

1 CHAPTER 9

---

2 **Influencing Public Policy**

3 **MARIA FE VILLAMEJOR-MENDOZA**

4 SUMMARY Despite being fully aware that influencing public policy is a  
5 long and tedious process, the University of the Philippines (UP) and the  
6 University of Manchester (UM) embarked on a higher education link on  
7 The Social Impact of Administrative Reforms, 2000-2006. The link evolved  
8 into a major resource for policy recommendations, knowledge sharing and  
9 multi-stakeholder consultative dialogues on such areas as privatisation and  
10 new public management, regulation and competition, combating corruption  
11 and rebuilding trust, electoral reform and democracy audit, and access of  
12 the poor to basic services such as water, power and telecommunications. It  
13 has strengthened the strategic partnership between these two leading  
14 academic institutions in the Philippines and the United Kingdom. It has  
15 also enhanced the policy research and other capabilities of both  
16 universities. Its activities have fed into the discourse of governance and  
17 development and into the agenda of policy change in the Philippines. It  
18 was a wise investment for development.

19 **Introduction**

20 Influencing public policy is a long and tedious process of policy  
21 advocacy. It may or may not result in immediate reforms, as chances are  
22 it may take beyond one's lifetime before changes in the policy arena may  
23 be accepted by the authorities and decision makers.[1] Nevertheless, it is  
24 an important strategy as it is within the realm of a Millennium  
25 Development Goal (MDG), number 8 to be precise, which is 'to develop a  
26 global partnership for development' committed to good governance and  
27 poverty reduction (United Nations Development Programme, 2005).

28 The higher education link between the National College of Public  
29 Administration and Governance (NCPAG), University of the Philippines  
30 (UP) and the Institute for Development Policy and Management (IDPM),  
31 University of Manchester (UM) has, to some extent, contributed to the

32 achievement of this goal through more progressive policy research and  
33 studies on selected concerns and consultative dialogues and networking  
34 with policy-makers and other relevant parties. These were done so that  
35 these stakeholders will be armed with clearer lenses and more  
36 enlightened bases for their policy decisions which, hopefully, may serve  
37 the public interest better. However, the link cannot claim complete credit  
38 for actual policy reforms that ensued, for example the Electric Power  
39 Industry Reform Act, revisions in water concessionaires' agreements or  
40 contracts and so on, because in addition to the inputs of the link, many  
41 other factors and actors interface to influence policy decisions and  
42 government actions.

43 This chapter chronicles these policy-influencing interventions of  
44 the link. It also analyses some of the ingredients or critical factors for  
45 successful policy reforms advocacy in the public sector, with the end in  
46 view of drawing lessons from the link's experience in shepherding  
47 reforms. It also suggests measures to sustain these gains beyond 2006, the  
48 official end of the link.

## 49 **Celebrating the Link's Interventions**

### 50 *The Context*

51 The timing of the link was fortuitous. It started in 1999 when IDPM was  
52 looking for a base to continue its long-standing partnership with UP, and  
53 specifically, shepherd policy ideas and reforms which it has generated  
54 through policy research on stabilisation and Structural Adjustment  
55 Policies (SAPs) in developing countries focusing on privatisation and  
56 liberalisation.

57 At that time, the NCPAG was also expanding its institutional  
58 linkages in order to more actively engage partners in critical discourse on  
59 public sector reforms. 'New public management', 're-engineering and  
60 reinventing governments', together with privatisation, deregulation and  
61 liberalisation, were the buzzwords that were seemingly believed to be  
62 fashionable then to adopt a-contextually in developing countries. Most of  
63 these reforms form part of the SAPs imposed on borrower countries by  
64 multilateral donor agencies. These were policy concerns that worried  
65 many concerned constituencies including NCPAG, as these have wide-  
66 ranging implications on the 'weakening of the state', the costs on the  
67 poor, and the role of governance in all these configurations.

68 The need to continue the re-examination on which policy reforms  
69 benefit the poor, as well as explore alternative solutions suited to the  
70 economic, cultural and political milieus of developing countries, urged a  
71 group of progressive 'intellectuals' from IDPM and NCPAG to organise  
72 themselves, continue what they have been doing, engage in the 'world of  
73 action' [2] and enhance the academe's role as social critic and partner in  
74 development.

75 *The Programme*

76 After a series of meetings and dialogues between IDPM and NCPAG  
77 (physically [3] in Manila and Manchester and virtually over the Web), a  
78 policy agenda to include the policy concerns listed above was crafted. In  
79 addition to these being the burning issues of the day, these themes were  
80 also the major interests of the two institutions and the preferences of the  
81 core group of the link.

82 The agenda was developed into a full-blown programme on the  
83 ‘Social Impact of Public Policy and Public Administration Reform in the  
84 Philippines’. It hopes to contribute to the rethinking of policy and reform  
85 initiatives in the public sector through such interventions as conduct of  
86 policy research and studies, consultative dialogues and meetings, visits  
87 and exchanges, and library materials acquisition. It received technical  
88 assistance from the British Council (BC)-Philippines and funding from  
89 the Department for International Development (DfID), United Kingdom  
90 (UK).

91 To guide the implementation of the programme, a logical  
92 framework was developed to contain the following: the link’s planned  
93 activities, purposes, outputs and impacts/effects (see Appendix 1). It was  
94 hoped that the link would progress according to plan such that by the  
95 end of the link period, policy and decision makers and other relevant  
96 parties engaged in the activities of the link would have been more aware  
97 of the pros and cons of policy alternatives and reforms. Also, the  
98 expectations were for the policy process to have been more participative  
99 and consultative and the collaborators of governance, for example, the  
100 government, civil society, business and the citizens themselves, would  
101 have been more engagingly cooperating among themselves to ensure  
102 transparency, accessibility and accountability in public transactions, to  
103 promote decentralisation and devolution, and generally to foster good  
104 governance.

105 However, as expected, something always happens along the way to  
106 frustrate or facilitate the realisation of these plans. Policy stakeholders  
107 may be difficult to convene. Policy studies may suffer from deficiency of  
108 relevant information. Resources may be inadequate. Moreover, and as  
109 earlier intimated, policy advocacy is a long, winding and tedious  
110 process. The hydraulic pressure and tension between and among interest  
111 and cause-oriented groups in the policy arena is so intense that the  
112 mortality among the faint-hearted is high! Others just fade away,  
113 especially when discouraged by the seeming insensitiveness or apathy of  
114 policy-makers to their advocacy. Fortunately, the link generally did not  
115 fail as the policy and decision makers and other relevant stakeholders in  
116 the country received its proposals and other outputs/inputs to their  
117 decision making more favourably (see section on Effects).

118           **The Core Partners**

119       The link spanned six years, from 2000 to 2006. The core group included,  
120       from the UP side, the dean/s and faculty of NCPAG led by Professors  
121       Ledivina Carino, Maria Concepcion Alfiler and Alex Brillantes, Jr, and  
122       the de facto ‘coordinator’-designate, Professor Maria Fe Mendoza [4]; and  
123       from the UM side the faculty of IDPM led by Professors Paul Cook and  
124       Martin Minogue.

125       Officially, the link had coordinators from both institutions. The  
126       dean represented NCPAG and Professor Cook represented IDPM. During  
127       the formative stages of the link, discussions and deliberations were  
128       physically held in Manila and Manchester. Later, when templates were  
129       established and major agreements on most points had been reached,  
130       discussions were virtually held via the Internet.

131       Decision making was joint, collegial and consultative as faculty  
132       members from both institutions participated in identifying policy thrusts  
133       and activities for particular periods. At the end of the day though, final  
134       judgement on which activities to pursue and who would go on exchange  
135       visits, present papers and so on, rested with the respective coordinators.  
136       A small staff complement based at the Dean’s Office of NCPAG and at  
137       Professor Cook’s office at IDPM (and later, at IDPM – Centre for  
138       Regulation and Competition, or CRC) served as the secretariat and  
139       administrative liaisons between the link partners and the BC-  
140       Philippines.

141           **The Activities**

142       As gleaned from Appendix 1, the link basically focused on the following  
143       activities related to policy advocacy and dialogue:

- 144       1. *Knowledge generation* through policy and related research and  
145       analysis, leading to the creation and management of an information  
146       base on regulation, competition, privatisation, combating corruption  
147       and improving access of the poor and other public sector reforms.
- 148       2. *Policy awareness raising* through consultative policy dialogues,  
149       networking, information dissemination and mobilising support of the  
150       public concerned, e.g. regulators, legislators, stakeholders in public  
151       utility companies and others involved in concrete policy agendas  
152       identified by the link partners.
- 153       3. *Policy influencing*, at the national and international levels, by  
154       involving policy-makers, political leaders and legislators in a  
155       dialogue process and by contributing to the preparation of policy  
156       documents and policy briefs on such areas as regulation, democracy  
157       assessment, rebuilding trust, improving access of the poor to public  
158       services such as water, telecommunications, electricity, and local  
159       services.

- 160 4. *Capacity building*, by way of organising policy appreciation  
 161 workshops for policy-makers and other important stakeholder  
 162 groups, as well as internally, through off-site PhD grants to faculty  
 163 and staff of UP.

### 164 **The Outputs**

165 Not all that was initially planned was achieved. The link started with a  
 166 very ambitious package of interventions to materially make a difference  
 167 in policy change and reform in the country. It hoped to do policy  
 168 research focused on a wide range of policy concerns such as poverty  
 169 alleviation, environmental protection and sustainable development,  
 170 empowering vulnerable groups, and gender and development.

171 Later, however, it dawned on the team that it can only do so much  
 172 in relation to their competency and expertise, resources and institutional  
 173 thrusts. Thus, as against planned targets, the link was able to produce  
 174 ‘only’ the following outputs from 2000-2006 (Table I):  
 175

Activities	Planned	Actual accomplishments
Policy research	On three major concerns: (1) poverty alleviation, state of the environment and sustainable development; (2) public sector reforms and the poor; (3) best practices for good governance, ensuring transparency and accountability and promoting decentralisation	Mainly policy concerns (2) and (3), with focus on regulation, competition, privatisation and public sector reforms; promoting transparency and accountability and access of the poor to basic services such as water, local services and telecommunications
Policy conferences, forums	On such issues as: (1) building capacities for good governance; (2) gender and development; (3) transparency and accountability; (4) environmental protection; (5) innovations to improve access and representation of vulnerable groups	Mainly (1) and (3)
Visits	At least once a year for each partner institution	There was a year when the UK partners did not come to Manila

176  
 177 Table I. Comparison of planned and actual accomplishments.  
 178

179 Specifically, the link's outputs were a number of policy research works,  
180 knowledge products and policy forums mainly on the following  
181 substantive policy concerns:

- 182 (a) privatisation and new public management, regulation and  
183 competition;
- 184 (b) access of the poor to basic services, such as water, electricity and  
185 telecommunications;
- 186 (c) democracy audit and electoral reform, governance, combating  
187 corruption and rebuilding trust in institutions.

188 A more detailed summary of these accomplishments is in Appendix 2.

189 As earlier intimated, these outputs were reflective of the substantive  
190 'comfort zones', preferences and thrusts of the link partners. Some policy  
191 concerns such as poverty alleviation, environmental protection, gender  
192 and development were not studied, mainly because of time and other  
193 constraints. However, other link activities such as capacity development  
194 activities, in terms of visits/exchanges and degree programmes,  
195 workshops and forums, were mindful of gender equality and balance.

196 As planned, the policy research was meant to feed into the policy-  
197 makers' agendas through policy dialogues and forums. The link thus  
198 organised a number of forums, with policy-makers and regulators acting  
199 as resource persons or reactors to the results and findings of the link's  
200 researches and studies. Among these were the workshop with regulators  
201 in 2002; the international conference on regulation and competition with  
202 the CRC, a research and policy advocacy programme spinning off from  
203 the link, in 2003; and the forum on regulatory governance in 2005. Re-  
204 examinations of public sector reforms such as deregulation, privatisation  
205 and liberalisation and their implications on poverty alleviation and the  
206 access of the poor to basic social services were discussed in these  
207 forums.

208 Studies on democracy audit, accountability and combating  
209 corruption were also presented for dialogues with policy-makers, civil  
210 society organisations and other concerned stakeholders in 2004 and  
211 2006. Outputs of these dialogues included proposed policy remedies and  
212 reform proposals, next-step advocacies and knowledge products such as  
213 working papers, journal articles, course notes and web page and link  
214 materials for utilisation and downloading by the more electronically and  
215 technologically adept users and the public.

216 All knowledge products were given free to the participants of the  
217 forums, and disseminated to the link's networks of partners. The latter  
218 include, among others, the Association of Schools of Public  
219 Administration in the Philippines (ASPAP), the Philippine Society for  
220 Public Administration (PSPA), and the Government of the Philippines-  
221 United Nations Development Programme (GOP-UNDP) Fostering  
222 Democratic Governance Programme, which covers a network of 34 or so

223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229

230        **Effects**

231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264

**IS THIS REF TO UNDP 2002A OR 2002B?**

265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296

**Overall Assessment of the Link**

297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307

(British Council & the Department for International Development, 2006)  
was generally positive in that it is very comprehensive and geared

308 towards the development objectives of the DfID, among them the  
309 achievement of MDG8. However, because of its broad scope and time  
310 constraints, some concerns were not touched on or studied. To reiterate,  
311 these were on such topics as the evaluation of poverty alleviation  
312 programmes and other approaches to improve the quality of life of  
313 Filipinos, evaluation of the effects of public sector reforms on the poor  
314 and marginalised, sustainable development, and promoting  
315 decentralisation and devolution (see sections on Outputs and Effects).

316 In general, the higher education link has afforded UP and UM  
317 opportunities to foster collaboration in research, teaching, policy  
318 advocacy and knowledge dissemination on public policy and public  
319 sector reform. Hopefully in the future, these will lead to better public  
320 policies and reform, and good governance for public welfare.

### 321 **Some Lessons Learned: why were we successful?**

322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350

351  
352  
353  
354  
355

356

357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369

370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376

*(a) Common 'ground'*

378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387

*(b) Able leadership, stewardship, commitment and cooperation of partners; able support of BC and DfID*

390  
391  
392  
393

394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434

**OK TO CHANGE THESE TO C, D AND E TO FOLLOW ON FROM A AND B ABOVE? (THEY WERE A, B, C IN YOUR ORIGINAL)** *Previous partnerships and engagements*

*(d) Flexible work programme*

*(e) Mutual trust and respect*

435

436

437 then to say about the experiences in managing this link? A number of  
438 lessons come to mind:

439

440 *1. Start with a clear vision*

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451 *2. Begin with few advocates*

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463 *3. Build upon professional and personal partnerships*

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472 *4. Engage the 'objects' of intervention early and make them partners of*  
473 *change as well*

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

*5. Be brave*

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

*6. Accept limitations.* The link partners are not naïve in acknowledging the limits of their intervention, early on, in the process. They knew that their work could influence public policy processes only to a certain extent and the actual decision and formulation of policy changes and reforms in the public arena remain in the hands of the policy-makers themselves. The partners are nevertheless happy that they can work beyond their ivory towers and contribute to the real world of policy reform, albeit only modestly.

510

The link has evolved into a major resource for policy recommendations, knowledge sharing and multi-stakeholder consultative dialogues on such areas as privatisation and new public management, regulation and competition, combating corruption and rebuilding trust, electoral reform and democracy audit, and access of the poor to basic services such as water, power and telecommunications. It has strengthened the strategic partnership between two leading academic institutions in the Philippines and the United Kingdom. It has enhanced the policy research and other capabilities of both universities. Moreover, the activities that UP and UM did as part of the link have fed into the discourse of governance and development and into the agenda of policy change in the Philippines.

523 It was a good engagement, and a worthy ‘product’ of the academe. It  
524 was a wise investment for development.

525 The partnership does not need to end merely because its  
526 development support officially ended on March 2006. It has to be  
527 continued. To sustain the gains of the partnership, earnest efforts have to  
528 be exerted to share the successes of the link. In addition, efforts to  
529 publish the knowledge products of the link have to be made in order to  
530 provide a legacy of sorts to the future generation of development  
531 advocates. Efforts in this direction have been under way, with the CRC  
532 and BC helping in the publication of a book series on regulation and  
533 competition – the dissertation and PhD theses of UP faculty members  
534 who were part of the link.

535 Earlier, a book entitled *Privatization, Regulation and Public Sector*  
536 *Reform*

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568 as these enhance the administration of public service delivery for the  
569 poor. For UM, it could lodge and disseminate its knowledge products on  
570 regulatory governance and the poor with its international collaborators in  
571 the CRC.

572 This link between UM and UP beyond 2006 could address such  
573 concerns as the need to strengthen citizenship and grass-roots capacity,  
574 nurture the downstream networks, or the communities themselves, and  
575 equip the base of society, that is, the masses, for sustainable development  
576 and poverty alleviation. The link would continue to reach out to and  
577 collaborate with other academics and governance players in the country  
578 and elsewhere in order that this social impact analysis of public policy  
579 and public administrative reforms contributes significantly in the efforts  
580 of the DfID to combat poverty, ensure environmental sustainability,  
581 improve governance and public administration, and sustain global  
582 partnership for development.

583 The series of publication activities and new engagements are  
584 envisioned to contribute to the gains of this collaboration, with the same  
585 intensity and resolve to do better in advocating progressive reforms that  
586 would significantly impact on the lives of our less privileged  
587 countrymen and women.

588

589 [1] The politics of policy-making in the Philippines is unlike in the UK  
590 where a relatively more developed policy think-tank sector is regularly  
591 consulted by the authorities for public policy decisions. Here, an  
592 amalgam of interest and policy groups jockey for position in order that  
593 their cause/s or advocacies may be heard. Some advocacies are listened  
594 to; others fall on deaf ears. Influencing public policy in this country is  
595 really a long struggle.

596 [2] Coleman (1972) coined this phrase to mean the real world outside the  
597 four walls of the classroom. It basically was a call for the academicians to  
598 step down from their ivory towers and make their ideas useful in policy  
599 advocacy and reform outside the academe.

600 [3] It was serendipitous that the first coordinators of the link, Professor Paul  
601 Cook and Professor Ledivina Carino, crossed paths during the link's  
602 formulation and formation stage. Professor Cook was in UP at that time,  
603 winding down IDPM's link with the UP School of Economics. Professor  
604 Carino, meanwhile, had several engagements in Europe as part of the  
605 International Society of Eminent Scholars, and had opportunities to talk  
606 with Professor Cook in Manchester for follow-through discussions.

607 [4] The link journeyed through three deanships in UP: (1) towards the end of  
608 the second term of Dean Carino (1998-2001); (2) the term of Dean Alfiler  
609 (2001-2004); and (3) the term of the incumbent dean, Professor Brillantes  
610 (2004-present). This explains the seeming change in the partner

- 611 institution coordinator for the UP side. For the UM side, there was no  
612 change as Professor Cook served as UK coordinator from beginning to  
613 end.
- 614 [5] Capacity building is defined as the ‘process of developing and  
615 strengthening the skills, instincts, abilities, processes and resources that  
616 organizations and communities need to survive, adapt, and thrive in the  
617 fast-changing world’ (Philbin, 1996). In this light, the link indeed helped  
618 in strengthening the portfolio of the College as it beefed up its roster of  
619 faculty with two PhD graduates.
- 620 [6] These are Professor Erwin Alampay and Miss Minerva Baylon. The latter  
621 was recruited into the faculty upon completion of her PhD from  
622 Manchester.
- 623 [7] The *development and dissemination*
- 624
- 625 [8] This includes BC Resident Officer Gill Westaway who took over the  
626 reigns of the Council in 2002. Its development officers managing the link  
627 have had three changes so far: Mae Genato in 1999 (conception stage),  
628 Nannette Mercado (initial years from 2000 to 2002), Rica Veloso  
629 (2002-2004) and Josue Claur (2004-2006).
- 630 [9] The higher order goal, which is seeing through actual reforms and  
631 changes in public policies, is however a different story and is the domain  
632 of the policy-makers themselves. The link may have little role to play in  
633 this endeavour.
- 634 [10] The term of Professor Carino saw the competition and regulation thrusts  
635 of the link more prominently studied. During the deanship of Professor  
636 Alfiler, the policy thrust was towards democratisation. When Professor  
637 Brillantes came in, the thrust was towards rebuilding trust and combating  
638 corruption. Their differing interests are fortunately converged in the link  
639 template which can accommodate as many diverse interests and causes as  
640 possible in the name of ‘social policy and public administration reforms’.
- 641 [11] The direction of interventions of this link was towards the policy-makers  
642 and other relevant stakeholders who could adjust policy-making and  
643 reform to work for the poor. The proposed direction of the new cycle or  
644 proposal would be towards the poor, thus balancing the equation.

645

646 British Council & the Department for International Development (2005)  
647 *Celebrating 25 Years of HE Links-East Asia*

648

649

*Policy Research*

650

*in the Social Sciences*

651

652

653

654

655

656

*Governance Concepts and Applications*

657

658

*Capacity Building in Social Justice Organizations*

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

uators. Monitoring and Evaluation Companion Series #1. New York:  
UNDP.

674

675

United Nations Development Programme (2002b) Second Philippines Progress  
Report on the Millennium Development Goals. New York: UNDP.

676

677

United Nations Development Programme (2005) Fostering Democratic  
Governance. A programme portfolio. Philippines.

678

679

University of the Philippines-NCPAG and University of Manchester-IDPM (1999)  
Concept Paper on the Proposed Higher Education Link on 'Social Impact of  
Public Policy and Public Administration Reform in the Philippines'.  
Programme Proposal submitted the British Council-Manila.

680

681

682

683

UP NCPAG and IDPM UM (2000-2006) Various reports on the HE link, 'Social  
Impact of Public Administration Reform, submitted to BC-Manila.

684



- 724 •
- 725
- 726 •

727  
728  
729 *Outputs*

- 730 •
- 731
- 732
- 733
- 734 •
- 735
- 736
- 737
- 738 •
- 739
- 740 •

741 *Purpose*

- 742 •
- 743
- 744
- 745
- 746
- 747
- 748 •
- 749
- 750
- 751
- 752 •
- 753
- 754
- 755
- 756 •
- 757
- 758
- 759

760 *Impacts/Effects*

- 761 •
- 762
- 763
- 764
- 765

766 •  
767 •  
768  
769 •  
770  
771

772 *Who benefits?*

773 •  
774 •  
775 •  
776

777  
778

779

06

780 : *Policy research*

781 *Outputs:*

782  
783

784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790

791  
792

793  
794  
795  
796

797

V. Mendoza

798 (2) 'The Political Economy of Regulating the Power Sector' by Ms  
799 Minerva S. Baylon

800 (3) 'The Access of the Poor in the Philippine Telecommunications  
801 Sector', 'Evaluating the Impact of Universal Access Models,  
802 Strategies, and Policies in ICTs on Poor Communities in the  
803 Philippines', 'Impact of ICTs', 'ICTs for Rural Poverty Reduction',  
804 and 'Use of ICTs for Community Participation' by Prof. Erwin  
805 Alampay

- 806 (4) 'Local Transport Regulation in the Philippines' by Prof. Perla  
807 Legaspi  
808 (5) 'Local Government Accountability' by Prof. Wilhelmina Cabo  
809 (6) 'Water Regulation in the Philippines' and 'The Impact on the Poor of  
810 Water Access in the Philippines' by Prof. Joyce Cuaresma  
811 (7) 'Citizenship: a Mode of Thinking (and Teaching)' by Prof. Edna Co  
812 (8) 'Towards a Research Agenda on Regulation, Privatization and  
813 Competition' by Profs Jose P. Tabbada, Maria Fe V. Mendoza and  
814 Minerva S. Baylon  
815 (9) 'Regulatory Governance Profile of the Philippines' by Profs Ledivina  
816 V. Carino, Jose Tabbada and Maria Fe V. Mendoza  
817 (10) 'Thatcher's Privatization Experience', 'Competition Policy and  
818 Development' by Prof. Paul Cook  
819 (11) 'Public Management and Regulatory Governance: Problems of Policy  
820 Transfer', 'New Public Management' by Martin Minogue  
821 (12) 'Corruption, Regulation and Governance Reforms: Issues for the  
822 State, Civil Society and AID Institutions' by Prof. Dennis Osborne  
823 (13) 'Governance, Partnership and Development' by Prof. Dennis Osborne  
824

825 In addition, a course on 'Special Problems in Public Administration:  
826 Combating Corruption and Rebuilding Trust' (PA 329) and its  
827 corresponding syllabus and source book/lecture notes was developed in  
828 2005 by Prof. Maria Fe V. Mendoza.  
829

830 A book entitled co-  
831 edited by Profs Paul Cook and Maria Fe V. Mendoza was published in  
832 2006. Three new books are in press,  
833 by Prof. Maria Fe V. Mendoza;  
834 by Prof. Minerva S. Baylon; and  
835 by Profs  
836 Erwin Alampay and Richard Heeks. These were planned to be written  
837 and launched by end of 2008.

838

839  
840

- 841 Conducted policy conferences, policy lectures and forums on  
842 (a) Thatcher's Privatisation by Prof. Paul Cook, October 2000, NCPAG,  
843 UP  
844 (b) New Public Management by Martin Minogue, October 2001, NCPAG,  
845 UP  
846 (c) Policy Issues Forum on the Omnibus Power Sector, March 2002,  
847 NCPAG, UP

- 848 (d) Corruption, Regulation and Governance reforms with Prof. Dennis  
849 Osborne, October 2002
- 850 (e) International Conference on Public Administration Plus Governance,  
851 October 2002, Manila Hotel
- 852 (f) Conference with Philippine Regulators, October 2002, Manila Hotel
- 853 (g) Pension Reform and Development by Prof. Armando Barrientos,  
854 January 2003, UP NCPAG
- 855 (h) Consultative Workshops on Public Enterprise Reform and  
856 Privatization in the Philippines, October 2002, June 2003, Discovery  
857 Suites
- 858 (i) International Conference on Regulation and Competition; Challenges  
859 and Innovations, October 2003, Shangri-la Hotel
- 860 (j) Policy Issues Forum on Power Sector Regulation, March 2004,  
861 NCPAG, UP
- 862 (k) Governance Forum on Electoral Reform, February 2005, UP NCPAG
- 863 (l) Governance Forum on Combating Corruption, March 2005, NCPAG,  
864 UP
- 865 (m) Governance Forum on Anti-corruption Efforts of the Civil Society  
866 Organizations, July 2005, UP NCPAG
- 867 (n) Governance Forum on Regulatory Governance, March 2006, UP  
868 NCPAG
- 869 (o) Governance Forum on Rebuilding Trust, March 2006, Linden Suites,  
870 Pasig
- 871 A number of policy briefs and conference papers were presented and  
872 disseminated in these forums and consultative dialogues. At least three  
873 Working Papers (on combating corruption, anti-corruption efforts of the  
874 civil society organisations, and regulatory governance) were published  
875 and circulated to the relevant parties and stakeholders.

876 *Visits*

877 *Outputs:*

878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887

888            *Activity: Library resource acquisition*

889            *Outputs*

890

891

892

893

894            *Activity: Equipment upgrade*

895            *Outputs*

896

897

898

899            *Activity: Others*

900            *Outputs*

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923            *Source*