ISSN 3082-5326
Research Article

Challenges, Opportunities, and Performance of Project Monitoring Committees in Local Governance: Evidence from Mabinay, Philippines

Daisyree C. Escoton
Romario P. Ybanez

International Journal of Interdisciplinary Viewpoints
Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 21-28, 2026

Correspondence: daisyree.escoton@foundationu.com
[1-2]Foundation University, Dumaguete City
Negros Oriental, Philippines

Abstract
This study examined the challenges, opportunities, and performance of Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) members in project implementation, monitoring, and assessment, including the relationship between challenges and opportunities, differences based on profile variables, and beneficiaries' perceptions of performance. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, survey data were analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistics. Findings revealed that PMC members experienced a low extent of challenges across all project phases, indicating functional competence; however, opportunities such as training, technical resources, and financial support were limited and inconsistently accessed. A strong negative relationship between challenges and opportunities was found during project implementation and a moderate negative relationship during assessment, suggesting that increased access to opportunities reduces operational difficulties. Differences in challenges were observed when grouped by sex and job designation, highlighting disparities in role exposure and resource access. Despite these constraints, beneficiaries perceived PMC performance as very high across implementation, monitoring, and assessment, reflecting strong institutional practices and commitment, and supporting the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, particularly SDG 16, SDG 4, and SDG 17.

Keywords
Project monitoring committee; Local governance; Performance assessment; public administration; Philippines

Citation
Escoton, D., & Ybanez, R. (2026). Challenges, Opportunities, and Performance of Project Monitoring Committees in Local Governance: Evidence from Mabinay, Philippines. International Journal of Interdisciplinary Viewpoints , 2(4), 21–28. https://doi.org/10.64612/ijiv.v2i4.118

Received: 15 February 2026
Accepted: 25 April 2026
Published: 30 April 2026

Peer Review Statement
This article underwent a double-anonymous peer review process in accordance with the editorial policies of the International Journal of Interdisciplinary Viewpoints. Both authors and reviewers remained anonymous throughout the review process.
Open Access Statement
The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Viewpoints is a fully open-access, peer-reviewed journal. All articles are freely available online immediately upon publication without subscription or access fees.
Funding Statement
The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.
Conflict of Interest
The authors declared no conflicts of interest.
Data Availability Statement
The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.
Author Contributions
The authors contributed to conceptualization, methodology, investigation, writing—original draft preparation, writing—review and editing, and supervision. The authors approved the final manuscript.
Ethics Statement
This study was conducted in accordance with ethical standards.

INTRODUCTION

Globally, project monitoring and assessment are essential for fostering good governance, accountability, and sustainable development, particularly in initiatives involving diverse stakeholders and complex institutional environments (Awa et al., 2024; Bridoux & Stoelhorst, 2022). This perspective is reinforced by stakeholder-centered approaches that emphasize inclusive governance and the integration of sustainability principles in organizational and project contexts (Berrone et al., 2023; Anderson et al., 2022).

At the local government level, particularly in developing countries, these challenges are intensified by limited resources and contextual constraints. Local government units (LGUs) are tasked with translating national development goals into localized programs, requiring effective monitoring systems to ensure accountability and performance. Studies on sustainable development and governance highlight the importance of aligning local initiatives with broader development frameworks while maintaining transparency and efficiency (Pakkan et al., 2023; Erin et al., 2022). Furthermore, literature on project management emphasizes that successful project governance relies on structured monitoring mechanisms, clear processes, and well-defined roles among stakeholders (Orieno et al., 2024; Ika & Pinto, 2022).

Empirical studies have shown that monitoring bodies often encounter issues such as unclear roles, overlapping responsibilities, weak coordination, and external pressures, all of which can affect monitoring effectiveness and project outcomes. These challenges are reflected in studies on organizational roles and governance systems, where ambiguity and structural inefficiencies hinder effective implementation (Mormul, 2021; Anglin et al., 2022; Klemsdal & Clegg, 2022). In project environments, such constraints are further compounded by limitations in resources, coordination mechanisms, and institutional support, ultimately influencing project performance and sustainability. Despite extensive research on project governance and stakeholder engagement, limited attention has been given to the operational dynamics of monitoring committees within local governments. Existing studies largely focus on governance structures, sustainability reporting, or performance measurement systems, with less emphasis on how monitoring bodies function in practice (Berrone et al., 2023; Erin et al., 2022; Lewis, 2024). This gap highlights the need to explore the actual roles, experiences, and challenges faced by Project Monitoring Committees (PMCs) within local governance systems.

Addressing this gap is essential for both theory and practice. This study contributes to stakeholder and role theories by examining the responsibilities and lived experiences of PMC members in local public-sector project governance (Bridoux & Stoelhorst, 2022; Klemsdal & Clegg, 2022). The findings aim to support local governments in strengthening monitoring systems through clearer role definitions, improved coordination, and capacity-building initiatives. Ultimately, this contributes to more accountable and effective governance practices, supporting sustainable development outcomes at the local level.

METHODOLOGY

Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive component was used to determine the extent of challenges encountered and opportunities experienced by Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) members in project implementation, monitoring, and assessment, as well as the level of performance as perceived by beneficiaries. The correlational component was used to examine the relationship between the challenges encountered and the opportunities experienced by PMC members. This design was appropriate because it provided a systematic description of the respondents' experiences and allowed the researchers to determine whether significant relationships existed between the study variables. Through this approach, the study generated a comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing PMC performance in the local governance context.

Locale

This study was conducted in the Municipality of Mabinay, a first-class municipality in the southern part of Negros Oriental, Philippines. The municipality was selected because it actively implements infrastructure and community development projects and has a functioning Project Monitoring Committee (PMC). Its accessible records and respondents—including PMC members, barangay officials, and project beneficiaries—provided reliable data for the study.

Respondents

The respondents of the study consisted of the mandatory members of the Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) as prescribed under Department of the Interior and Local Government Memorandum Circular 2019-198, along with barangay officials and project beneficiaries in the Municipality of Mabinay. A total of 172 respondents participated in the study, including eight (8) PMC members, 154 barangay beneficiary officials, and ten (10) project beneficiaries. The eight PMC members included representatives from the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG), a non-government organization (NGO), the Local Development Committee, and five members appointed by the Local Chief Executive. The study employed total enumeration, as all available respondents were included to ensure a comprehensive and representative assessment of the challenges, opportunities, and performance of the PMC.

Instrument

A researcher-developed questionnaire served as the primary instrument for data collection. Part I contained the informed consent statement, while Part II gathered the profile of the Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) members. Part III assessed the challenges encountered in project implementation, monitoring, and assessment, and Part IV measured the opportunities experienced in these areas. A separate questionnaire was administered to barangay officials and project beneficiaries to determine their perceptions of the PMC's performance. The instrument was validated by three experts in research and local governance. A pilot test was conducted with ten respondents to establish reliability, and Cronbach's alpha was computed to determine the internal consistency of the items. A coefficient of 0.70 or higher was considered acceptable. The final instrument was used to gather data on the challenges, opportunities, and performance of the PMC members.

Procedure

Following the approval of the research design during the design hearing, the researchers incorporated all revisions and recommendations provided by the panel members. A formal letter requesting permission to conduct the study was submitted to the Provincial Government of Negros Oriental and to the Office of the Municipal Mayor of Mabinay. Upon approval, the researchers secured a copy of the endorsed authorization letter and presented it to the appropriate office

responsible for project implementation. This facilitated the administration of the research questionnaire to the identified respondents. Prior to the distribution of the survey instrument, the researchers explained the purpose and objectives of the study and assured the respondents that their responses would be treated with strict confidentiality and anonymity. After retrieving the accomplished questionnaires, the data were encoded, tabulated, and processed using Microsoft Excel.

Analysis

To address the research questions, both descriptive and inferential statistics were used. Frequency counts and percentages described the profile of the Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) members in terms of sex and job designation. Mean and standard deviation were computed to determine the extent of challenges and opportunities in project implementation, monitoring, and assessment, as well as the level of PMC performance as perceived by barangay officials and project beneficiaries. Mean scores were interpreted using a five-point Likert scale: 4.21–5.00 (Very High), 3.41–4.20 (High), 2.61–3.40 (Moderate), 1.81–2.60 (Low), and 1.00–1.80 (Very Low). Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient (rs) was used to examine the relationship between challenges and opportunities. This nonparametric test was appropriate because the data were ordinal and based on Likert-scale responses. Correlation strength was interpreted as follows: ±0.50 to ±1.00 (strong), ±0.30 to ±0.49 (moderate), ±0.10 to ±0.29 (weak), and ±0.01 to ±0.09 (very weak). All data were encoded in Microsoft Excel and analyzed using jamovi to ensure accurate computation and interpretation of the results.

Ethical Considerations

This study was conducted with respect for all participants, including public officials, PMC members, and community beneficiaries. Approval was obtained from Foundation University, the Local Government Unit of Mabinay, and the Office of the Municipal Mayor before data collection. All participants were informed of the purpose of the study, the nature of their participation, and the intended use of the data. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all respondents. Explanations were provided in Cebuano (Bisaya) when necessary to ensure full understanding. Confidentiality and fairness were strictly observed throughout the study. No personal identifiers were collected, and all responses were treated as confidential and used solely for academic purposes. The data were securely stored and accessed only by the researchers. Participants were free to decline answering any question or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. The findings were analyzed and reported honestly and responsibly to protect participants' rights and maintain the integrity of the research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As shown in Table 1.1, the extent of challenges encountered by Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) members in project implementation was low, with a composite mean of 2.08 (SD = 1.34), indicating that these challenges were rarely experienced. This suggests that PMC members were generally competent in performing their implementation-related responsibilities (Ingle & Mahesh, 2022). The highest-rated challenge was limited understanding of project progress based on the contractor's Statement of Work Accomplished (SWA) ($\bar{x}$ = 2.38, SD = 1.60), followed by lack of knowledge about the types of projects ($\bar{x}$ = 2.13, SD = 1.25) and incapability in reading plans ($\bar{x}$ = 2.13, SD = 1.64), all interpreted as rarely experienced. These findings indicate minor gaps in interpreting technical documents and project reports (Orieno et al., 2024; Hashim et al., 2022). Minimum understanding of the program of works ($\bar{x}$ = 2.00, SD = 1.07) also reflected limited technical knowledge, while inability to attend coordination meetings ($\bar{x}$ = 1.75, SD = 1.16) was never experienced, indicating strong participation and collaboration among members (Sankaran et al., 2021; Amin et al., 2023). While major implementation challenges were uncommon, strengthening technical competencies and addressing structural constraints could further improve project implementation and monitoring effectiveness (Akinola et al., 2023; Mormul, 2021).

Table 1.1
Extent of Challenges Encountered by the PMC Members in terms of Project Implementation

I encountered the following challenges in implementing the project:	$\bar{x}$	VD	EoC	SD
1. Less ideas on project progress based on the contractor's Statement of Work Accomplished (SWA).	2.38	R	L	1.60
2. Lack of knowledge about the types of projects.	2.13	R	L	1.25
3. Incapable of reading plans.	2.13	R	L	1.64
4. Minimum understanding on what is program of works.	2.00	R	L	1.07
5. Unable to attend coordination meetings regarding project discussions.	1.75	N	VL	1.16
Composite	2.08	R	L	1.34

Note: Verbal Description (VD); Extent of Challenges (EoC); 4.21-5.00, Always (A), Very High (VH); 3.41-4.20, Frequently (F), High (H); 2.61-3.40, Seldom (S), Moderate (M); 1.81-2.60, Rarely (R), Low (L); 1.00- 1.80, Never (N), Very Low (VL); N = 8

As shown in Table 1.2, the extent of challenges encountered by Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) members in project monitoring was low, with a composite mean of 2.23 (SD = 1.45), indicating that these challenges were rarely experienced. This suggests that PMC members were generally capable of performing monitoring functions, although some areas still required strengthening (Orieno et al., 2024). The highest-rated challenge was limited monitoring conducted on a set schedule and periods throughout the project duration ($\bar{x}$ = 2.63, SD = 1.41), interpreted as moderately experienced, indicating occasional inconsistencies in monitoring schedules that may delay timely interventions and weaken project control (Hasan et al., 2021). Limited knowledge in recommending solutions for project defects ($\bar{x}$ = 2.38, SD = 1.51), incapability in identifying project defects ($\bar{x}$ = 2.25, SD = 1.39), and limited knowledge on what to inspect during monitoring ($\bar{x}$ = 2.00, SD = 1.51) were rated as rarely experienced, reflecting minor gaps in technical and analytical competencies (Gupta et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2023). Inability to attend coordination meetings among PMC members ($\bar{x}$ = 1.88, SD = 1.46) was also rarely experienced, indicating that collaboration and communication were generally maintained (Amin et al., 2023). Inconsistent monitoring schedules and minor technical gaps highlight the need to strengthen monitoring frameworks,

capacity-building initiatives, and institutional support to further improve monitoring effectiveness (Akinola et al., 2023; Orieno et al., 2024; Moussa et al., 2026).

Table 1.2
Extent of Challenges Encountered by the PMC Members in terms of Project Monitoring

I encountered the following challenges in implementing the project:	x̄	VD	EoC	SD
1. Limited monitoring done on a set schedule and periods throughout the project duration.	2.63	S	M	1.41
2. Minimum knowledge on recommending project solutions for defects.	2.38	R	L	1.51
3. Incapable of identifying project defects.	2.25	R	L	1.39
4. Less ideas on what to inspect in monitoring.	2.00	R	L	1.51
5. Unable to attend coordination meetings between PMC members on what project to monitor.	1.88	R	L	1.46
Composite	2.23	R	L	1.45

Note: Verbal Description (VD); Extent of Challenges (EoC); 4.21-5.00, Always (A), Very High (VH); 3.41-4.20, Frequently (F), High (H); 2.61-3.40, Sometimes (S), Moderate (M); 1.81-2.60, Rarely (R), Low (L); 1.00- 1.80, Never (N), Very Low (VL); N = 8

As shown in Table 1.3, the extent of challenges encountered by Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) members in project assessment was low, with a composite mean of 2.08 (SD = 1.42), indicating that these challenges were rarely experienced. This suggests that PMC members were generally capable of conducting project assessment, although minor gaps remained (Orieno et al., 2024). Difficulty in comparing actual site conditions with planned outputs, unfamiliarity with assessment methods, and limited immersion in project conditions were all rated as rarely experienced, indicating basic knowledge of assessment processes but some difficulties in applying methods and verifying project status (Ika & Pinto, 2022). Absence during monitoring and assessment activities and limited knowledge of RPMES forms also reflected minor participation and technical gaps that could affect the completeness and consistency of evaluation results (Amin et al., 2023; Lewis, 2024). Although these challenges were infrequent, financial and logistical constraints and institutional pressures may still influence assessment effectiveness (Akinola et al., 2023; Hasan et al., 2021; Mormul, 2021). Strengthening technical skills, field exposure, and the use of standardized tools could further improve the accuracy and effectiveness of project assessment (Orieno et al., 2024).

Table 1.3
Extent of Challenges Encountered by the PMC Members in terms of Project Assessment

I encountered the following challenges in implementing the project:	x̄	VD	EoC	SD
1. Unable to differentiate the actual site status and planned and documented Scope and Program of Works.	2.13	R	L	1.64
2. Unfamiliar with different methods used in assessment.	2.13	R	L	0.99
3. Lack of immersion to actual project conditions.	2.13	R	L	1.55
4. Absent during the conduct of Monitoring and Assessment (M&E) using the timeliness of project implementation.	2.00	R	L	1.60
5. Minimum knowledge about the RPMES Forms used in evaluating projects.	2.00	R	L	1.31
Composite	2.08	R	L	1.42

Note: Verbal Description (VD); Extent of Challenges (EoC); 4.21-5.00, Always (A), Very High (VH); 3.41-4.20, Frequently (F), High (H); 2.61-3.40, Sometimes (S), Moderate (M); 1.81-2.60, Rarely (R), Low (L); 1.00- 1.80, Never (N), Very Low (VL); N = 8

As shown in Table 2.1, the extent of opportunities experienced by Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) members in project implementation was low, with a composite mean of 2.53 (SD = 1.58), indicating that these opportunities were rarely experienced. This suggests that although opportunities for coordination, learning, and capacity development were available, they were not consistently maximized (Orieno et al., 2024). The highest-rated opportunity was regular coordination with the implementing office (Municipal Engineering Office) for project status (x̄ = 2.88, SD = 1.81), interpreted as sometimes experienced, indicating that coordination mechanisms existed but were not consistently practiced (Amin et al., 2023). Attendance in technical assistance seminars (x̄ = 2.75, SD = 1.49) and use of RPMES forms as a monitoring tool (x̄ = 2.63, SD = 1.77) were also sometimes experienced, suggesting that training and standardized tools were available but not fully utilized (Lewis, 2024; Orieno et al., 2024). In contrast, receipt of the LPMC Handbook Vol. 1 (x̄ = 2.25, SD = 1.83) and participation in webinars (x̄ = 2.13, SD = 0.99) were rarely experienced, reflecting limited access to formal learning resources (Magano et al., 2021). Strengthening access to training, regular coordination, and consistent use of monitoring tools could enhance project implementation and improve PMC effectiveness (Hashim et al., 2022; Moussa et al., 2026).

Table 2.1
Extent of Opportunities Experienced by the PMC Members in terms of Project Implementation

I encountered the following opportunities in implementing the project:	x̄	VD	EoO	SD
1. Regular coordination with the implementing office (Municipal Engineering Office) for the status of projects.	2.88	S	M	1.81
2. Learn more in attending technical assistance seminars for PMC members about project implementation.	2.75	S	M	1.49
3. Able to use the RPMES Forms as a tool for the details and accomplishment of the project.	2.63	S	M	1.77
4. Able to receive LPMC Handbook Vol. 1 for the PMC containing what to deal with in project implementation.	2.25	R	L	1.83
5. Participating in webinar sessions for project implementation.	2.13	R	L	0.99
Composite	2.53	R	L	1.58

Note: Verbal Description (VD); Extent of Opportunities (EoO); 4.21-5.00, Always (A), Very High (VH); 3.41-4.20, Frequently (F), High (H); 2.61-3.40, Sometimes (S), Moderate (M); 1.81-2.60, Rarely (R), Low (L); 1.00- 1.80, Never (N), Very Low (VL); N = 8

As shown in Table 2.2, the extent of opportunities experienced by Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) members in project monitoring was low, with a composite mean of 2.43 (SD = 1.53), indicating that these opportunities were rarely experienced. This suggests that while opportunities were available, they were not consistently accessed or fully utilized to improve monitoring effectiveness (Orieno et al., 2024). The highest-rated opportunities were attendance in technical assistance seminars (x̄ = 2.75, SD = 1.58) and provision of transportation for monitoring activities (x̄ = 2.75, SD = 1.91), both

interpreted as sometimes experienced, indicating that capacity-building and logistical support were available but inconsistent (Amin et al., 2023). Participation in webinar sessions ($\bar{x}$ = 2.63, SD = 1.30) was also sometimes experienced, reflecting the presence of digital learning opportunities (Magano et al., 2021). In contrast, use of RPMES forms after monitoring ($\bar{x}$ = 2.25, SD = 1.39) was rarely experienced, and receipt of the LPMC Handbook Vol. 1 ($\bar{x}$ = 1.75, SD = 1.49) was never experienced, indicating limited access to standardized tools and reference materials (Lewis, 2024; Hashim et al., 2022). Overall, the findings indicate that strengthening institutional support, expanding access to resources, and promoting regular use of monitoring tools and learning materials could significantly enhance project monitoring effectiveness and PMC performance (Orieno et al., 2024; Moussa et al., 2026).

Table 2.2
Extent of Opportunities Experienced by the PMC Members in terms of Project Monitoring

I encountered the following opportunities in implementing the project:	$\bar{x}$	VD	EoO	SD
1. Learn more in attending technical assistance seminars for PMC members about project monitoring.	2.75	S	M	1.58
2. Provided transportation for the monitoring of projects.	2.75	S	M	1.91
3. Participating in webinar sessions for project monitoring.	2.63	S	M	1.30
4. Able to use RPMES Forms as a tool after monitoring to compare the implementation office's target accomplishment to the actual inspection.	2.25	R	L	1.39
5. Able to receive LPMC Handbook Vol. 1 for the PMC containing what to observe in monitoring	1.75	N	VL	1.49
Composite	2.43	R	L	1.53

Note: Verbal Description (VD); Extent of Opportunities (EoO); 4.21-5.00, Always (A), Very High (VH); 3.41-4.20, Frequently (F), High (H); 2.61-3.40, Sometimes (S), Moderate (M); 1.81-2.60, Rarely (R), Low (L); 1.00- 1.80, Never (N), Very Low (VL); N = 8

As shown in Table 2.3, the extent of opportunities experienced by Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) members in project assessment was low, with a composite mean of 2.43 (SD = 1.47), indicating that these opportunities were rarely experienced. This suggests that while opportunities were available, they were not consistently accessed or institutionalized in PMC practices (Orieno et al., 2024). Attendance in technical assistance seminars, participation in webinars, receipt of the LPMC Handbook Vol. 1, and use of RPMES forms for assessment and problem-solving all obtained the same mean ($\bar{x}$ = 2.75), interpreted as sometimes experienced, indicating that training and assessment tools were available but not regularly utilized (Lewis, 2024; Amin et al., 2023). In contrast, receipt of financial assistance for project assessment obtained the lowest mean ($\bar{x}$ = 1.63, SD = 1.06), indicating that this opportunity was rarely experienced and highlighting limited financial support for field validation, data collection, and reporting activities (Akinola et al., 2023; Hasan et al., 2021). Strengthening institutional support, improving access to resources, and promoting regular use of assessment tools could enhance the effectiveness, consistency, and reliability of project assessment practices (Hashim et al., 2022; Moussa et al., 2026).

Table 2.3
Extent of Opportunities Experienced by the PMC Members in terms of Project Assessment

I encountered the following opportunities in implementing the project:	$\bar{x}$	VD	EoO	SD
1. Learn more in attending technical assistance seminars for PMC members about project assessment.	2.75	S	M	1.58
2. Participate in webinar sessions for project assessment.	2.75	S	M	1.78
3. Able to receive LPMC Handbook Vol. 1 for the PMC containing what to observe in evaluating projects.	2.75	S	M	1.83
4. Able to use RPMES Forms as a tool in evaluating to have problem-solving sessions to improve the project.	2.75	S	M	1.58
5. Able to receive financial assistance for project assessment.	1.63	R	L	1.06
Composite	2.43	N	VL	1.47

Note: Verbal Description (VD); Extent of Opportunities (EoO); 4.21-5.00, Always (A), Very High (VH); 3.41-4.20, Frequently (F), High (H); 2.61-3.40, Sometimes (S), Moderate (M); 1.81-2.60, Rarely (R), Low (L); 1.00- 1.80, Never (N), Very Low (VL); N = 8

As shown in Table 3, the relationship between the challenges encountered and the opportunities experienced by Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) members varied across project phases. Project implementation showed a strong negative relationship (rs = −0.650), indicating that increased opportunities were associated with fewer implementation challenges. This suggests that access to coordination, training, and tools can substantially reduce implementation difficulties (Orieno et al., 2024; Amin et al., 2023). In project monitoring, a weak positive relationship was observed (rs = 0.108), indicating minimal association between challenges and opportunities and suggesting that other factors, such as technical competence, coordination, and monitoring consistency, may exert greater influence (Hasan et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2023). Project assessment showed a moderate negative relationship (rs = −0.356), indicating that increased opportunities were associated with fewer assessment-related challenges, although the effect was less pronounced than in implementation (Lewis, 2024; Orieno et al., 2024). This underscores the need to strengthen capacity-building programs, monitoring systems, and the regular use of assessment tools to maximize opportunities and improve PMC effectiveness (Moussa et al., 2026).

Table 3
Relationship between the Extent of Challenges Encountered and the Opportunities Experienced by the Project Monitoring Committee Members

Relationship between the Challenges and Opportunities in…	r_s	Degree of Relationship
Project Implementation	-.650	Strong
Project Monitoring	.108	Weak
Project Assessment	-.356	Moderate

Note: Value of r_s; Between ± 0.50 to ± 1.00 , strong ; Between ± 0.30 to ± 0.49, moderate; Between ± 0.10 to ± 0.29, weak; Between ± 0.01 to ± 0.09, very weak; N = 8

As shown in Table 4, the challenges encountered by Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) members varied according to sex and job designation, suggesting that individual and role-related factors influenced performance. Female respondents (n = 5) obtained a higher mean score ($\bar{x}$ = 2.47; Md = 2.40) than male respondents (n = 3; $\bar{x}$ = 1.37; Md = 1.20), indicating that female members experienced more challenges, although still within the low extent category (Hashim et al., 2022; Magano et

al., 2021). In terms of job designation, respondents classified under "Others" (n = 3) recorded the highest mean ($\bar{x}$ = 2.72; Md = 2.57), interpreted as a moderate level of challenges, followed by MENRO ($\bar{x}$ = 2.40). In contrast, Sangguniang Bayan Member and ABC President obtained the lowest mean ($\bar{x}$ = 1.20), indicating a very low level of challenges. These findings suggest that members in less specialized roles may encounter more difficulties due to limited access to technical knowledge, training, and decision-making authority (Orieno et al., 2024). Overall, the results underscore the need for targeted capacity-building programs, clearer role definitions, and equitable access to resources and training to strengthen PMC effectiveness across all member groups (Sankaran et al., 2021; Anglin et al., 2022; Moussa et al., 2026).

Table 4
Difference in the Challenges Encountered by the Project Monitoring Committee Members when They are Grouped according to Their Profile Variables

Variables	N	$\bar{x}$	Md
Sex			
• Male	3	1.37	1.20
• Female	5	2.47	2.40
Job Designation			
• Sangguniang Bayan	1	1.20	1.20
• DILG Officer	1	1.77	1.77
• ABC President	1	1.20	1.20
• Municipal Engineer	1	1.70	1.70
• MENRO	1	2.40	2.40
• Others	3	2.72	2.57

Note: Verbal Description (VD); Extent of Challenges (EoC); 4.21-5.00, Always (A), Very High (VH); 3.41-4.20, Frequently (F), High (H); 2.61-3.40, Sometimes (S), Moderate (M); 1.81-2.60, Rarely (R), Low (L); 1.00- 1.80, Never (N), Very Low (VL); N = 8

As shown in Table 5.1, the performance of the Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) in project implementation was very high, with a composite mean of 4.28 (SD = 0.81), indicating that beneficiaries strongly agreed that the PMC effectively carried out its implementation-related responsibilities. The highest-rated indicator was ensuring that LGU projects were implemented according to the approved plan ($\bar{x}$ = 4.49, SD = 0.73), reflecting strong adherence to standards and effective oversight (Orieno et al., 2024). Coordination with barangay officials ($\bar{x}$ = 4.36, SD = 0.88) and ensuring timely project completion ($\bar{x}$ = 4.27, SD = 0.79) were also rated very high, highlighting the PMC's important role in collaboration and implementation efficiency (Amin et al., 2023). Promoting transparency and addressing implementation issues both obtained a mean of 4.14 (SD = 0.82), interpreted as high performance, suggesting opportunities to further strengthen accountability and responsiveness (Lewis, 2024). Overall, the findings indicate that despite minor operational challenges, the PMC maintained excellent implementation performance through effective governance, stakeholder engagement, and institutional support (Magano et al., 2021; Moussa et al., 2026).

Table 5.1
Level of Performance of the Project Monitoring Committee in Relation to Project Implementation as Perceived by the Beneficiaries

Indicators	$\bar{x}$	VD	LoP	SD
1. The PMC ensures that LGU projects are implemented according to the approved plan.	4.49	SA	VH	0.73
2. The PMC coordinates effectively with barangay officials during project implementation.	4.36	SA	VH	0.88
3. The PMC helps ensure that projects are completed on time.	4.27	SA	VH	0.79
4. The PMC promotes transparency during project implementation.	4.14	A	H	0.82
5. The PMC addresses issues encountered during project implementation.	4.14	A	H	0.82
Composite	4.28	SA	VH	0.81

Note: Verbal Description (VD); Level of Performance (LoP); 4.21-5.00, Strongly Agree (SA), Very High (VH); 3.41-4.20, Agree (A), High (H); 2.61-3.40, Neutral (N), Moderate (M); 1.81-2.60, Disagree (D), Low (L); 1.00- 1.80, Strongly Disagree (SD), Very Low (VL); n = 148

As shown in Table 5.2, the performance of the Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) in project monitoring was very high, with a composite mean of 4.21 (SD = 0.85), indicating that beneficiaries strongly agreed that the PMC effectively performed its monitoring functions. The highest-rated indicator was ensuring that project funds were properly utilized ($\bar{x}$ = 4.30, SD = 0.86), reflecting strong financial accountability and transparency (Lewis, 2024). Conducting site visits to check project progress ($\bar{x}$ = 4.24, SD = 0.87) and regularly monitoring ongoing LGU projects ($\bar{x}$ = 4.23, SD = 0.84) were also rated very high, highlighting the PMC's active role in verifying project status and supporting timely completion (Hasan et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2023). Community involvement during monitoring ($\bar{x}$ = 4.17, SD = 0.88) and immediate reporting of project concerns or delays ($\bar{x}$ = 4.09, SD = 0.80) were rated high, suggesting opportunities to further strengthen participatory monitoring and responsiveness (Amin et al., 2023). Overall, the findings indicate that despite limited opportunities, the PMC maintained excellent monitoring performance through strong accountability, effective governance, and institutional support (Magano et al., 2021; Moussa et al., 2026).

Table 5.2
Level of Performance of the Project Monitoring Committee in Relation to Project Monitoring as Perceived by the Beneficiaries

Indicators	$\bar{x}$	VD	LoP	SD
1. The PMC ensures that project funds are properly utilized.	4.30	SA	VH	0.86
2. The PMC conducts site visits to check project progress.	4.24	SA	VH	0.87
3. The PMC regularly monitors ongoing LGU projects.	4.23	SA	VH	0.84
4. The PMC involves the community during project monitoring.	4.17	A	H	0.88
5. The PMC immediately reports project concerns or delays.	4.09	A	H	0.80
Composite	4.21	SA	VH	0.85

Note: Verbal Description (VD); Level of Performance (LoP); 4.21-5.00, Strongly Agree (SA), Very High (VH); 3.41-4.20, Agree (A), High (H); 2.61-3.40, Neutral (N), Moderate (M); 1.81-2.60, Disagree (D), Low (L); 1.00- 1.80, Strongly Disagree (SD), Very Low (VL); n = 148

As shown in Table 5.3, the performance of the Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) in project assessment was very high, with a composite mean of 4.21 (SD = 0.81), indicating that beneficiaries strongly agreed that the PMC effectively conducted assessment activities. The highest-rated indicator was evaluating completed projects objectively ($\bar{x}$ = 4.31, SD = 0.84), reflecting fair and systematic assessment of project outcomes (Orieno et al., 2024). Assessing whether projects met community needs ($\bar{x}$ = 4.24, SD = 0.84) and ensuring accountability after project completion ($\bar{x}$ = 4.23, SD = 0.75) were also rated very high, highlighting the PMC's strong role in linking assessment to community relevance and accountability (Amin et al., 2023). Using assessment results to improve future projects ($\bar{x}$ = 4.14, SD = 0.86) and communicating findings to stakeholders ($\bar{x}$ = 4.13, SD = 0.78) were rated high, indicating opportunities to further strengthen the use and dissemination of assessment results (Lewis, 2024). Overall, the findings indicate that despite limited opportunities and minor challenges, the PMC maintained excellent assessment performance through strong governance, effective use of available resources, and institutional support (Magano et al., 2021; Moussa et al., 2026).

Table 5.3
Level of Performance of the Project Monitoring Committee in Relation to Project Assessment as Perceived by the Beneficiaries

Indicators	$\bar{x}$	VD	LoP	SD
1. The PMC evaluates completed projects objectively.	4.31	SA	VH	0.84
2. The PMC assesses whether projects meet community needs.	4.24	SA	VH	0.84
3. The PMC ensures accountability after project completion.	4.23	SA	VH	0.75
4. The PMC uses assessment results to improve future projects.	4.14	A	H	0.86
5. The PMC communicates assessment results to concerned stakeholders.	4.13	A	H	0.78
Composite	4.21	SA	VH	0.81

Note: Verbal Description (VD); Level of Performance (LoP); 4.21-5.00, Strongly Agree (SA), Very High (VH); 3.41-4.20, Agree (A), High (H); 2.61-3.40, Neutral (N), Moderate (M); 1.81-2.60, Disagree (D), Low (L); 1.00- 1.80, Strongly Disagree (SD), Very Low (VL); n = 148

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study concludes that Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) members in the Municipality of Mabinay experience generally low levels of challenges in project implementation, monitoring, and assessment, indicating that they are functionally capable of carrying out their responsibilities. Nevertheless, access to opportunities such as training, adequate resources, and standardized tools remains limited and inconsistent. The significant negative relationships between challenges and opportunities in project implementation and assessment suggest that expanding these opportunities can substantially reduce operational difficulties, while the weak relationship observed in monitoring indicates that procedural and structural factors also affect effectiveness. Differences in challenges according to sex and job designation further reveal that some members, particularly female participants and those in less specialized roles, may require additional support. Despite these constraints, beneficiaries rated the PMC's performance as consistently very high, demonstrating effective and accountable oversight of local government projects. Overall, the findings affirm that the PMC is performing efficiently, but sustained improvement depends on stronger institutional support, broader access to developmental opportunities, and enhanced technical competencies.

It is recommended that the Local Government Unit of Mabinay enact a municipal ordinance institutionalizing a comprehensive support system for the Project Monitoring Committee. This ordinance should provide for continuous capacity development programs, mandatory use of standardized monitoring and assessment tools, and the establishment of a structured project monitoring framework to ensure consistency and accountability. It should also allocate sufficient resources, including funding, equipment, and access to technical reference materials, to support effective monitoring activities. In addition, the ordinance should promote role-specific and inclusive capacity-building mechanisms that address the diverse responsibilities of committee members, while strengthening participatory and results-based governance practices to enhance transparency, community engagement, and the utilization of assessment findings for evidence-based decision-making and improved project outcomes.

References

Akinola, G., Fagbenle, O., Ogunde, A., & Akerele, A. (2023). Cost Reduction Techniques in Public Higher Educational Buildings in Southwestern Nigeria: Awareness Among Project Participants. In E3S Web of Conferences (Vol. 437, p. 04001). EDP Sciences. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202343704001

Amin, H., Scheepers, H., & Malik, M. (2023). Project monitoring and evaluation to engage stakeholders of international development projects for community impact. International Journal of Managing Projects in Business, 16(2), 405-427. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-02-2022-0043

Anderson, C. C., Denich, M., Warchold, A., Kropp, J. P., & Pradhan, P. (2022). A systems model of SDG target influence on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Sustainability science, 17(4), 1459-1472. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-021-01040-8

Anglin, A. H., Kincaid, P. A., Short, J. C., & Allen, D. G. (2022). Role theory perspectives: Past, present, and future applications of role theories in management research. Journal of Management, 48(6), 1469-1502. https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063221081442

Awa, H. O., Etim, W., & Ogbonda, E. (2024). Stakeholders, stakeholder theory and corporate social responsibility (CSR). International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility, 9(1), 11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-024-00094-y

Berrone, P., Rousseau, H. E., Ricart, J. E., Brito, E., & Giuliodori, A. (2023). How can research contribute to the implementation of sustainable development goals? An interpretive review of SDG literature in management. International Journal of Management Reviews, 25(2), 318-339. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12331

Bridoux, F., & Stoelhorst, J. W. (2022). Stakeholder theory, strategy, and organization: Past, present, and future. Strategic Organization, 20(4), 797-809. https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270221127628

Erin, O. A., Bamigboye, O. A., & Oyewo, B. (2022). Sustainable development goals (SDG) reporting: an analysis of disclosure. Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies, 12(5), 761-789. https://doi.org/10.1108/JAEE-02-2020-0037

Fobiri, G., Musonda, I., & Muleya, F. (2022). Reality capture in construction project management: A review of opportunities and challenges. Buildings, 12(9), 1381. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12091381

Gupta, K., Zhang, W., & Hall, R. P. (2021). Risk priorities and their co-occurrences in smart city project implementation: Evidence from India's Smart Cities Mission (SCM). Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science, 48(4), 880-894. https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808320907607

Hasan, R., Chowdhury, S. A., & Akter, J. (2021). Construction project monitoring: The cost and schedule control by Earned Value Method (EVM). Journal of Technology Management and Business, 8(1), 1-9. https://penerbit.uthm.edu.my/ojs/index.php/jtmb/article/view/8063

Hashim, M. Z., Chao, L., & Wang, C. (2022). The role of project managers' attributes in project sustainability management and project performance under China Pakistan economic corridor. Chinese Management Studies, 16(3), 708-731. https://doi.org/10.1108/CMS-08-2021-0333

Ika, L. A., & Munro, L. T. (2022). Tackling grand challenges with projects: Five insights and a research agenda for project management theory and practice. International Journal of Project Management, 40(6), 601-607. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2022.05.008

Ika, L. A., & Pinto, J. K. (2022). The "re-meaning" of project success: Updating and recalibrating for a modern project management. International Journal of Project Management, 40(7), 835-848. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2022.08.001
Ingle, P. V., & Mahesh, G. (2022). Construction project performance areas for Indian construction projects. International Journal of Construction Management, 22(8), 1443-1454. https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2020.1721177
Klemsdal, L., & Clegg, S. (2022). Defining the work situation in organization theory: bringing Goffman back in. Culture and Organization, 28(6), 471-484. https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2022.2090563
Lewis, J. M. (2024). New Public Management, performance measurement, and measuring for governance. In Handbook on Measuring Governance (pp. 45-61). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781802200645.00011
Magano, J., Silvius, G., Silva, C. S., & Leite, Â. (2021). Exploring characteristics of sustainability stimulus patterns of project managers. Sustainability, 13(7), 4019. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13074019
Mormul, K. (2021). Risk management in the management control system in polish local government units—assumptions and practice. Risks, 9(5), 92. https://doi.org/10.3390/risks9050092
Moussa, E. F., Puerta, J. G. D. L., Ipiña, D. L. D., & Gomez, I. P. (2026). Collaborative governance in the public sector: trends and dynamics. International Journal of Business Environment, 17(2), 143-170. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBE.2026.152811
Orieno, O. H., Ndubuisi, N. L., Eyo-Udo, N. L., Ilojianya, V. I., & Biu, P. W. (2024). Sustainability in project management: A comprehensive review. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 21(1), 656-677. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.1.0060
Pakkan, S., Sudhakar, C., Tripathi, S., & Rao, M. (2023). A correlation study of sustainable development goal (SDG) interactions. Quality & quantity, 57(2), 1937-1956. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-022-01443-4
Sankaran, S., Jacobsson, M., & Blomquist, T. (2021). The history and future of projects as a transition innovation: Towards a sustainable project management framework. Systems research and behavioral science, 38(5), 696-714. https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2814
Shunglu, R., Köpke, S., Kanoi, L., Nissanka, T. S., Withanachchi, C. R., Gamage, D. U., ... & Withanachchi, S. S. (2022). Barriers in participative water governance: A critical analysis of community development approaches. Water, 14(5), 762. https://doi.org/10.3390/w14050762
Zhang, H. M., Chong, H. Y., Zeng, Y., & Zhang, W. (2023). The effective mediating role of stakeholder management in the relationship between BIM implementation and project performance. Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, 30(6), 2503-2522. https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-04-2020-0225