

Public Disclosure Authorized

# SUPPORT TO PARCELIZATION OF LANDS FOR INDIVIDUAL TITLING (SPLIT) P172399

Public Disclosure Authorized

## Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)



Republic of the Philippines  
**DEPARTMENT OF AGRARIAN REFORM**  
February 2020

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents .....	ii
List of Tables .....	ii
List of Figures .....	ii
List of Acronyms .....	iv
I. Background .....	1
II. Objectives .....	2
III. Stakeholder Mapping and Analysis.....	2
IV. Stakeholder Engagement during Project Preparation .....	7
Initial Consultations Undertaken.....	7
Plans for Further Consultations During Project Preparation.....	9
V. Stakeholder Engagement Plan During Project Implementation.....	10
Periodic Consultation .....	10
Principles and methods for engagement .....	10
Indigenous Peoples .....	11
Intermittent Interaction with Stakeholders at the Regional, Provincial and Municipal Levels.....	11
Interactions with Stakeholders at the CCLOA Community Levels.....	12
VI. Institutional Arrangements and Resources .....	13
VII. Grievance Redress Mechanism .....	14
Grievance and Redress Mechanism (GRM).....	14
VI. Stakeholder Engagement Monitoring and Evaluation .....	23
Annexes .....	24
Annex A. Minutes of Consultation with Stakeholders, Baguio City, Benguet Province .....	24
Annex B. National Stakeholders’ Consultation for Project SPLIT .....	29
Annex C. 2nd National Stakeholders’ Consultation for Project SPLIT with NGOs/POs .....	34

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Key stakeholders of the SPLIT project.....	3
Table 2. Meetings and consultations conducted during early project preparation .....	8
Table 3. Stakeholder engagements during the rest of project preparation .....	9
Table 4. Stakeholder interactions at the regional, provincial and municipal levels .....	11
Table 5. Stakeholder interactions at CCLOA community levels during project implementation .....	12
Table 6. Project SPLIT Complaints and Grievance Committee (CGC) Machinery and Composition .....	16

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Major Steps in the Grievance Handling Process .....	19
---	----



## LIST OF ACRONYMS

AD	Ancestral Domain
A & D	Alienable and Disposable
ARB	Agrarian Reform Beneficiary
ARBO	Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Organization
ALI	Agrarian Law Implementation
BARC	Barangay Agrarian Reform Committee
BALA	Bureau of Agrarian Legal Assistance
BLTI	Bureau of Land Tenure Improvement
MISS	Management Information Systems Service
FOO	Field Operations Office
CADC	Certificate of Ancestral Domain Claim
CADT	Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title
CALT	Certificate of Ancestral Land Title
CARP	Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program
CARPER	Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program Extension with Reforms
CARP-IA	CARP – Implementing Agencies
CENRO	Community Environment and Natural Resources Office
CCLOA	Collective Certificate of Land Ownership Award
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DA	Department of Agriculture
DAR	Department of Agrarian Reform
DARRO	DAR Regional Office
DARPO	DAR Provincial Office
DARMO	DAR Municipal Office
DBM	Department of Budget and Management
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DENR – LMB	Land Management Bureau
DENR – FMB	Forest Management Bureau
DENR – BMB	Biodiversity Management Bureau
DENR – NAMRIA	National Mapping and Resource Information Authority
DENR – EMB	Environment and Management Bureau
DOF	Department of Finance
ESA	Environment and Social Assessment
ESF	Environment and Social Framework
FPIC	Free Prior and Informed Consent
ICC – TB	Investment Coordinating Committee – Technical Board
ICC- CabCom	Investment Coordinating Committee- Cabinet Committee
IP	Indigenous Peoples

IPRA	Indigenous Peoples Rights Act
LAD	Land Acquisition and Distribution
LRA	Land Registration Authority
LBP	Land Bank of the Philippines
LGUs	Local Government Units
LC	Land Classification
MARPO	Municipal Agrarian Reform Program Officer
NEDA	National Economic & Development Authority
NCIP	National Commission on Indigenous Peoples
PARPO	Provincial Agrarian Reform Program Officer
ROD	Register of Deeds
SEP	Social Engagement Plan
SPLIT Project	Support to Parcelization of Lands for Individual Titling

## **SUPPORT TO PARCELIZATION OF LANDS FOR INDIVIDUAL TITLING (SPLIT) PROJECT**

### **Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)**

**Department of Agrarian Reform**  
February 2020

#### **I. BACKGROUND**

1. The proposed "Support to Parcelization of Lands for Individual Titling or Project" (SPLIT) would involve the parcelization or subdivision of Collective Certificate of Land Ownership Award (CCLOAs or mother CLOAs) into individual land titles of agrarian reform beneficiaries (ARBs). The project will be implemented with the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) as the lead agency and being proposed for funding by the World Bank. The project will help realize the completion of the Philippine's land reform program. Since the start of the agrarian reform program in 1972 (i.e. Operation Land Transfer and then Comprehensive Agrarian Reform), the government has redistributed a total of about 4.8 million hectares to about 2.8 million farmer beneficiaries. However, only 53% of this are individual titles. The rest 47% or about 2.5 million hectares are collective CLOA titles which were issued to a group of beneficiaries. The collective CLOAs were mostly issued around the 1990s and resorted to as a strategy to fast track the acquisition of lands and its subsequent distribution of lands to farmers or Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries.

2. The issuance of CCLOAs was intended to be a temporary instrument until the formal subdivision of the parcel can be done. However, the subdivision of CCLOAs into individual ARB parcels had been very slow such that even now there are still about 1.4 million hectares of CCLOAs lands that have remained un-subdivided. For many years, the occupants of the parcels covered by CCLOAs have relied on temporary or informal boundaries of their landholdings. Without formal proof of individual ownerships, the farmers feel insecure about their landholdings, preventing them from investing on more permanent land improvements and making them vulnerable to adverse claims and encroachments. Moreover, the lack of individual titles has prevented the farmers from realizing the full financial potentials of their landholdings.

3. The project, particularly the process of parcelization of CCLOAs, will impact not only on the current occupants of the land covered by the CCLOAs but also on other interested parties, including government agencies, individual landed estates, civil society groups, farmer groups, business partners and others. This Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) is being prepared as an integral part of the Environmental and Social Impact Management measures of the project. The SEP is also required under the World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework (ESF), particularly Environmental and Social Standard 10 on Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure (ESS10). The SEP provides stakeholders with opportunities to contribute to the project design, express their views on the risks, impacts and mitigation measures of the parcelization process and keep track of the progress of, and engage in, the project implementation.

## II. OBJECTIVES

4. The SEP is aimed to (i) set out how the communication with stakeholders will be handled throughout project preparation and implementation; (ii) describe the timing and methods of the engagement; (iii) describe the range and timing of information to be communicated to project affected parties and other interested parties as well as the type of information to be sought from them; (iv) describe measures to remove obstacles to participation and how the views of the differently affected groups will be captured.

## III. STAKEHOLDER MAPPING AND ANALYSIS

5. This section presents the identified stakeholders and their interests in the Project. A stakeholder is defined as any individual or group who is potentially affected, positively or negatively, by the Project, or who has an interest in the Project and its potential impacts. In order to define an engagement process for project preparation and implementation, the following types of stakeholders have been identified. As the Project progresses, the SEP will be regularly updated, including with new stakeholders as needed.

(i) **Project affected parties** are individuals, groups, local communities, and other stakeholders that may be directly or indirectly, positively or negatively by the Project. These include: a) agrarian reform beneficiaries (communities and individual members) benefitting from subdivision of collective CLOAs; b) individual households who are not eligible for inclusion in the Project and may therefore be adversely affected.

ii) **Interested parties** are stakeholders who may be interested in the project because of its location, its proximity to natural or other resources, or because of the sector or parties involved in the project. These may be local government officials, community leaders, and civil society organizations, particularly those who work in or with the affected communities.

6. Within the project affected parties, it is important to understand project impacts and whether they may disproportionately fall on disadvantaged or vulnerable individuals or groups, who often do not have a voice to express their concerns or understand the impacts of a project. This may involve single-parent households, tillers, elders, the poorest households, ethnic minorities and indigenous peoples.

7. The project will be implemented by the Department of Agrarian Reform. However, various other government agencies will be involved and will have key roles in the validation of CCLOA and its subsequent parcelization into individual titles. The validation of the CCLOA will involve various bureaus and units of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) which have mandates over land classification and management of public lands, and the NCIP which has mandate over Indigenous Peoples lands. The parcelization will also involve the Land Registration Authority (LRA). The table below (Table 1) maps out the various stakeholders of the SPLIT project.

*Table 1. Key stakeholders of the SPLIT project*

<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Interest on the Project</b>	<b>Degree of Influence on the Project</b>	<b>Role/Potential Role in the Project Implementation.</b>
DAR	High	High	Lead implementing agency
Philippine Congress	High	High	Policy support and potential Land Reclassification.
DENR – Office of the Under-secretary for Operations	High	High	Key Partner: Provides direct supervision of Provincial and Community Environment and Natural Resources Officers (PENROs and CENROs) involved in the validation/confirmation of inspection, verification and approval of surveys (IVAS) for CCLOAs
DENR – Offices of the Under-secretary, LMB, FMB & BMB	High	High	Key Partner: The respective Undersecretaries provide direct supervision of each of the staff bureaus to be primarily involved in project implementation.
DENR - LMB	High	High	Key Partner, inspection, verification and approval of submitted survey plan for CCLOAs
DENR - NAMRIA	Low	Medium	Provides the Land Classification Maps which will be the basis for validating whether CCLOAs are in A&D lands and whether there are overlaps
DENR - FMB	High	High	Key Partner in the management of lands which fall within Timberland Classification
DENR - BMB	High	High	Key Partner in the management of lands which fall within Protected Areas
LRA/ Register of Deeds	High	High	Key Partner: cancellation of CCLOAs and registration of individual CLOAs in the name of ARBs; creation of a special lane for CARP transactions at the ROD of high LAD provinces
NCIP	High	Medium	Key Partner: Provides management of lands within Ancestral Domain and provides Certificate of Preconditions for any titling within ancestral domain. NCIP also facilitates free, prior and informed consent by indigenous groups in CCLOAs.
DA	High	High	Key Partner: DA can provide support services to ARBs
ARBs/ARBOs	High	High	Main Beneficiary. Affected Parties. Some will be from indigenous groups.
LGUs	Medium	Medium	Interested party, productive farmers, tax collection
PARCCOM	High	Medium	PARCOM, the Presidential Agrarian Reform Coordinating Committee, is an umbrella organization with representatives from key stakeholders, including agrarian reform beneficiaries and land owners.
BARC	High	Medium	Barangay Agrarian Reform Council (BARC) includes local stakeholders, including agrarian reform beneficiaries.
Non-ARB mother CLOA occupants	High	High	Project Affected People. This includes non-ARB occupants in the CCLOA lands.
LBP	High	High	Key Partner: Preparation and issuance of individual farmer beneficiary amortization schedule for covered CCLOAs.
NGOs	Medium	Medium	Potential partner in project implementation and support services
CSOs	Medium	Medium	Provide policy support and oversight. Some may have critical views of the project

Stakeholder	Interest on the Project	Degree of Influence on the Project	Role/Potential Role in the Project Implementation.
NEDA, DBM, DOF	High	High	Oversight Agencies

8. *Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) – Office of the Assistant Secretary for Staff Bureau.* The DENR is the main agency tasks with management of the country’s natural resources, including lands. Lands are classified either as Alienable and Disposable (A&D) and Public Forests. A large part of lands in the Philippines are still classified as Public Lands (or Public Forests or Timberland) which are inalienable or still public domain. These lands are under the management of DENR. The management of public lands falls into two bureaus: Timberlands are managed by the Forest Management Bureau (FMB) while Protected Areas are falls under the management of Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB). Another bureau of DENR which will be involved in the individual titling process is the Land Management Bureau (LMB). These bureaus are under the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Staff Bureau. Hence the office will have a crucial coordinative role in the project.

9. *DENR-Land Management Bureau (LMB).* LMB is responsible for administering, surveying, managing, and disposing Alienable and Disposable lands and other government lands not placed under the jurisdiction of other government agencies. The reclassification of public domain lands into A&D used to be a function of DENR's Land Management Bureau until 1987 when the authority is transferred to the Philippine Congress. Now, the Land Management Bureau is still in charge of delineating surveying lands.

10. *DENR-Forest Management Bureau (FMB).* The FMB is responsible for conservation, management, development and proper use of the country's environment and natural resources, specifically forest and grazing lands, mineral resources, including those in reservations and watershed areas, and other lands in the public domain. The FMB also issues special land use permits and tenurial instruments to occupants of lands that are classified as forestlands.

11. *DENR – Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB).* The BMB is responsible for conservation and sustainable management of the country’s biodiversity. It has three major programs, (i) protected areas and other ecosystems management and development; (ii) coastal and marine ecosystems management; and (iii) wildlife resource conservation program.

12. *DENR-National Mapping and Resource Information Authority (NAMRIA).* NAMRIA is the official keeper of Land Classification Map which would be the basis for the validation of the CCLOA with respect to the boundaries of Timberland and A&D lands. It can facilitate access to these maps.

13. *The Philippine Congress -* The congress provides policy support to the project and to the Agrarian Reform Program. Congress also has the authority to reclassify lands from public forest to A&D. This role may be crucial for some CCLOA which are found to overlap with the boundaries of Timberland.

14. *Department of Agriculture (DA) -* DA can provide agricultural support services to the ARBs in the CCLOAs during and after the subdivision into individual titles. The traditional support from DA would be training, technology and marketing linkages. It can also provide

farm-to-market roads, small irrigation and other value chain infrastructure support to ARB communities.

15. *Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries (ARBs) and Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Organizations (ARBOs)* - ARBs in the CCLOA will be the main beneficiaries of this project. However, they may have reasons or apprehensions against individual titling, individually or collectively as a group. Possible reason would include apprehension about taxes, amortization payments, loss of control by their cooperatives. Hence they would need to be consulted to improve the project design and approach. Some ARBs will be indigenous peoples, in both homogenous and mixed communities, and these may have particular interests and needs for consultations and project support.

16. Field visits and dialogues with the ARBs, includes meetings with the women in the community, the Indigenous Peoples, the local officials and other vulnerable members in the barangay. Consultations at the field level shall be done in separate group to ensure that each sector is heard.

17. *Land Registration Authority (LRA)* - The LRA is responsible for issuing decrees of registration and certificates of title and register documents, patents and other land transaction for the benefit of landowners, agrarian reform-beneficiaries and the registering public in general. It is tasked to issue all subsequent or transfer certificates of title. LRA keeps the title history or records of transaction involving titled or registered lands. It provides legal and technical assistance to the courts relative to land registration cases, and to other government agencies with respect to registration of administratively issued titles. LRA has been extending its services to the DAR in the implementation of the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP). LRA will have a key role in the issuance of individual titles to ARBs. LRA has Registry of Deeds offices in major cities and towns all over the country.

18. *National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP)* - NCIP is the government agency responsible for the formulation and implementation of policies, plans and programs to promote and protect the rights and well-being of the Indigenous Cultural Communities/Indigenous Peoples (ICCs/IPs) and the recognition of their ancestral domains as well as their rights. The NCIP provides assistance and serve as the medium through which assistance can be provided to the ICC/IPs. It may also formulate and implement policies, plans, programs and projects for the economic, social and cultural development of the ICCs/IPs. It has the authority to issue certificate of ancestral domain titles (CADTs) and certificate of ancestral land titles (CALTs). NCIP will have a key role in CCLOAs that have extant ICC/IP communities or in CCLOAs that overlaps with Ancestral Domain, if any. In either of these cases, the project is required to undertake the Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) as per the World Bank's ESS7 on Indigenous Peoples and for CCLOAs inside Ancestral Domains FPIC under the Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act (IPRA) is required. However, for CCLOAs issued before the enactment of RA 8371 or the Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act (IPRA), the "Section 56 : Existing Property Rights Regimes – Property rights within the ancestral domains existing and/or vested upon effectivity of the Act, shall be recognized and respected" applies. The NCIP will issue a Certificate of Precondition, after the FPIC process shall have been achieved in accordance with the IPRA Implementing Rules and Regulations. For CCLOAs outside the Ancestral Domain, NCIP can help facilitate consultations with ICC/IPs leading to the attainment FPIC in accordance with the World Bank's ESS7.

19. *Local Government Units (LGUs)* - The local governments have high interest in the project because the CCLOA land occupants are their constituents. LGUs can facilitate consultations and meetings with ARBs and other affected parties in the communities. It also could provide help to resolve conflicts regarding boundaries, and provide crucial neutral witness during delineation of boundaries of individual landholdings inside the CCLOA. It could also provide local security to project personnel.

20. *Non-ARB occupants of CCLOA lands* - Since the CCLOAs were issued several years ago, there will very likely be occupants within the CCLOA lands that are neither the original ARBs nor a legal heir of the original ARB. These occupants will be very apprehensive about the project, particularly in the process of validation of the CCLOA beneficiaries (particularly to the so-called "inclusion" and "exclusion" process) for many legitimate reasons. These groups need to be consulted in a focus group discussion format and their grievances and apprehensions should be considered in the project design and approach.

21. *Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP)*. The LBP was created by Republic Act 3844 (the Agrarian Land Reform Code) to finance the acquisition and distribution of agricultural estates for division and resale to small landholders as well as the purchase of the landholding by the agricultural lessee. It becomes the main bank that financed the land acquisition under the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Law (RA 6657), LBP is part of the implementing agency of the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP) and is involved in land evaluation, compensation to owners of private agricultural lands, and collection of amortizations from CARP farmer-beneficiaries. ARBs in CCLOAs are unable to actually pay amortization payments because their individual landholdings have not been formally delineated. LBP has allowed farmers to pay advanced amortizations from CCLOA holders but has reportedly stopped this practice. The LBP will be a key partner in this project, especially in providing information to the ARBs about the terms and amounts of amortization payments, given that the CCLOAs were issued long time ago.

22. *NGOs and CSOs*. Many of the Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) are advocates of the CARP and had been critics in its implementation. They would be interested to know that the CCLOAs will finally be subdivided into individual titles. The CSOs could provide valuable policy and advocacy support to the project. Some CSOs may be critical of the project. On the other hand, there are a number of non-government organizations (NGOs) that have been working with ARB communities for quiet sometime, often with financial support from international donors. Forthcoming stakeholders' consultations will include representations from NGOs involved in agrarian reform and rural development like the Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ANGOC), Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in rural Areas (PhilDHRRA), Center for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (CARRD), Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM) and the Pambansang Kilusan ng mga Samahan ng Magsasaka. NGOs and CSOs involved in environment protection, biodiversity, indigenous peoples and women groups (Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Foundation, Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID), and the National Federation of Peasant Women in the Philippines (AMIHAN), among others. These NGOs could provide valuable information about the status of the ARBs in the CCLOAs, their socioeconomic profile and other issues concerning the farmers, the IPs, vulnerable groups both in the macro and field level. Follow through consultations shall be made in the provinces and municipalities during the project implementation.

23. This group includes the Presidential Agrarian Reform Coordinating Committee (PARCCOM) representatives of the agrarian reform beneficiaries and the land owners at the national and provincial levels and have been invited to several consultations. At the municipal level is the Barangay Agrarian Reform Council (BARC).

#### **IV. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT DURING PROJECT PREPARATION**

##### **Initial Consultations Undertaken**

24. During the conceptualization of the project, DAR consulted the different units and offices of the Department at the Central, Regional and Provincial Level engaged in the Land Acquisition and Distribution (LAD). A series of workshops and meetings were conducted to discuss the parcelization process, the cost involved, the magnitude of collective CLOAs that need to be subdivided into individual titles, identified the hindrances and lessons learned in the earlier collective CLOAs subdivision efforts of the DAR. The workshops and meetings were attended by officials of the Bureau of Land Tenure Improvement, Bureau of Agrarian Legal Assistance, Office of the Undersecretary and Assistant Secretary for Field Operations, MISS and the Regional Directors and PARPOs of High LAD Regions and Provinces. The results of these workshops and meetings were considered in the conceptualization of the project.

25. The project preparation team which the DAR has formed following the identification of the project, have already conducted several meetings and discussions with the key partner agencies, particularly the Office of the DENR Assistant Secretary for Staff Bureau, the DENR-Land Management Bureau and the DENR - Forest Management Bureau, the Land Registration Authority. The preparation team has also coordinated with oversight agencies e.g. NEDA and DBM to prepare for formal approval of the ICC Technical Committee and ICC-Cabinet Committee. DAR has also engaged and disclosed the project to the Provincial and Regional Development Councils in order to secure their endorsements.

26. On environmental safeguards, the DAR secured clearance from the Environment & Management Bureau/DENR in April 2019. The EMB responded that the Project SPLIT does not require Environmental Clearance Certificate (ECC) nor Certificate of Non Coverage (CNC) as the Project is not covered by the Philippine Environmental Impact Statement System (PEISS).

27. The World Bank dispatched a Project Identification Mission in October 2019, and a Preparation Mission in November that paved the way to further consult with other stakeholders like the Land Registration Authority and Land Management Bureau at the national level, and the Register of Deeds and Land Management System at the Provincial/Regional levels.

28. Meetings with NCIP and concerned DENR Bureaus were also held to orient them of the Project SPLIT and discuss its potential environmental and social impacts and risks.

29. Initial dialogues with a few ARBs and IP-ARBs were also done in Batangas, Iloilo and Benguet to solicit the ARBs view and thinking of the Project SPLIT, as to its acceptability and how they foresee the parcelization and individual titling to benefit them.

30. These preliminary meetings, dialogues and consultations provide scenarios that help in assessing the potential impacts and risks the parcelization and individual titling might cause in the lives of the affected parties, especially the agrarian reform beneficiaries, the indigenous peoples and their communities.

31. Further meetings and consultations are scheduled with the stakeholders like the NCIP, the ARBs, the Indigenous Peoples, LGUs and NGOs in the coming months prior to Project SPLIT implementation. Feedback from these stakeholders will be sought to inform the finalization of the SEP and related instruments to address potential environment and social impacts and risks of the Project.

Table 2 below summarizes the meetings and consultations that have been conducted so far since the start of Project SPLIT conceptualization.

**Table 2. Meetings and consultations conducted during early project preparation**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Topics Discussed</b>
December 2018	DAR Regional Directors of high LAD Regions & Provinces	Project concept, experiences and hindrances in parcelization of CCLOA
January 2019	LRA	Initial talks on how to secure titles in line with the inventory of CCLOAs; streamline process of registration
January 2019	DENR	Issued CCLOAs that overlap with timberland
April 2019	DENR EMB	Environmental Clearance Requirements
October 2019	Land Registration Authority	Land titling process
October 2019	DENR Land Management Bureau	CCLOAs that overlap with forest/timberlands
October 7, 2019	Registry of Deeds Provincial Levels	Registration Process, Requirements, timelines
October 8, 2019	ARBs in Barangay San Isidro, Rosario, Batangas	Status and experience of ARBs and occupants in the still un-subdivided mother. Reactions and concerns about the proposed individual titling.
November 4, 2019	DENR Land Management Bureau	CCLOAs in lands still classified as Public Forest
November 8, 2019;	DENR Forest Management Bureau	CCLOAs in lands still classified as Public Forests and tenurial instruments and programs available for farmers occupying these lands
November 8 & 16, 2019	DENR Assistant Secretary for Staff Bureau	Possible CCLOA overlaps with Lands still classified as Public Forest, Overlaying of CCLOAs in LC Maps
November 4, 2019	NCIP	Possible CCLOA overlaps with Ancestral Domain claims
November 6, 2019	ICC/IP ARBs in Bgy. Toyongan, Calinog, Iloilo	Status of ARBs and non-ARBs in the land covered by the CCLOA. Location of CCLOA vis-a-vis Ancestral Domain. Interests in subdivision, current constraint faced.
November 7, 2019	ARBs in Cabatuan, Iloilo	Status of ARBs and non-ARB occupants in the land covered by the CCLOA
November 7, 2019	NCIP Region VI or Western Visayas	Overlap of CCLOA and Ancestral Domain in Region VI. Status of private lands inside Ancestral Domain. Role of NCIP
November 7, 2019	NGO: Center for Agrarian Reform & Rural Development (CARRD)	NGO development works in ARB communities. General interests and issues of ARBs in subdivision

January 24, 2020	ARBs in Atok, Benguet, CAR	Lessons learned from DAR support services to CLOA holders in mountainous areas with indigenous communities
------------------	----------------------------	--

32. After the initial disclosure of the safeguard instruments in the DAR website on January 20, including the draft SEP, ESA, ESMF, IPPF, RPF and LMP, a regional consultation with stakeholders composed of representatives from the DENR-CAR, DA-CAR, LRA-ROD Benguet, DAR CAR & Provincial Offices, PARCCOM Chairpersons, BARC Chair and representative of farmers' organization in the Cordillera Administrative Region was held in Baguio City, Benguet Province. Most of the participants are themselves Indigenous Peoples. It was followed by a consultation at the national level held at the DAR Central Office and was attended by representatives of the DENR and its bureaus, LMB, FMB & BMB, the Department of Agriculture, NCIP, Land Bank of the Philippines and the PARCCOM representing the ARB sector.

33. Key inputs and recommendations made during the consultations are (i) involvement of the PARCCOM in the monitoring and information dissemination; (ii) consider the provision of Road Right of Way prior to the parcelization to ensure that farm-to-market roads will be provided to the farmers even of those far from the current access; (iii) beneficiaries be provided with support services (e.g. training on appropriate technology, organic agriculture, IPM and SALT, etc.); (iv) securing FPIC following the ESS7 of the WB and not the FPIC as defined by NCIP since the SPLIT Project will only cover parcelization of CCLOA which were already distributed to the ARBs; (v) clarification on policies regarding 10 year holding period of the CCLOA, if the reckoning date is at issuance of the CCLOA or of the individual title, on the schedule of amortization and real property tax due of the ARBs. As there are ongoing talks with the Land Bank of the Philippines, the DILG and LGUs, the DAR's position is on what is more beneficial for the ARBs. Minutes of the two (2) consultations are shown in Annex A.

#### Plans for Further Consultations During Project Preparation

34. Further meetings and consultations are scheduled with stakeholders, such as the NCIP, the ARBs, Indigenous Peoples, LGUs and NGOs, prior to Project SPLIT implementation, including a public consultation with NGOs and CSOs in Manila on February 19.

**Table 3. Stakeholder engagements during the rest of project preparation**

Stage/Preparation Activity	Stakeholder Engagement Event	Timeline
Firming up of the Project Design and Strategies	Various consultation meetings with government agencies, ARBs, CSO and NGOs working with ARBs	January 2020
Environmental and Social Assessment and Preparation of Environmental and Social Management Framework	Consultation meetings with ARBs in selected CCLOA sites; NGOs operating and CSOs. The 1st draft of the ESA & ESMF were disclosed in the DAR website on Jan 20, 2020	December 2019 – January 2020
Social Assessment and Preparation of Resettlement Policy Framework	Consultation meetings of ARBs in selected CCLOA sites, NGOs and CSOs. The 1 <sup>st</sup> draft of the RPF and Labor Management Plan were disclosed in the DAR website on Jan 31, 2020.	December 15, 2019-January 15, 2020
Socio-cultural assessment and Preparation of Indigenous Peoples Framework	Consultation meetings of ICC/IPs ARBs communities in selected sites, NGOs and CSOs. The 1 <sup>st</sup> draft of the	December 15, 2019 - January 15, 2020

	IPPF was disclosed at the DAR website on Jan 20, 2020	
Project Appraisal Mission of World Bank	Meetings with various government agencies, ARBs, NGOs and CSOs	January 23 and -28, 2020; Feb. 19, 2020
Preparation of Project Implementation Manual (PIM)	Workshops with all agencies involved in the project to discuss the draft PIM	February to March, 2020

## V. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN DURING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

### Periodic Consultation

35. During project implementation, the project management will conduct consultations with stakeholders particularly the agrarian reform beneficiaries and other project-affected persons in the community in the the pulong-pulong (the participatory planning process for parcelization). In addition, consultations will be held with other stakeholders, such as government partners, PARCCOM, BARC, NGOs and CSOs, including during World Bank Implementation Support Missions. During these consultations, the progress of the project implementation will be presented to key partners, the press and interested CSOs at the national level and at selected regions, and province/provinces. Members of the press and representatives of CSOs will be invited during these consultation sessions.

### Principles and methods for engagement

36. To enhance the effectiveness of the engagement process, the SEP is based on the following principles:

- the culture, fundamental human rights, values and traditions of stakeholders are respected in accordance with established legal precedent and accepted practice in the Philippines;
- stakeholders are treated with sensitivity and respect in terms of their issues, views and suggestions;
- interaction with stakeholders is meaningful, culturally appropriate (including language, as needed), and is timely, transparent and responsive;
- vulnerable groups are included in the engagement to assess differential needs and perceptions of stakeholder groups (i.e. men, women, youth);
- data from stakeholder engagement is incorporated into assessments site-specific environmental and social management and mitigation plans as needed;
- access to information and disclosure will be ensured to ensure stakeholders are informed about the Project, its potential benefits, impacts and risks, affected peoples' entitlements, GRM channels; and
- informed consultation without coercion to ensure that communities and households have power of choice to participate, or not, in the Project.

37. Further to enhance effective engagement a suite of communication methods will be used to promote easy, transparent, direct, open and interactive communication with all stakeholders, and to elicit feedback in the project preparation and implementation phases.

38. Public disclosure will be done through any of the following means:

- Newspapers, posters, radio, television;
- Information centers and exhibitions or other visual displays;
- Brochures, leaflets, posters, nontechnical summary documents and reports;
- Official correspondence, meetings;
- Website, social media

39. Stakeholder engagement will be done through any of the following means:

- Regular meetings with relevant government agencies at central, regional and municipal levels;
- Stakeholder workshops at national, regional, provincial levels
- Public meetings or pulong-pulong at collective CLOA level;
- Use of support organizations when needed (e.g. to support vulnerable communities / households;

40. Public information materials to enable wider access to project information as well as progress will be developed. This includes the types and forms of information dissemination, as well as timing which will be determined during project implementation based on assessments of communities' access to such information and barriers. Stakeholders' communication and consultation preferences, particularly those of target communities will also be carefully assessed to promote greater participation and social inclusion.

### Indigenous Peoples

41. Particular efforts will be made to ensure participation of, and engagement with, indigenous communities and households. The use of indigenous organizations or organizations (e.g. NGOs) that support them, may be needed to facilitate the engagement process. The regional NCIP offices may also need to be involved in CLOA level engagements with indigenous communities. The Project's Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework includes further measures to engage with indigenous peoples, including the procedures for free, prior and informed consent as per the Bank's ESS7.

### Intermittent Interaction with Stakeholders at the Regional, Provincial and Municipal Levels

*Table 4. Stakeholder interactions at the regional, provincial and municipal levels*

<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Nature of Interaction</b>	<b>Frequency and Purpose</b>
DENR – Region	Coordination meetings	Semiannually. Update on progress and resolve pending issues
PENRO	Coordination meetings	Monthly. Update on progress; resolve issues
CENRO	Coordination meetings	Monthly. Update on progress and resolve pending issues
LRA/Registry of Deeds	Coordination meetings	As necessary. Update on progress; resolve issues
PLGU	Coordination meetings	As necessary. Update on progress; resolve issues
MLGU	Coordination meetings	As necessary. Update on progress; resolve issues

NGOs/CSOs	Coordination meetings	As necessary. Update and seek help on support services
State Universities & Colleges	Coordination meetings	As necessary. Update and seek help on support services
Regional NCIP	Coordination meetings and Workshop	As necessary. Discuss requirements and strategies in obtaining free and prior informed consent with affected ICC/IP communities in the regions
Congressional District Office	Coordination meetings	Once a year. Explore the possibility of sponsoring a bill converting CCLOA lands that overlap with Timberland into A&D lands.

## Interactions with Stakeholders at the CCLOA Community Levels

42. At the CCLOA level, the Project Team shall interact with the ARBs and the actual occupants of the CCLOA lands on a regular basis from validation to issuance of individual titles. These consultations can be done at least twice at the CCLOA level and more as needed especially in areas where there are issues on list of ARBs, actual occupants, inclusion/exclusion and boundary disputes.

**Table 5. Stakeholder interactions at CCLOA community levels during project implementation**

<b>Project Activities</b>	<b>Nature of Interaction</b>	<b>Purpose</b>
Project Awareness	Community consultations and awareness raising	To inform CCLOA members of the project's objectives and requirements, including their entitlements and ESF provisions of the ESMF, RPF and IPPF
Validation of CCLOA vis-a-vis Land Classification Status	Community consultation, ground validation LC and CCLOA maps in the presence of representatives of CENRO, LGU and Barangay Agrarian Reform Committee (BARC)	To identify possible overlap with Timberland, Protected Area or Ancestral Domain
Validation of CCLOA ARB lists vis-a-vis Actual Occupants	Consultation with actual occupants of all land parcels within the CCLOA in the presence of LGU and BARC.	To validate the list of ARBs versus current actual occupants of the land parcels within the CCLOA
Socioeconomic Survey/Profile of Actual Occupants	House to house visit by survey enumerators during the conduct baseline study. For CCLOA: MARPO to submit CARPER LAD Form 70-B of AO No. 2	To undertake a socioeconomic profile of the actual occupants.
Validation of Inclusion and Exclusion Lists	Community consultation in the presence of BARC & LGU officials  Separate one-on-one meetings shall be conducted with "excluded" occupants with BARC & LGU officials	To update the community on the qualified recipients of individual titles  To explain reasons for exclusion and the rights and entitlements of the "excluded" occupants, including those whose landholdings will be reverted back to Timberland status, based on the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF).
Delineation of Individual Parcel Boundaries (Land Survey)	Ground walkthrough of the boundary points of individual ARBs with BARC & LGU representative, and adjacent lot ARBs	To determine and validate parcel boundaries and resolve conflicts

<b>Project Activities</b>	<b>Nature of Interaction</b>	<b>Purpose</b>
Preparation of Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) based on the RPF (if needed)	A series of consultations shall occur with all the "excluded" occupants, including those whose landholdings will be reverted back to Timberland status (e.g. the Project-Affected People or PAPs)	To formulate the Resettlement Action Plan for the affected based on the RPF and based on the socioeconomic profile of the occupants.
Implementation of the RAP	Periodic update and consultations with the PAPs based on the RAP	To fulfill the consultation requirements of the RAP, to update on the progress of RAP implementation, resolve issues and concerns
Preparation of Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) in areas with indigenous peoples	A series of consultations shall occur with indigenous peoples in CCLOA to ascertain their position and stand on the parcelization of CCLOA issued to them within their Ancestral Domain for subdivision as per the IPPF	To formulate the Indigenous Peoples Plan for indigenous peoples present in CCLOAs.
Implementation of the IPP	Periodic update and consultations with indigenous peoples on the IPP	To fulfill the consultation requirements of the IPP, to update on the progress of IPP implementation, resolve issues and concerns
Issuance of Individual Titles to Qualified ARBs	Community gathering	To distribute titles.

43. In all levels of Project consultations, the project affected persons especially the vulnerable groups shall be included and heard. In addition to the bigger community consultation, a separate dialogue shall be made with the vulnerable groups, like women and IPs to encourage their participation and avoid possible intimidation from other sectors.

## **VI. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND RESOURCES**

44. At the Project preparation and pre-implementation stage, stakeholder engagement was initiated by the Project Management Service-Support Services Office, Foreign Assisted and Special Projects Office and the Field Operations Office. Upon commencement of Project Implementation, the SEP will be effected by the Project Safeguards Group. The group shall be composed of the Safeguards Specialist and DAR organic staff to be assigned as Safeguards Point Persons from the Central, Region and Provincial Offices. Budget for stakeholder engagement shall be taken from the Safeguards Cost provided under the Project Management component.

45. The stakeholder engagement activities shall be incorporated in all the components, especially in component 1- parcelization of CCLOA particularly in the validation and 'pulong-pulong'. Hence, the SEP shall be captured in the project's management system. Though the stakeholder engagement activities are look-out of the Safeguards group, Technical Staff and DAR Officials will be part of the group during meetings and consultations to ensure that queries, issues and concerns raised in the meeting will be addressed. The Safeguards Group together with the M & E shall develop a stakeholder database to ease documentation and monitoring of commitments, agreements and action taken.

46. On inter-agency arrangements, the Joint DAR-DENR-NCIP-LRA Administrative Order No. 1 series of 2012 (JAO 1) will primarily serve as the Project's policy and operational framework between and among the concerned agencies involved in the Project, with the DAR taking the lead role and serving as the secretariat of the JAO.

## **VII. GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM**

### Grievance and Redress Mechanism (GRM)

47. The Project will establish a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) designed to seek/generate feedback from and to project stakeholders and address/ respond to grievances, problems, issues or complaints related to project activities and project environmental and social performance. The Project will ensure through the GRM that all project stakeholders will be aware of their rights to access and/or will have access to the GRM at all project management levels, which will be provided in a transparent manner free of costs and without fear of reprisal or retribution on the part of aggrieved parties. In addition, the Project's GRM will help ensure that the rights and interests of project stakeholders are protected from unforeseen lapses in said project performance and that all concerns arising therefrom in all project phases will be effectively addressed. To achieve these ends, the Project will regularly engage project stakeholders and provide them information on the processes and means of raising and addressing grievances through the GRM.

48. It should be noted that this GRM shall not include concerns directly involving agrarian law implementation otherwise referred to as ALI cases which will be resolved in accordance with the rules and procedures on Inclusion/Exclusion described in the ESA and RPF.

#### *Basic Principles*

49. Consistent with applicable national laws and the WB-ESF, this GRM adopts following principles that will help guide project implementation and fulfill the Project's commitment to provide opportunities for all stakeholders to meaningfully participate:

1. Transparency – To encourage comments and feedback (negative and positive) to improve the Project, stakeholders must be aware of complaints, grievances and problems reported, involved in their redress, and kept informed on the progress made in resolving grievances.
2. Participatory – All project stakeholders are encouraged to participate or contribute in bringing up complaints, grievances and comments to the attention of the Project management.
3. Inclusive and Sensitive – Project stakeholders are given the opportunity to raise concerns and the right to be accorded a response. The GRM will allow anyone, especially the poor, the disadvantaged groups, the women, etc. to raise grievance or complaints, be heard and be involved in its redress.

4. Simple and Accessible – The procedures to file complaints and seek redress are kept simple and easy to understand by the stakeholders. Complaints and queries may be sent through different accessible means.
5. Responsive and Accountable – The GRM could strengthen channels of communication and mechanisms to enable project implementers to be accountable to all stakeholders and work transparently to resolve problems, enhancing Project responsiveness and developing trust and broad support from the stakeholders.
6. Quick and Proportionate Action – Response to grievance and comments is ensured within an acceptable timeline. Corresponding action will be responsive and commensurate to a complaint or comment. The GRM demonstrates the Project’s commitment to strive more on providing solutions to address problems rather than penalize respondents to complaints from aggrieved parties.
7. Objective – The GRM entails objectivity in processing grievances so that it can render fair and unbiased actions or responses and will be perceived as such to encourage stakeholders to utilize it, thus enhancing the Project’s overall performance. In all instances, conflicts of interest or any perception of such will be carefully looked into and promptly avoided.
8. Confidentiality and Security – To remain accessible, open and trusted, the GRM shall ensure that the identities of complainants are kept confidential to encourage stakeholders to openly participate and file complaints or comments.
9. Due process – The Project upholds and respects the rights of parties who are subject to complaints to be present and be heard before the appropriate complaints/grievance committee that will hear, settle, mediate or conciliate complaints or grievance.

#### *GRM Policy Guidance*

50. The following policy guidance shall be upheld in the implementation of the GRM process:

1. Every grievance shall be resolved fairly, promptly, effectively and expeditiously in a transparent manner that is culturally appropriate, free of any cost and accessible at all times, at the lowest level possible in the project management grievance machinery. Through alternative dispute resolution processes like mediation and conciliation, project-related conflicts, complaints and grievances shall be addressed following the applicable customs and traditions in resolving land disputes in specific localities. If resolution/settlement is not achieved within the set timeframe at the lowest level, grievances will be elevated to the next higher level following the hierarchy of GRM machinery.
2. The aggrieved parties shall be informed that they are assured freedom from coercion, discrimination, reprisal and biased action on their grievances.
3. A grievance may be submitted verbally or in writing made through any of the access points and channels described in the following sections.
4. In the designation of grievance officers, coordinators and technical advisory members shall consider their integrity, probity, sincerity, credibility, availability and willingness to perform their duties as such.

5. Complaints or grievances can be made anonymously and the identity complainants may be kept confidential unless they expressly provide consent to publicly identify them and/or to allow further verification and investigation of their grievance.
6. Aggrieved parties shall be informed of their option to appeal their grievance outside of the Project's GRM process or in another separate mediation process within the Project management structure, which will be determined by the CPMO.
7. The scope of the Project-level GRM shall include and will be made available and accessible for project stakeholders and other interested parties, including direct-hire or contracted project workers, who may want to raise questions, comments, suggestions and/or complaints, or provide any feedback from all activities funded by the Project.
8. Contractors with project-contracted workers shall incorporate relevant provisions of this GRM and those in the LMP in their contracts with said contracted workers, and shall forthwith inform such workers of their rights and obligations thereunder and the measures put in place to protect them from reprisal for its use, at the time of their recruitment to the Project.
9. For grievances of indigenous cultural communities/indigenous peoples (ICCs/IPs), all complaints shall be discussed and negotiations must be carried out within the specific communities where the affected ICCs/IPs live. The appropriate GRM machinery/level together with the tribal council concerned should facilitate this process while upholding the customs and traditions of the tribe in resolving their land disputes should the conflicts be within the tribes and clans.

As for conflicts involving both ICCs/IPs and non-ICCs/IPs, the Project must ensure that affected ICCs/IPs are properly represented. Where necessary, the Project will bring in NCIP staff to ensure that rights of ICCs/IPs are protected. If mediation/conciliation/negotiations are stalled, or ICCs/IPs disagree with all possible options presented during these deliberations, the affected tribes can bring their grievance or complaints to the municipal-level GRM of the Project. Should this still fail the ICCs/IPs' expectations, the ICCs/IPs can elevate their complaints to the provincial representative of the NCIP and the Office of the Provincial Agrarian Reform Program Officer, with copies of the complaint furnished the Office of the Provincial Governor.

Resolution of conflicts should be encouraged at the lowest level possible, through the facilitation of municipal and community tribal councils. Again, the proceedings of such meetings and interactions with affected ICC/IP households/communities must be documented and distributed to relevant stakeholders.

10. All levels of the GRM machinery shall maintain a registry/database of grievances to be submitted regularly to the central GRM at CPMO which shall include the same in the Project's periodic reports the World Bank.

### *Project-level GRM Machinery and Composition*

51. The Project will establish Complaints and Grievance Committees (CGCs) at the central, regional, provincial, municipal and barangay levels to serve as the Project's GRM machinery. The installation and management of the CGCs shall be done at the initial stages of and throughout project implementation, especially prior to the start of parcelization activities. The structure and composition of the CGC machinery is proposed, as follows:

**Table 6. Project SPLIT Complaints and Grievance Committee (CGC) Machinery and Composition**

<b>CGC Levels</b>	<b>Composition</b>	<b>Designated/responsible DAR personnel</b>
CPMO – Central CGC	Central Grievance Officer	- National Project Director

<b>CGC Levels</b>	<b>Composition</b>	<b>Designated/responsible DAR personnel</b>
	Central CGC Coordinator Central Technical Advisory Team	- Central ESSU Safeguards Specialist - Component heads - Project compliance officer or equivalent
RPMO – CGC	Regional Grievance Officer Regional CGC Coordinator Regional Technical Advisory Team	- Regional Project Director - Regional ESSU Safeguards Focal Person - Component heads - Project compliance officer or equivalent
PPMO – CGC	Provincial Grievance Officer Provincial CGC Coordinator Technical Advisory Team	- Provincial Project Director - Provincial ESSU Safeguards Focal Person - Component heads - Project compliance officer or equivalent
MPMO – CGC	Municipal Grievance Officer Municipal CGC Coordinator Technical Advisory Team	- Provincial Project Director - Provincial ESSU Safeguards Focal Person - Component heads - Project compliance officer or equivalent
Barangay CGC or Tribal Council/ Members of ICCs/IPs conflict resolution system	Barangay Grievance Officer Barangay CGC Coordinator (appointed from BARC) Barangay/Tribal CGC Advisory Team	BARC Chairman/Tribal Chieftain Barangay Safeguards Coordinator designated by the MARPO/DARPO from among the BARC members or Tribal Council Select BARC members, Brgy. Captain/Tribal Council Members and a representative from the NCIP

### *Functions of CGC Personnel*

The functions of responsible CGC members will be, as follows:

52. The heads of the CPMO, RPMO, PPMO, MPMO and BARC will serve as the Central, Regional, Provincial, Municipal and Barangay Grievance Officers, respectively. These officers shall manage the CGCs, provide directions on grievance resolution and be responsible in the approval of mitigation measures as prescribed by the technical advisory teams at their own respective levels.

53. The organic DAR personnel designated as Safeguards Specialist (CPMO), Safeguards Focal Persons (RPMO, PPMO & MPMO) and Barangay Safeguards Coordinator (appointed from among the BARC members) will serve as the CGC Coordinators at their respective levels. The CGC Coordinators will perform the following functions, as appropriate:

1. Document and maintain a registry of grievances
2. Screen/determine validity of grievance/concerns

3. Initiate resolution process through referral to the CGC
4. Refer issues to concerned project personnel for technical advice
5. Organize team for validation of concerns, as necessary
6. Assist in the resolution process through validation of concerns and technical assistance in crafting mitigation measures
7. Provide written response to concerned project personnel/units, contractors and complainants
8. Refer unresolved complaints to the next higher level of CGC, as appropriate

54. Members of CGC Technical Advisory Teams will provide assistance in the resolution process through validation of concerns and technical assistance in crafting mitigation measures, as needed.

55. Each Technical Advisory Team shall include an organic DAR lawyer or equivalent paralegal with knowledge on labor and work-related laws who shall provide advisory on grievances related to labor or workplace conditions. The CGCs at the central, provincial, regional and national level (which include Safeguards Specialist and Focal Persons designated as CGC Coordinators) shall maintain coordination and communication exchanges with the contractors who employ project-contracted workers to ensure that all labor-related grievances are expeditiously and fairly resolved and systematically documented.

56. All CGC personnel will undergo proper training on the GRM, relevant national laws, regulations and the WB ESF Standards.

#### *Project GRM Channels*

57. The Project PMOs shall provide appropriate channels for submission of grievances before the start of project implementation, which may include the following:

1. Grievance Drop Box: This provides a means for anonymous complainants to raise concerns without revealing their identities. Labelling the grievance box to a more culturally-sensitive term will be encouraged. The box should be secured and locked before being placed in a secure but accessible area in the barangay/project sites or project offices and should be opened only by authorized CGC personnel on a regular basis (at least once a week) especially during community consultations in the presence of at least one CGC volunteer to ensure proper documentation.
2. A Project CGC email address will be established and disclosed publicly at each project level.
3. An official physical address for Grievance Desk with Contact Persons in every PMO level will be established and publicly disclosed prior to project implementation, where complainants may send complaints through letters via personal, postal or courier delivery.
4. A hotline number or call center at each project level will also be established and can be publicly accessed via voice calls or SMS.

#### *Possible Types of Grievances*

58. The Project may expect the types of grievances that may be lodged before the CGCs to include the following which will serve as reference for CGC Coordinators in documenting and facilitating resolution of such concerns:

1. Non-contentious queries, comments, and suggestions. – This type is non-contentious and merely requests for information/updates, seeks clarification or a response and suggestions to enhance the project design, improve operations and facilitate administrative/logistical support to the project.
2. Compliance with project policies, processes and implementation. – This type of grievance results from the non-observance of project policies or non-performance of obligation of any of the parties involved in project activities, processes and documents. These may be primarily addressed at the barangay-level consultations, although there may be cases especially those involving direct-hired or contracted project workers when action from various PMO levels or in a separate process for project workers in the GRM will be required.
3. Other more serious grievances or complaints. – These may include grievances or offenses pertaining to misuse of funds, allegations of corruption, falsification of public documents, etc.

### *Grievance Handling Procedures*

59. The grievance process will be accessible to individual or group stakeholders and other interested/affected parties who may wish to file a grievance or ask clarifications regarding the Project through the use of standard complaint form to be developed and provided by the CGC Coordinators. The grievance process involves major steps as outlined below:

**Figure 1. Major Steps in the Grievance Handling Process**



60. **INTAKE** – This step involves receipt/filing, recording of complaints and queries in the registry/database of grievances:

#### Step 1: Filing of complaint, feedback or query

61. A Grievance Form (to be prepared prior to project implementation) will be accomplished by the concerned individual or group of individuals or by the CGC Coordinator if needed. Complainant may be project beneficiaries, project affected persons, or other concerned project stakeholders or interested parties, including direct-hires or contracted project workers. The Form shall be filed with CGC Coordinator of the relevant CGC level.

62. Grievances may also be directed at any CGC level by means of various uptakes such as via call, text messaging, e-mail, grievance drop box, and personal appearance. At the barangay level, drop box and personal appearance will be minimum uptakes. Complainants have the right to stay anonymous depending on particular situations, provided that contact information is made available by the complainant to the CGC Coordinator for verification and communication purposes.

### Step 2: Recording of queries, feedbacks and complaints in the registry/database

63. Any grievance will be recorded by the CGC Coordinator in the Registry/Database of Grievances of the relevant CGC level where the grievance is received/filed.

64. VERIFICATION – This activity includes gathering of facts and clarifying information in order to have a clear picture of the circumstances surrounding the grievance or complaint. It involves the assessment of validity of grievance, conduct of fact-finding meetings/interviews, when necessary. The activities at the relevant CGC level, particularly the CGC Coordinator and the technical advisory team, may include the following:

1. Analysis/review of issues that need to be validated and the persons/parties involved
2. Determination of facts to be verified and how to gather them. Validation methods include site visits, review of documents, interviews and meetings with concerned individuals/groups
3. Secure all documents/means of verifications (MOVs) that will support the findings
4. Ensure that whole procedure is properly documented (such as minutes of meeting, recordings or photos), fair and transparent
5. Present findings/results of validation to the relevant Grievance Officer for their decision.

Thus, the next steps in the GRM will be as follows:

### Step 3: Assessing validity of the query, feedback or complaint

65. The validity of the grievance will be assessed by the CGC Coordinator. If not relevant to the project, the CGC Coordinator will conduct the necessary intervention within five (5) working days such as providing an explanation or education session to the complainant. When the explanation is accepted the complainant will need to sign the Resolution Form (to be prepared prior to project implementation) as indication of acceptance of the explanation.

66. Since grievance may be directed at any level, the CGC Coordinator will also verify if the case is rightfully intended for their level. If assessed otherwise, the CGC Coordinator shall notify and endorse the grievance to the appropriate level for proper resolution.

67. If indeed the grievance is project-related, the CGC Coordinator will refer the case to the relevant CGC level which shall proceed to the next steps of the GRM process.

68. Further, if the grievance is labor-related, the CGC Coordinator will refer the matter to the member of Technical Advisory Team with knowledge on labor laws and the requirements of ESS2 who shall convene a separate GRM process for project workers that may include additional members with competence on labor matters, as needed and necessary. The labor GRM process shall follow in essence the steps described in this GRM but with specific focus on labor issues or concerns raised by aggrieved project workers.

69. Step 4: Organizing fact-finding meetings/interviews with the relevant parties, when needed or required, to further establish facts and circumstances of the case and discuss how to resolve the same.

70. If grievance is assessed as valid, project-related, and falls within the first type of grievance, within five (5) working days from the date the complaint was received, the CGC Coordinator shall respond at the point of intake or refer the matter to the appropriate project personnel or unit that can address the same and relay the response to the complainant or inquirer concerned.

71. If the grievance is of the second type, within ten (10) working days from the date the complaint was received, the relevant CGC will organize meetings/consultations/ interviews together with the relevant parties to further investigate and/or establish facts and circumstances of the case and discuss how to resolve the same. Based on these activities, the CGC shall come up with recommendations to resolve the case and present this to the aggrieved party and seek consent to implement such mitigation measure. All meetings should be recorded and copies of the minutes of meetings will be provided to the complainant. The grievance shall be resolved within 15-30 working days upon receipt of grievance.

72. If the grievance is of the third type, within ten (10) working days from the date the complaint was received, the relevant CGC will organize meetings/consultations/ interviews together with the relevant parties to further investigate and/or establish facts and circumstances of the case and discuss how to resolve the same. Based on these activities, the CGC shall come up with recommendations to resolve the case and present this to the aggrieved party and seek consent to implement such mitigation measure. All meetings shall be recorded and copies of the minutes of meetings will be provided to the complainant. The grievance shall be resolved within 30-60 working days upon receipt of grievance.

73. ACTION – This step reflects the steps towards the resolution of the case. Actions to a grievance include openly discussing the issues with relevant parties and arriving at agreements and decisions.

74. In general, the process is kept simple and all grievances will be dealt with at the lowest level possible – at the barangay or municipal level. This is because the ultimate users of the system are the stakeholders of the barangay participating in the Project. They should therefore be kept informed and involved in determining actions to be taken. At this step, the CGC and aggrieved party agree on a resolution, conduct of alternative resolution process, or elevation of grievance to higher CGC level, thus:

#### Step 5: Agreeing on a resolution

75. If aggrieved party agrees with mitigation measure/resolution, the concerned CGC shall implement the agreed resolution. The Resolution Form shall be signed by the complainant and the relevant CGC with copies to be sent to the next CGC level copy furnished the Central CGC. For labor-related grievances, in addition to the copy of the Resolution Form to be furnished, the CGC shall provide guidance with recommendations to the relevant/involved contractor to improve working condition/labor management issues.

76. Confirmation that the case has been resolved from anonymous complainant(s) and those who wouldn't be able to personally sign the resolution form due to security reasons will be communicated through their provided contact information and will be asked to confirm agreement on the resolution via text message or email.

77. FEEDBACK – This step involves replying to the grievance sender and informing the complainant or aggrieved party of the status of his/her complaint. If complainant is unknown, the status or the redress documents covering the complaint will be posted in the appropriate medium to be provided or utilized by the Project. Response to grievances under the first type must be presented during community consultations to provide clear and complete information to persons about their queries.

78. FOLLOW-UP – This step involves determination of the result/outcome of resolved grievances. Follow-up must also be done to all resolved grievances immediately after feedback is provided to the complainant to determine if the final resolution yielded positive result to the aggrieved party. This involves asking whether the complainant was satisfied or not satisfied with the resolution of the issue. The Central and Regional CGCs shall conduct selected audit to review if handling of grievances conforms with the Project's GRM process.

79. APPEAL – Any person who does not agree with the decision on a complaint or grievance may file an appeal with the next higher level of the grievance redress machinery or to any appropriate project management office. The appeal shall be resolved by the receiving office within 30 working days.

#### *Escalation of Grievances to Higher CGC levels*

80. In cases where any grievance is not resolved at certain CGC levels, the matter shall be elevated to the next higher CGC level. Thus:

81. Step 6: If no amicable resolution is reached, conduct another resolution procedure or escalate grievance resolution to a higher level, until case is resolved.

82. If no response is received or no action taken by the level to which the complainant filed the grievance within 15 working days after the registration of the complaint, the complainant may appeal/elevate the grievance to the higher CGC level for appropriate action.

83. For example, if no understanding or amicable solution is reached within five (5) days for the first type of grievances, 30 days for the second type, and 60 days for the third type, or if no response is received from the relevant CGC within fifteen (15) days after the registration of complaint, the complainant can file another complaint or appeal, as appropriate, to the next level of CGC and shall cite the reason for elevating the grievance. The concerned higher CGC will organize meetings within ten (10) working days to discuss how to resolve the matter and offer resolution to the complainant. This process is repeated in provincial, regional and central CGCs.

84. If the complainant finds such mitigation measures acceptable, the relevant CGC will implement the resolution. The Resolution Form shall be signed by complainant and the CGC with copies to be sent to the next CGC level copy furnished the Central CGC.

#### Step 7: Case resolved or closed or is outside jurisdiction of the Project GRM

85. A case shall be registered as resolved if the Resolution Form or any other document of its equivalent has been secured from the complainant. If the complainant is still not satisfied with the decision of the Central CGC, in the absence of any response within the stipulated time, the case shall be deemed closed. The complainant, as a last resort, may opt to submit the

unresolved case to the courts, or in case of project workers, to proper administrative or existing arbitration procedures with the assistance of the CPMO.

86. The CPMO Desk Officers for complaints and grievances are (1) Atty. Christine Evangelista and Atty. Mary Mae Gadon of the Bureau of Agrarian Legal Assistance of DARCO who may be contacted through the following means: (*email addresses*: [director.bala@dar.gov.ph](mailto:director.bala@dar.gov.ph) & [odbala2015@gmail.com](mailto:odbala2015@gmail.com); *office address*: 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Main Building, Dept. of Agrarian Reform, Elliptical Road, Diliman, QC; Telephone No. 8-453-2220. They shall oversee the proper handling of complaints and grievances and ensure that a summary of the entries of the CGC logs per region shall be part of the progress reports submitted to the World Bank.

## **VI. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

87. Relevant Environment and Social Safeguards documents such as the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), Environment & Social Assessment (ESA), Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and the Environment & Social Commitment Plan (ESCP) shall also be disclosed by the DAR in its website and should be made available in the DARROs, DARPOs and DARMOs. Similarly, project orientation will be conducted in the different DAR field offices covered by the Project SPLIT to update the stakeholders on the approved process and requirements for project implementation.

88. Meetings with stakeholders shall be documented, highlighting agreements and ways forward which will be monitored throughout project implementation.

88. A third party monitor for the Project will be engaged at mid-term and end-of-project under the Project Management & Monitoring and Evaluation component.

## ANNEXES

### Annex A. Minutes of Consultation with Stakeholders, Baguio City, Benguet Province

**Consultation on the Support to Parcelization of Lands for Individual Titling (SPLIT)  
Project Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) Instruments  
January 23, 2020, 2:00 - 5:00 P.M.  
Holiday Inn Hotel, Baguio City**

#### I. List of Attendees

1. Ms. Maria Theresa Quiñones	World Bank
2. Ms. Maya Villaluz	World Bank
3. Mr. Svend Jensby	World Bank
4. Mr. Efren Perlas	PARCCOM, Abra
5. Mr. Eugene Cales	PARCCOM, Benguet
6. Mr. Modesto, Bahul, Sr.	PARCCOM, Ifugao
7. Mr. Fransco Alunday	PARCCOM, Kalinga
8. Ms. Glory Libang	PARCCOM, Mt. Province
9. Mr. John Bugaling	PARCCOM ARB Representative
10. Mr. Dick Evasco	BARC Chair, Atok , Benguet
11. Mr. Christopher Degay	DENR
12. Engr. Antero Mappang, Jr.	DENR
13. Ms. Ma. Gina Lopez	DENR
14. Atty. Guerrero Felipe	ROD, Benguet
15. Atty. Eugene P. Follante	DAR, CAR Regional Director
16. Ms. Jane Torribio	DAR, CAR CARPO
17. Ms. Angela Pang-ot	DAR, CAR, SARPO
18. Mr. Raymund Salio-an	DAR, Mt. Province, SARPO
19. Ms. Adela Damaso	DAR, OIC PARPO II, Mt. Province
20. Mr. Reynaldo Mamongyao	DARPO, Kalinga
21. Mr. Edano Canao	OIC PARPO II, DARPO Kalinga
22. Mr. Deogracias Almora	PAPRO II, DARPO Ifugao
23. Mr. Peter Bantasan	PCAO, DARPO Benguet
24. Ms. Artemio Dumaoang	OIC PARPO II, DARPO Apayao
25. Ms. Maritess Ocampo	DAR, ARPO II, Abra
26. Atty. Penelope De Dusen	OIC PARPO II, DARPO Abra
27. Ms. Maritess Fajardo	DAR, CAR-ARPT
28. Mr. Artemio Martin	DAR, CAR, Engr. II
29. Mr. Molines Ewis	DAR CAR, Engr. II
30. Mr. Jefferson Lasaten	DAR, CAR, SARPO
31. Mr. Edgardo Basas	DAR
32. Mr. Eric Ramos	DAR
33. Mr. Nelson Montalan	DAR
34. Usec. Bernie F. Cruz	FASPO and Project Implementation Officer
35. Asec. Ubaldo Sadiarin, Jr.	FASPO
36. Asec. Ma. Celerina G. Afable	Support Services Office

37. Dir. Homer Tobias	Regional Director - I, Special Asst. for SPLIT Project
38. Dir. Marjorie Ayson	BALA
39. Dir. Joey Sumatra	BLTI
40. Dir. James Arsenio Ponce	PARC Secretariat
41. Atty. Christine Evangelista	BALA
42. Ms. Rosario Regalado	Project Management Service
43. Ms. Arlene Pascua	Project Management Service
44. Ms. Jonna Mae Torre	UFASPO
45. Ms. Inna Almodal	UFASPO
46. Mr. Fred Abad	UFASPO
47. Mr. Kier Racimo	UFASPO

## II. Proceedings

The consultation meeting started at 2:30 in the afternoon with Asec. Ubaldo Sadiarin, Jr. delivered his welcome message to the participants. CARPO Jane Torribio of DAR-CAR acknowledged the presence of the different partner line agencies and stakeholders while Ms. Rosario Regalado of Project Management Service presented a brief background of the Support to Parcelization of Lands for Individual Titling (SPLIT) Project and it was followed by the presentation of Atty. Christine Evangelista on the environmental and social framework instruments. After the presentation, an open forum followed where questions and clarifications on the Project SPLIT were made and comments to the safeguards approach and instruments were raised.

## III. Open Forum

Question/Clarification/Suggestions	Response
<p>1. Atty. Guerrero Felipe (Registry of Deeds/ROD, Benguet):</p> <p>a. Suggested that in the approved survey plans, the road right- of-way (RROW) should be included.</p> <p>b. What if one of the owners of collective CLOA (CCLOA) died, the subdivision of CLOA would be delayed?</p> <p>c. Suggested that the name of the previous owner should not be removed from the original CCLOA even if it was already transferred to the heirs, to clearly show that it was not yet paid by the original owner.</p> <p>d. Overlap of CCLOA with Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title (CADT), in ancestral domains.</p>	<p>- RD Homer Tobias (DAR, Region 1): Appreciated the suggestion and noted that RROW should indeed be considered.</p> <p>- RD Homer Tobias (DAR, Region 1): Issues on heirs is addressed in the Department Administrative Order (DAO) No. 2 (series of 2019).</p> <p>- RD Homer Tobias (DAR, Region 1): It is clearly stated in DAO No. 2 (series of 2019) that the names of the heirs of the original owners/ARBs are the ones indicated in the CCLOAs.</p> <p>- Director Joey Sumatra (DAR, Bureau of Land Tenure Improvement/BLTI): The SPLIT Project will undertake an inventory to identify if there are CCLOAs issued in</p>

<p>e. Is there a need to get free and prior informed consent (FPIC) under the SPLIT Project since CCLOAs are issued already? There is no need since the SPLIT Project's intervention is not an infrastructure or business investment – these are the activities where FPIC is required under the Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act (IPRA).</p>	<p>ancestral domain areas, and whether these were issued before or after the enactment of the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Svend Jensby (World Bank/WB): ESS7 requires that the IPs should be consulted and informed of the Project, its benefits, risks and impact, and that they provide FPIC on the Project. However, the definition of FPIC in the Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) should refer to the FPIC definition following ESS7 and not the IPRA definition. Requirements under the IPRA will be confirmed with NCIP.</li> </ul>
<p>2. Dir. James Ponce (Presidential Agrarian Reform Council Secretariat) wanted to be clarified on the Department of Agriculture's (DA's) programs to be tapped such as sloping agriculture technology (SALT), integrated pest management (IPM), and organic agriculture; and if these are the same programs that DAR also provide to the ARBs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asec. Celerina Afable (DAR, Support Services Office/SSO): Some of the regular/locally-funded and foreign-assisted projects of DAR provide technical assistance on SALT, IPM and organic agriculture. As the Project is a land titling activity, individual CLOA holders will be linked to these technical assistance including those under the programs and projects of the DA and DENR.</li> </ul>
<p>3. Ms. Adela Damaso (DAR, PARPO-Mt. Province) asked if during the conduct of survey, it was found out that portions of the CCLOA is classified as timberland, but the actual/current usage is an agricultural land, how should we classify the land? Which would prevail - the land classification or the current land use?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RD Homer Tobias (DAR, Region 1): DAR will provide the list of ARBs in areas classified as forest (including timberland) to DENR for them to process the appropriate stewardship contract or tenurial instrument. He cited the example of Palawan which is classified as timberland but is now a rice land with irrigation facilities. Such case will be covered by the Joint Administrative Order (JAO) being formulated by DAR and DENR.</li> <li>- Director Joey Sumatra (DAR, BLTI): A Presidential Directive provides information about the appropriate tenurial instruments.</li> <li>- Director Marjorie Ayson (DAR, Bureau of Agrarian Legal Assistance/BALA): Emphasized that prior to survey, projections would be undertaken by DENR</li> </ul>

	<p>to identify the land classification. In view of this, it is not possible that the survey will be stopped in the middle of the activity because of incorrect land classification. It is important that DAR strictly adhere to and follow the parcelization process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff of Bureau of Land Tenure Improvement (DAR, BLTI): It is an opportune time that under the Project, the DENR will undertake the verification of the land classification. The projection will not only address the DAR’s CCLOAs but also DENR’s and LRA’s concerns.</li> </ul>
<p>4. Engr. Christopher Degay (DENR) shared that during the time of former President Joseph Estrada, all the distributed CCLOAs were classified as timberland and should be reverted back to DENR.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Director Marjorie Ayson (DAR, BALA): The land classification during that time could have been based only on table validation. Under the SPLIT Project, this would be done properly through actual/on-the-ground validation.</li> </ul>
<p>5. Mr. Efren Perlas (Provincial Agrarian Reform Committee or PARCCOM, Abra) suggested that the PARCCOM should be notified during the “pulong-pulong.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Director Joey Sumatra (DAR, BLTI): The PARCCOM should be involved in the project as well as the Barangay Agrarian Reform Council (BARC). Their roles are very critical during the validation process because they know the area and the ARBs. The BARC is also very much involved in the implementation of the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM).</li> <li>- Director Marjorie Ayson (DAR, BALA): Agreed that the PARCCOM should look at “technical displacement” to protect the original ARBs. The PARCCOM can also help in the dissemination of notices to ARBs.</li> </ul>
<p>6. CARPO Jane Torribio (DAR-CAR) asked if the “pulong-pulong” would suffice as compliance to the FPIC process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Svend Jensby (WB): Explained that what is required in the IPRA should be followed and this needs to be confirmed with the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) and legal experts. As regards the World Bank, the safeguards instruments should be followed, and the ESS7’s FPIC definition and requirements should be integrated into the participatory process for subdivision of</li> </ul>

	<p>CCLOAs. It was also noted that regional differences should be considered, including the decision making processes of IPs in a particular area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Edano Canao (DAR, Kalinga PARPO): Indicated that there is no need to seek FPIC as there is no conflict of interest between the NCIP/IP and the DAR as CCLOAs are issued already.</li> <li>- Atty. Guerrero Felipe (ROD, Benguet): Shared that in Benguet there are no conflict between CCLOA and CADT as the CCLOAs were issued long before the IPRA enactment.</li> <li>- Director Marjorie Ayson (DAR, BALA): Shared the experience in Nueva Vizcaya where the Bungkalot tribe prefer the CLOA over the CADTs since with CLOA they were provided with support services, while with CADT access to support services is hardly provided by the NCIP.</li> </ul>
<p>7. Ms. Maya Villaluz (WB): Asked if there are CCLOAs/CADTs issued in protected areas?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Atty. Guerrero Felipe (ROD, Benguet): Explained that in the Cordillera Administrative Region, there are CADTs within timberlands and protected areas.</li> </ul>

In closing, Ms. Maria Theresa Quiñones of the World Bank thanked and appreciated the participation of the stakeholders. She added that they gathered new learnings from the consultation that would be useful in finalizing the safeguards instruments. She encouraged the participants to visit the DAR website, study the safeguards documents and share additional feedback with DAR.

## Annex B. National Stakeholders' Consultation for Project SPLIT

### **National Consultation on the Support to Parcelization of Lands for Individual Titling (SPLIT) Project Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) Instruments**

**January 28, 2020, 10:00 - 12:00 N.N.**

**HRD Training Center, DAR Compound, Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City**

#### **I. List of Attendees**

1. Ms. Maria Theresa Quiñones	World Bank
2. Ms. Maya Villaluz	World Bank
3. Mr. Svend Jensby	World Bank
4. Mr. John Bugaling	PARC
5. Mr. Jaime Tadeo	PARC
6. Mr. Alexander Jacob	DENR
7. Mr. Stanley Lota	DENR
8. Ms. Kristine Mercado	DA
9. Ms. Frances Antonette Brillo	DA
10. Mr. Warlito Cabuna	DA
11. Ms. Shelly Calata	NCIP
12. Mr. Abdullah Lakarin	NCIP
13. Mr. Guerrero Patino	DENR-BMB
14. Mr. Norlito Sarmiento	DENR-FMB
15. Mr. Henry Pacis	DENR-LMB
16. Mr. Warlito Quirimit	DENR-LMB
17. Mr. Alex Lorayes	Land Bank of the Philippines
18. Usec. Bernie F. Cruz	FASPO and Project Implementation Officer
19. Asec. Ubaldo Sadiarin, Jr.	FASPO
20. Usec. Emily Padilla	Support Services Office
21. Asec. Ma. Celerina G. Afable	Support Services Office
22. Ms. Lucienne Pulgar	Project Management Service
23. Ms. Clemencia Padrinao	Project Management Service
24. Ms. Rosario Regalado	Project Management Service
25. Ms. Arlene Pascua	Project Management Service
26. Ms. Desirie Chua	Project Management Service
27. Ms. Jonna Mae Torre	UFASPO
28. Ms. Inna Almodal	UFASPO
29. Mr. Fred Abad	UFASPO
30. Mr. Willar Pantí	UFASPO
31. Mr. Jose Mari Hernando	AFASPO
32. Mr. Philip Alvarez	AFASPO
33. Atty. Elmer Distor	Asec. FOO
34. Atty. Lucius Jun-Jun Malsi	Undersecretary, FMAO
35. Dir. Susana Leones	BARBD
36. Dir. Nestor Bayoneto	MISS
37. Ms. Marcy Ballesteros	FOO
38. Ms. Dalangin Parel	DAR - CALABARZON
39. Mr. Ramon Dayrit	DAR - CALABARZON

40. Mr. Rey Bicara  
41. Ms. Jane Torribio

DAR - MIMAROPA  
DAR - CAR

## II. Proceedings

The consultation meeting started at 10:30 in the morning, Undersecretary Bernie F. Cruz delivered the welcome message to the participants. He said that the activity is part of the responsibility of the Department to provide update on and disclose the SPLIT Project and its environmental and social safeguards to the stakeholders. The discussion will focus on the environmental and social framework instruments to gather comments and inputs from all the stakeholders and to address all the issues and concerns before the project starts. PARPO Marcy Ballesteros acknowledged the presence of the different line agencies and stakeholders. Assistant Secretary Ma. Celerina G. Afable presented a brief background of the Support to Parcelization of Lands for Individual Titling (SPLIT) Project and it was followed by the presentation of Ms. Rosario Regalado on the Environmental and Social Framework Instruments. After the presentation, the floor was opened for comments and questions.

## III. Open Forum

Question/Clarification/Suggestions	Response
<p>1. Mr. Alex Lorayes (Landbank of the Philippines/LBP): Shared that the Project should look at the situation on the ground, if it is suited for agriculture and it is the current land use, the production side should be taken into consideration be it within or outside of timberland. But if the nature of the land is like 18 degrees slope and forestland then there may be a need to change the tenurial instrument. Provision for resettlement and housing should also be considered.</p>	<p>- Noted</p>
<p>2. Mr. Henry Pacis (DENR-Land Management Bureau/LMB): Shared that there is no land classification before. Some lands were erroneously classified the lands in the old patent. It is even more difficult to correct when it is transferred and approved in the LRA.</p> <p>We have to look at the condition of the area, if the slope of the land is above 18 degrees, technically it is classified as forest land and we need to change the classification of the land.</p>	<p>- Usec. Bernie Cruz (DAR-FAPSO): Said that primarily the project was done to solve the issues on land classification and to help the ARBs.</p>

<p>3. Mr. Lorayes (LBP): Inquired whether we are looking at areas that are generally classified as agricultural?</p> <p>He suggested to have DAR-DENR agreement that areas within timberland utilized for agricultural purposes should be released, so that full support will be extended to ARBs. Provision of housing could also be done.</p>	<p>- Usec. Bernie Cruz (DAR-FASPO): There are initiatives between DAR-DENR which were incorporated in the safeguards instruments. For areas that are located in forest land, the ARBs will not be displaced and they will be provided with the correct tenurial instrument. Also, we have to ensure that there is no overlapping so that the proper tenurial instrument will be provided.</p>
<p>4. Mr. Guerrero Patino (DENR-Biodiversity Management Bureau/BMB): Mentioned that it is a welcome development to settle the boundaries especially in the protected areas to correct the mistakes in the past.</p> <p>He shared that Republic Act (RA) 7586 or National Integrated Protected Area System (NIPAS) Act was amended by RA 1103-A (E-NIPAS Act).</p> <p>He added that the BMB initiatives to set boundaries/delineate protected areas, undertake socio economic survey of tenurial migrants and identification of occupants are among the activities that may compliment the DAR's and DENR's efforts.</p>	<p>- Noted.</p>
<p>5. Mr. Norlito Sarmiento (DENR-Forest Management Bureau/FMB): Said that on the part of FMB there is an ongoing classification of protection and production forest in cooperation with NAMRIA.</p> <p>He agreed that there will be no displacement as CCLOAs that overlaps with timberlands will only require a change in tenurial status.</p>	<p>- Noted.</p>
<p>6. Usec. Lucius Jun-Jun Malsi (DAR-Financial Management and Administration/FMA): Shared that the SPLIT Project is not a development</p>	<p>Though not addressed directly in the meeting, WB's ESS5 on Land Acquisition, Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement applies to SPLIT Project and</p>

<p>project in a sense that it only involves the provision of individual title/CLOA to the rightful owner. With regard to the case of informal settlers, the DAR has to be careful to avoid Commission on Audit (COA) disallowances which is experienced now by the Railway Project and other projects. As the government is not morally or legally obligated to pay compensation but maybe disturbances payment, it is not required to provide payment as in paying new lands.</p> <p>On the issue of Indigenous Peoples (IPs), he asked what law are we going to follow in terms of types of titling, the local or international law?</p>	<p>requires that affected persons are supported to maintain their levels of livelihoods and that lost assets, i.e. crops, structures are compensated at replacement costs. This is also spelled out in the Project’s Resettlement Policy Framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Svend Jensby (WB): Said that DAR should follow the local law which is the IPRA Law in terms of what forms of title is offered to IPs; the Bank is not requiring changes to national law. However, he noted that the ESS7 would apply to the SPLIT Project and would require a consultative process obtaining consent from IPs on titling activities, but that the Bank would not impose a particular type of titling for IPs outside of the SPLIT Project. It was also supported by Mr. Lorayes of Landbank.</li> </ul>
<p>7. Mr. Lorayes (LBP): Inquired on the reckoning period to comply with the 10 years holding period. He said that DAR should clearly define this. If it will be from the issuance of the CCLOA or registration date of the individual CLOA. This should be clearly defined in the Administrative Order being prepared by the DAR.</p> <p>He also shared that under Private Agricultural Land (PAL), there are 798,000 hectares without Land Distribution and Information Schedule (LDIS), and involving about 411,000 ARBs which have a collectible amount of PhP44.33 billion.</p> <p>Mr. Lorayes also expressed his reservations for the 3-year implementation period of the Project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asst. Secretary Elmer Distor (DAR-Field Operations Office/FOO): Replied that as ownership is not clearly defined in CCLOA, it would be difficult for the farmers to pay both amortization and taxes. It could be that amortization should start at the issuance of individual CLOA while the holding period effectivity starts at the issuance of the CCLOA. It is a “policy issue” and should consider which is more beneficial for the ARBs.</li> <li>- Usec. Bernie Cruz (DAR-FASPO): Assured that the Project involves interagency coordination. So the DAR is closely coordinating with DENR and LRA.</li> </ul>

<p>8. Mr. John Bugaling (PARCCOM): Suggested that the DAR do a “Cimatu, in Boracay” for this Project, i.e., involving convergence. He added that the PARCCOM can be tapped in the monitoring and provide quick response as needed.</p>	<p>- Noted.</p>
<p>9. Mr. Guerrero Patino (DENR-BMB): Inquired about the composition of the safeguards team.</p>	<p>- Ms. Rosario Regalado (DAR-PMS): Said that the team will be project-hired as project management offices will be organized.</p> <p>- Usec. Bernie Cruz (DAR-FASPO): Added that there will be Steering Committees that will be created that will involve representatives from the different concerned agencies.</p>
<p>10. Usec. Emily Padilla (DAR - Support Services Office): She was concerned on the number of ARBs that would benefit from the parcelization project and who should be given support services.</p>	<p>- Asec. Elmer Distor (DAR-FOO): The validation process is still ongoing.</p> <p>- Usec. Bernie Cruz (DAR-FASPO): Said that about 1.1 million ARBs will benefit from SPLIT Project.</p>
<p>11. Ms. Maya Villaluz (WB): Asked for clarification on the status of the ARBs to make sure that each of the stakeholders/people that would be involved in the project would be protected. Also, to make sure that proper support services would be given to the ARBs. To have balance between social and the environment.</p>	<p>- Usec. Bernie Cruz (DAR-FASPO): Said that the best safeguard measure for the first part of the project, is for the World Bank to support the DAR’s project like the IPAC which will be repackaged by the Department next year.</p>

In closing, Ms. Maria Theresa Quiñones of World Bank thanked the DAR and the rest of the attendees for the inputs provided during the consultation. She encouraged the participants to visit the DAR website, study the safeguards documents and share additional feedback with DAR.

Asec. Elmer Distor ended the consultation sharing that to correct the errors of the past there is a need to expedite the process, check the reckoning date of the CCLOA, whichever is favorable with the ARBs, include safeguards in the implementation and look forward to another project.

Annex C. 2nd National Stakeholders' Consultation for Project SPLIT with NGOs/POs

**Consultation on the Support to Parcelization of Lands for Individual Titling (SPLIT)  
Project Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) Instruments**

**February 19, 2020, 10:00 - 1:00 P.M.**

**OSEC Boardroom, DAR, Quezon City**

**IV. List of Attendees**

48. Fr. Francis Lucas	Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ANGOC)
49. Mr. Nataniel Don Marquez	Haribon Foundation
50. Mr. Thaddeus Martinez	KAISAHAN Tungo sa Kaunlaran ng Kanayunan
51. Ms Mary Claire Demaisip	at Repormang Pansakahan
52. Ms Christine N. Ariban	Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE)
53. Mr. Eugenio T. Eugenio	Magsasaka Partylist
54. Mr. Nanding Anati	Magsasaka Partylist
55. Ms Ayi T. Alimodal	Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM)
56. Ms Carla Santos	Center for Agrarian Reform & Rural Development
57. Ms Joe-Anna Marie Abelinde	(CARRD)
58. Ms. Melania B. Conta	CARRD
59. Mr. Jose P. Amora	Buhid Mangyan
60. Mr. Lagtum Pasag	Sadik Habanan Bukid –Mindoro (SHB)
61. Mr. Mandy Y. Sumbad	SHB
62. Mr. Datya Igna	SHB
63. Mr. Matigan Soligan	Pambansang Kilusan ng mga Samahang Magsasaka
64. Mr. Ireneo R. Cerilla	(PAKISAMA)
65. Mr. Raul Socrates Banzuela	World Bank
66. Mr. David Llorito	World Bank
67. Ms. Maya Villaluz	FASPO and Project Implementation Officer
68. Usec. Bernie F. Cruz	Support Service Office
69. Usec Emily Padilla	FASPO
70. Asec. Ubaldo Sadiarin, Jr.	Support Services Office/PMS
71. Asec. Ma. Celerina G. Afable	Regional Director - I, Special Asst. for SPLIT Project
72. Dir. Homer Tobias	BALA
73. Dir. Marjorie Ayson	BALA
74. Atty. Christine Evangelista	BALA
75. Mr. Adriel Quezada	BARBD
76. Dir. Ma. Susana E. Leones	BARBD
77. ADir. Ma. Elena Cabanes	Project Management Service
78. Ms Lucienne S. Pulgar	Project Management Service
79. Ms Clemencia Padrinao	Project Management Service
80. Ms Josie Arevalo	Project Management Service
81. Ms. Rosario Regalado	Project Management Service
82. Ms. Jennifer Bartolome	Project Management Service
83. Mr. Ron Tolentino	Project Management Service
84. Ms Desirie Chua	Project Management Service
85. Ms. Jonna Mae Torre	UFASPO
86. Mr. Jules Espiras	UFASPO

87. Mr. Fred Abad	UFASPO
88. Mr. Kier Racimo	UFASPO
89. Mr. Roberto E. Giue	PAMRS
90. Ms Pinky Roque	PAMRS
91. Mr. Jeffrey Quianzon	BLTI
92. Mr. Jade Intela	GSD
93. Ms Dianne D. Salto	Office ASec FASPO
94. Mr. Derrick Delos Reyes	Office ASec FASPO
95. Mr. Eduardo R. Regio	Office of UFOO

## V. Proceedings

The consultation meeting started at 10:20 AM and was chaired by Asec Ma. Celerina G. Afable of SSO and Project Management Service. She requested each of the participants to introduced themselves and their organization. Undersecretary Bernie Cruz of FASPO welcomed and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. He shared that the consultation was called for to inform the body on what the SPLIT Project is and to present the environmental and social framework instruments of the Project which is among the requirements of the World Bank. He added that through the stakeholders’ consultation, the Department seeks inputs, comments and suggestions on the safeguards instruments from the NGO partners on agrarian reform, indigenous peoples, environment and rural development.

Asec Afable presented the background of the Support to Parcelization of Lands for Individual Titling (SPLIT) Project, its rationale, objectives, coverage and components (Annex A). It was followed by the presentation of Atty. Christine Evangelista of BALA on the environmental and social framework instruments (Annex B). After the presentation, an open forum followed where questions and clarifications on the Project SPLIT were made and comments to the safeguards approach and instruments were raised.

## VI. Highlights of Open Forum

Question/Clarification/Suggestions	Response
<p>1. <b>Mr. Lagtum Pasag</b> Buhid Mangyan, Oriental Mindoro</p> <p>Based on how we understand the concept of the project, there’s a possibility that the IPs inhabiting the area, where the collective CLOA (CCLOA) exist, would be greatly affected as the IPs would have to be relocated should the project come into full implementation. As there are CCLOA existing in Mindoro that may include “sacred area” like ancestral domain, burial site of IPs, and some watershed.</p> <p>When the IPs were displaced due to the actual parcelization of the CCLOA, they might go to the mountains and do their</p>	<p>Usec. Bernie Cruz, DAR FASPO:</p> <p>Noted the observation and suggestion of Mr. Pasag.</p> <p>Fr. Francis Lucas, ANGOC:</p> <p>Reiterated that one of the concerns raised by Mr. Pasag is the unsettled issues on the overlapping CADT with CLOA in Mindoro.</p> <p>Usec. Cruz, FASPO:</p> <p>Informed the group that based on RA 6657 and in RA 9700, DAR is tasked to undergo</p>

Question/Clarification/Suggestions	Response
<p>agricultural activities there, do “kaingin”, and might cut some forest trees. Sometimes, it’s the government policies that push us to go to the mountains and do things that are detrimental to the environment.</p> <p>Our CADT, which was awarded in 2012 were not recognized. We hope that with this project, the DAR together with DENR, and LRA, as lead agencies involved in land titling, will recognize and look into the overlapping of our CADT with CLOAs and settle the issue once and for all.</p> <p>Suggested that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. DENR, DAR, and NCIP should discuss among themselves about the imminent effects of this project to the IP communities and mutually agree on what’s the appropriate thing to do.</li> <li>b. FPIC be observed in projects.</li> <li>c. For DAR and NCIP to discuss among themselves, especially in the identification of beneficiaries. There were cases that the identified beneficiaries were not the original occupants of the actual land, but from other adjacent municipalities.</li> </ol>	<p>parcelization of CCLOA. And with the coming of the SPLIT Project, wherein DAR, together with other institutions involved in providing instrument for land ownership (e.g., LRA, DENR, NCIP), will pursue this subdivision of CCLOA. DAR is in continuous consultation, and part of the SPLIT Project is the hiring and assignment of personnel in DENR and LRA, who provide dedicated work on land titling. Usec. Cruz also shared to the group that the purpose of the project is to have a clear delineation of the of beneficiaries’ tenurial instrument.</p> <p>It was explained that there is a JAO No 1 s. 2012 among DENR, DAR, NCIP and LRA to address the jurisdictional and operational issues between and among the agencies.<sup>1</sup></p>
<p>2. Claire Demaisip, Policy Advocacy Campaign &amp; Legal Affairs Coordinator, KAISAHAN</p> <p>Inquired if the IP-beneficiaries in areas with CCLOAs in ancestral domain lands, under the SPLIT Project, be given the option not to undergo parcelization and for their land to remain in CCLOA status until such time they are ready for parcelization.</p>	<p>Director Homer Tobias, DAR- Region 1:</p> <p>Agreed with the observation, as there were some cases where the IPs, though they know that the area is an ancestral domain, they insist that their lands be covered and be given a CLOA, that’s why they were awarded with CCLOA. The SPLIT Project provide options if they still want to remain under a CCLOA or not. RD Tobias added that there are certain conditions on how they will remain under a CCLOA so that their ongoing agricultural activities and practices remain and respected.</p>

Question/Clarification/Suggestions	Response
<p>She also said that the DAR should also recognize the idea that for some beneficiaries, like the IP communities, having a CCLOA is beneficial to them in managing their consolidated agri production which is collective in nature.</p>	
<p>3. Joe Anna Marie Casidsid-Abelinde, RAV Manager, CARRD</p> <p>Shared that in 2017, CARRD and the Asian Institute of Management, conducted a study on CCLOA parcelization, in Panay Island, particularly in Capiz.</p> <p>She mentioned that the initial slides in the presentations looked very similar to their study and clarified what DAR mean by ‘operational bottlenecks in CCLOA parcelization.’</p> <p>She elaborated that based on their study, the most difficult part in the stages of CCLOA parcelization lies on the first stage where we validate whether the original occupants of the awarded land, if they are still the one occupying the said land. Validation on the original occupants of the CCLOA is very difficult, and that happens during the stage one.</p> <p>She asked DAR on how to address the operation bottlenecks, especially at the grassroots level.</p> <p>She shared that CARRD have an ongoing partnership with DAR-Iloilo and DAR-Capiz regarding the strategy on the parcelization of CCLOA. The intervention provided to the farmers is on capacitating them within their landholdings so they can be empowered to be in-charge with the affairs of their lands with the help of para-legals. She said that the CARRD can share with DAR their strategy paper to help secure the property rights of the farmers who want to parcelized their lands.</p>	<p>Director Marjorie Ayson (Bureau of Agrarian Legal Assistance or BALA):</p> <p>Responded that based on the Administrative Order on parcelization, there is a portion there that is “Pulong-Pulong” which is part of the DAR’s program on ARB Validation. The DAR accept the reality that from the time the CCLOAs were awarded to these beneficiaries, with that span of time, and to validate the status of this CCLOA today, there really is a possibility that the actual occupants are not there anymore.</p> <p>She informed that in the first “pulong-pulong”, the group will be joined by the MARO and a Legal Officer wherein they will validate whether the names appearing at the back of the CCLOA title are still there and occupying the said land.</p> <p>After the ARB validation, the next step is to look into who are presently occupying/cultivating the land. Whoever is currently occupying / cultivating the said land is not guaranteed that they will be the one to be awarded with individual CLOA. They need to pass or undergo farmer beneficiary screening. We all know for a fact that these current occupants of the land could be those who bought the rights to the land from the original CCLOA holder.</p> <p>The field officials would have to look into the actual cultivators if they qualify under Section 22 of RA 6657, check on the total aggregate land holding of the actual cultivator, if its more than three (3) hectares of the award ceiling, he/she will be disqualified.<sup>2</sup></p>

Question/Clarification/Suggestions	Response
	<p>She appreciated the gesture of Ms. Abelinde in sharing their strategy paper. She added that the DAR, particularly in the regional offices like CAR, Region 1, and Region 2, implements Agrarian Justice on Wheels, wherein both DARAB and Legal Sector go out of their way and conduct hearings to address the plight of the farmers.</p> <p>Director Homer Tobias, DAR - Region 1:</p> <p>Also welcomed the sharing of the CARRD 's strategy paper.</p>
<p>4. Rene Cerilla, Policy Advocacy Leader PAKISAMA</p> <p>Asked if the declared CCLOA found out to be overlapping within an ancestral domain, who do we award the title?</p> <p>How does the flow of support services be within these parcelarized /subdivided CCLOA?</p> <p>Who will pay for the fees needed for the titling?</p> <p>And how about those CCLOA where the beneficiaries have arrears in the payment of amortization, will it be parcelarized? And if it was really proven that there were arrears and the original beneficiaries are missing...can the land be awarded to other beneficiaries? Like consider awarding it to our young farmers who are having a problem looking for lands to till / cultivate.</p>	<p>Director Ayson, BALA:</p> <p>As a rejoinder to her previous response from the query of Ms. Abelinde, she said that there is a Monitoring Form under AO 2, the "Whereabouts of the farmer", and under the "Remarks" portion, it should include information on how the rights on the lands were transferred from the original occupants to the current occupants.</p> <p>In response to the question raised by Mr. Cerilla re who do we award the title when there's an overlapping of CCLOA with CADT, Dir. Ayson responded that based on the AO 2, there are various categories per situation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Regular CCLOA (no issue with CADT, no overlapping) – this is the ideal situation. CCLOA within the domain of DAR to distribute, and within the domain of DAR to cover. If there's an actual occupant in the land, all we have to go through is the qualification or disqualification based on Section 22 of RA 6657.</li> <li>b. CCLOA within timberland /forest land per projection but based on the actual use it is a developed agricultural land. There are appropriate provisions which we include in the safeguard instrument. There is an ongoing work on this matter with DENR.</li> </ol>

Question/Clarification/Suggestions	Response
	<p>c. CCLOA that overlaps with a CADT – we have guidelines on this.</p> <p>Director Tobias, DAR- Region 1:</p> <p>In addition, on the explanation given by Dir. Ayson, Dir. Tobias further that when there’s an overlap of CCLOA with a CADT, what the DAR normally do as indicated in the law, is to assess and determine what title was issued first? Is it the CCLOA or the CADT?</p> <p>If we were to check, we have issued several CCLOA prior to the promulgation of the IPRA Law in 1997. So based on our process, it should be the CCLOA.</p> <p>Usec. Emily O. Padilla, DAR- Support Services Office (SSO):</p> <p>On the issuance of CADT, it is very clear on the IPRA Law, that the vested rights within the CADT / CADC issued will be respected. We really have to determine, IPRA Law was passed in 1997, and CARP is 1988, and 1972 is PD 27, we really have to respect the titles issued prior to IPRA Law. Secondly, we need to check what was overlapped, is it Ancestral Domain or Ancestral Title. It’s very clear that ancestral domain cannot be parcelarized nor be covered as CCLOA. But if it’s a CADT, it can be parcelarized and be divided to the individual IPs. That’s why, during the validation process, we need to qualify if it’s a Domain or a CADT.</p> <p>Director Tobias, DAR- Region 1:</p> <p>On the query whether who will pay the fees for the titling, Dir. Tobias responded that from the time that the CARP was implemented, it still the DAR who pay for the cost of the titling.</p>
<p>5. Jose Amora, Para-Legal and Manager of ARB organization - KASAPI. CARRD-assisted</p>	

Question/Clarification/Suggestions	Response
<p>Mr. Amora shared to the group support services their organization was able to access from the ARCESS project of DAR like the dump truck and credit assistance under the APCP.</p> <p>He also shared his observation that a farmer from their community was disqualified from availing an APCP credit assistance because he sold his right to a piece of land that is covered under CCLOA. However, despite this, the said farmer was also wishing that he be granted a 3-has. of land and file an exclusion case against other farmer beneficiaries. There was an order of finality by the Regional Office. The said case is now at the Supreme Court. With this, he suggested that the government should have a “sharp tool” to penalize the violator.</p> <p>The field officials at the grassroots level, the MAROs and the PAROs, will only rely on the procedure. The name of the said violator remains in the CCLOA, so when the redocumentation process and parcelization process proceed, that violator will still receive his individual CLOA.</p> <p>The money that we will loan from the WB will only be put into waste if we will not penalize this kind of violator. Let us protect other beneficiaries.</p>	
<p>6. Eugene Eugenio, NLO Coordinator Foundation for Phil. Environment</p> <p>Commented that he is looking for the participation of NCIP in the project because there will be a conflict with the IPRA Law. NCIP to be on board in the project.</p> <p>On the JAO No. 1, between DAR, DENR, LRA, and NCIP, I think there was an information that NCIP is</p>	<p>Dir. Tobias, DAR- Region 1:</p> <p>Informed that Undersecretary Pangulayan of Legal Affairs Office of DAR heads the meeting on the said Joint Administrative Order (JAO) No. 1 between DAR, DENR, LRA, and NCIP. The meeting is convincing NCIP to go back to the group to perfect the JAO as it serves a platform for the NCIP to lay issues and concerns on IPs/ancestral domain matters.</p>

Question/Clarification/Suggestions	Response
<p>withdrawing its intention to be involved in the discussion of the JAO.</p>	
<p>7. Mr. Matigon Suligan Sadik Habanan Buhid - Mindoro</p> <p>Problem with our CCLOA, whom do we consult to address our concerns on the overlapping claims. Some of the farmers occupying the land were not original occupants of that land, they're from other municipality. We hope that with the SPLIT Project, our problem will have its resolution.</p>	<p>Dir. Tobias, DAR- Region 1:</p> <p>Stated that though he does not have clear background of the issue/case cited by Mr. Suligan, he assured that with the SPLIT Project, said concerns will be included when the Project conducts its validation. The various types of situations at the ground level will be reviewed and evaluated and will eventually be resolved as to who is the qualified beneficiary for that piece of land.</p>
<p>8. Mr. Raul Socrates Banzuela, Executive Director, PAKISAMA</p> <p>Shared that he is both happy and sad, happy as he met old friends and partners in DAR, but sad as he asked the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Do we really need this project?</li> <li>b) How important is the issuance of individual title?</li> <li>c) Was there ever a research conducted that says that unless it is titled individually, the lands will not be productive, their cooperatives will not progress?</li> </ul> <p>What is needed is individual survey, parcelary survey for the ARBs to know where their exact location if for individual planning. He cited the Pecuaría experience, with more than 400 members, in about 800 hectares with no individual title. Hence the farmers were not able to sell their land. When the 20% became successful they are helping the 80%.</p> <p>He further said that individual titling is not a pre-requisite for the lands to be productive. It will only facilitate</p>	<p>Dir. Tobias, DAR, Region 1:</p> <p>We are mandated under RA 9700 that we parcelize the CCLOA.</p> <p>Usec. Cruz, DAR FASPO:</p> <p>Based on the project's development objective of –improve land tenure security and strengthen property rights of ARBs. It will address issues on IPs and forest land overlaps.</p> <p>Since most of the farmers/ARBs are old, the children who have the capacity to improve the lands will be encourage to do so especially if they have the title.</p> <p>He added that the problem if the CCLOA is in the name of the cooperative, if the farmer member left the coop, the land is left as well.</p> <p>He also cited Hacienda Luisita, since the farmers do not have the title with them earlier, there were selling of lands, but when the titles were distributed individually, the farmers are more secured.</p> <p>He agreed that the DAR should ensure that the lands should be made productive and provided with support services. That the best safeguard is the support services provided to the farmers.</p>

Question/Clarification/Suggestions	Response
<p>rampant selling of lands, of the farm, of rights.</p> <p>Hence, individual titling should be done with corresponding measures and conditions like, (i) complete support services will be provided to the ARBs, (ii) ARB must be member of cooperative, (iii) that they can only sell their farm to the cooperatives/organizations.</p> <p>He also suggested that, the DAR may include representatives from the group as part of the Steering Committee when the Project is implemented.</p>	<p>Usec Bernie Cruz added that the DAR is not alone in the implementation of the SPLIT Project, partners like DENR, LRA and NCIP.</p>
<p>9. Rene Cerilla, PAKISAMA</p> <p>Cited several situations where the poverty felt by farmer would prompt them to sell their lands:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The need to feed their families</li> <li>b. The need to send their children to school</li> <li>c. When the lands they are occupying are surrounded with “converted agri lands”</li> </ol> <p>The farmers are vulnerable to sell their lands, with the issues on rice tariffication, low prices of copra/coconut, among others. The farmers are pushed to sell their right over their land (CCLOA), and more so if it’s already individually titled.</p>	<p>Usec. Cruz, FASPO:</p> <p>It is really in the law that we need to parcelized and distribute the CCLOA into individual title and it’s a marching order from the President.</p> <p>Also, for the Land Bank of the Philippines to collect the land amortization for the private agricultural lands.</p> <p>There are government programs that are implemented to address such issues.<sup>3</sup></p>
<p>10. Fr. Francis Lucas, ANGOC</p> <p>Commented that when the land is titled, it is more vulnerable for selling.</p> <p>Raised two issues: (i) land grabbing, and (ii) not so young farmers If no support on the agriculture, from the government, with or without title, farmers will sell their land.</p>	<p>Usec. Cruz, FASPO:</p> <p>Noted the comments and suggestions.</p>

Question/Clarification/Suggestions	Response
<p>He asked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Clean CCLOA – are the farmers have option not to parcelize their lands?</li> <li>b. On conflict re overlapping - who really decides? JAO was issued to guide in the decision making, but until now issues remain unresolved, now, the NCIP withdraw their participation in the JAO. On inter-departmental issues, who decides?</li> </ul> <p>He suggested the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Strengthening the policies/law on land conversion from agriculture to other uses.</li> <li>b. Electronic transparency platform for other stakeholders to have access to information</li> </ul>	
<p>11. Mr. Nathaniel Don Marquez, Executive Director, ANGOC</p> <p>Agreed that titled land will increase tenurial security, but it is not the only security measure, so the project should include safeguard components such as support services, legal environment against land conversion, conflict resolution especially during identification of the beneficiaries, gender equity.</p> <p>He asked the plan of the government on the balance of the land for distribution.</p> <p>He also asked the basis for choosing Regions 1, 8 and 9 for the field testing.</p> <p>On safeguard measures, how can interested parties participate and how this can be implemented in the ground level?</p>	<p>Usec. Cruz, FASPO:</p> <p>Reiterated that the DAR is mandated to parcelize the CCLOA and distribute individual title. He added that the marching order from the President is to complete the distribution of lands, including all the balances for land distribution before his administration ends.</p> <p>Rosario R. Regalado, DAR –PMS</p> <p>Requested permission to share... that the SPLIT Project, prepared the environmental and social safeguards that would address concerns on conflict resolution, on indigenous peoples, on resettlements, on overlaps in protected areas and forest lands. These environmental and social safeguards instruments are posted at the DAR website, that comments and inputs on these documents are welcome to help the</p>

Question/Clarification/Suggestions	Response
	Department implement the SPLIT Project well.
<p>12. Mr. Thaddeus Martinez, HARIBON Foundation, Inc.</p> <p>Shared that in the preparation of the IRR for RA 10654 or the Fisheries Code, DA-BFAR in coordination with DAR, shall establish as fisherfolk settlement area. He inquired if this was considered under the SPLIT Project?</p>	<p>Usec Cruz, DAR FASPO:</p> <p>The SPLIT Project is focused on the parcelization of CCLOA distributed by DAR. In close coordination with DENR, for land declared as forest lands DENR may provide appropriate tenurial instrument to the actual occupants of the land, and assured that under the Project no one will be displaced.</p> <p>Director Ayson, BALA:</p> <p>Regarding the establishment of settlements, that can be possible for new lands. The CCLOA we are talking here involved pre-identified ARBs. We cannot separate a portion of that especially in those areas that are coastal. This project has already pre-identified ARBs and it can never be used as settlement area.</p>
<p>13. Mr Mandy Sumbad, Vice Chairman, Sadik Habanan Buhid- Mindoro</p> <p>Requested that the Project truly do validation in the field, that their sacred land will not be covered by CCLOA and, that the government respect their rights, that they be consulted on projects in their area and seek their permission and approval.</p>	<p>Usec Cruz, FASPO:</p> <p>The requests/suggestions are considered in the SPLIT Project.</p>

<sup>1</sup> Safeguards have been incorporated into the project documents to address all potential environmental and social risks that may be associated with the Project, including the points raised by Mr. Pasag, as well as those that have surfaced during the past consultations undertaken by the DAR with other project stakeholders. The documents are already disclosed publicly in the DAR website and will be updated as necessary to inform the public and project beneficiaries.

<sup>2</sup> The peculiar situations on the ground will be further assessed on a per CCLOA basis as emphasized in the Project's environmental and social safeguards documents to protect the rights and interests of all stakeholders particularly the ARBs, the actual occupants and/or cultivators and avoid risks of displacements. The safeguards measures of the Project will be periodically assessed and reviewed even during implementation, and feedback from stakeholder consultations will be considered in enhancing these measures.

<sup>3</sup> In the Project's ESMF, safeguards measures to address such risks include facilitating the farmers' access to these existing government programs to fight poverty. An existing measure under RA 6657 also provides that the sale of agricultural lands, including CARP-awarded lands, requires clearance from DAR.

Ms Maya Villaluz thank the stakeholders for their active participation in the meeting. She expressed that the DAR was able to organized several consultations for the enhancement of the safeguard instruments. She added that the Environment and Social Framework is a new framework being adopted by the WB which become adoptable in October 2018. In the

Philippines, the SPLIT Project is the first project that will have to follow all the relevant standards. Hence, the DAR, invited the NGOs/CSOs to seek their comments/inputs for the enhancement of the ESF instruments. The ESF instrument can be downloaded in the DAR website.

In closing, Assistant Secretary Ubaldo Sadiarin Jr. thanked the meeting for their active participation and valuable inputs and suggestions on the SPLIT Project. That though topics on taxes to be paid by the farmer and payment of amortization were not touched, he is confident that the matters can be thoroughly discussed in other venue.

The meeting ended at 1:15 PM.