

Bottom-up Budgeting Results Framework¹ **(As of May 26, 2014)**

The Philippine Development Plan, consistent with the Millennium Development Goals, has set a target of reducing poverty from 26.5% in 2009 to 16.6% by 2015. The Bottom-up Budgeting (formerly called the Bottom-up Budgeting Program) seeks to contribute to this effort by helping make the national government resources allocation more efficient and effective, thus making the government more responsive to local needs. This in turn will help reduce poverty and foster more inclusive growth.

Unlike other programs that tend to focus on the supply side of governance reforms, Bottom-up Budgeting focuses on strengthening the citizens' demand for good governance. It seeks to establish supportive policies and create mechanisms that enable citizens and grassroots organizations to increase their demand for improved local service delivery and a more accountable government.

Bottom-up Budgeting is expected to lead to better targeting and more efficient service delivery by better aligning the national government agencies' existing resources with the people's demands through participatory planning process.. The program will help transform relations between citizens and government, from one which is largely patronage-based to one where citizens become more empowered to effectively hold their government accountable for better and more responsive service delivery.

In sum, the Bottom-up Budgeting aims to *contribute* to the impact and *achieve* the strategic objective as stated below:

- Impact :** Bottom-up Budgeting aims to contribute to making governance responsive to the local needs and making public resources allocation more efficient and effective. This in turn will contribute to poverty reduction and inclusive growth.
- Strategic Objective :** [To increase citizens' access to local service delivery through demand-driven budget planning process.](#)
[To strengthen government accountability in local public service provision.](#)

¹ This Results Framework will be applied to FY2013 round implementation to FY2017 round planning phase. FY2012 round and FY2013 round planning, which were already completed at the time of the design of this Results Framework, will be taken as pilots and a qualitative study on the pilots will be undertaken separately to extract key lessons learned.

Impact		Remarks			
Citizen empowerment and more responsive governance		Bottom-up Budgeting aims to contribute to making governance responsive to the local needs and making public resources allocation more efficient and effective. This in turn will contribute to poverty reduction and inclusive growth.			
Strategic Objective	Strategic Objective Indicators	Data Source/ Methodology	Frequency	Responsible Agency for Data Collection	Remarks
Increase citizens' access to local service delivery through demand-driven budget planning process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of beneficiaries satisfied with access to services that meet their needs. ▪ % increase in beneficiary HHs' access to and utilization of key infrastructure and services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Process evaluation ▪ CLMP ▪ Project functionality assessment ▪ Qualitative IE ▪ Trend analysis using secondary data 	Annual Annual Annual Endline Endline	DBM NAPC DBM DBM DBM	
Strengthen government accountability in local public service provision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of local government units (LGUs) that have integrated Bottom-up Budgeting in the local development process. ▪ Civil society organizations (CSOs) and basic sector organizations (BSOs)' perceived increase in their influence on the decision-making process and outcomes in the local development councils. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document comparison – annual investment plan (AIP) vs. Bottom-up Budgeting priority project list ▪ Process evaluation ▪ CLMP ▪ Qualitative IE 	Endline Annual Annual Endline	DBM DBM NAPC DBM	

Intermediate Results	Intermediate Result Indicators	Data Source/ Methodology	Frequency	Responsible Agency for Data Collection	Remarks
1. Participating CSOs and BSOs' capacities for participatory local development are strengthened.	1.1 # of CSOs and BSOs that receive coaching from the Community Mobilizers (CM) under GPBP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DILG monitoring 	Annual	DILG	
	1.2 # of provinces (out of 24) that have established Provincial Coordination Teams.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DILG monitoring 	Annual	DILG	
2. Participating CSOs and BSOs are empowered to represent the citizens' development needs.	2.1 % of CSO assemblies where participants are satisfied with the local needs identification process and outcome.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NAPC PFP report ▪ CM MIS report ▪ Process evaluation ▪ Qualitative IE 	Quarterly Quarterly Annual Endline	NAPC DILG DBM DBM	
	2.2 # of CSOs and basic sector groups attending the CSO assembly in each LGU.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NAPC PFP report ▪ CM MIS report 	Quarterly Quarterly	NAPC DILG	
	2.3 % of CSO assemblies where participants are satisfied with the LPRAT member selection process and outcome.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NAPC PFP report ▪ CM MIS report ▪ Process evaluation ▪ Qualitative IE 	Quarterly Quarterly Annual Endline	NAPC DILG DBM DBM	
	2.4 % of coached CSOs who feel better equipped to represent the citizens' needs at the LPRAP workshop.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NAPC PFP report ▪ CM MIS report 	Quarterly Quarterly	NAPC DILG	
3. LGUs, CSOs, and BSOs are engaged in the participatory LPRAP planning and sub-project prioritization process.	3.1 % of LPRAP planning meetings with at least 50% of participants from CSOs/BSOs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CM report 	Quarterly	DILG	
	3.2 % of LPRAP workshops where CSOs/BSOs, LGUs and LCEs satisfied with the planning process and outcome of the LPRAPs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CM report ▪ PFP report ▪ Process evaluation ▪ Qualitative IE 	Quarterly Quarterly Annual Endline	DILG NAPC DBM DBM	

	<p>3.3 % of LPRAPs whose priority projects match the CSOs/BSOs' priority areas.</p> <p>3.4 % of CSOs/BSOs who feel that their priority issues were reflected in the LPRAPs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CM report ▪ PFP report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CM survey ▪ PFP report ▪ Process evaluation ▪ Qualitative IE 	<p>Quarterly Quarterly</p> <p>Annual Quarterly Annual Endline</p>	<p>DILG NAPC</p> <p>DILG NAPC DBM DBM</p>	
4. LPRAP priority projects are completed in time and utilized satisfactorily.	<p>4.1 % of LPRAP projects completed within the fiscal year. (completion)</p> <p>4.2 % of projects rated functional and utilized after completion. (utilization/functionality)</p> <p>4.3 % of projects that require O&M with adequate O&M arrangements for projects. (sustainability)</p> <p>4.4 % of beneficiaries satisfied with the timeliness and quality of the projects. (quality)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MIS ▪ SP functionality assessment ▪ Gov't supervision mission reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SP functionality assessment ▪ Gov't supervision mission reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SP functionality assessment ▪ Gov't supervision mission reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SP functionality assessment ▪ Process evaluation ▪ Gov't supervision mission reports ▪ Qualitative IE 	<p>Quarterly Annual</p> <p>Quarterly</p> <p>Annual</p> <p>Quarterly</p> <p>Annual</p> <p>Quarterly</p> <p>Annual</p> <p>Annual Quarterly</p> <p>Endline</p>	<p>DBM DBM</p> <p>DILG</p> <p>DBM</p> <p>DILG</p> <p>DBM</p> <p>DILG</p> <p>DBM</p> <p>DBM DILG</p> <p>DBM</p>	

5. GPB is managed satisfactorily and all stakeholders coordinate effectively.	5.1 % of NGA ROs that submit satisfactory progress reports within 20 days after the end of each quarter.	▪ MIS	Quarterly	DILG	
	5.2 % of LGUs that conduct quarterly LPRAT meetings.	▪ CM report	Quarterly	DILG	
	5.3 Publicly accessible GPBP platform is established and progress is displayed on time.		Quarterly	DBM	
	5.4 % of registered citizen feedback addressed satisfactorily.	▪ NAPC GRM report	Quarterly	NAPC	
	5.5 % of CSO Assemblies held in time for the LRPAP workshops.	▪ CM report	Quarterly	DILG	
	5.6 % increase in the perception of better coordination/information exchange among all stakeholders.	▪ Process evaluation ▪ Qualitative IE	Annual Endline	DBM DBM	

List of Proposed Studies

No.	Study	Description	Frequency/ Timing	Responsible Agency	Estimated Cost (Php.)
1.	Annual Process Assessment	Sample-based assessment that examines the quality of the participatory decision-making process i.e.- who participates and who actually influences the decision-making. The study will undertake a comparative analysis between with and without a LPRAP facilitator and Bottom-up Budgeting only vs. Bottom-up Budgeting + KALAHI-CIDSS sites. The study will illuminate necessary changes in the process for the subsequent round. The study will also continue to survey the same set of sample sites to provide longitudinal data and assess any changes over time. The study will help validate the third party monitoring supervised by NAPC.	Annual	DBM/DILG	
3.	Qualitative Impact Evaluation	As quantitative impact evaluation is not possible, a qualitative study will be undertaken based on a stratified sample that tries to capture a representative sample of municipalities/cities with different socio-economic profiles. The evaluation will try to capture both the process and the outcomes of Bottom-up Budgeting to illuminate some key lessons learned.	End of 2016	WB	
4.	Sub-Project Functionality Assessment	The study will take a sample of different types of sub-projects financed under Bottom-up Budgeting, and assess their technical quality and the sustainability, and identify areas that need to be strengthened e.g. – more facilitation on operation & maintenance, technical supervision etc. The first assessment will be conducted in 2015 Q1 to capture the FY2013 subprojects (to be completed around 2014 Q3), and 2016 Q1 to capture the FY2014 subprojects as well as the O&M status of FY2013 subprojects one year after completion.	2015 Q1 2016 Q1	DBM/DILG	