

The Implementation of the Standardized Land-Based Equipment Management Procedures and the Delegation of Responsibilities in the Field Offices of the Department of the Public Works and Highways (DPWH) In the Province of Albay

Romeo Niño C. Casim Jr.¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: Equipment Management Maintenance Delegation of Responsibilities Public Administration Kendall Concordance Albay	The study examined standardized land-based equipment management procedures and delegation-related responsibilities in DPWH field offices in Albay. Weighted means described four equipment-management domains and five delegation-related domains. Coefficients of concordance and reported chi-square tests assessed agreement on indicator rankings among districts. Participant numbers, sampling, detailed instrument specifications, and collection procedures were not reported. Equipment-management procedures had an overall weighted mean of 4.36, interpreted as Much Implemented. Express maintenance ranked highest (4.46), followed by preventive maintenance (4.44), corrective maintenance (4.41), and capital project activities (4.11). The delegation-related summary reported an overall mean of 4.30, interpreted as Much Evident. However, the budget and monitoring domain means in that summary differ materially from their detailed findings. All concordance tests were described as nonsignificant, with multiple numerical versions reported. The findings support review of emergency repairs, parts and tools, performance reporting, technical development, financial coordination, and accountability. Negative and positive statements within the delegation-related domains complicate interpretation of the overall score. The study describes perceptions and rankings rather than verified equipment reliability, downtime reduction, or causal links between standardization and delegation. The recommendations favor integrated records, clearer responsibilities, lifecycle planning, and coordinated review, subject to clarification of the methodological and statistical record.

1. Introduction

Equipment management in public works involves keeping machinery available for operational needs while maintaining records, technical capability, and accountability. Preventive servicing, corrective repairs, urgent field maintenance, and equipment support for capital projects address different stages of the same management task. An assessment of these activities is useful when it distinguishes perceived implementation from demonstrated reliability or cost effectiveness.

The study examined standardized land-based equipment management procedures and delegation of responsibilities in DPWH field offices in the Province of Albay. The equipment-management assessment covered preventive, corrective, and express maintenance and capital project activities. The delegation-related assessment covered equipment availability and aging, technical training and personnel, funding constraints, monitoring and reporting, and non-compliance with procedures. The second set combines capabilities and operational problems, which requires careful attention to item direction.

Muchiri et al. (2011) developed a maintenance performance framework connecting organizational objectives, maintenance activities, and maintenance results. Their distinction between processes and outcomes is relevant to interpreting a questionnaire profile. A high rating for inspection or documentation is a process assessment; equipment availability, reliability, and maintenance costs require additional performance evidence. The study's ratings cannot establish those outcomes without the corresponding operational records.

Tsang (2002) discussed strategic choices involving maintenance service delivery, organization, methodology, and support systems. This perspective suggests that assigning responsibilities is connected to technical and administrative arrangements. It does not establish that standardized organizations necessarily show significant agreement on rankings, nor that a lower concordance coefficient demonstrates ineffective maintenance.

Olanrewaju and Abdul-Aziz (2015) examined maintenance processes in a building-management context. Their integrated approach offers relevant concepts, while differences between buildings and land-based equipment restrict direct transfer of findings. The study provides a local equipment-management profile and should not be presented as replicating a building-maintenance evaluation or establishing the effectiveness of a particular maintenance model.

The research questions addressed the implementation level of the four equipment-management domains; agreement on their rank orders; the level of delegation-related responsibilities across five domains; agreement on those rankings; and policy recommendations. The analysis distinguishes rating magnitude, the content and direction of statements, and agreement on relative ordering. These distinctions prevent favorable labels from obscuring negative indicators or nonsignificant tests from being treated as proof of no shared practice.

2. Methods

2.1 Analytical approach and setting

The study presented quantitative assessments of standardized land-based equipment management procedures and delegation-related responsibilities in DPWH field offices. Weighted means described the listed domains and indicators; rank-agreement analyses used coefficients of concordance and chi-square statistics. The formal research-design designation was not reported. No experimental assignment, control condition, repeated measurement, or participant-level predictive analysis was described. These features are not inferred from the title or from references to implementation.

The findings refer to district offices and different respondent groups, but the office names, participant roles, total sample, and group allocation were not specified. Numbers of ranking groups and respondents are not reconstructed from the test statistics. The fieldwork period was not reported.

2.2 Measurement and procedures

The reported findings contain four equipment-management domains and five delegation-related domains, with ten named statements in each. The measurement instrument's identity, development, response anchors, interpretation intervals, validation, and reliability were not reported. Much Implemented (MI) describes equipment-management domain means, while Much Evident (ME) describes delegation-related means. Individual interpretation codes are retained only where explicitly attached to the item in the numerical findings. Most items have no separately specified code.

Sampling procedures, recruitment, response rates, administration mode, dates of collection, missing-data treatment, and the calculation of weighted means were not specified. The statistical term weighted mean is retained, but the weighting formula and aggregation across groups are not reconstructed. Counts of listed indicators describe the reported findings and do not establish the number or composition of participants.

Ethics approval, individual consent, confidentiality safeguards, and data-retention arrangements were not documented. No approval number or consent procedure is supplied by assumption. The study is presented through aggregate findings without adding personal participant information. Administrative or institutional affiliation is not treated as evidence of independent ethics review.

2.3 Statistical treatment and reporting

The concordance analyses assessed agreement on indicator rank orders among district groups. The study reported coefficients of concordance (W) and chi-square tests. W describes consistency of ordering, while a weighted mean describes the level of a rating. Neither statistic estimates a causal effect or a correlation between the two sets of study domains.

Reported probability inequalities and hypothesis decisions are retained as stated. A threshold such as $p > 0.05$ is not an exact p value. Acceptance of the null hypothesis is reported as the stated decision, while interpretation is limited to failure to establish significant agreement. The full ranking matrices, degrees of freedom, treatment of ties, software, and unrounded calculations were not reported, so the tests could not be independently reproduced.

Tables reconstruct the numerical findings stated in the results narrative. Detailed district values, numeric ranks, response frequencies, and standard deviations are not supplied where unreported. Indicator wording and displayed numerical precision are retained. Em dashes mark an unreported value or interpretation, never zero. Multiple numerical versions are displayed together when they differ; no corrected value has been substituted.

3. Results

The tables distinguish domain profiles, overall summaries, and agreement statistics. Indicator interpretations appear only when explicitly assigned in the numerical findings. Domain labels are not automatically applied to every item, and no missing interpretation is inferred from a presumed scale cutoff. Analytical discussion follows each table.

3.1 Preventive maintenance

Table 1. Preventive maintenance

Indicator	Weighted mean	Reported interpretation
Maintenance checklists are consistently utilized during all maintenance activities conducted	4.62	—
Operators are trained to perform basic preventive maintenance tasks effectively	4.58	—
Equipment is inspected routinely to detect potential issues before failures	4.54	—
Lubrication and cleaning of equipment are regularly performed by assigned personnel	4.50	—
Preventive maintenance activities are properly documented and recorded for future reference	4.46	—
Safety inspections are integrated into all preventive maintenance activities conducted regularly	4.46	—
Maintenance schedules are communicated clearly to all concerned personnel and staff	4.45	—
Regular preventive maintenance schedules are established and strictly followed consistently	4.42	—

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted mean	Reported interpretation
Spare parts are readily available for all scheduled preventive maintenance activities	4.25	—
Equipment downtime is minimized through effective and timely preventive maintenance actions	4.12	—
Overall weighted mean	4.44	MI

Note. — means no separate item value or interpretation was specified. Overall interpretation is retained as reported.

Checklist use, operator training, and routine inspection were rated above spare-parts availability and minimizing downtime. The profile suggests that technical routines were more favorably perceived than some conditions needed to translate them into uninterrupted operation. It does not establish actual failure rates or the number of maintenance tasks completed on schedule.

The study supports reviewing maintenance schedules together with parts availability and records of downtime. Muchiri et al. (2011) distinguish maintenance efforts from maintenance results within a performance framework. That distinction is useful here: favorable ratings of preventive activities should be followed by examination of equipment availability and reliability rather than interpreted as direct evidence of their improvement.

3.2 Corrective maintenance

Table 2. Corrective maintenance

Indicator	Weighted mean	Reported interpretation
Repair activities are properly recorded and documented for monitoring purposes	4.57	—
Replacement of defective parts is carried out without delay when needed	4.53	—
Faults and issues are accurately diagnosed before performing any repair actions	4.50	—
Downtime caused by equipment failure is minimized through efficient repair actions	4.50	—
Qualified personnel handle all corrective maintenance tasks efficiently and safely	4.47	—
Standard procedures are followed strictly during all repair activities performed	4.47	—
Equipment repairs are conducted promptly after breakdown occurs in operations	4.37	—
Root cause analysis is conducted after every equipment failure occurrence	4.30	—
Necessary tools and equipment are available for all required repair activities	4.27	—
Emergency repair protocols are established and implemented effectively during equipment failures	4.17	—
Overall weighted mean	4.41	MI

Note. — means no separate item value or interpretation was specified. Overall interpretation is retained as reported.

Repair documentation and defective-part replacement received stronger ratings than emergency protocols, tool availability, and root-cause analysis. This differentiates recording a repair and restoring operation from preparedness for the next failure. A high documentation rating does not establish that records were complete enough to identify recurring defects.

The findings support clearer emergency roles and more systematic use of repair histories when reviewing repeat failures. Decisions about tools and technical support should reflect actual equipment and task requirements. The study did not inspect work orders or calculate repair duration, so it cannot determine whether a particular protocol reduced downtime or whether parts replacement addressed the underlying cause of failure.

3.3 Express maintenance

Table 3. Express maintenance

Indicator	Weighted mean	Reported interpretation
Field workers are capable of performing basic quick repairs when necessary	4.71	—
Response time to maintenance requests is quick and efficiently managed always	4.54	—
Tools and materials for quick repairs are accessible at all times	4.54	—
Emergency maintenance support is reliable and efficiently delivered when needed	4.54	—
Express maintenance helps reduce equipment downtime significantly during operations period	4.46	—
Maintenance personnel are readily available whenever maintenance services are required	4.41	—

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted mean	Reported interpretation
Quick maintenance procedures are standardized and consistently followed by maintenance personnel	4.41	—
Communication for urgent maintenance concerns is effective among all personnel involved	4.41	—
Equipment is restored to operation within the shortest possible time frame	4.29	—
Minor repairs are performed immediately at the site without unnecessary delays	4.25	—
Overall weighted mean	4.46	MI

Note. — means no separate item value or interpretation was specified. Overall interpretation is retained as reported.

Field workers' quick-repair capability was rated above immediate on-site repairs and restoration within the shortest time. This suggests that perceived competence and the ability to deploy it promptly should be examined separately. Availability, communication, and standardization shared the same reported mean, but that equality does not demonstrate that all requests were handled in an equivalent way.

The study supports reviewing how urgent requests reach the responsible personnel and how tools and parts are mobilized. Rapid restoration should remain consistent with safe and appropriate technical work. No elapsed response times, service volumes, or repair-quality measures were reported, so express maintenance cannot be judged more efficient than other maintenance approaches solely from its relatively higher domain mean.

3.4 Capital project activities

Table 4. Capital project activities

Indicator	Weighted mean	Reported interpretation
Budget allocation adequately supports equipment needs for all project activities	4.37	—
Equipment utilization is optimized in project implementation and execution phases	4.16	—
Equipment selection aligns properly with project requirements and operational needs	4.12	—
Lifecycle management of equipment is properly implemented across all project phases	4.12	—
Disposal of unserviceable equipment follows standard procedures and proper documentation	4.12	—
Procurement of equipment follows proper planning procedures and approval processes	4.08	—
Monitoring of equipment usage is regularly conducted by responsible personnel	4.08	—
Coordination among units ensures efficient equipment use throughout project implementation	4.08	—
Project timelines consider equipment availability and condition during planning stages	4.04	—
Equipment performance is regularly evaluated and reported to management personnel	3.96	—
Overall weighted mean	4.11	MI

Note. — means no separate item value or interpretation was specified. Overall interpretation is retained as reported.

Budget support for equipment was rated above evaluation of equipment performance and consideration of availability during scheduling. The profile suggests that equipment management during project preparation and review deserves attention alongside funding. It does not show that allocations were adequate for each project or that utilization was objectively optimized.

The findings support linking equipment selection, scheduling, condition, and performance reporting across a project's life cycle. Olanrewaju and Abdul-Aziz (2015) discuss integrated maintenance processes in a building context; their work offers a management perspective rather than direct evidence about DPWH machinery. The study's lower capital-project rating identifies a local review priority without validating a particular lifecycle strategy.

Table 5. Summary of equipment-management implementation

Domain	Weighted mean	Label
Express maintenance	4.46	MI
Preventive maintenance	4.44	MI
Corrective maintenance	4.41	MI

Domain	Weighted mean	Label
Capital project activities	4.11	MI
Overall weighted mean	4.36	MI

Note. Domain and overall means are reproduced as reported. Means have no physical units; interpretation codes are defined in Methods. Express maintenance had the highest reported mean and capital project activities the lowest. The profile suggests stronger perceptions of routine and urgent maintenance than of some equipment-management arrangements across project activities. It does not establish that quick repairs were the most cost-effective maintenance strategy.

The overall Much Implemented classification is descriptive. Each approach addresses a different operational need, and the study did not compare their costs, reliability outcomes, or effects on service continuity. A balanced policy should consider equipment condition and project demands alongside the rating profile.

Table 6. Reported agreement on implementation indicator rankings

Domain	Initial W / χ^2	Other W / χ^2	Reported p	Stated H_0 decision
Preventive maintenance	0.21 / 5.67	0.212 / —	$P > 0.05$	Accepted
Corrective maintenance	0.12 / 3.24	0.119 / —	$p > 0.05$	Accepted
Express maintenance	0.48 / 12.96	0.482 / —	$p > 0.05$	Accepted
Capital project activities	0.19 / 5.13	0.189 / —	$p > 0.05$	Accepted

Note. Values separated by a slash are W and χ^2 . Different versions are shown where reported; — means not specified. Hypothesis wording is retained.

All four maintenance domains were reported as nonsignificant, with the null hypothesis described as accepted. Express maintenance had the largest W and corrective maintenance the smallest. This identifies different degrees of reported ordering consistency, not a comparative test of equipment reliability or maintenance efficiency.

Additional three-decimal W values are retained alongside the initial versions. The findings do not give sufficient ranking information to identify a preferred calculation. Nonsignificance should not be interpreted as proof that standard procedures were ineffective or that districts lacked all shared understanding; it means significant agreement was not established under the stated analysis.

3.5 Availability and aging of equipment

Table 7. Availability and aging of equipment

Indicator	Weighted mean	Reported interpretation
Aging equipment is regularly assessed for performance, safety, and reliability	4.37	—
Allocation of equipment is effectively managed among different project requirements	4.37	—
Equipment availability meets operational demands across all field office projects	4.33	—
Replacement plans are developed for outdated and inefficient equipment units	4.33	—
Older equipment is maintained properly to ensure continued operational efficiency	—	—
Reporting systems capture accurate data on equipment status and aging conditions	4.33	—
Decision-making regarding equipment use is clearly delegated to responsible personnel	4.29	—
Equipment downtime due to aging is minimized through timely maintenance interventions	4.29	—
Equipment condition is monitored consistently through scheduled inspections and evaluations	4.25	—
Responsibility for equipment upkeep is clearly assigned among field personnel	4.20	—
Overall weighted mean	4.31	ME

Note. — means no separate item value or interpretation was specified. Overall interpretation is retained as reported.

Assessment and allocation of aging equipment received stronger ratings than clearly assigned upkeep responsibilities and scheduled condition monitoring. This suggests a perceived distinction between managing the asset pool and defining accountability for individual equipment. One maintenance statement has no separately attached numerical value; its mean remains unreported rather than being borrowed from the following statement.

The profile supports clarifying custodial duties and recording the basis for deployment, inspection, and replacement decisions. Equipment condition and operating demand should inform those decisions, but the study contains no asset register or condition assessment with which to verify them. Favorable delegation-related ratings cannot demonstrate that aging equipment was reliable or that decision authority was consistently exercised.

3.6 Technical training and skilled personnel

Table 8. Technical training and skilled personnel

Indicator	Weighted mean	Reported interpretation
Knowledge transfer among experienced and new workers is effectively practiced	4.46	—
Skilled workers are available to handle complex equipment maintenance tasks effectively	4.42	—
Personnel receive regular technical training related to equipment operation and maintenance	4.37	—
Personnel are updated on safety standards and equipment handling procedures	4.33	—
Continuous learning opportunities are provided to enhance personnel technical capabilities	4.33	—
Certification programs are encouraged for personnel handling specialized equipment operations	4.33	—
Employees demonstrate competence in operating and maintaining assigned equipment properly	4.29	—
Training needs assessments are conducted regularly to identify skill gaps	4.29	—
Adequate supervision ensures proper application of technical skills in operations	4.25	—
Training programs are aligned with current technological advancements and equipment requirements	4.16	—
Overall weighted mean	4.32	ME

Note. — means no separate item value or interpretation was specified. Overall interpretation is retained as reported.

Knowledge transfer and the availability of skilled personnel were rated above training alignment with technological requirements and supervision of skills application. This identifies a perceived distinction between existing experience and continued capability development. It does not establish competence through a practical test or demonstrate that any certification requirement was satisfied.

The findings support reviewing training content against the equipment actually used and the tasks assigned to personnel. Peer learning can complement formal training, but both should connect to observed performance. The study did not compare trained and untrained personnel or evaluate learning gains, so technical development remains a policy priority rather than a demonstrated cause of improved maintenance outcomes.

3.7 Budgetary constraints and delayed fund releases

Table 9. Budgetary constraints and delayed fund releases

Indicator	Weighted mean	Reported interpretation
Financial planning is challenged by unpredictable funding schedules and allocations	4.247	—
Budget allocation is insufficient to meet increasing equipment operational demands	4.163	—
Delayed fund releases hinder scheduled maintenance and repair activities implementation	4.123	—
Financial constraints impact the availability of spare parts and materials	4.123	—
Maintenance activities are postponed due to limited available financial resources	4.123	—
Project timelines are affected by delays in funding disbursement processes	4.120	—
Cost-cutting measures affect the quality of equipment maintenance practices implemented	4.040	—
Budget limitations affect timely procurement of necessary equipment and maintenance resources	4.037	—
Delayed payments impact service providers supporting equipment maintenance operations significantly	3.997	—
Budget monitoring systems ensure proper utilization of allocated financial resources	3.997	—
Overall weighted mean	4.097	ME

Note. — means no separate item value or interpretation was specified. Overall interpretation is retained as reported.

Unpredictable funding schedules and insufficient allocations were rated as more evident concerns than payment delays and budget monitoring. The statements combine difficulties with a positively worded monitoring item, which complicates interpretation of a single domain score. A higher score cannot uniformly mean better delegation when most items describe constraints.

The findings support examining whether financial schedules align with maintenance needs and whether processing responsibilities are clear. They do not establish the amount of additional funding required or a causal effect on project timelines. The domain mean is retained as reported, while the differing value assigned to this domain in the later summary is presented separately without choosing an assumed correction.

3.8 Weak monitoring documentation and reporting systems

Table 10. Weak monitoring documentation and reporting systems

Indicator	Weighted mean	Reported interpretation
Data management systems fail to provide accurate and timely equipment information	4.54	—
Communication gaps hinder proper reporting of equipment issues and concerns	4.54	—
Monitoring systems are inadequate for tracking equipment usage and performance data	4.50	—
Documentation of maintenance activities is incomplete or inconsistently recorded across projects	4.50	—
Record keeping practices are not properly maintained by assigned personnel	4.50	—
Reporting procedures lack standardization among different field offices and units	4.457	—
Lack of monitoring tools affects effective supervision of equipment operations	4.417	ME
Reports are delayed due to inefficient documentation and submission processes	4.37	—
Monitoring responsibilities are unclear among personnel handling equipment management tasks	4.33	—
Evaluation of equipment performance is limited due to insufficient recorded data	4.24 / 4.247	—
Overall weighted mean	4.44	ME

Note. — means no separate item value or interpretation was specified. Overall interpretation is retained as reported. The evaluation row preserves 4.24 in the initial list and 4.247 in the later discussion.

Inaccurate information and communication gaps were rated as prominent monitoring concerns. Other statements address incomplete records, inconsistent reporting, and unclear responsibilities. Because these are negatively worded items, a favorable-sounding extent label signifies the reported visibility of problems rather than evidence that the information system is performing well.

The findings support reviewing data definitions, reporting responsibility, and validation before introducing new technology. A shared system would require reliable inputs and clear ownership; digitizing an incomplete record would not by itself resolve the underlying issue. The study did not audit data quality, measure reporting delay, or test a digital intervention, so its proposed information-system changes remain recommendations.

3.9 Non-compliance and resistance to standard procedures

Table 11. Non-compliance and resistance to standard procedures

Indicator	Weighted mean	Reported interpretation
Supervisory enforcement of procedures is weak across different field offices	4.54	—
Monitoring compliance is challenging due to lack of strict enforcement measures	4.54	—
Personnel fail to follow established equipment management procedures during operations consistently	4.50	—
Resistance to standard procedures affects efficiency of equipment maintenance practices	4.50	—
Deviations from standard protocols occur frequently during equipment operation activities	4.50	—
Lack of awareness contributes to non-compliance with established operational guidelines	4.457	—
Personnel exhibit reluctance in adopting updated procedures and operational standards	4.417	—

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted mean	Reported interpretation
Training deficiencies contribute to improper implementation of standard procedures consistently	4.373	—
Accountability measures are insufficient to address non-compliance issues among personnel	4.33	—
Organizational culture affects adherence to established rules and equipment procedures	4.247	—
Overall weighted mean	4.44	ME

Note. — means no separate item value or interpretation was specified. Overall interpretation is retained as reported.

Weak supervisory enforcement and difficulty monitoring compliance were rated above organizational culture and accountability provisions. The profile emphasizes perceived implementation problems despite the presence of standardized procedures. It does not verify the frequency of specific violations or show that an individual employee resisted a documented instruction.

The study supports clearer responsibilities, feedback, and consistent review of deviations. Technical training alone may not address issues involving authority, resources, or organizational processes, but those explanations require further examination. The negative wording should guide interpretation: a higher mean indicates a more evident compliance concern under the stated item content, not stronger adherence to equipment management standards.

Table 12. Delegation-related means in detailed findings and summary

Domain	Detailed mean	Summary mean	Summary label
Non-compliance and resistance to standard procedures	4.44	4.44	ME
Technical training and skilled personnel	4.32	4.32	ME
Availability and aging of equipment	4.31	4.31	ME
Budgetary constraints and delayed fund releases	4.097	4.31	ME
Weak monitoring documentation and reporting systems	4.44	4.097	ME
Overall weighted mean	—	4.30	ME

Note. Both numerical versions are retained. No replacement mean has been calculated.

The summary assigns different means to the budget and monitoring domains from those in the detailed findings. Consequently, the stated ranking of these two domains cannot be treated as reconciled. The overall 4.30 and its Much Evident classification are retained from the summary without recalculating a replacement.

The mixed item direction also limits the meaning of a single delegation score. Higher means for monitoring deficiencies and non-compliance describe more evident problems, whereas capability statements describe favorable arrangements. The summary cannot therefore be read as an unqualified measure of successful delegation or used to infer a causal relationship with maintenance implementation.

Table 13. Reported agreement on delegation-related indicator rankings

Domain	Initial W / χ^2	Other W / χ^2	Reported p	Stated H ₀ decision
Availability and aging of equipment	0.16 / 4.32	0.155 / 4.20	P > 0.05	Accepted
Technical training and skilled personnel	0.31 / 8.37	0.310 / 8.381	p > 0.05	Accepted
Budgetary constraints and delayed fund releases	0.46 / 12.42	0.458 / 12.381	p > 0.05	Accepted
Weak monitoring documentation and reporting systems	0.30 / 8.1	0.299 / 8.090	p > 0.05	Accepted
Non-compliance and resistance to standard procedures	0.33 / 8.91	0.332 / 8.981	—	Accepted

Note. Values separated by a slash are W and χ^2 . — means not specified. Different numerical versions and probability wording are retained. The delegation-related tests were all described as nonsignificant and the null hypothesis as accepted. Budgetary constraints had the greatest reported W, while equipment availability and aging had the smallest. These results concern ranking consistency among groups and do not test whether financial constraints caused problems in delegated performance.

Several W and chi-square entries appear in two numerical versions. The differences require the underlying output and do not justify choosing a guessed correction. The last domain has no explicitly attached p inequality in the initial numerical list, although the overall decision covers all domains. That distinction is retained rather than supplying an unreported probability.

4. Discussion

4.1 Maintenance implementation and its operational meaning

The study reported a stronger profile for express, preventive, and corrective maintenance than for capital project activities. This suggests that day-to-day servicing was more favorably perceived than some arrangements connecting equipment to project planning and evaluation. The rating differences do not establish comparative efficiency or demonstrate that one maintenance approach produced better results.

Across the maintenance domains, comparatively lower statements concerned downtime, spare parts, emergency protocols, tools, immediate on-site repair, and equipment performance reporting. These concerns connect technical activity with organizational support. The study supports reviewing these links, while possible explanations involving procurement, workload, equipment age, or resource scarcity remain unmeasured.

Muchiri et al. (2011) provide a framework for extending this profile through performance measures that connect maintenance processes with results. Application would require actual records and suitable indicators, rather than treating the ratings as measures of operational availability. The study did not calculate failure rates, repair times, maintenance costs, or a before-and-after change in downtime.

4.2 Delegation and the direction of the statements

The delegation-related profile requires more caution than its generally favorable label suggests. Equipment availability and technical training include capability statements, whereas monitoring deficiencies and non-compliance mostly describe problems. A higher score can therefore carry different meanings across domains. No documented reverse-scoring or validated composite structure was reported to resolve that difference.

The budget and monitoring means also differ between the detailed findings and the summary. Both versions are retained, so the study cannot support a single unqualified ranking of those concerns. The reported overall delegation mean should be considered descriptive of the reported summary, rather than an independently verified measure of effective allocation of authority.

Tsang (2002) treats organization and support arrangements as strategic elements of maintenance management. This offers a basis for considering responsibilities alongside resources and technical processes. It does not supply evidence that the present group differences were caused by decentralization, that delegation improved reliability, or that agreement should be statistically significant under standardized procedures.

4.3 Implications for equipment governance

The recommendations call for clearer duties among district leadership, equipment-management personnel, mechanics, operators, property personnel, and finance and administrative units. The practical issue is to connect authority with the resources, information, and review needed to perform an assigned task. A responsibility written in a guideline is distinct from evidence that the task was completed and reviewed.

The proposed policy directions include scheduled preventive maintenance, emergency repair protocols, support for quick field repairs, performance monitoring, integration with capital projects, written responsibilities, continuous technical development, financial planning, digital information management, compliance review, standardized documentation, equipment lifecycle and replacement planning, measurable maintenance evaluation, inter-office knowledge sharing, and continuous policy improvement.

Olanrewaju and Abdul-Aziz (2015) offer an integrated maintenance perspective, but their building context should not be treated as direct validation of these equipment policies. Local implementation would need attention to equipment type, condition, workload, parts availability, and responsible staff. The study did not compare policy alternatives or assess their financial feasibility.

An integrated record system is useful only if records are complete, definitions are consistent, and responsibilities for updates and action are clear. The monitoring-related findings support reviewing those conditions before expecting a digital platform to resolve them. Proposed indicators such as response time, repair completion, availability, and downtime would extend the study with operational evidence; none is an outcome already demonstrated by the present ratings.

5. Conclusion

The study reported Much Implemented standardized land-based equipment management procedures in DPWH field offices in Albay. Express maintenance had the highest domain mean and capital project activities the lowest. Delegation-related findings were described as Much Evident, but their mixed item direction and conflicting budget and monitoring means prevent an unqualified interpretation of effective delegation. All reported concordance tests were described as nonsignificant, with alternative numerical versions requiring reconciliation. The findings support clearer responsibilities, maintenance support, technical development, financial coordination, reliable records, and lifecycle planning. They do not demonstrate improved equipment reliability, reduced downtime, or a causal relationship between standardization and delegation. Complete methods, item-scoring clarification, and verification of the numerical record remain necessary for submission.

References

- [1] Muchiri, P., Pintelon, L., Gelders, L., & Martin, H. (2011). Development of maintenance function performance measurement framework and indicators. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 131(1), 295–302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2010.04.039>
- [2] Olanrewaju, A. L., & Abdul-Aziz, A.-R. (2015). Building maintenance processes and practices: The case of a fast developing country. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-263-0>
- [3] Tsang, A. H. C. (2002). Strategic dimensions of maintenance management. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*, 8(1), 7–39. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552510210420577>