

11 PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

QUEZON CITY

This Comprehensive Development Plan of Quezon City is in full compliance with the mandate of the City Development Council to initiate the preparation of a "multi-sectoral development plan". It is also a multi-year plan: long-term, medium-term and annual. (Sec106-108, RA 7160). As such, this CDP is a rich source of programs and projects, services and regulatory measures which future city administrations can use to steer the city towards the desired state as articulated in the vision statement.

In the preparation of this CDP enormous amounts of effort and time were expended by the different sectors and stakeholders. A considerable portion of inputs was spent on generating and analyzing the planning data base. This is necessary because the integrity and reliability of the data base depend on the validity and responsiveness of the proposed actions and policy interventions.

11.1 Preparatory Activities

A number of preparatory activities were undertaken by the sectoral TWGs at the CPDO to lay the groundwork for the conduct of transition workshops after the May 2010 elections. These preparatory activities are grouped around the three types of policy interventions, namely:

- 1) programs/projects;
- 2) non-projects or services; and,
- 3) proposed legislations.

11.1.1 Structuring Proposed Projects

Projects are the basic inputs to the 3-year Local Development Investment Program (LDIP) from which annual components to be included in the Annual Investment Program (AIP) will be culled out. The long list of projects by the five sectors in this CDP needs to be further sifted and structured so that only those projects that are "owned" by the city shall be included in the LDIP. As earlier indicated, the LDIP process shall be undertaken after the CDC will have been reconstituted following the swearing in of the new set of local officials. This is to ensure that the new administration will have a sense of ownership of the plan and thus feel compelled to implement it.

Prior to the LDIP process the following preparatory activities were undertaken by each sectoral committee.

1'. Sifting projects according to ownership. It must be noted that the lists of projects in this CDP represent what the sectoral committees have determined to be necessary to address the issues and fill the gaps that emerged in their respective data analysis. Some of the projects identified are the responsibility of the national government; others properly belong to the individual barangays. Still other projects could be assumed by non-government sectors. These should now be classified and distributed to the different agencies and sectors concerned. Only those for which the city is responsible shall be collected as inputs to the LDIP process.

2. Prioritizing projects within each sector. Not all projects listed by each sector, even if all of these are owned by the city, may be submitted to the CDC for inclusion in the LDIP. Because of the large number of projects from all the sectors combined, it may be necessary for the CDC Secretariat to limit the number of projects to be submitted by each sector. When this happens, each of the sectors should select projects which they deem to be urgent. For this purpose, tools for short-listing projects such as the Conflict- Compat-

ibility-Complementarity (CCC) Matrix, the Project-Resource Impact Matrix, or the Urgency Test may be used.

For easy reference, the criteria for determining the levels of urgency of projects are listed in the Table 11.1.

3. Preparation of project briefs.

Before submitting their priority projects for consideration in the LDIP process, each of the sectors or its proponent/s should prepare a project brief for every proposed project. The project brief should have the following contents:

- a. Name and type of project
- b. Activity components
- c. Estimated cost of resource inputs per activity component
- d. Justification for the project
- e. Target beneficiaries
- f. Target outputs or success indicators
- g. Possible risks or external factors
- h. Expected private sector response

Table 11.1 Criteria for Project Ranking

Level of Urgency	Criteria
Urgent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot be reasonably postponed • Would remedy conditions dangerous to public health, safety and welfare • Needed to maintain critically needed programs • Needed to meet emergency situations
Essential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required to complete or make usable a major public improvement • Required to maintain minimum standards as part of on-going programs • Desirable self-liquidating projects • External funding is available
Necessary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be carried out to meet clearly identified and anticipated needs • Needed to replace obsolete or unsatisfactory facilities • Repair or maintenance projects to prolong life of existing facilities
Desirable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needed for expansion of existing projects • Designed to initiate new programs considered appropriate for a progressive community
Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nice to have, but can be postponed without detriment to present operations if budget cuts are necessary
Deferrable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended for postponement or elimination from immediate consideration in the current LDIP • Questionable in terms of over-all needs, adequate planning or proper timing.

11.1.2 Structuring Non-Projects

The long list of non-projects or services which the different sectors deemed as necessary to carry out the identified policy interventions have to be further processed as well. The first thing to do is to check whether the identified service can be upgraded to a project.

1. Upgrading non-projects to

projects.

An activity that is listed as a non-project can be changed into a project if it satisfies the following criteria:

- There is a definite output to be produced.
- There is a sense of urgency to produce the output.
- The activity is not likely to be repeated within the next 3 years.

If upgrade is possible, the new project should be added to the list of projects to be considered for inclusion in the LDIP. On the other hand, if upgrade is not possible, the activity should be retained as non-project and further analyzed as follows:

- Break the service or non-project into its specific activity or task components.
- Identify the office or department responsible for carrying out the service as part of its functions.
- Match the needed tasks with the capacity of the responsible office or department.
- Suggest appropriate actions as needed.
- Summarize the results into the

following format as in Table 11.2:

The results of this process should provide inputs, first, to the Budget Office as an aid to determining the level of increases in the MOOE of individual offices. This should put to an end the practice of giving uniform fixed-rate escalation of the MOOE component of the local budget. Secondly, the results should provide a basis for the HRMO to design intra-and inter-office / department capability building programs.

11.1.3 Structuring Needed Legislations

Finally, the list of needed regulatory measures identified by the different sectors should find its way into the legislative agenda of the *SangguniangPanlungsod*.

Pending completion of the computerized Legislative Tracking System it was not possible for the different sectors to determine whether the legislation ideas they identified are already existent or still non-existent. It is now incumbent upon the legislative staff through the office of the SP Secretary to collect and probe the suggested legislations listed in the CDP. The suggested

logical framework for analyzing each proposed legislation is as follows:

Table 11.2 Template for Farming Out of Non-Projects

Service/ Non-Project Proposed	Activity or Task Components	Department/ Office Responsible	Gaps in Capacity of Responsible Dept./ Office	Recommended Action

Jurisdiction. Ascertain whether the proposed legislation is within the LGU's prescribed powers.

Those found to be outside the LGU's powers to enact should be submitted to the Congressmen who are regular members of the CDC for them to file the necessary bill in Congress. In addition, the proposed legislation may be lobbied before identified advocates in the Senate.

Existence. Among the proposals that fall within the LGU's prescribed powers, determine whether there are any existing SP outputs that are of the same or similar subject as the proposed one. If none, simply propose enactment of a new legislation. If already existent, inquire into whether it is still sound in construction.

Soundness of construction. If construction is defective, propose amendment or repeal or total replacement. If still sound in construction, probe into its implementation.

Implementation. If the legislation is of sound construction and is implemented properly, what is obviously needed is to monitor the outcome and impact on the affected population. On the other hand, if the implementation is encountering problems, the questions to be considered are: what seem to be the causes of such difficulties? Is it due to deficiencies of the implementing body? Can these short-

comings be corrected by another legislation or will an executive issuance suffice?

For easy reference, summarize the results in tabular form as shown

Table 11.3 Template for Processing Needed Local Legislation

Title of Proposed Legislation	Status		Subject Classification	SP Committee for Referral	Possible Sponsor
	New	Amendment			

in Table 11.3 below.

11.2 LDIP Process

The results of the project structuring preparatory activities set the stage for the preparation of the 3-year LDIP by the reconstituted CDC. The resulting List of Prioritized Projects is presented in Table 10.4.

11.3 ELA Process

The LDIP, added to the results of the preparatory structuring of legislative proposals, will become an input to the preparation of the next 3-year Executive- Legislative Agenda (ELA).

11.4 CDP Legitimization

QC CDP and Local Development Investment Program (LDIP) 2017-2020 was approved by the City Development Council during its session on CDC Regular Meeting held 20th of July, 2017 