makers, stakeholders and the project team to understand the project holistically: situation before the project; desired situation to be achieved when the project is delivered; and implementation or activities to be undertaken during the project delivery.

He then provided the participating LGUs with sample funding facilities (ODA and local) that they can access for their proposed projects, the implementing agencies and donors, the areas of assistance and objectives, and the different guidelines and procedures.

Center for Governance
2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT

Lastly, Mr. Principe enumerated the criteria for proposal evaluation – clarity, completeness, responsiveness, consistency, capability, efficiency, accountability, and realistic, and how these can be achieved in a project proposal.

Project Impact:

The presentations of the LGUs' project logframes showed that the training was able to provide the participants with the knowledge and equip them with skills on project development and management. Although some of the outputs, as per the panel members, contained shaky Important Assumptions (IAs), or too many IAs, they were able to capture what should be included in a logical framework. Some of them would also need to refine their Problem Tree outputs but all in all, they were able to grasp the logic behind the construction of a Problem and an Objective Tree and how these are translated into a logframe.

They were also able to identify key issues in their localities that served as starter problem of their Problem Trees and were able to analyze the root causes of these problems which helped them identify the possible solutions as reflected in their Objective Trees. Generally, the LGUs were able to present good outputs as observed by the panel members. They also expressed their positive views on the conduct of this training during the Closing Ceremonies wherein some of them were requested to provide their feedback/testimonials on the overall conduct of the course and it will in the course evaluation forms.

Overall, the participants gave positive feedback on the training with an average rating of 4.71 for the course evaluation (*see attachment 1*). They gave the highest rating to usefulness of training materials with a score of 4.87 followed by usefulness of course and appropriateness of instruction materials with 4.83 and 4.80, respectively. The participants found the learnings they acquired about project proposal writing and highly competent resource persons as particularly rewarding about the course.

The participants also gave relatively high ratings for the resource persons with 4.94, 4.81, 4.69, 4.68, 4.41 and 4.08 for Mr. Principe, Mr. Macalindong, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Rasul, and Ms. Capistrano, respectively. They found the extensive knowledge and experience of the resource persons as their positive points.

Lessons Learned:

The following are the lessons learned from the preparation to the implementation of the training:

1. Weekly follow-up and reminders to the participants to settle the payment and accomplish the Participant Information Sheet (PIS) prior the training's conduct helped in securing the course fees ahead. Five days prior the event, 75% of the participating LGUs have already settled the payment and have submitted their accomplished PIS. This helped in the smooth registration process during the first day of the training. Long queue of participants who needed to pay on the first day was also avoided.
2. Asking someone from the Cash Office who would focus on the collection of fees also facilitated the training's smooth and hassle-free registration process.
3. Dividing the group into two (2) and having a parallel presentation and critiquing of the participating LGUs' logframe due to large number of participants helped in ensuring that each group had enough time to present their outputs and receive substantial comments/inputs from the panel members.

Center for Governance
2017 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT

V. Attachments

- Summary of Evaluation for Course and Resource Person (for training program)

Prepared by:

Bernadette D. Rodriguez
Bernadette D. Rodriguez
Project Manager

Noted / Approved by:

Imelda C. Caluen 9/14/2017
Imelda C. Caluen
Center Head

Notes:

1. Project details on Section I-III can be generated thru PMIS based on PMs Inputs.
2. Project Managers are required to accomplish Section IV & provide Section V to reflect results of project implementation
3. Project Managers can update/adjust the pre-filled sections(I-III) based on actual data