

# COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLANNING CAPACITY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT UNITS IN SAMAR PHILIPPINES

Rosalina Salazar-Quitilig<sup>1</sup>, Ronald L. Orale

<sup>1</sup>Planning Office, Samar Provincial Government, Philippines

[ayensalazarquitilig@gmail.com](mailto:ayensalazarquitilig@gmail.com)

## Abstract

Like in other countries land use planning is imperative because of the scarcity of land. Land use planning aims to find a balance among competing and sometimes contradictory uses. In the Philippines, all local government units (LGUs) from the province, city, and municipality are mandated to formulate its Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUPs). This paper assesses the capacity of the planning team of the LGUs in the CLUP preparation. It takes the case of the Province of Samar, one of the hardest hit provinces during Super Typhoon Yolanda "Haiyan." Its methodology includes primary data gathering through interview using a structured questionnaire among the planning teams of one provincial, two cities and 21 municipalities out of 27 LGUs in the preparation of comprehensive land use plan. It is supported by secondary data from the Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board, and the Provincial Land Use Committee. The study result showed that capacity building is desperately needed by CLUP planners as LGUs are unable to craft this required document. CLUP planners are not equipped to deal with the issues of CLUP formulation, not just regarding know-how but also regarding staffing, equipment, and database. These weaknesses of the LGUs may have contributed to the high poverty incidence in Samar; failing to plan is planning to fail. It is recommended that the government provide a packaged technical assistance on the whole cycle of CLUP preparation with corresponding funding to fully capacitate the cities and municipalities.

**Keywords:** CLUP preparation, LGU capacity needs, Province of Samar, Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction, DRR/CCA

## I. INTRODUCTION

"Land is a scarce resource increasingly affected by the competition of mutually exclusive uses." In rural areas, the fertile lands are threatened by population growth, illegal logging resulting in erosion, environmental pollution, effects of climate change, urbanization. On the remaining land, other users compete to achieve food security, economic growth, energy supply,

nature conservation, and other objectives (FAO/UNEP, 1999).

The scarcity of land makes land use planning imperative. Land use planning "can help to find a balance among these competing and sometimes contradictory uses" (Land Use Planning, GIZ, 2011:1). "Land use planning is defined as a systematic and iterative procedure carried out to create an enabling environment for sustainable development of land resources

which meets people's needs and demands. It assesses the physical, socio-economic, institutional and legal potentials and constraints on an optimal and sustainable use of land resources, and empowers people to make decisions about how to allocate those resources" (FAO/UNEP 1999: 14).

Land Use Plan is a blueprint for local development. It is also defined as the "rational approach of allocating available land resources as equitably as possible among competing user groups and for different functions ..." (Section 3(k) of RA 7279 known as the "Urban Development and Housing Act of 1992). Further, " a CLUP shall delineate actual boundaries on the ground within the territorial jurisdiction, embody the desired land use patterns of the barangay, city or municipality, translate and integrate sectoral plans, and provide appropriate policies for each of the four land use planning categories (HLURB, 2013).

Why is CLUP important? CLUP plays a vital role in the development of a locality, as a tool it is used in response to the current constraints and challenges of development of achieving food security, mitigating and adapting to climate change, protecting biodiversity while at the same time initiating economic growth, protecting people from natural disasters, preventing and settling land are just a few of the many challenges rural areas in developing countries are currently facing, which can be addressed through land use planning. Hence, a CLUP is necessary as it is one of the tools that can help to meet them as it focuses on negotiating future land and resource uses by all relevant stakeholders (GIZ, 2012).

Further, in the CLUP process- the importance of participatory planning is an invaluable ingredient. This builds on a participatory land use and development planning process by the communities and for the communities. It ensures that people directly affected by the plan and those who

will implement it also participate in its formulation. In short, they make the plan. This process can dramatically change the insight and accuracy of the situational analysis, the practicality of the target results, the acceptability of the methods, and hence the probability of successful implementation. But the absence of which can result in a fragmented and multiple sectoral plans (GIZ, 2013:10).

Finally, LGUs in Samar are confronted with challenges of developing and managing their territories, such as the impending threats of disasters and climate change, the vulnerabilities of the province to various hazards (DRVA, 2013) as experienced during the devastation brought by typhoons Glenda, Ruby, and Yolanda. Moreover, the lack of capacity of LGUs in CLUP preparation is evidenced by the few numbers of PLUC approved CLUP, outdated and, the presence of LGUs with no CLUPs.

It is with the above-stated contention that the researcher deemed it necessary to conduct this study which assessed the planning capacities of the LGUs and answered the question why majority were unable to complete their CLUPs.

This study also presented the capacity assessment results of the LGU in the preparation of this mandated document.

## II. METHODOLOGY

The study used both primary and secondary data. Primary data were gathered through the conduct of interview using a structured questionnaire. The secondary data were collected from the Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board, and the Provincial Land Use Committee.

### 2.1 Research Design

This study is a descriptive research and was conducted using structured interview questionnaire.

## 2.2 Research Locale

The research locale is in the Province of Samar. It covered 24 out of 27 LGUs, which comprise of one provincial, two cities and 21 municipalities.

## 2.3 Participants

The participants were among the HLURB suggested planning core team and support group. The planning core team may include the following: Municipal Planning and Development Coordinators (MPDCs); Municipal Engineers (MEs) Municipal Architecture/ Environmental Planner; and, Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Officers (DRRMOs).

The support group composed of any or all of the following: encoder/writer/ mapper/ draftsman/researcher; Sangguniang Bayan (SB) Representative on Housing; Department of Education District Supervisor; Municipal Health Officer (MHO); Municipal Social Welfare and Development Officer (MSWDO); Philippine National Police (PNP); SK Federation; and, Legal Expert as needed.

## 2.4 Data Gathering

The researcher personally distributed the questionnaires to the respondents during their monthly meeting and another forum. The other questionnaires were personally distributed to the respondents in carline municipalities. The remaining questionnaires were mailed to the MPDCs in the island and geographically isolated municipalities.

## 2.5 Instrumentation

The instrument used in the study was a structured interview questionnaire which requires according to Cristobal and Cristobal (2013:168) the skill of the interviewer to express his thoughts clearly. The structured questionnaire was used because the possible answers were already provided and

respondents just have to select from them. The questionnaire covered queries on the respondent's profile; awareness, knowledge, and attitude about Comprehensive Land Use Plan Formulation; institutional and technical capacities of the LGU for Land Use Planning. The study also attempted to draw information on the LGUs level of understanding of Comprehensive Land Use Plan Formulation in general and the basic tools used in CLUP planning, in particular.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section contains the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the results of the study on a.) The respondent's profile; b) awareness, knowledge and attitude about CLUP Formulation; and, c) institutional and technical capacities of the LGU for Comprehensive Land Use Planning.

### 3.1 Status of CLUPs

Almost all LGUs in the Province of Samar have outdated CLUPs except that of Calbayog City which is still within its 20-year plan period (CLUP usually have a 10- year plan period).

Among the 27 LGUs comprising of one province, two cities, and 24 municipalities, only one city and three municipalities in the Province of Samar have Sangguniang Panlalwigan (SP) approved CLUPs. These were reviewed by the Provincial Land Use Committee as mandated in EO 72 which provides for the preparation and implementation of the CLUPs of the LGUs. These are the CLUPs of Basey, Calbayog City, Marabut, and Motiong. The other twelve LGUs have CLUPs approved by the HLURB before the passage of EO 72 which include the CLUPs of Catbalogan City, municipalities of Calbiga, Daram, Gandara, Hinabangan, Jiabong, Paranas, Sta. Rita, San Jorge, Sta. Margarita, Tarangnan, and, Villareal. The

remaining 10 LGUs of Almagro, Pagsanghan, Matuguinao, Pinabacdao, San Jose de Buan, San Sebastian, Sto. Nino, Tagapul-an, Talalora, and Zummarraga do not have approved CLUP at all (Refer to Table 1).

The Province of Samar has an approved Provincial Physical Framework Plan (PPFP), 1993-2002 crafted through the Technical Assistance on Physical Planning (TAPP) funded by the Australian Aid (AusAid). The PPFP was reviewed by the Regional Land Use Committee (RLUC) and approved by the Housing and Land Use Regulatory (HLURB) National Land Use Commission/Board of Commissioners through Resolution No. 720 Series of 2002.

A successor plan entitled Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plan (PDPFP), 2010-2015 was also crafted with the technical assistance of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA). Then, subsequent technical assistance was provided jointly by the

Australian Government, European Commission, United Nations Development Program, and, NEDA through the project "Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Process."

Thus, crafting the "Disaster Risk Reduction/Climate Change Adaptation Enhanced Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plan, 2010-2015 approved by the Sangguniang Panlalawigan through SP Resolution No. 14-053-14. Recently, the Province of Samar through its provincial funds updated its DRR/CCA Enhanced PDPFP with Plan Period 2016-2021 approved through SP Resolution No. 14-118-15.

The Province of Samar has approved Plans while the municipalities don't have. Why? Probably because of the series of technical capacity building and financial assistance provided to the former and the absence or lack of the same to the later, respectively. This could denote that a

Table 1. Status of Provinces, Cities, and Municipalities With and Without Approved CLUPs, December 2015

Province/City/Municipality	Date Approved	Resolution No	Municipalities without CLUPs
1. Calbayog City	1-Dec-2005	SP 11-190-05	1. Almagro 2. Matuguinao 3. Pagsanghan 4. Pinabacdao 5. San Jose de Buan 6. San Sebastian 7. Sto. Nino 8. Tagapul-an 9. Talalora 10. Zummarraga  Of the 17 with CLUP, only one is active.
2. Marabut	20-Aug-2003	SP 116-03	
3. Motiong	17-Mar-2005	SP 1133	
4. PPFP* of W. Samar	17-Apr-2002	R 720**	
5. Basey	1-Jun-2000	SP 108	
6. Hinabangan	21-Oct-1991	R494, S91	
7. Gandara	21-Apr-1987	R380, S87	
8. Sta. Margarita	4-Apr-1986	R297, S86	
9. Villareal	22-Nov-1985	R271, S85	
10. Daram	11-Jul-1985	R249, S85	
11. Jiabong	13-Dec-1884	R219, S84	
12. San Jorge	6-Sep-1984	R202, S84	
13. Paranas (Wright)	5-Jul-1984	R199, S84	
14. Calbiga	4-Jan-84	R172, S84	
15. Tarangnan	1-Sep-1982	R85, S82	
16. Sta. Rita	2-Dec-1981	R36, S81	
17. Catbalogan	24-Sep-80	NCC PLAN	

Source: <http://hlurb.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/services/lgu/STATUSCLUP2015.pdf>

Note: R – Resolution SP- Sangguniang Panlalawigan  
 \* Provincial Physical Framework Plan (PPFP)

NCC- National Coordinating Council for Town Planning  
 \*\* Approved By National Land Use Commission

technical assistance on the complete cycle of CLUP formulation should also be provided to the cities and municipalities to capacitate its planners so that the mandated CLUP will be crafted.

**3.2 Profile of CLUP Planners**

The following represents the basic information of the 70 respondents' CLUP planners.

**3.2.1 Age and Sex**

Table 2 shows that the respondents of the study have a mean age of 47.54 years old or of prime working age. This suggests that they are at the peak of their lives characterized as active physically and intellectually capable of accomplishing assigned tasks like formulating the CLUP. However, among them are few who are near the retirement age and will be requiring replacements and training. A few respondents are of the younger age that still needs CLUP training. More than one-half of the respondents are males.

Table 2. Age and Sex of the CLUP Planners

Age			Sex		
Age	n	%	Age	n	%
25-30	5	7.14	Male	48	68.57
31-35	5	7.14	Female	22	31.43
36-40	6	8.57			
41-45	11	15.71			
46-50	12	17.14			
51-55	16	22.86			
56-60	9	12.86			
61-65	6	8.57			
Total	70	100.00	Total	70	100.00

**3.2.2 Position**

Of the 70 respondents' CLUP planners interviewed a combined 40 percent were from the Provincial/City/Municipal Planning and Development Office comprising of the MPDCs, encoder/draftsman/researchers/ C/MPDO Staff. The

Provincial/City/ Municipal Planning and Development Coordinators are usually taking the lead in the data gathering, analysis, mapping, consolidating and finalizing the CLUP. However, some of them are performing multi-functions- meaning other than being the MPDCs are also designated as the MDRRMO, Municipal Accountant or assigned to other major functions. Further, most MPDCs do not have support staff. Therefore, additional tasks/designations reduce the time devoted to CLUP planning activities which could contribute to non-completion of the Plan.

Table 3. Position of Respondents

Position	n	Percent
P/C/MPDC	18	25.71
P/C/MPDC Staff	10	14.29
P/MDRRMO	8	11.43
MSWDO	5	7.14
ME	6	8.57
MA	4	5.71
MENRO	2	2.86
Municipal Health Officer	2	2.86
Municipal Civil Registrar	2	2.86
Principal II	1	1.43
Civil Society/NGO	1	1.43
Municipal Assessor	1	1.43
City Investment Officer	1	1.43
Nurse II	1	1.43
Asst. LDRRMO	1	1.43
Secretary to the SB	1	1.43
PSWDO Staff	1	1.43
Municipal Administrator	1	1.43
Assistant City Engineer	1	1.43
Assistant Municipal Assessor	2	2.86
Assistant CPDC	1	1.43
Total	70	100.00

**3.2.3 Highest Educational Background**

Table 4 shows that majority (67.14%) of the interviewees have bachelors' degree as the highest educational background and only very few planners have a masteral degree and MA units. Graduate and post-graduate education could have to make the planners

more technically prepared to formulate the plan.

more than five years of planning experience which suggest that they are capable of preparing the CLUP.

Table 4. Highest Educational Background of Respondents

Educational Background	N (Multiple Answer)	%
M.A. Or M.S Degree With Doctoral Units	2	2.86
M.A. or M.S. Degree **Major: Public Management	3	4.29
Bachelor Degree With M.A./M.S. Units	17	24.29
Bachelor Degree	48	68.57
Total	70	100.00

### 3.2.4 Length of Land Use Planning Experience

Table 5. Length of Land Use Planning Experience of Respondents and the Lead Planner (MPDC)

Length of Land Use Planning Experience	Respondents		Lead Planner: MPDCs	
	n	%	n	%
0-4	46	65.71	4	22.22
5-9	3	4.29	3	16.67
10-14	9	12.86	6	33.33
15-19	4	5.71	1	5.56
20-24	5	7.14	1	5.56
25-29	3	4.29	3	16.67
Total	70	100.00	18	100.00

More than one-half (65.71%) of the interviewees have 0-4 years length of land use planning experience (Table 4). Moreover, among the 18 MPDCs interviewed only four or 22.22% have 0-4 years of land use planning experience. These are the newly hired, and others are designated as MPDCs which still lack the necessary knowledge, skills, training and capacity (Table 5) contributing to the non-completion of the CLUP. The rest of the MPDCs' respondents of 77.78 percent have

### 3.2.5 Eligibility of Respondents

Table 6 lists the eligibility of the interviewees which shows that among them one-third (34.88%) have career service professional eligibility. While others of 24.42 percent are passers of Civil Engineering Licensure Examination. Only three respondents (3.49%) have environmental planner eligibility. This could imply that they lack the basic knowledge and skills in CLUP preparation. Section 5 paragraph (a)1 of Republic Act No 10587 otherwise known as the "Environmental Planning Act of 2013" states that "The practice of Environmental Planning shall embrace the following.. (a) providing professional services in the form of technical consultation, rendering of technical advice, plan preparation, capacity building ... involving the following: 1. National, regional or local development and physical framework and comprehensive land use plans."

Further, the same Act provides in Article VI, Sec 37. Transitory Provisions-that: "(a) Within a period of three years from the effectivity of this Act, local government units may continue to issue appointments to persons who are not registered and licenced environmental planners for the positions of national or local planning and development coordinators, or chiefs of local planning and development offices, only on a temporary status or acting capacity." This is a challenge to the LGUs' CLUP planners either to capacitate them to pass the environmental planner board examination or hire new MPDCs with environmental planner eligibility.

### 3.2.6. Respondents by LGU- Province/ City/ Municipality

Table 7 shows that majority (81.43%) of the respondents are from the Municipal

Local Government Units. They are members of the core group and support groups who are directly involved in the CLUP planning as the suggested Composition of the Planning Team specified in the 2013 CLUP Guidebook of the Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board.

Table 6. Eligibility of Respondents

Eligibility	n Multiple Response	%
(1) Career Service Professional	30	34.88
(2) Environmental Planner Licensure Examination (LE)	3	3.49
(3) Others		
***Architecture LE	1	1.16
***LE for Teachers	3	3.49
***LE for Administrators	1	1.16
***Business Development Provider	1	1.16
***Mechanical Eng'g LE	2	2.33
***Physician LE	1	1.16
***Civil Engineering LE	21	24.42
***Social Worker LE	6	6.98
***PRC (not indicated)	1	1.16
***Brgy. Official	1	1.16
***Civil Service (Sub-prof.)	2	2.33
***Geodetic LE	1	1.16
Agriculturist LE	1	1.16
Medical LE	1	1.16
***Real Estate Appraiser	1	1.16
None	5	5.81
No Answer	4	4.65
Total	86	100.00

Table 7. Respondents by LGU

LGU	n	%
Province	4	5.71
City	9	12.86
Municipality	57	81.43
Total	70	100.00

### 3.3 Awareness, Knowledge and Attitude About Comprehensive Land Use Plan Formulation

One of the possible reasons why important processes such as CLUP formulation did not comply is probably due to limited knowledge about how important CLUP in guiding community development and understanding the process to produce one. The forgoing is a descriptive presentation of respondents' knowledge and attitude to CLUP.

#### 3.3.1 Level of CLUP Knowledge

Majority comprising 72.86 percent of the interviewees have knowledge about the CLUP process which could be attributed to the "continued advocacy of the HLURB in rendering technical assistance to local government units in the formulation of their CLUPs" (HLURB, 2015)

However, it seems that across the important CLUP process suggested by the HLURB, the LGUs planning teams interviewed have Little Knowledge (LK) as illustrated in Tables 8. It is however noted that 35-53 % of the respondents has better knowledge perhaps as a result of past training, programs, and experiences. While 20-28 % of no knowledge and 15-32 per cent of no knowledge is not surprising, it only validates that weak planning capacity is prevalent. This is important because it shows that past efforts have not made a significant influence/effect on the issue. It also confirms that capacity building on the "12 step CLUP process" (HLURB, 2013) is still critically needed and should be given top priority.

Respondents are weakest along the development of thrust and spatial strategies, preparing, reviewing, implementing and monitoring of Land Use Plans. Overall, Samar planners have rated themselves to have almost little knowledge. There were less than 3% who classified themselves as

Table 8. Level of Knowledge of Respondents' about New Guidelines in CLUP Formulation

CLUP Process	Scale/Level Of Knowledge										Mean	Interpretation	
	1		2		3		4		5				
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
1. Organize the CLUP Planning Team	14	20.00	11	15.71	31	44.29	12	17.14	2	2.86	2.67	K	
2. Identify the Stakeholders	15	21.43	10	14.29	31	44.29	13	18.57	1	1.43	2.64	K	
3. Set the vision	14	20.00	11	15.71	36	51.43	8	11.43	1	1.43	2.59	K	
4. Analyze the situation	14	20.00	8	11.43	37	52.86	11	15.71	0	0.00	2.64	K	
5. Set the Goals and Objectives	14	20.00	10	14.29	35	50.00	11	15.71	0	0.00	2.61	K	
6. Establish Development Thrust and Spatial Strategies	15	21.43	17	24.29	27	38.57	11	15.71	0	0.00	2.49	LK	
7. Prepare the Land Use Plans	15	21.43	16	22.86	29	41.43	9	12.86	1	1.43	2.50	LK	
8. Draft the Zoning Ordinance	14	20.00	23	32.86	28	40.00	4	5.71	1	1.43	2.36	LK	
9. Conduct Public Hearing	15	21.43	12	17.14	36	51.43	6	8.57	1	1.43	2.51	K	
10. Review, Approve the CLUP and Zoning Ordinance	19	27.14	17	24.29	27	38.57	7	10.00	0	0.00	2.31	LK	
11. Implement the CLUP and Zoning Ordinance	18	25.71	15	21.43	28	40.00	8	11.43	1	1.43	2.41	LK	
12. Monitor and Evaluate the CLUP and Zoning Ordinance	20	28.57	15	21.43	25	35.71	9	12.86	1	1.43	2.37	LK	
											Total	2.51	K
Legend:	1.00 to 1.50	No Knowledge		(NK)									
	1.51 to 2.50	Little Knowledge		(LK)									
	2.51 to 3.50	Knowledgeable		(K)									
	3.51 to 4.50	Very Knowledgeable		(VK)									
	4.51 to 5.00	Expert		(E)									

an expert in new guidelines in CLUP formulation.

3.3.2. Scale/Level of Knowledge About Mainstreaming DRR-CCA In CLUP Process

Section 9e of Republic Act 10121 or the Philippine DRRM Act provides for the integration of disaster risk reduction measures into the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. This mandate necessitates the importance of available updated DRR/CCA Data and information and adequate

knowledge and skills on mainstreaming DRR/CCA particularly in the "Province of Samar which is susceptible to various hydrometeorological and geologic hazards" (DRVA, 2013). However, the study shows those regarding Scale/Level of Knowledge in "Mainstreaming DRR-CCA in CLUP Process" (HLURB, 2013) only 33-43 percent of the respondents are knowledgeable (Table 9). This is a challenge to the mandated agencies like HLURB, NEDA, and other concerned agencies to intensify its capacity building interventions to the LGUs.



Table 9. Level of Knowledge of Respondents' about New Guidelines in CLUP Formulation

CLUP Process	Scale/Level Of Knowledge										Mean	Interpretation
	1		2		3		4		5			
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1. Collect and Organize Climate Change and Hazard Information	10	14.29	16	22.86	30	42.86	14	0.61	0	0.00	2.69	K
2. Scope of the Potential Impacts of Hazards and Climate Change	11	15.71	18	25.71	28	40.00	11	0.57	2	2.86	2.64	K
3. Develop Exposure Data Base	14	20.00	21	30.00	27	38.57	8	0.55	0	0.00	2.41	LK
4. Conduct Disaster Risk Assessment (DRA) and Climate Change Vulnerability (CCV) Assessment Findings	13	18.57	23	32.86	23	32.86	8	0.47	3	4.29	2.50	LK
5. Integrating DRA and CCV in the CLUP Formulation	16	22.86	17	24.29	28	40.00	9	0.57	0	0.00	2.43	LK
<b>Total</b>											<b>2.48</b>	<b>LK</b>
Legend:	1.00 to 1.50	No Knowledge		(NK)								
	1.51 to 2.50	Little Knowledge		(LK)								
	2.51 to 3.50	Knowledgeable		(K)								
	3.51 to 4.50	Very Knowledgeable		(VK)								
	4.51 to 5.00	Expert		(E)								

Perhaps this can be addressed through the provision of technical assistance/grant on the complete cycle of CLUP formulation process; and, the provision of incentives to compliant LGUs.

### 3.4 Institutional Capacity of the LGU For Land Use Planning

#### 3.4.1 Status of LGU's Comprehensive Land Use Plans

The preparation of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan is explicitly mandated in the Local Government Code (Sec. 20 (c), RA 7160) which states that, "the local government units shall, in conformity with existing laws, continue to prepare their respective land use plans

enacted through zoning ordinances which shall be the primary and dominant bases for the future use of land resources...". Anent to it, the respondents were asked about the status of their LGUs CLUPs and 37 or 50.68% of the respondents said that they have not yet completed their Plan. Their responses support the data presented in Table 1 that only a few LGUs have approved plans, a majority have obsolete and others are still updating their plans. This a challenge to the mandated agencies to intensify their CLUP capacity development programs to reach out more LGUs.

All claims that their LGU is in the process of formulating their CLUPs, but surprisingly 40.16% of them do not know the status as shown in Table 11. Only about 6%

says their CLUP is almost complete while about 20% of the respondents say they just have started. If CLUP the basic of all the plans have not been formulated, how much more the mainstreaming and integrating of DRA and CCV, says some respondents. Data shows that more than half of them have just started. However, a significant 30% doesn't know about it. This behavior suggests that there are people in the LGU who were expected to be members of the council for development but are not aware. It indicates their wanting participation in the planning process.

### *3.4.2 Reasons for Incomplete CLUP*

The majority (68.57%) of the respondents answered that the reasons why their LGUs' CLUPs are incomplete due to its on-going preparation (Table 13: Appendix). The worst case is that some LGUs has not yet started its CLUP formulation. Worth mentioning also is the low level of percentage of accomplishment among LGUs in its CLUP formulation as shown in Table 11(Appendix). The reasons could be the issues identified in Table 12 specifically the lack of CLUP related equipment and references profiled in Table 13 which is indicative of the lack of capacity of the planners. Lack of capacity can be attributed to the lack and no knowledge, inadequate institutional tools, and references compounded by the lack of sectoral data and maps required in the crafting of the CLUP.

Moreover, the status of LGUs' CLUP regarding the sectoral data requirements in 2015 is indicative that sectoral data, in general, is still wanting. The respondents are still in the data gathering, data analysis and mapping stages (Table 12: Appendix). This could mean that LGUs are still way beyond the completion of this document. However, this could be an opportunity for coordinative effort among national, regional and local agencies to share their maps and database; and, capacitate and support the LGUs.

Further, five reasons were provided by the respondents for not starting the formulation of the CLUP preparation, such as unfinished cadastral survey; the consultant commissioned to formulate the LGUs CLUP failed to finish the task; still data gathering; and, no knowledge in CLUP preparation. Again, these reasons are challenges to the concerned agencies to facilitate the provision of the needed interventions.

### *3.4.3 Issues And Problems Encountered in CLUP Preparation*

Table 13(Appendix) shows the issues and problems encountered by the CLUP Planners categorized as major, minor or not a problem at all. About twenty to forty-seven percent of the interviewees responded that among the major issues and problems encountered in the CLUP preparation are: the absence of geographic information (GIS) specialist (57%); the multi-tasks assigned to MPDCs/overload of assignments(47%); insufficiently qualified staff(36%); lack of incentives(34%); lack of funding(31%); preference of LGU to construction projects over planning(31%); lack of equipment like computer, plotter, GPS(26%); and, weak coordination and cooperation among the department heads both local and national (23%)]. Minor problems were also encountered by the respondents. A significant number of the respondents never answered for not knowing about the issues why the CLUP is yet to be formulated.

### *3.4.4 Percent of Respondents with Available CLUP Related Equipment and References in the LGU*

Equipment, key documents, and references which aid the Local Government Units' planning team in the CLUP formulation are wanting, as shown in Table 14(Appendix). Hazard maps are only available in few respondents. Special equipment like computers needed and geographic information system lack which

implies that advanced mapping and methods are unavailable or new to LGUs. The lack of CLUP planning basic references is indicative of the lack of know-how to scientifically deal with the CLUP issues. This also suggests that mandated agencies from national agencies should share their studies, data, maps and other information to the local LGUs to fast-track CLUP preparation.

### *3.3.5 Percent of Respondents with Available Planning Database For CLUP Formulation*

Data needed for scientific sectoral and sub-sectoral analysis is not sufficient; only basic data is present (Table 15: Appendix). The inadequate database could create a problem in that decisions have to be made with incomplete information, and also contribute to the additional delay and even non-completion of the CLUP. These data are available from various government agencies such as PhilVocs, PAGASA, DENR-MGB, DENR-BSWM, NSO, NEDA, DTI and all other institutions. Even State Universities and Colleges possess a wealth of information which is very useful in the planning process. All listed facilities and materials needed in formulating CLUP are common; some are very accessible while other needs to be localized and therefore requires on-field data gathering. What is lacking are people to do the data gathering job and inputted to GIS database for analysis.

This lacking information is also attributed to poor data management of LGUs. In the study of Gomba et.al. (2009), it was revealed that some data gaps are missing in many LGUs in Eastern Visayas. Some of the data seems to be untrue or unrealistic, suggesting that data gathering was flawed or there were no data at all.

### *3.3.6 Institutional Tools for Land Use Planning in the LGU*

The institutional tools for land use planning available in the LGUs are profiled in

Table 16 (Appendix). While Executive and Legislative Agenda; and, Comprehensive Provincial/City/Municipal Development Plan are very common in most respondents, other LGUs are lacking guiding documents that make it difficult the formulation of the CLUP. The presence of updated institutional tools/references could facilitate and make easier CLUP preparation specifically in the sectoral data and analysis, mapping and formulation of plans and programs.

### *3.3.7 Capacity Development for CLUP Formulation If Needed by Respondent*

Most (49 respondents or 70%) of the respondents need capacity development for the CLUP formulation. This confirms the LGUs need of a complete cycle of CLUP formulation. Further, the technical assistance would be more realistic if coupled with financial assistance to fund the crafting of this Plan. In 2012 to the end of 2015, series of PLGU-Samar & GIZ led activities were conducted to facilitate the LGU planners the needed skills to gather important data using bottom-up approaches. It also capacitated the planners to use important technologies such as GPS and GIS in formulating Barangay Plans which are crucial in formulating a more comprehensive land use plans.

### *3.3.8 Identified Capacity Development for CLUP Formulation Needed by Respondent*

Another important aspect is the opportunity for capability building of CLUP planners which is still wanting. The study presents in Table 11 the identified capacity development needs of the respondents to make easier the CLUP formulation. The identified training needs are not new to many of the respondents. Less than half have not indicated capacity building needs as most of them have attended similar training. The series of training facilitated by the PLGU Samar-Planning Office with the assistance of GIZ was more than enough to equip the planners the needed skills. To date, no

significant output has been realized. This maybe because there is no setback on the part of the LGU (i.e. cases filed, no funding/IRA) for not complying the mandate. Perhaps the on-compliance is because the LGU will not significantly suffer if they don't have the CLUP, says one respondent.

Table 10. Capacity Development for CLUP Formulation Needed by Respondent

Capacity Development Needed	Frequency (Multiple Answer)
GIS Training/ Advance GIS Training/ Mapping	7
CLUP Formulation Process by Module/ CLUP Formulation for new CPDO Staff/ MPDC	7
Mainstreaming DRR & CCA in the formulation of CLUP.	5
Review/reorient/update Planners of CLUP Formulation/parameters	4
Land Use/Thematic Mapping	4
Sectoral and Sub-sectoral Data Gathering and Analysis	4
Preparation/Updating of Hazard Mapping including Storm Surge and Tsunami.	3
Map digitizing	2
Orient the CLUP Support Group regarding the guidelines on CLUP formulation	1
The orientation of barangay. Leaders/officials on the Importance of CLUP	1
Areas in Development Trust and Spatial Strategies, and Special Study Areas	1
Preparation of Forest Land Use Plan (FLUP)	1
Training on zoning	1
Map Data/Analysis	1
Total	42

### 3.3.9 Recommendations/Suggestions of the Respondents to Assist in the Formulation CLUP

The recommendations and suggestions of the respondents to assist in the formulation of the CLUP are tabulated in

Table 17(Appendix) which could be categorized into three: capacity building, incentivizing such as granting of rewards and recognition or penalizing non-compliant LGUs; and manpower complementation.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

Almost all of LGUs in Samar have no active CLUPs; those who has are already obsolete. There is a dire need to hire a competent and dedicated workforce to man the CLUP process. Members of the team must also be those who can deliver and possess the right skills and attitude to assist the MPDC/CPDC in the formulation of the plans. Current CLUP planners are not equipped to deal with the issues of CLUP formulation, not just regarding know-how but also regarding staffing, equipment, and database. Almost the entire system needed to support CLUP planning teams in the LGUs is inadequate

Although CLUP preparation is mandated by the law there is a need to back it up with penalty or sanction to obliged non-compliant LGUS to prioritize this deliverable. On the contrary, to encourage LGUs to complete their CLUPs those compliant can be provided with incentives in the form of recognition or financial rewards.

Moreover, should a capacity building be provided it has to be the complete CLUP cycle coupled with corresponding budgetary allocation/financial assistance supported or backed up with a dedicated team of technical experts to assist the LGUs in the CLUP preparation until its completion?

Although technical assistance is regularly available in HLURB, DILG and NEDA but LGUs are still unable to complete their CLUPS. Therefore it is recommended that the government should introduce a capacity development program for the complete/whole cycle of CLUP preparation with corresponding funding to fully capacitate the CLUP planners.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to thank the supportive Samar P/C/MPDCs and Reynadel Dahan for the data tabulation

## REFERENCES

- Cristobal, A.M. & De la Cruz- Cristobal, M. C. (2013). *Methods of Research*. C&E Publishing, Inc. (pp 168)
- Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, 2011, *Land Use Planning: Concept, Tools and Applications*: pages 209 and 1
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) United Nations United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), 1999, *The Future of Our Land Facing the Challenge*
- Housing Land Use and Regulatory Board, 2013, *CLUP Guidebook: A Guide to Comprehensive Land Use Plan Preparation, Volume 1*
- CLUP Guidebook: A Guide to Comprehensive Land Use Plan Preparation, Volume 2.
- Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board, 2014, *Supplementary Guidelines Mainstreaming CCA/DRR in CLUP*, p25-26
- Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board (HLURB), *Status of Provinces, Cities and Municipalities with and without CLUPs*. <http://hlurb.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/services/lqu/STATUSCLUP2015.pdf> (Accessed: June 8, 2016)
- Congress of the Philippines (2013). RA No. 10587. *Environmental Planning Act of 2013* <http://www.gov.ph/2013/05/27/republic-act-no-10587/> (Accessed: August 12, 2016)
- Malacanang (1993) Executive Order No. 72. *Providing for the Preparation and Implementation of the Comprehensive Land Use Plans of Local Government Units Pursuant to the Local Government Code of 1991 and Other Pertinent Laws*. [http://hlurb.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/laws-issuances/mandates/EO\\_72.pdf](http://hlurb.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/laws-issuances/mandates/EO_72.pdf) (Accessed October 3, 2016)
- Congress of the Philippines, (1991). *Local Government Code of 1991*. [http://www.lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1991/ra\\_7160\\_1991.html](http://www.lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1991/ra_7160_1991.html) (Accessed: August 2, 2016)
- GIZ (2013). *SIMPLE Trainer's Toolkit*. Manila, Philippines: Environment and Rural Development (EnRD) Program. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
- Lidasan H. S., Espada I.C., De Leon, & M. R. M (2009) *Needs Assessment of Transport Planning and Traffic Management of Local Cities: The Case of the Philippines*. *Journal of the Eastern Asia Society for Transportation Studies*, Vol. 7.
- Provincial Development Council, Province of Samar, *Disaster Risk Reduction/Climate Change Adaptation (DRR/CCA) Enhanced Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plan, (2016-2021)*
- Provincial Development Council, Province of Samar, *Disaster Risk Vulnerability Assessment (DRVA) Report, 2013*

## APPENDICES

Table 11. Percent of Accomplishment of On-going CLUP Formulation (As of December 2015)

CLUP Process/Mainstreaming DRA-CCA	Percent of Accomplishment (%)											
	0-20		21-40		41-60		61-80		81-99		No Answer	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>A. CLUP Process</b>												
1. Organize the CLUP Planning Team	7	10.00	3	4.29	8	11.43	16	22.86	13	18.57	23	32.86
2. Identify the Stakeholders	5	7.14	5	7.14	7	10.00	18	25.71	12	17.14	23	32.86
3. Set the vision	4	5.71	9	12.86	3	4.29	21	30.00	9	12.86	24	34.29
4. Analyze the situation	5	7.14	6	8.57	6	8.57	24	34.29	4	5.71	26	37.14
5. Set the Goals and Objectives,	4	5.71	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Establish Development Thrust and Spatial Strategies	9	12.86	10	14.29	6	8.57	19	27.14	1	1.43	25	35.71
7. Prepare the Land Use Plans	14	20.00	8	11.43	6	8.57	13	18.57	3	4.29	26	37.14
8. Draft the Zoning Ordinance	18	25.71	0	-	12	17.14	6	8.57	3	4.29	31	44.29
9. Conduct Public Hearing	23	32.86	5	7.14	5	7.14	5	7.14	0	-	32	45.71
10. Review, Approve the CLUP and Zoning Ordinance	22	31.43	4	5.71	6	8.57	5	7.14	1	1.43	32	45.71
11. Implement the CLUP and Zoning Ordinance	23	32.86	2	2.86	8	11.43	3	4.29	1	1.43	33	47.14
12. Monitor and Evaluate the CLUP and Zoning Ordinance	20	28.57	3	4.29	8	11.43	3	4.29	1	1.43	35	50.00
Total		19.87		7.10		9.68		17.16		6.19		40.0
<b>B. Mainstreaming DRA and CCV in the CLUP</b>												
1. Collect and Organize Climate Change and Hazard Information	13	18.57	7	10.00	12	17.14	11	15.71	2	2.86	25	35.71
2. Scope of the Potential Impacts of Hazards and Climate Change	14	20.00	7	10.00	12	17.14	11	15.71	2	2.86	24	34.29
3. Develop Exposure Data Base	15	21.43	6	8.57	15	21.43		-		-		-
4. Conduct Disaster Risk Assessment (DRA) and Climate Change Vulnerability (CCV) Assessment Findings	15	21.43	6	8.57	18	25.71	6	8.57	1	1.43	24	34.29
Total												
C. Integrating DRA and CCV in the CLUP Formulation	15	21.43	8	11.43	10	14.29	9	12.86	1	1.43	27	38.57
Grand Total												

**APPENDICES**

Table 12. Status of LGUs' CLUP in Terms of the Sectoral Data Requirements

Sectoral/Sub-Sectoral Data	Status of Sectoral Data Requirements (Multiple Answer)						Total
	Data Gathering	Data Analysis	Mapping	Finalization	Completed	No Answer	
<b>I. ECOSYSTEM ANALYSIS</b>							
Resource Mapping	24	7	12	6	0	25	74
Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction	22	11	6	8	1	24	72
Forest Ecosystem	17	14	9	9	1	24	74
Coastal Resources	19	8	6	7	2	30	72
Biodiversity	22	9	7	6	0	28	72
<b>II. SECTORAL STUDIES</b>							
Demographic Study	13	15	4	10	6	24	72
<b>Social Sector Study</b>							
Education	19	11	3	6	4	27	70
Health and Sanitation	11	6	1	5	1	47	71
Education	19	11	1	8	5	27	71
Housing	20	12	2	7	1	28	70
Social Welfare Services	14	19	2	9	6	24	74
Protective Services	15	17	2	9	2	26	71
Sports and Recreation	17	11	1	10	0	31	70
<b>Economic Sector Study</b>							
Agriculture	18	14	2	11	0	25	70
Forestry	15	15	6	9	2	26	73
Commerce and Trade	22	9	2	9	0	28	70
Industry	21	11	2	9	0	27	70
Tourism	21	9	2	9	0	29	70
<b>Infrastructure Sector Study</b>							
Transportation	19	13	3	9	0	26	70
Power	19	14	2	8	1	26	70
Water	15	18	1	8	2	26	70
Information and Communication Technology	23	12	1	7	0	27	70
<b>III. SPECIAL AREAS</b>							
Green Growth	25	7	4	3	0	31	70
Urban Design and Development	24	8	5	4	0	29	70
Ancestral Domain	24	8	3	3	0	32	70
Solid Waste Management	14	10	2	15	2	27	70

## APPENDICES

Table 13. Issues and Problems Encountered in CLUP Preparation

Land Use Planning Issues and Problems Encountered	Major Problem		Minor Problem		Not a Problem		No Answer	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1. Absence of local ordinance for the CLUP formulation	8	11.43	14	20.00	26	37.14	22	31.43
2. Absence of Executive Order with established responsibilities creating the Provincial core Team and Support Group for CLUP Formulation	7	10.00	16	22.86	25	35.71	22	31.43
3. Weak coordination and cooperation among the department heads both local and national	16	22.86	19	27.14	12	17.14	23	32.86
4. Insufficiently qualified staff	25	35.71	21	30.00	7	10.00	17	24.29
5. Frequent staff changes or detailing of staff to other offices	16	22.86	17	24.29	14	20.00	23	32.86
6. Multi-Tasks assigned to MPDCs/Overload of Assignments	33	47.14	14	20.00	4	5.71	19	27.14
7. Preference of LGU to construction projects over planning	22	31.43	17	24.29	8	11.43	23	32.86
8. Lack of equipment like computer, plotter, GPS	18	25.71	28	40.00	6	8.57	18	25.71
9. Absence of Geographic Information Specialist (GIS) Specialist	40	57.14	9	12.86	3	4.29	18	25.71
10. Lack of incentives	24	34.29	18	25.71	12	17.14	16	22.86
11. Lack of funding	22	31.43	23	32.86	8	11.43	17	24.29
12. Inadequate sectoral data	19	27.14	24	34.29	8	11.43	19	27.14
13. Limited reference materials	22	31.43	20	28.57	8	11.43	20	28.57
14. Boundary disputes	21	30.00	16	22.86	13	18.57	20	28.57
15. Out-dated maps	23	32.86	20	28.57	7	10.00	20	28.57
16. Not so supportive officials (executive and legislative)	3	4.29	24	34.29	22	31.43	21	30.00
17. Planning Core Team not well-versed in using computer for planning purposes	5	7.14	28	40.00	13	18.57	24	34.29



## APPENDICES

Table 14. Availability of CLUP Related Equipment and References in LGU

Equipment and References	n	%
1.CLUP Guidebook 2014 Volumes 1-3	26	37.14
2.Geographic Information System (GIS)	14	20.00
3.Hazard Maps		
Flood Map	32	45.71
Rain Induced Landslide Map	25	35.71
Storm Surge Map	23	32.86
Sea Level Rise Map	10	14.29
Ground Shaking Map	13	18.57
Liquefaction Map	17	24.29
Earthquake-Induced Landslide Map	16	22.86
Ground Rupture Map	9	12.86
Tsunami Map	4	5.71
4.Other Thematic Maps		-
Base Map	38	54.29
Land Classification Map	35	50.00
Land Cover Map	31	44.29
Existing Land Use Cover Map	26	37.14
Slope Map	34	48.57
Soil Map	28	40.00
Mineral Map	17	24.29
Land Suitability Map	22	31.43
Protection Land Use Map	18	25.71
Land & Water Transportation Map	18	25.71
Settlement Map	22	31.43
Social Services Facilities Map	20	28.57
5.Computers For Planning Use	36	51.43
6.Plotter	4	5.71
7.HLURB Modular Courses	24	34.29
8.Economic Planning Reference	17	24.29
9.Ecosystem Planning Reference	17	24.29
10. Infrastructure Planning Reference	18	25.71
11. Sustainable Integrated Management and Planning for Local Government Ecosystem (SIMPLE) Toolkit	23	32.86
13.Others Specify: Rapid Earthquake Assessment Software (REDAS), Capacity Development Program- Executive and Legislative Agenda (CDP-ELA)	0	0.00

## APPENDICES

Table 15. Availability of Planning Database For CLUP Formulation

Sectoral/Sub-sectoral Data	Scale										No Answer		Total F
	Insufficient		Fairly Sufficient		Sufficient		More Sufficient		Most Sufficient		F	%	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
<b>I. ECOSYSTEM ANALYSIS</b>													
Resource Mapping	2	2.86	24	24.00	8	11.43	3	4.29	0	6.12	33	47.14	70
Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction	4	5.71	16	16.00	17	24.29	4	5.71	0	8.16	29	41.43	70
Forest Ecosystem	5	7.14	22	22.00	6	8.57	5	7.14	1	10.20	31	44.29	70
Coastal Resources	3	4.29	19	19.00	12	17.14	1	1.43	0	2.04	35	50.00	70
Biodiversity	5	7.14	17	17.00	7	10.00	1	1.43	0	2.04	40	57.14	70
<b>II. SECTORAL</b>													
Demographic Study	2	2.86	9	9.00	17	24.29	4	5.71	3	8.16	35	50.00	70
Social Sector Study													
Education	1	1.43	18	18.00	15	21.43	6	8.57	2	12.24	28	40.00	70
Health and Sanitation	1	1.43	15	15.00	19	27.14	5	7.14	3	10.20	27	38.57	70
Housing	6	8.57	18	18.00	13	18.57	5	7.14	0	10.20	28	40.00	70
Social Welfare Services	1	1.43	16	16.00	21	30.00	3	4.29	2	6.12	27	38.57	70
Protective Services	1	1.43	19	19.00	14	20.00	7	10.00	0	14.29	29	41.43	70
Sports and Recreation	5	7.14	21	21.00	8	11.43	4	5.71	0	8.16	32	45.71	70
Economic Sector Study													
Agriculture	1	1.43	20	20.00	17	24.29	4	5.71	0	8.16	28	40.00	70
Forestry	4	5.71	20	20.00	9	12.86	8	11.43	0	16.33	29	41.43	70
Commerce and Trade	7	10.00	19	19.00	12	17.14	4	5.71	0	8.16	28	40.00	70
Industry	7	10.00	18	18.00	13	18.57	4	5.71	0	8.16	28	40.00	70
Tourism	4	5.71	17	17.00	4	5.71	4	5.71	0	8.16	28	40.00	57
Infrastructure Sector Study													
Transportation	3	4.29	17	17.00	19	27.14	4	5.71	0	8.16	27	38.57	70
Power	4	5.71	16	16.00	17	24.29	6	8.57	1	12.24	26	37.14	70
Water	4	5.71	17	17.00	16	22.86	5	7.14	1	10.20	27	38.57	70
Information and Communication Technology	8	11.43	18	18.00	13	18.57	4	5.71	0	8.16	27	38.57	70
<b>III. SPECIAL AREAS</b>													
Green Growth	10	14.29	20	20.00	11	15.71	0	-	0	-	29	41.43	70
Urban Design and Development	11	15.71	17	17.00	13	18.57	1	1.43	0	2.04	28	40.00	70
Ancestral Domain	15	21.43	13	13.00	5	7.14	1	1.43	0	2.04	36	51.43	70
<i>1- Insufficient    2- Fairly Sufficient    3-Sufficient    4- More Sufficient    5- Most Sufficient</i>													

## APPENDICES

Table 16. Institutional Tools for Land Use Planning Available in the LGU

Institutional Tools/References	Indicate Planning Period	Check if Available
1. Comprehensive Provincial/City/ Municipal Development Plan	2003-2023 (5), 2007-2032 (2), 2012-2015, 2012-2016, 2016-2021(2), 2011-2020 (3), 2011-2016, 2010-2015, 2015-2025 (2), 2010-2013 (3)	38
2. Executive and Legislative Agenda	2013-2015 (5), 2014-2016 (6), 2013-2016	42
3. Solid Waste Management Plan	2000-2010, 2015-2016, 2016-2025 (3), 2007-2016	32
4. Local Investment and Incentive Code	2011 (5)	15
5. Environmental Code		5
6. Capacity Development Program	2013-2016	13
7. SIMPLE Barangay Development Plans		13
8. Forest Land Use Plan (FLUP)		14
9. Flood and Landslide Assessment Report by Barangay	2010	17
10. Infrastructure Plan		10
11. Disaster Risk Vulnerability Assessment Report	2013	27
12. Socio-Economic Profile	2010 (2), 2014, 2013 (2)	32
13. Ecological Profile	2014	19

## APPENDICES

Table 17. Recommendations/Suggestions to Assist the Formulation of CLUP by Respondent

Recommendations/Suggestions	Frequency (Multiple Answer)
Policy on Mandatory CLUP Preparation to the LGU Officials with corresponding Sanctions and Penalties	3
Training in CLUP Preparation of CLUP as some of the CPDO/MPDO employees knowledgeable in this area have already retired while some were detailed to other offices	2
Unloading of special project/additional designation/assignments of the MPDC and other CLUP Core Group to focus on CLUP Preparation	2
Give more time and effort, encourage other members to work with the CLUP Planning Core Team	2
More funds and training not only the MPDCs but the whole CLUP Team.	2
Refresher CLUP course/write shop to update the existing plan/ More CLUP training to enhance capacity/skills of CLUP Team	2
Completion of the Cadastral Survey/ Provision of cadastral maps	2
Hire a team/consultant that will focus only on the CLUP preparation	2
Deployment of knowledgeable HLURB/PPDO staff to the municipality until CLUP completion	2
Provision of Technical assistance for the completion of the CLUP	2
Institutionalize the Sustainable Integrated Management & Planning for LGU Ecosystems (SIMPLE) for and effective data gathering	2
Create a functional GIS Team with separate database for planning purposes only	1
Provision of Incentive System to LGU with approved CLUP - and make it as one of the criteria in granting Seal of Good Housekeeping (SGH)	1
All projects to be implemented must be certified by the MPDC as part/included in the CLUP.	1
Additional researchers especially for Technical aspect	1
Capacitate the Planning Office/ Training on GIS mapping/ Training Technical writing	1
Someone should guide us step by step, AutoCAD expert, complete gadgets/ GIS Experts, Write-ups formulation, Technical aspects	1
Provide assistance in accessing of Hazard Maps and other Thematic Maps from the concerned/mandated agencies.	1
The technical assistance of an expert who will review the LGUs initial or partial outputs and make necessary recommendation or suggestion for its improvement when necessary.	1
Appointment of capable and dedicated staff	1
Everything that is within the context of the CLUP formulation is given consideration especially on the baseline data from barangay.	1
Total	