

Understanding the Outcomes of the Parcelization of Collective Titles

Chona R. Echavez, PhD
Leah E. Pilongo, PhD

FINAL REPORT

Public Disclosure Authorized

Public Disclosure Authorized

Public Disclosure Authorized

Public Disclosure Authorized



Contents

Acronyms	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
Introduction	1
Research Methodology.....	2
• Research Design.....	2
• Grouping Matrix.....	2
• Data Collection Instruments	2
• Coding and Analysis	2
• Profile of informants.....	4
• Conduct of pulong-pulong	4
• Conduct of land subdivision survey	8
• Marital property rights	13
• Gender and access to land.....	14
• Amortization and taxes.....	14
• Agricultural extension services	15
Conclusion.....	16
Recommendations	16
References	14
Annexes.....	13
• Annex Table 1. Summary Table of Field Work Activities	13
• Annex Table 2. Distribution of Key-Informant Interviews (KIIs) for Davao Oriental and Misamis Oriental	14
• Annex Table 3. Distribution of IDIs per Province (Davao Oriental and Misamis Oriental).....	14
• Annex Table 4. Distribution of IDI USING FGI/FGD Tool for Davao Oriental and Misamis Oriental.....	14

ACRONYMS

ARB	Agrarian Reform Beneficiary
ARPT	Agrarian Reform Program Technologist
BARC	Barangay Agrarian Reform Council
CARP	Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program
CARPO	Chief Agrarian Reform Program Officer
CLOA	Certificate of Land Ownership Award
DAR	Department of Agrarian Reform
DARAB	Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board
DARCO	Department of Agrarian Reform Central Office
DARPO	Department of Agrarian Reform Provincial Office
DARRO	Department of Agrarian Reform Regional Office
DARPP	Department of Agrarian Reform Parcelization Program
DENR	Department of Natural Resources and Environment
FGI	Focus Group Discussion
ICLOA	Individual Certificate of Land Ownership Award
IDI	In-Depth-Interview
KII	Key Informant Interview
LBP	Land Bank of the Philippines
LRA	Land Registration Authority
MARO	Municipal Agrarian Reform Office
MARPO	Municipal Agrarian Reform Program Officer
PARO	Provincial Agrarian Reform Office
PARPO	Provincial Agrarian Reform Program Officer
QMS	Quality Management System
ROD	Registry of Deeds
SARPT	Senior Agrarian Reform Program Technologist

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE:

Private property rights are widely considered to be one of the most important tools in fighting inequality and promoting economic growth. In the Philippines in particular, a lack of formal, individual property rights is a key obstacle facing many farmers as they work to maximize productivity on their lands and escape poverty.

Of the 4.9 million hectares of land that have been distributed to over 2.8 million Filipino farmers under the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP), almost half (2.37 million hectares) were awarded in the form of collective titles that failed to provide beneficiaries with full individual property rights. To address this issue, the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) is in the process of subdividing these collective titles and distributing individual land titles to the respective Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries (ARBs).

Castro-Zarzur, Gordoncillo, Gunnsteinsson, Jarvis, Johnson, Perova, and Srouji (2020) evaluated the impacts of the DAR Parcelization Program (DARPP) on agricultural investment, output and the channels, such as tenure security and trade gains – through which these impacts may materialize. The randomized controlled trial found that the subdivision survey stage of the parcelization process decreased ARB's perceptions of tenure security and perceptions of local government's ability to effectively enforce their property rights. Aligned with these concerns, the subdivision survey increased ARB's anxiety levels by 9 percent and decreased their life satisfaction by 26 percent compared to the control group. The subdivision survey also decreased women's decision-making power in the households of male ARBs. Importantly, the study was only able to identify the impacts of an intermediate stage in the parcelization process and, as such, cannot be used to draw conclusions about the effects of the program as a whole. It reflects the short-term impacts of the program while beneficiaries are going through a transition in land rights.

This follow-up study uses qualitative methods to better understand the intervention's effects and channels. It also complements the previous study by examining the impacts of the study in the longer-term. Half of the sample in this study had already received their individual land titles, which is the final stage of the parcelization process. The subdivision survey for most of those who were still waiting for their individual land titles had taken place multiple years ago, so although their land rights were still in transition, they had not experienced recent changes in their land tenure status.

This qualitative study used Key Informant Interviews (KII), Focus Group Interviews (FGI), and In-Depth-Interviews (IDI) in Misamis Oriental and Davao Oriental. In total, 66 interviews were conducted. A collaboration with IPA Philippines and the World Bank Group (WBG), this study intends to collect qualitative data from key informant interviews with the local DAR staff, ARBs, and their spouses through Focus Group Interviews (FGIs) and In-Depth-Interviews (IDIs) separately with ARBs' and their respective spouses.

KEY FINDINGS

The *Pulong-pulong*: how it is communicated, who are invited (are the ARBs' spouse included), its conduct, attendance, how it is perceived, topics covered, and views of amortization and tax payment

The *pulong-pulong*, which is loosely translated as a "community meeting," is the primary interaction point between DAR, the ARBs, and the local leaders. DAR policy is to hold a *pulong-pulong* with all ARBs in a collective title prior to conducting a subdivision survey. It aims to inform the stakeholders of the parcelization process, schedule of activities, and documentary requirements of the ARBs, as well as to address land border disputes, if any. This study looked at DAR's *pulong-pulong* invitees. It is also essential to determine how the invitation affected the relationship between ARBs and their spouses, especially in land decisions (regarding utilization and agricultural inputs).

- The Municipal Agrarian Reform Office initiates the *pulong-pulong* by sending invitation notices to the beneficiaries and other stakeholders such as the Barangay Officials.
- Both ARBs and their spouses were interviewed on their participation in the subdivision process, from the *pulong-pulong* to the subdivision survey. When asked if both ARBs and their spouses attended the *pulong-pulong*, half of the total number of ARB participants said that they attended the *pulong-pulong*, and half of the spouses of ARBs interviewed noted that only ARBs were invited to the *pulong-pulong*. More informants from Davao Oriental compared to Misamis Oriental claimed that no one from their household received an invitation for the *pulong-pulong* from DAR.

- Most informants who attended the *pulong-pulong* for their title reported positive impressions. Specifically, the discussion during the *pulong-pulong* helped them feel secure after learning about the land parcelization process. A few were apprehensive about the amortization and the property tax to be paid.¹
- The *pulong-pulong* was effective in helping beneficiaries understand the process and addressing concerns about land parcelization. However, the study also found that there is a need to ensure that invitations reached the beneficiaries and that concerns regarding inclusivity, venue, frequency, and coverage had to be improved.
- Several informants were apprehensive about having to pay the amortization and the property tax. They were worried that they might not be able to raise sufficient funds to pay for these.
- Several beneficiaries claimed they could not attend the *pulong-pulong* because they did not receive an invitation. They reasoned that this was perhaps because they live in a more secluded part of the locality. The implementers, however, claimed that the change of domicile, abandonment, and/or selling of the land are some of the common reasons why a beneficiary did not receive the invitation.

The subdivision survey: its conduct, how it is communicated, how it is perceived by the ARBs, spousal participation, and its outcomes (including pressure to sell or lease the land)

The subdivision survey involves the subdivision of lots per actual tillage of ARBs and non-coverable areas or as agreed upon by all parties based on *pulong-pulong* and field personnel negotiation. It includes proper monument² installation, relocating original lot boundaries, and determining the CARP coverage area and exclusions. The DAR or a private survey firm administers this process.

- The informants found the subdivision survey physically taxing because of the need to traverse parcel boundaries to ensure that these do not overlap with the land boundaries of other landholders. Notwithstanding, the beneficiaries perceive that the land subdivision survey effectively settled boundary disputes, if any. The presence of beneficiaries and owners of adjacent lots during the land subdivision surveys helped address concerns

and correct measurements before finalizing the survey.

- The subdivision survey is seen as an essential activity in the parcelization process and had a better attendance on the part of the ARB and the spouse than the *pulong-pulong*. Both the ARB and the spouse perceived the sub-division survey as the final step to obtaining the individual land title. There were those who thought that their land rights were clear and permanent, and those who thought that their rights are temporary. The former started expanding the portion being tilled or further developing the land by clearing, cleaning, and planting more permanent crops/perennial trees. The latter believed that their land claim is temporary until the title is released. Without the title, they feared that the government would take their property.
- The beneficiaries believed there was a need to ensure the spouse's presence to make the process more inclusive and informative. In addition, the beneficiaries also pointed out the need to send out invitations early and ensure that these reached the beneficiaries ahead of time.
- The land subdivision survey and the awarding of individual land titles shifted the beneficiaries' perception of the ownership status of the land given to them. ARBs perceived that subdivision survey is a step closer to owning the land, whereas, being awarded with the land title is an affirmation of their ownership. However, while there was a greater understanding of the conjugal ownership of the awarded land, it did not lead to greater involvement of the spouse in the major decision-making about the land. Female spouses seemed to leave major decisions to their respective spouses. Specifically, the participation of female spouses in planning and decision-making about the land was generally limited to actual cultivation such as planting, weeding, etc.
- Analysis of the responses by the three groups of informants—DAR staff, ARBs, and spouses of ARBs—revealed that there was no pressure for them to sell or lease the land granted to them by the government. This development is noteworthy because agrarian reform beneficiaries are legally barred from selling the land awarded to them.

Issuance of individual land titles and those who are still waiting for individual land titles to be issued: Change in

¹ Although the New Agrarian Emancipation Act (RA 11953) eliminated the need for amortization payments, the reform was passed in July 2023, after the conclusion of this study.

² Monuments are physical markers denoting the boundaries of ARBs' parcels within and between collective titles.

tenure security trust in government, and overall quality of life

Although the previous impact evaluation study found that delays in receiving the individual titles may erode trust in the government, this longer-term follow-up study did not corroborate that finding. ARBs and their spouses expressed their trust that the government will give them security of tenure by the issuance of their individual land titles.

- Notwithstanding the protracted processing of land titles, the informants harbor no ill feelings towards the government. The majority of informants expressed a feeling of gratitude towards the government. However, those who have not yet received their land titles had a broad spectrum of views ranging from a continuing trust in the government and its processes to the insinuation of a government bureaucracy that is uncaring and inept.
- The views about how shifts in land rights have affected the quality of life were also diverse. Some believe that not much has changed in their state of life even after they were awarded their individual titles. There are also those who credited having a land of their own as a reason for improving their state of life. Those who believe that their quality of life has improved did so because they now have the autonomy to decide on the crops to be planted and the investments to be made on the land. For both of those who received their ICLOAs, and those who believed they would eventually receive their ICLOAs, they felt secure in developing the land, and invested on their lands.
- The informants commonly believed that the issuance of their land titles would happen a few months up to two years after the land subdivision survey. However, this was not the case because the process took several years, with at least one case reporting that it took over two decades starting from the land subdivision survey until finally receiving his/her individual land title. The informants perceived that once they had their land titles, they would be in a better position to make decisions on the land, such as what crops to plant, how much area to be planted, what animals to raise, and how many. Informants who already received their titles felt more secure about their land ownership, saying that no other claims would be made on the land already awarded to them.
- The issuance of the land title provided the informants with a sense of security over the land awarded to them. It also made them feel that they were in a better position to decide anything about the land. When during the sub-division survey, they had already started investing in their land by making

improvements/expanding production and planting more permanent crops and perennial trees, all the more that they made efforts upon receiving their individual land titles. Some beneficiary households could also present their individual land title as proof of ownership to enable them to have a connection and/or access to electricity and water services.

Presence of agricultural extension services: How it mediates the effects of the sub-division survey

- Several informants claimed that agricultural extension services provided them with the needed support on agricultural inputs. Cultivation would have been more difficult since they would not have access to fertilizer and other inputs. In the bigger picture, the presence of agricultural services made farmers feel the presence of the government.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This qualitative study had findings that did not align with the findings of the previous impact evaluation. Because the sample and timing of the studies are different, the divergence in findings can not only be explained but can help deepen our understanding of ARBs' experiences with the parcelization process and program. The previous study only examined the impacts of an intermediate stage of parcelization—after the subdivision survey and before issuance of the individual titles—whereas the current study includes some ARBs who have only completed the survey subdivision stage and others who have already received their individual land titles. The impact evaluation measured impacts of the subdivision survey approximately one to two years after the subdivision survey. The timing between the subdivision survey and the interview was considerably longer in the qualitative study. For example, one of the ARBs in the qualitative study disclosed that his land underwent subdivision survey in 2004 and received his individual land title in 2018 (that was 14 years after). Another ARB shared that his land was subdivided in 2012, until the interview was conducted, he was still waiting at the time of the interview in 2022.

Economic theory predicts that formalized property rights can influence investment decisions and productivity by reducing the threat of expropriation, increasing access to credit, and/or gains from trade (Besley 1995). The parcelization of collective titles is expected to have positive impacts on these outcomes. However, the direction and magnitude of the impacts of an intermediate stage of parcelization are theoretically ambiguous. On the one hand, the subdivision survey may settle boundary disputes, provide clarity on borders, and reassure ARBs that they will eventually receive individual land titles, all of which could increase perceptions of tenure security or make it easier to lease out the land. On the other hand, any process of change can breed uncertainty during the transition, and the long duration

of the process coupled with the temporary relinquishment of title documents during processing may cause a decline in perceived tenure security.

Considering the findings of the two studies together, there is evidence for all three of these theoretical predictions. The qualitative research reveals that formal, individual property rights documented in an individual title do seem to improve tenure security. Some ARBs also feel empowered given their improved tenure status to invest more in their land, and others have used their title documents to gain access to productivity-enhancing services, like electricity or water. The subdivision survey did provide clarity on borders and settled boundary disputes, as noted in the qualitative research. However, some ARBs also noted in qualitative interviews that they perceived their land rights as temporary after the subdivision survey and feared the government could revoke their rights without the title document. This sentiment is also corroborated by the quantitative research, which demonstrated that on average the subdivision survey lowered tenure security compared to a control group. These differing reactions to the subdivision survey may come from different individuals. Indeed, the impact evaluation found that declines in tenure security and increases in anxiety were concentrated among ARBs who would have to make amortization payments for their land.³ In addition, the impacts of the subdivision survey may shift over time. Any process of change can generate uncertainty and anxiety, especially when ARBs must relinquish their collective title documents during the process of parcelization. This may be particularly salient when this process of change has been more recent. As time progresses, ARBs may note that their access to the land has not changed, and this may alleviate some of their anxiety as time passes while waiting for their individual titles.

Both the previous study and the qualitative study highlighted ways that the process of parcelization could be improved. Specific recommendations from the qualitative analysis include:

1. **Pulong-pulong:** Because the *pulong-pulong* is a critical step in the parcelization process during which important issues are discussed, it is imperative to ensure the attendance of the ARBs and other stakeholders (e.g., adjacent landowners, BARC Chair). Areas for the improvement of the *pulong-pulong* can be grouped into the following: invitation, inclusivity, venue, frequency, and coverage. A formal invitation should be sent at least one week

before the *pulong-pulong*, including the agenda to be discussed. For inclusivity, the invitations need to reach as many beneficiaries as possible, including the spouses of ARBs, to avoid the connotation that only select individuals are invited. Regarding the venue, a more conducive venue should be used for future *pulong-pulong* activities. The venue should be in the community where most ARBs reside rather than at the town center, which is not only far but also costly. In addition, the venue should be a more conducive community space that is well-ventilated and noise-free. The *pulong-pulong* should better cover the financial obligations of ARBs. This includes information on the recent New Agrarian Emancipation Act, which condones principal payments, interests, and penalties on land that ARBs are currently tilling, assumes the obligation of ARBs who were required to make direct compensation to former landowners, and exempts ARBs from the payment of estate tax. Financial information should also include detailed information on requirements related to the payment of property tax.

2. **Subdivision Survey:** ARBs and their spouses reported that their presence during subdivision surveys was valuable as it helped to clarify boundaries and ensure all parties agreed on the measurement of the new titles. Thus, greater effort should be made to ensure that both ARBs and spouses are able to observe survey activities. In addition, stating in the invitation the role of the spouse (particularly the wife) and his/her responsibility during the *pulong-pulong* will highlight the need for them to attend. One way to address the issue of 'invisibility' of women in agriculture is to write the names of the spouses, especially the females, on the invitations.
3. **Issuance of Individual land titles:** Despite the continuing trust that ARBs have towards the government, even with the long delay of individual title issuance, there should be efforts to speed up the parcelization process and issuance of individual land titles. All agencies involved should cooperate and unify their efforts to address the long delay in issuance and avoid building up frustration among the awardees.
4. **Agricultural extension services:** Agricultural services are still found to be lacking to connect various inputs and activities to produce the desired effects of increased productivity, increased household incomes and investments.

³ Until the New Agrarian Emancipation Act was signed into law in July 2023, some recipients of CARP-awarded lands were required to make payments to the Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP) to compensate the former landowners. Generally, land that used to belong to

private landholders was compensable, meaning that ARBs were required to reimburse the value of the land, whereas lands that were previously government-owned were non-compensable and did not require payments.

5. Gender and Parcelization Process: Gender is a theme that cuts across various steps in the parcelization process and needs to be integrated in the whole process. There is a need for a clear toolkit to help translate the goal of promoting gender equality into concrete guidance on how this can be achieved at the community level. Female spouses need to be invited to the *pulong-pulong* to receive important information on the parcelization process that is key for ensuring they have an equal voice on decisions about the land. Spousal communication and engagement in the process should be encouraged to ensure active participation and progress toward gender-related goals. Providers of extension services need to communicate and transmit information and technology to ARBs and spouses, and the rest of the household members.

INTRODUCTION

Background and Objectives

The United Nation's 2030 Agenda has given countries a framework for shared prosperity in a sustainable future and combating extreme rural poverty. It recognizes the many international organizations and CSOs working to achieve the 17 SDGs in its effort to promote rural development and nation-building in the 21st century.⁴ The Comprehensive Agrarian Reform (CARP) was formed in 1988 to redistribute 9 million hectares of land from the government, private owners, and businesses to small-scale farmers and landless rural households who had previously been deprived of their land. Due to political pressure to demonstrate progress, 4 million hectares of land were allocated to farmer organizations as "collective" land titles due to the Land Reform and Development Act of 2000. Recognizing that collective titles can hinder investment and financial market development, the Philippine government has begun subdividing collective titles and providing individual farmers with formal titles for their respective properties. The DAR has been assigned the responsibility of carrying out the program.

The country's long-standing inequity in land ownership and tenancy relations is one of the root causes of the rural economy's poor performance, particularly in terms of investment, productivity, income growth, and poverty. The chances of rural households gaining access to and control over agricultural land need to be improved to create sustainable livelihoods and escape rural poverty. Incentives to increase farm production and turn small farmers or tenants into effective agricultural producers or businesses are also provided by private property rights to land. Land redistribution and the provision of individual property rights through parcelization are expected to increase productivity, increase household incomes and investments, and decrease rural poverty.⁵ This study aims to understand how the programs inputs could lead to developmental changes by examining the experiences, attitudes, and behaviors of implementers and beneficiaries during and after the intervention. The findings can serve as an eye-opener to government policymakers on how to approach the implementation of agrarian reform by mapping the issues, concerns, and challenges that hinder the program's implementation.

An Impact Evaluation (IE) was conducted between 2013 and 2020 with the goal of determining the impact of strengthened individual property rights on agricultural investment, which was achieved by splitting communal land titles into individual titles.

The IE was conducted as a Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT) with 475 collective titles in the Bicol region and Mindanao Island. The endline survey was conducted at a point in the parcelization process when ARBs in the treatment group had previously gotten their land surveys and were informed that individual title papers would be provided, but these had not yet been received. As a result, the findings are unable to provide light on the effects of receiving individual land titles. Subdivision surveys led to declines in ARBs' views of tenure security and faith in government, life satisfaction, and women's agricultural decision-making power, according to endline results at this stage of the intervention. Most impacts were stronger for ARBs who were expected to make government amortization payments after parcelization.⁶

This research aims to conduct a follow-up qualitative study with agrarian reform beneficiaries (ARBs) and their households to elicit further information about the intervention's effects and the channels driving these effects.

The follow-up qualitative study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. How are *pulong-pulong* assemblies and subdivision surveys run in the field? How does the DAR communicate with ARBs before and after fieldwork?
2. How did ARBs perceive the subdivision survey process? What aspects of the *pulong-pulong* and subdivision survey process did ARBs find useful and informative? What aspects of the process did ARBs find need improvement?
3. How does the expectation of paying amortization payments and/or property taxes affect respondents' tenure security and agricultural investment?
4. How did subdivision surveys influence their perception of tenure security, trust in government, and overall quality of life?

⁴ United Nations. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

⁵ Ballesteros, Marife M., Jenica Ancheta, and Tatum Ramos. "The Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP) After 30 Years: Accomplishments and Forward Options," (2017).

⁶ Castro-Zarzur, R., Gordoncillo, P., Gunnsteinsson, S., Jarvis, F., Johnson, H., Perova, E., & Srouji, P. (2020). Land rights in transition: Preliminary experimental evidence on how changes in formal tenure affect agricultural outcomes, perceptions, and decision-making in the Philippines.

5. What aspects of the subdivision survey process may have affected outcomes for respondents?
6. To what extent were the spouses of ARBs involved in the subdivision process, and how did the intervention affect understanding of spousal rights to agricultural land? Did this understanding affect the manner of decision-making with regard to agriculture or the household?
7. What are respondents' understandings of the intervention and their expectations for their land rights following receipt of individual titles?
8. What are the longer-term impacts of receiving the subdivision survey and (if titles have been distributed) individual title documents?
9. For those respondents who were able to receive their individual titles since the endline survey, how did this cause a shift in their feelings in terms of tenure security, trust in government, life satisfaction, decision-making on the land, and/or agricultural investments?
10. If respondents have not yet received their title documents, what are their expectations of the timeline and their land rights while waiting for titles?
11. Why does the presence of agricultural extension services and/or agrarian reform communities mediate the effects of the subdivision survey?
12. Do ARBs receive pressure to sell or lease out their land following the parcelization process? If so, where does this pressure come from?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Overview of Research Design

Research Design

This study is qualitative in nature, utilizing Key Informant Interview (KII), Focus Group Interview (FGI), and In-Depth-Interview (IDI). The KIIs were used among DAR implementers to learn about their experiences on the implementation regarding the subdivision of the collectively titled land. The FGIs were conducted among male and female ARBs. Further, individual interviews were conducted separately among ARBs and their spouses to capture the gender perspective. This procedure allowed the interviewees to elaborate on their responses and explore their thoughts and impressions during the individual interviews since they will not consider how their spouse would react to the answers they provided.

Grouping Matrix

The study sites were Misamis Oriental and Davao Oriental, which have the greatest concentration of CLOAs. On the one hand, Misamis Oriental has the most number where individual land title documents have been distributed. On the other hand, Davao Oriental has had very little movement starting from the processing of the collective land title to the distribution of the individual land title. The reason for this is unclear. All the more that a study is needed to find out what is preventing the issuance of individual land titles. In all, a total of 66 interviews were conducted.

Group 1	Large number of CLOAs where individual title documents have been distributed (Misamis Oriental)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARBs with an individual land title issued • ARBs with ASP only/ complete fieldwork
Group 2	Large number of CLOAs where there was very little movement in the issuance of individual land titles (Davao Oriental)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARBs with individual land title issued • ARBs with ASP only /complete fieldwork

Data Collection Instruments

To gather the information, an integrated package of qualitative data collection instruments has been developed, namely guides for the following: Key Informant Interview, In-depth Interview for ARB and spouse, and Focus Group Interview. See Annex Table 1 for the summary of fieldwork activities. Annex Tables 2 to 7 reflect the distribution of all informants, as a whole, with the use of various qualitative data collection techniques for the two provinces covered by the study.

Coding and Analysis

All interview transcripts were coded using a coding scheme developed from the study's research questions and main hypotheses. This coding scheme is a guide that

was adjusted based on the researchers' observations throughout the coding process. SPSS Version 27 was used to code the 66 interview transcripts. The study's overall objectives guided the qualitative analysis. The depth of the investigation revealed the most common response to the questions. The heterogeneity of the responses provided by the respondents is referred to as response variation. Finally, the depth of the answers provides more in-depth information on the reasons and factors that influenced their responses.

Profile of informants

Half of the ARB IDI informants are males. When examined by province, the percentage of informants who are males was slightly higher in Davao Oriental than in Misamis Oriental. The average age of the IDI ARB informants is 56.2 years old, with those in Davao Oriental slightly older than those from Misamis Oriental. All the ARB IDI informants from Davao Oriental are married while 9 in 10 in Misamis Oriental are married.

Table 1. Sex, marital status of IDI, FGI informants and average age

Methodology/ informant type	Davao Oriental	Misamis Oriental	Total
IDI ARB	(n = 11)	(n = 11)	(n = 22)
% Male	54.5	45.4	50.0
% Married	100.0	90.9	95.5
Average age	57.6	54.7	56.2
IDI ARB spouse	(n = 11)	(n = 11)	(n = 22)
% Male	45.5	45.5	45.4
% Married	100.0	90.9	95.5
Average age	55.7	55.3	55.5
FGI ARB	(n = 11)	(n = 11)	(n = 22)
% Male	50.0	40.0	45.5
% Married	83.3	60.0	72.7
Average age	55.7	62.0	58.6

For the spouse of ARB IDI informants, the majority are females and 45.5 percent are males, in both Davao Oriental and Misamis Oriental. The overall average age of the spouse IDI informants is 55.5 years old, with the informants from Davao Oriental slightly older than the informants from Misamis Oriental.

Less than half of all FG Informants are males. When grouped by province, 50.0% in Davao Oriental and 40.0% in Misamis Oriental are males. It appears that the FG informants in Misamis Oriental are a bit older than the FG Informants in Davao Oriental. In terms of marital status, 8 in 10 FG Informants from Davao Oriental are currently married as against 6 in 10 in Misamis Oriental.

⁷ *Pulong-pulong*, which is loosely translated as a "community meeting," is the main interaction point between DAR, the ARBs, and the local leaders (Barangay Local Government Unit and BARC represented by the BARC chairperson). It aims to inform the stakeholders of the parcelization process, schedule of activities, and

The 54.5% of the 22 FG Informants have their CLOA, 40.9% have an approved survey design, and 4.5% have completed fieldwork. Half of Davao Oriental's 12 FG Informants and 6 of Misamis Oriental's 10 have CLOAs. About the same number of FG Informants from Davao Oriental and Misamis Oriental has an approved survey plan.

Among the key informants (hereafter referred to as Implementers), 77.8 percent are males. The average age of the informants is 57.7 years old, and among the 8 who were able to provide information, have been in service for an average of 32.9 years.

Table 2. Profile of key informants

Profile of Key Informants (n = 9)	
% Male	77.8
Average age (in years)	57.7
Average length of service (in years)	32.9
Position	
ARD	11.1
MARO/PARO/MARPO/PARPO/CARPO	88.9
Education	
Agriculture	11.1
Bachelor of laws	11.1
Master's Degree	77.8

Except for 1 informant who was an Assistant Regional Director (ARD), the rest were either the Municipal Agrarian Reform Office (MARO)/ Provincial Agrarian Reform Office (PARO)/ Municipal Agrarian Reform Program Officer (MARPO)/Provincial Agrarian Reform Program Officer (PARPO)/Chief Agrarian Reform Program Officer (CARPO). The data further show that 77.8 percent of the informants had Master's Degree, 11.1 percent had Bachelor of Laws, and 11.1 percent had Bachelor's Degree in Agriculture.

Conduct of pulong-pulong

A *pulong-pulong*⁷ of various stakeholders such as the ARBs, adjacent landowners, and LGU officials is a critical requirement for undertaking subdivision surveys of privately owned land covered by the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP). To determine how the *pulong-pulong* was conducted, the informants were asked whether they received an invitation, were able to attend the activity, what was discussed during the

documentary requirements of the ARBs, as well as thresh land border disputes, if any. Source: Department of Agrarian Reform. (2015). *QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM: CONDUCT OF PULONG-PULONG* (DNC – LTP-011 Rev No. 01).

activity, how issues were resolved, and how they felt about the whole process.

a. Invitation

Of the 66 informants, 47 received an invitation, 18 did not receive an invitation, and one (1) failed to answer the question. When pressed for details, 33 of the 47 who received an invitation disclosed that only the ARB member of the household was invited, 11 said that both ARB and spouse were invited, and three (3) said that other family members were invited. The three (3) informants who reported that another family member was invited added that this happened because the land to be subdivided was owned by the clan.

Table 3, Invited to the Pulong-Pulong

Received Invitation	47
ARB	33
Both ARB & Spouse	11
Parents & Siblings	3
Did Not Receive Invitation	18
No Response	1

Across the three types of informants, more from Davao Oriental claimed that no one from their household received an invitation for a *pulong-pulong* from DAR. It is also noted that only Misamis Oriental had several informants who are spouses who reported that they also received an invitation to the *pulong-pulong*.

The implementers revealed that procedurally, the ARBs or those whose names were listed in the CLOA were the ones invited to attend the *pulong-pulong*. Various implementers identified that the following were invited to the *pulong-pulong*: BARC Chairperson, Barangay Officials, assigned DAR personnel, heirs of deceased ARB, actual tillers, and landowners of adjoining properties.

All implementers claimed that ARBs and other participants were sent invitation notices. These invitation notices were prepared by the Municipal Agrarian Reform Officer (MARO) and delivered by the Senior Agrarian Reform Program Technologist/Agrarian Reform Program Technologist (SARPT/ARPT) to the invitees. These notices were sent to the invitees at least 7 calendar days or 5 working days before the scheduled *pulong-pulong*. In cases where the ARB did not receive an invitation, the implementers disclosed that this was either due to a change in domicile or the fact that they were no longer the actual occupants of the area. An implementer said that there had been cases wherein the beneficiary was displaced and forced to leave the land

due to conflict. Abandonment and the selling of the land are the two reasons why some beneficiaries are no longer the owner or tiller of the land.

b. Attendance

Forty-six (46) of the 66 informants said that their household were represented in the *pulong-pulong*, 11 said that no one from the household participated, and nine (9) were unable to answer the question. The 46 households were represented in the *pulong-pulong* by 38 ARBs, seven (7) ARB and their spouses, and one (1) spouse. Further examination of the data revealed that 35 informants were personally present during the *pulong-pulong*: 14 FGI, 15 ARB, and six (6) spouses.

Marginally, more female ARBs claimed that they had attended the *pulong-pulong* organized by DAR. Four (4) of the five (5) female ARB informants in Davao Oriental and five (5) of the six (6) female ARB informants in Misamis Oriental participated in the *pulong-pulong*. Among their male counterparts, three (3) of the six (6) ARB informants in Davao Oriental and three (3) of the five (5) informants in Misamis Oriental claimed to have participated. However, the opposite was observed in the case of the spouse informants. Of the six (6) female spouse informants in Davao Oriental, only one (1) had participated in the *pulong-pulong* (together with spouse) while of the five (5) female spouse informants in Misamis Oriental, only one (1) attended (alone). Paid work generally was the reason given by male ARBs for not attending the *pulong-pulong*. Whereas, for female spouses, the reason they gave was that the invitation was generally only addressed to the ARB, so they opted to stay at home and do household chores. The female spouses were not slighted about not being invited to the *pulong-pulong*. According to them, their husbands and them are the same. The female spouses added that their husbands kept them informed about what transpired during the activity.

Table 4. Attendance to Pulong-Pulong

Attended Pulong - Pulong	46
ARB	38
Spouse	1
Both ARB and Spouse	7
Did Not Attend	11
No Response	9

About the same number of all informants from Davao Oriental (6) and Misamis Oriental (5) confided that the couple did not attend the *pulong-pulong*. The lack of information or invitation was the leading reason cited by

the ARBs for the non-attendance. Meanwhile, domestic duty/household chore was the leading reason mentioned by the ARB spouses for not being able to attend the *pulong-pulong*.

The implementers said that invitations are sent to the ARBs. However, four out of nine stated that spouses and heirs of the ARBs can attend in the *pulong-pulong* in the event that the ARBs are not available. An implementer further explained why female ARBs and spouses participated in the *pulong-pulong*. One implementer disclosed that *“oftentimes it is the ARB spouse who attends the pulong-pulong because the male ARB is usually busy with farm work.”*

Among the other reasons mentioned by the implementers why an ARB fails to attend the *pulong-pulong* are (1) personal reasons, e.g., health, (2) cannot afford transportation costs, and (3) the ARB executed a duly notarized waiver of rights to become an ARB as provided by DAR Administrative Order No. 07-03 series 2003. Execution of the said waiver results to the land being awarded by DAR to other potential ARBs. Another implementer added that an ARB who cannot attend the *pulong-pulong* has the option of sending/nominating a representative to attend on his/her behalf.

The implementers claimed that they had a way to reach out to ARBs who did not attend the *pulong-pulong*. One common strategy used was to seek assistance from the BARC Chairperson to inform and/or accompany the beneficiary to the DAR office. Another implementer claimed that they also requested those who have attended to re-echo what transpired in the *pulong-pulong* to their neighbors who were fellow beneficiaries. The assistance by the BARC chairperson in reaching out to ARBs who failed to attend the *pulong-pulong* is limited. The ARB and spouse interviews showed minimal contact with BARC Chairperson. In addition, the information relayed by those who attended the *pulong-pulong* is often incomplete.

c. Topics Discussed

Nineteen (19) of the 35 informants who were personally present during the *pulong-pulong* disclosed that the rights and obligations of ARBs were discussed during the *pulong-pulong*, nine (9) mentioned the process and the requirements for land subdivision and titling, four (4) mentioned land subdivision survey, and one (1) each mentioned materials to be provided during subdivision survey, and support for farm inputs. An informant was unable to provide information on what was discussed during the *pulong-pulong*.

Implicit in the data is the variation in the response pattern between the male and female IDI informants. In particular, female informants were able to mention more topics that were discussed during the *pulong-pulong*. The

female informants mentioned land subdivision, briefing on the rights and responsibilities of ARBs, and titling process and requirement. On the other hand, the male informants generally only mentioned briefing on the responsibilities and rights of ARBs.

Of the six (6) male ARB informants present in the *pulong-pulong*, four (4) reported that amortization payment was discussed. Among the nine (9) female ARB informants present, five (5) said that amortization was discussed. Taxes was also discussed during the *pulong-pulong* according to five (5) of the six (6) male ARB informants and all nine (9) female ARB informants.

Seven (7) of the nine (9) KI implementers claimed that those with Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP)-compensable lands were informed of the amortization process during the *pulong-pulong*. An implementer expounded that what was discussed during the *pulong-pulong* was only a reminder because, at the time when beneficiaries were still being identified, they were already informed of the qualification and obligation. Apart from the amortization process, the implementers also claimed that the need to pay property taxes and marital property rights were likewise discussed. It appears, however, that discussion of the timeline for parcelization was limited due to tasks/functions discussed by other government bureau dependencies, such as the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and the Registry of Deeds (ROD).

One reason for the limited discussion about a timeline for parcelization was that different stages of the process are performed by different government agencies, according to an implementer:

“for new lands, the most number of days that the title can be released from the ROD is 112 days from the gathering of documents. It is explained during the pulong-pulong that it is not only DAR that is working on parcelization. It is a partnership with other agencies like DENR for approval of survey, ROD for generation and registration of computerized titles. Under Project Split, DAR is no longer the one who generates the CLOA, it’s the ROD. The ARBs are expecting to receive their individual CLOAs at the soonest possible time but admittedly, this was not the case. I think in the 1990s, we started to issue collective CLOA. Some of these Collective CLOAs are not yet parcelized or subdivided.”

Slightly more informants from Misamis Oriental disclosed that DAR had not communicated with them after the *pulong-pulong*. The communication received was about the need for the ARB to sign a document at DAR or about the update of the land subdivision survey.

d. Feeling after attending the pulong-pulong

Sixteen of the 46 informants who attended the pulong said that they felt happy after attending the event, 13 felt assured that they will be given land, 8 felt relieved because they now knew the land subdivision process,

Table 5. Number of formants who discuss pulong-pulong with spouse.

Table 5 Number of informants who discuss pulong-pulong with spouse		
	Male	Female
IDI ARB (n males = 6, n females = 9)	5	7
IDI Spouse (n males = 5, n females = 6)	3	5
FGI ARB (n males = 6, n females = 6)	5	5

and 2 had mixed emotions because they will have to pay the land amortization as well as the taxes. Two informants however felt indifferent and 5 either cannot recall what they felt back then or had no response to the question.

Slightly more male informants felt glad/happy about what they heard at the pulong-pulong. In addition, marginally more males than females felt positive because they would be given land to till. On the other hand, slightly more females expressed relief after knowing the land subdivision process.

e. Useful aspects

Among the three groups of informants, only the ARB spouses were asked how effective the activity was based on the expected outcome. It was revealed from their responses that, overall, ARB spouses who attended the pulong-pulong found it effective. The common theme of their responses indicated that the pulong-pulong helped them understand the process and addressed their concerns on land parcelization. A male ARB spouse mentioned that the pulong-pulong “...was 100 percent effective...because it helps us... understand... parcelization.” This view is shared by a female spouse informant who said that the pulong-pulong helped her “...know the process on what to do with our land to obtain the title.”

Apart from disseminating information on the land parcelization process, the pulong-pulong also made a lasting impact because of the discussion on agrarian policies and the obligations and responsibilities of the beneficiaries. A male spouse informant from Davao Oriental disclosed that the pulong-pulong “...made a big impact because we were reminded of [our] obligation. So, after all the effort made by DAR if we still do not act about it, then it's our fault already. It is our failure as beneficiary.” Perhaps as a result of the discussion on the above-mentioned topics, a female spouse informant

from Davao Oriental declared that “We will never decide to sell this land....”

f. Discussion of Pulong-pulong with Spouse

The question on whether the events that transpired during the pulong-pulong was discussed with the spouse was asked if only the ARB was present in the activity. As previously mentioned, a total of 38 ARBs from across 3 methodologies attended the activity. Of the 38 ARBs present in the pulong-pulong, 30 discussed with their spouses what transpired during the activity. The disaggregation of the number of ARBs who discussed with their spouses what transpired during the pulong-pulong is shown in Figure 3.

Most discussion revolved around land-ownership—i.e., that the land will be legally owned by the household—and the need to cultivate and develop the land. Couples also discussed about the need for the household to pay tax and amortization. Several informants disclosed that due to the passage of time, they no longer recall what their ARB spouse told them.

g. Area(s) for improvement

IDI and FG ARB informants who attended the pulong-pulong were asked how the activity can be improved. The IDI informants from Davao Oriental had varied answers. Two informants said that they did not have any suggestions as to what needed to be improved. One mentioned that ARBs should be required to attend the pulong-pulong, two mentioned the need to speed up the process of issuing land titles, and one recommended that the BARC Chairman personally inform those who are living nearby and send a letter at least a week before the activity for ARBs who live in far-flung areas.

The responses of IDI informants from Misamis Oriental, on the other hand, can be grouped into the following, namely: invitation, inclusivity, venue, and frequency.

As to invitation, it was stressed that it should be sent early. An informant from Misamis Oriental underscored the importance of sending the notices ahead of time “...so that they would be able to gather all the people that need to be present.” This recommendation is rooted on how notices are sent by DAR. Procedurally, formal notices which include the agenda are sent through channel--the Barangay Officials or the Barangay Agrarian Reform Committee Chair--5-7 days ahead of the pulong-pulong schedule. The Barangay Official/BARC Chair is expected to deliver the formal notice to the ARB. However, if the residence of the ARB is far, the Barangay Official/BARC Chair may seek the assistance of the ARB’s neighbors/relatives to deliver the notice. Subsequently, delivery is delayed or in some instances, the formal notice is lost and only the verbal message is passed to the ARB.

There was also the need to reach as many beneficiaries as possible to allay the notion that only select individuals are invited. A least two informants from Misamis Oriental suggested changing the venue of the activity. One of these two informants suggested that a more conducive venue be used for future *pulong-pulong* activities rather than just a “waiting shed.” The other informant suggested that the *pulong-pulong* should be held in the community rather than in the Población,⁸ which is not only far but also costly. Two informants felt the need for additional *pulong-pulong* to be conducted. A female informant suggested additional *pulong-pulong* sessions, a suggestion which was shared by another female informant from the same province.

The response pattern on how to improve the *pulong-pulong* markedly differs between the FG Informants from Davao Oriental and those from Misamis Oriental. A common theme in the response pattern of FG Informants from Davao Oriental pertains to the need for the beneficiaries to be active and participative. A male spouse informant from Davao Oriental emphasized that beneficiaries need to positively respond to the effort exerted by DAR. A male spouse informant from Davao del Sur, however, expressed dissatisfaction with some DAR employees. According to him, some employees come unprepared for the activity and just concocted stories and afterward ask for the signatures of the participants. On the other hand, the common suggestion of the FG Informants from Misamis Oriental is the preference for a formal invitation. It was also suggested that the agenda of the *pulong-pulong* should be prepared ahead and that additional sessions be held in the future.

Conduct of land subdivision survey

a. Attendance/participation

A land survey is a critical component of the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP). The Quality Management System (QMS) for Subdivision and Relocation Survey enjoins ARBs and adjoining landowners to be present during the conduct of the survey to ensure that all monuments are properly placed and the subdivision survey is properly done.

Most informants were present during the subdivision survey. Particularly, 17 of the ARB IDI informants, nine (9) of the Spouse IDI informants, and 15 FG informants were present during the land subdivision survey. When examined by province, nine (9) ARB IDI informants, eight (8) spouse IDI informants, and eight (8) FG Informants from Davao Oriental were present during the subdivision survey. In Misamis Oriental, eight (8) ARB IDI informants,

one (1) IDI spouse informant, and seven (7) FG informants were present during the land subdivision survey. When examined by sex, 23 of the 32 male informants were present and 18 of the 34 female informants were present during the subdivision survey.

	Davao Oriental	Misamis Oriental
IDI ARB (n=17)	9	8
IDI Spouse (n=9)	8	1
FGI ARB (n=15)	8	7

Results revealed that all the 11 male ARB IDI informants were present during the subdivision survey while only six (6) of the 11 female ARB IDI informants were present. A similar case can be observed among the spouse IDI informants where the number of male informants who reported being present during the subdivision survey is twice the number of their female counterparts. Being preoccupied with domestic chores or tasks was the leading reason cited by the female ARB and female spouse informants for being unable to participate in the subdivision survey. On the other hand, job/occupation was the leading reason for the male informants skipping the subdivision survey. A different pattern emerged among the FG Informants because more females than males were present during the subdivision survey. A male FG Informant explained that his father represented him during the survey, while another claimed that he had work that day. The female FG Informants who were not present during the subdivision survey were unable to provide a reason for their absence.

The disclosures by the implementers were very similar to that of the ARB informants. Work is the leading reason for being unable to attend the subdivision survey. Other implementers mentioned health reasons, change in domicile, and having abandoned or sold their lots as reason for being unable to attend the subdivision survey.

The presence of beneficiaries during the land subdivision surveys helped address concerns and correct measurements before it became final. This was the experience of a male ARB who found out that the area that he tilled was not covered in the measurement. He complained about it to the surveyor, who then consulted the BARC Chairperson. After consulting with the BARC Chairperson and perhaps with other claimants, a resurvey was done to include the area cultivated by the claimant.

⁸ Población refers to the administrative center, old town, or central business district area of a Filipino city or municipality.

b. Perception of the land subdivision survey

The ARB informants found the survey process tiring because they needed to assist the surveyors in identifying the boundaries of each parcel. In particular, the ARBs were assigned to put the sticks and place the concrete boundary markers on the ground. A male ARB informant from Davao Oriental disclosed, *"It is not easy to be present in the survey. We were the ones who placed the concrete markers because there are only two surveyors, the engineer, and his assistant."* Another ARB informant from Davao Oriental disclosed that it would not be possible for the engineer and his assistant to do the entire job by themselves, as apart from taking measurements, they also carried a transit which is a sort of measuring instrument used in land surveys. The whole process also involved a lot of moving around to properly identify the boundaries of each parcel. While most ARBs actively participated in the land subdivision survey, a few took a passive stance, opting to just wait for the survey to start.

c. Usefulness/effectiveness of the land subdivision survey

The informants were also asked about how useful the land survey was in settling boundary disputes and providing clarity about borders.

Most of the informants noted that the land subdivision survey was effective in settling boundary disputes. The response pattern differs, with more informants in Davao Oriental compared to respondents from Misamis Oriental, who regarded land subdivision as very effective in minimizing boundary disputes. The informants noted that the boundary markers placed during the survey settled the disputes between claimants, if any. Other informants in both provinces noted that there was no border conflict to start with while the rest were unable to provide any information.

According to the informants, the land subdivision survey clarified the boundaries of the land holding of claimants. A male FG Informants it, the land subdivision survey *"...is effective in providing [border] clarity thus preventing encroachments [by other claimants]."*

The answers given by ARB informants affirms the claims of key informants that the subdivision survey was very effective in resolving boundary disputes by providing clarity on borders. An ARB informant capsulized the thoughts of the rest of the ARBs that the subdivision survey is 100% effective in settling boundary disputes. Another ARB shared that the subdivision survey is very effective in resolving boundary disputes because the survey prevents chaos or even violence that might lead to death as the boundaries will already be clarified.

All in all, the subdivision survey is seen as an essential activity in the parcelization process and elicited better attendance on the part of the ARB and spouse than that during the *pulong-pulong*. Both the ARB and spouse perceived the subdivision survey as the final step to obtaining the individual land title. Common answers were given by both male and female ARBs that since their land areas are already surveyed, there is no doubt about their ownership of the land. With such assurance, they have started expanding the portion tilled or further developed the land by clearing, cleaning, and planting more permanent crops/perennial trees. This sentiment is universally shared by the informants who have and who have not yet received their land titles. One of the male ARBs said that he planted some coconut trees after the subdivision survey was conducted as he was confident that that parcel would be transferred to his name in the future. The same perception was shared by other male and female ARBs who have not received their ICLOAs yet.

Another ARB captured the reasons of other ARBs on developing their land after the subdivision survey. It seemed that the subdivision survey conducted by DAR is already a signal that will eventually own the land. An ARB expounded:

"When it was under the mother CLOA, we just planted forest and fruit trees. But we cannot have an income from these trees. We were prohibited to harvest the trees. After the subdivision survey, we started to grow corn, cassava, banana, etc. It would be a waste if we would not plant more crops/cultivate the land, most especially it was awarded to us by the government."

Still, several ARBs had no sense of security in the land they tilled. They held the notion that pending the release of the land title, the land can be taken away from them by the government.

d. Areas for improvement

The few informants who were unable to attend the land subdivision survey were asked what their recommendations would be to improve the subdivision survey. Of the three categories of informants, only the Spouse IDI informants provided their views.

A female informant from Misamis Oriental thinks that the presence of the spouse will make the process more inclusive and informative. Spontaneously, in her own words, she said, *"It would be nice if the spouses were also required to attend the survey so that we could [also] learn the boundaries of each parcel and will not be too dependent on the information provided by the husbands."* On the other hand, a male spouse believed that the early sending of notices would improve the participation rate of the farmer-beneficiaries and their

spouses. Lastly, a female spouse recommended to her fellow beneficiaries to exert more effort in attending/participating in the activities related to the land subdivision process.

e. Issuance of land title

Twelve (12) of the 22 FG informants and 11 of the 22, for each of the ARB and spouse informants had already received their individual land titles. Six (6) of the 12 FG informants, 7 (seven) of the ARB IDI, and nine (9) of the 11 IDI spouse informants who reported that they received their title were able to provide information on the waiting period for the release of the land title.

The information provided by informants paints a picture of protracted processing and release of individual land titles, which ranged from 5 to 26 years. The prolonged release of the individual title did not align with the expectations of the beneficiaries. The experiences of the beneficiaries are best captured by the statement of a male ARB informant from Misamis Oriental who said, "*I thought it would be quick, but as it turns out, it takes time since it will be processed in Manila. I thought it would only take a year.*"

The average waiting period, reckoned from the year of the subdivision survey, for ARB IDI informants who have received their titles is 13.5 years in Davao Oriental and 6.80 years in Misamis Oriental. Among the IDI spouse informants, the average waiting period is 10.3 years in Davao Oriental and 7.0 years in Misamis Oriental. On the other hand, the average waiting period of the ARB FG Informants is 15.5 years in Davao Oriental and 8.75 years in Misamis Oriental.

The IDI and FG Informants differed in their expectations of when they might receive their individual land titles. Those who expected to receive their titles within a definite period expressed hope that it would be within the current year or at the next year at the latest. There are also those who did not give it much thought and were just patiently waiting. A male ARB informant believed that he would receive his title once he had fully paid for it, just like the case of his father. It was learned that some ARBs sought the assistance of town officials in a bid to expedite the process.

The ARB (n=11) and FG (n=10) informants who have not yet received their land titles were asked about their understanding of their interim rights. The respondents' view of their interim rights pending the issuance of an individual title can be grouped into two polarities: those who believed that they have the right to the land and those who believed that without proof of ownership, the land can be taken away from them by the government for some reason. Two (2) of the 10 FG informants and six (6) of the 11 ARB IDI informants believed that they had a

right to the land thus, it may not be taken away from them by other parties. Slightly more informants believed the need to have a title as an official and authoritative record of ownership.

An informant believes that even though he has yet to receive his title, no one may encroach on the land and has staked a claim on it because the government has granted him ownership of the land. He also believes that he had the right to cultivate but is proscribed from leasing or selling it. Several FG Informants hold the view that pending the release of the land title, their claim to the land is only temporary. They believed that without the title, the property maybe taken back from them by the government. Notwithstanding such belief, they were still responsible for taking care and cultivating the land while waiting for the title, as was mentioned by a male FG Informant from Misamis Oriental.

Another issue raised in the previous impact evaluation study suggested that holding out on getting individual titles would make people less trusting of the government. However, the answers generated in this qualitative study showed a positive perception of the government. The ARBs and their spouses expressed their trust in the government's ability to provide them with the security of tenure through the issuance of their individual property titles. Still, very few stated their negative sentiments.

f. Feelings towards the government

The patient character of Filipinos is noticeable in the informants' responses to the question, "*What was your feeling towards the government before receiving your individual land title?*" Notwithstanding the protracted processing of land titles, the informants harbored no ill will towards the government. For example, a male ARB informant from Davao Oriental simply stated that "*I did not feel bad towards the government; I just waited for the title to be released.*" The ARB FG Informants also had similar feelings towards the government.

The feeling of gratitude towards the government is unmistakable across all types of informants. A Spouse IDI informant from Misamis Oriental disclosed, "*I was grateful. I have a big trust in the government. They have a much larger outlook for the welfare of the people now than when we were young. My trust in the government is around 70% or 80%.*" A similar view is held by a female FG Informant from Misamis Oriental, who declared that she is "*thankful to the government for its land program and giving us the opportunity to become an agrarian reform beneficiary and receive an individual land title.*"

Those who have not yet received their land titles were also asked how they regarded the government, given that they have yet to receive their individual land titles. The response pattern reveals a spectrum of views

ranging from a continuing trust in the government and its processes to the insinuation of an uncaring and inept government bureau. An ARB IDI informant from Davao oriental opined that he was truly curious as to why the title had taken so long to be released. Notwithstanding, he continues to have trust in the government and is hopeful that he will eventually receive his title.

An explanation with these perceptions gathered from the informants can be gleaned on the push of the former administration to propel the CARP implementation in 2018. As pointed out in the Philippine Daily Inquirer (October, 2019), the former President Rodrigo R. Duterte ordered the DAR to parcelize all collective CLOAs, and he provided funds through government and international funding resources. Additionally, he gave the DAR instructions to complete the Land Acquisition and Distribution (LAD) procedure by 2022. Previous administrations boast of high LAD performance simply because CARP during the earlier periods focused on alienable and disposable lands of the public domain (A&D lands) and unused agricultural government-owned lands (GOLs).

Pertaining to Private Agricultural Lands (PALs) being subjected to CARP is another concern. As noted by PDI (October, 2019), these types of lands subjected to CARP occupied the last rung in the implementation ladder. PALs are difficult to cover under CARP due to the resistance of landowners. Landowner challenges have the net effect of dragging, if not halting, CARP implementation.

Furthermore, DAR implemented initiatives commended by the Anti-Red Tape Authority to streamline its services. It used Republic Act No. 11032, also known as the "Ease of Doing Business and Efficient Government Service Delivery Act of 2018," as one of its initiatives to ensure that quality services are delivered to the public more efficiently and timely. The DAR's Agrarian Legal Sector initiated a ZERO-BACKLOG program starting 2018 to address matters accrued throughout past administrations. This government move is an additional contributory factor that led to the positive perceptions in the perspectives of the ARBs.

g. Changes in the state of life

Land ownership had long been regarded as critical in uplifting the state of life for rural farmers. ARB and FG Informants who already received their land titles were asked whether there were changes in their state of life. Four of the 12 FG informants who already received their land title reported that life had not changed after they received their land title, seven (7) noted positive changes, while one (1) was unable to provide any information. Meanwhile among the 11 ARB IDI informants who already received their land titles, five (5)

noted no change, five (5) noted positive changes, and one (1) was unable to respond to the question.

When asked for details, only two (2) of the seven (7) FG informants who noted positives change in their state of life answered. One (1) of the two (2) reported her family planted more bananas while the other informant failed to expound on the "bit of a change" that he mentioned. Meanwhile, among the five (5) ARB IDI informants who noted positive changes in their lives after receiving their land title, two (2) mentioned that it improved their emotional well-being (i.e. happiness, excitement), one (1) reported that they expanded their livestock production, and two (2) expanded their crop production. Those who expanded their livestock and/or crop production did so because they now have full control of the land that they till.

There were slightly more female ARBs than male ARBs who claimed that being awarded land made a positive change in their lives. The opposite was observed among the FG informants, where slightly more male ARBs than female MRBs noted a positive impact of land on the quality of life of the household. The limited sample size however precludes the drawing of a sound conclusion on said trend.

Female ARBs mentioned that having land of their own enabled them to decide on the crops to plant and cultivate the land to the fullest. Land ownership in this case created an incentive for the household to expand production because they did not have to pay rent and/or share to the land owner for each crop or livestock produced.

A male ARB informant noted that apart from being able to expand farm production, the title enabled their household to have access to utilities such as water and electricity. When pressed for details, the informant disclosed that utility providers, such as the Water District and Electric Company, require proof of land/domicile ownership before providing their services. This was done by the utility providers to deny services to land grabbers and avoid being sued for trespassing by the legitimate owners of the property. Apart from the material and financial changes, having owned the land may also have certain psychological benefits. An ARB FG informant claimed that he now sleeps soundly because he now has proof of ownership of the land that he is cultivating. On the other hand, male ARBs who saw no positive change reasoned that other than receiving the title, they could not identify any change in the quality of life of their households.

h. Changes in investment in land

One of the working hypotheses of the study was that being given an individual land title would lead to upward changes in the way households invest in their land. The

reality is, however, more complicated than meets the eye.

More ARB IDI informants reported that there was no change in the way their households invest in their land. On the other hand, more spouse informants claimed that because of receiving the individual title, the household invested more in its land. A 64-year-old spouse informant from Davao Oriental claimed that they had more plants now as compared to before and that they were able to plant coconuts on the whole land. A 54-year-old female spouse from Davao Oriental also asserted that they had added some coconuts and bananas to the back portion of the house. Apart from planting more, the responses of the spouse informants revealed that investments were also made in livestock and the physical improvement of the farm. Three spouse informants disclosed that there were no changes in the way their households were investing in their land.

i. Pressure to sell or lease land

Analysis of the responses by the three groups of informants revealed that there was no pressure for them to sell or lease the land granted to them by the government. This development is noteworthy because agrarian reform beneficiaries are legally barred from selling the land that was awarded to them.

Perspectives from various male and female ARBs highlighted their strong position of not renting out or leasing their lands with the following narratives:

“I just want to till the land myself. I don’t want to lease to others since that is not enough, how will my children survive, and to where they can find a living?”

“I don’t want to rent it [to others] I just want it for myself to till it.”

“No, honestly speaking I consider our family as indigent. We struggle for a living, my husband’s income in fishing is not always sustainable, it’s preferable to till that area for the sake of my 11 children. It helps us survive for living if we don’t have money for rice then we can get some banana from the farm. I was not thinking of leasing it, even if we struggle for the needs of my children in their study. I tell them that we need to take care and cultivate our land so in the future they could still inherit it, if the time comes that my husband and I will pass away, we will leave the land to them.”

The general sentiment of the ARBs is to till the land and not to have it leased. However, for certain circumstance, an ARB shared that he had his land leased. He stated,

“Actually, I once leased our land for around one term because my children were entering college... {we can no longer afford to send our children to higher education. Hence, the decision to lease the land. We cannot afford to buy fertilizer to make the land productive}. We planted cassava in that area. This was before it was subdivided, we leased it for around 3 years at Php 1000 per year, I think. That was a long time ago. After that, we didn’t lease it again.”

With regard to pressure to lease or sell their ICLOAs, ARBs generally did not feel pressure on doing so. Male and female ARBs shared the following thoughts:

“As of now, there is no pressure to lease or sell our land and I don’t have plans to. I don’t know in the future, the decision will be up to my children then.”

A female ARB shared these lines who laughed gently,

“No, why are we going to let others rent it? (gentle laugh). We will cultivate it.”

An ARB shared that a banana plantation owner offered to rent his land, however, he did not agree with that offer. He said,

“I never think about it, because our residence is also here. The owner of that banana plantation will cut the coconut trees to plant the bananas, Then, what will be my source of income after that?”

However, while there is no pressure to sell or lease land, a male spouse IDI informant from Davao Oriental confessed that they sometimes used their land title as collateral for the money they borrowed to finance the education of their children. This report by the informant highlighted one allied issue in agrarian reform—access to affordable credit. Without access to affordable credit, farmers to turn to informal lenders, often at a high interest rate, resulting to debt trap of which there is no easy escape. A 64-year-old male FG Informant also confided that he would sell the land if offered a favorable price (₱1.0 million).

j. Changes to income-generating activities

A few informants reported that they are engaged in other income-generating activities such as non-farm part-time work and a sari-sari store. It was however found that those who are engaged in other income-generating activities do so even before becoming an ARB. A female FG informant for example disclosed that they already have a small sari-sari store before they received the land title. Another mentioned that her spouse was already a machine operator before they became an ARB.

k. Name on the title

Only the ARB IDI informants and the ARB FG Informants were asked whose name was in the land title and whether it aligned with their expectations. Nine of the 11 ARB IDI informants and 6 of the 12 FG informants said that their name and that of their spouse is reflected on the title. When examined by sex, 5 of the 9 ARB informants and 3 of the 6 FG informants who said that their name and that spouse is listed as co-owners in the land title are males.

A common theme in the responses of the informants, both male and female, suggested that they expected that the title should be in the name of both spouses. A 60-year-old male ARB informant from Davao Oriental best summarizes the expectations of the majority when he said, "*[It was both in our name] because when the land was awarded to me, we were already married, maybe if I am single at the time, she might not be included to the title.*" However, 4 ARB IDI informants and 1 FG Informant thought that it would only be their names that would be placed on the titles.

When asked what they think about the mismatch with their expectation, a 59-year-old male ARB informant from Misamis Oriental thinks that the mismatch happened because the surveyor only put his name and not that of his wife. A 64-year-old male FG Informant from Davao Oriental said he expected the name of his wife to be also on the title, but this was not the case. He added, "*They should put my wife's name because she is my wife.*"

The implementers noted that there were cases when the name of the spouse was not included in the title. This usually happens when the name of the spouse was not disclosed to DAR during the initial stages of the parcelization process, the ARB had a common-law wife, or the beneficiary was still single during the initial stages. Reports by Key Informant indicated that legal remediation is needed to include the name of the spouse in the title. However, the legal remedy requires a petition for rectification from the beneficiary or his/her spouse. If there is no petition for rectification, no correction will be done to the title.

Marital property rights

In the Philippines, in the absence of a pre-nuptial agreement, properties acquired before and during the marriage are considered conjugal property.

Disclosure by the ARB informants signifies that they asked the opinion of their spouses about what transpired in the *pulong-pulong*. This report by the ARB informants

was affirmed by the spouse informants, who disclosed that their ARB spouses asked their opinion about what happened during the *pulong-pulong*. Spouses whose land had already undergone a subdivision survey also generally discussed what transpired during the survey.

There is a high degree of understanding among informants about the concept of conjugal property. An ARB informant from Davao Oriental explained that conjugal property means that married couples "*have equal rights to the land.*" Another informant, also from Davao Oriental, believed that conjugal property means that she "*cannot sell the land without my husband's signature.*" This view of a conjugal property was best summarized by an ARB informant from Misamis Oriental who stated that "*...it is the property of my husband and I. It is not just mine, it is not just his, but it is for both of us.*" Fifteen of the 22 ARB IDI informants and 13 of the 22 Spouse IDI informants believe that the DAR-awarded parcel is a conjugal property. Meanwhile 3 of the ARB IDI informants and 5 of the Spouse IDI informants believed that the property is not conjugal. Being an inheritance of either the ARB or the Spouse is the most common reason for believing that the land given is not a conjugal property. The remaining 4 ARB IDI informants and 4 Spouse IDI informants disclosed that they do not know if the parcel is conjugal or not.

An attempt was made to analyze whether there is a relationship between the perception of conjugal ownership of land received from the government and how couples discuss what transpired during the *pulong-pulong*. The analysis revealed that such a relationship cannot be gleaned from the qualitative information provided by the ARB and Spouse IDI informants. Specifically, those who think and those who does not think that the land given to them is a conjugal property both discussed with their spouses what transpired during the *pulong-pulong*.

Seven of the nine implementers disclosed that their office monitors whether a conjugal property is properly issued in the name of both spouses. However, based on the response of a 50-year-old female informant, it appears that the identification as a conjugal property hinges on the declaration of the ARB. This means that a property cannot be tagged as conjugal because of the absence of the declaration by the ARB.

A 61-year-old male implementer disclosed that they started monitoring in the year 2000 whether a conjugal property is properly issued to the names of the spouses. A 55-year-old male implementer mentioned that they need to ensure that the property is properly issued to avoid going through a lengthy court proceeding.

On the other hand, an implementer who disclosed that they did not monitor if conjugal properties were being properly issued, reasoned that they were unable to do so

because of the sheer volume of CLOAs that they have yet to issue.

When the ARB informants were asked whether they were interested to learn more about marital property rights, all except 2 ARB informants from Davao Oriental and another 2 from Misamis Oriental replied in the affirmative. ARB informants were also asked what the most helpful ways to learn about marital property rights are, and they gave two common answers: through seminars and meetings. ARB and spouse informants were unable to provide details about what they want to learn about marital property rights, however. This is perhaps because they do not know much about it. As one female spouse informant puts it: "...Yes, because there are a lot of things about the rights of the spouse that we don't know about." The desire to learn more about the topic is a recurring theme for both the ARB and Spouse IDI informants, however.

Gender and access to land

The mainstreaming of gender in the implementation of agrarian reform in the Philippines started in 1991. To protect the rights of both spouses to ownership of the land, the DAR Operational Guideline Governing the Non-Gender Biased Implementation of Agrarian Laws stipulated that the Emancipation Patent/Certificate of Land Ownership Award (EP/CLOA) shall be issued in the names of both.⁹

Co-titling intended to improve gender equity has also yielded mixed results.¹⁰ In the Philippines, however, Coral (2015) noted that "formal land titles improve women's access to production credit and empower women to assert themselves more effectively with agencies that provide inputs and extension services."¹¹ Because land titles were only recently obtained, this was not emphasized in the IDIs and FGIs.

The study matched the responses of couple beneficiaries on whether they knew if the land awarded to them was conjugal. Analysis revealed that the responses of 7 out of 10 couples matched. Among those whose responses matched, 8 out of 10 claimed that they knew that the land awarded by DAR is a conjugal property. The data also revealed that 7 out of 10 couple informants had matched responses when asked if they understood the rights of each spouse with respect to the land that was awarded to them. All those with matched responses were found to have a good grasp of what conjugal property is.

Analysis of responses revealed that just 10 out of 22 couple informants had matched responses when asked if parcelization changed their perception of the ownership regime of the land awarded to them. Among the couples whose responses matched with each other, half claimed that parcelization shifted their perception of the conjugal ownership regime of the land that was awarded to them. For example, a 62-year-old ARB informant disclosed that "...before CARP, I had no idea the land was conjugal property, but after parcelization, I realized it was." This could mean that the parcelization process, which includes the *pulong-pulong* shifted the perception of the beneficiaries about ownership of the land that was/will be awarded to them.

It, however, appears that the understanding of what a conjugal property is, or the change in the perception about the conjugal nature of the awarded land, did not lead to greater involvement of the spouse in the decision-making on land. Only 4 out of the 22 couple informants reported that the spouse became more involved in decision-making on land. The involvement of female spouses in planning and decision-making about the land was generally limited to actual cultivation, such as planting, weeding, etc., and in deciding what to plant. It is more likely that for major decisions, the spouses leave those to the male ARBs to decide.

Amortization¹² and taxes

a. Understanding of amortization

All groups of informants who were awarded LBP – compensable land only had a general working knowledge about amortization. The most common themes among those mentioned include the need to pay Landbank and the possibility that their land will be awarded to other beneficiaries if the amortization remains unpaid.

A 52-year-old female spouse from Misamis Oriental disclosed that DAR had informed them about amortization. She added, "*We're waiting for notice or computation. Before, there was someone from the Land Bank who collected the payment from our mother, and she asked us for our share of the payment. I'm not sure if there are receipts. The collection never happened again, though.*" A 64-year-old male spouse informant from Davao Oriental also disclosed that they were supposed to start payment in 2021 but were unable to do so

⁹ Republic of the Philippines. DAR Administrative Order No. 01-11. Retrieved from <http://www.lis.dar.gov.ph/documents/6402>.

¹⁰ Brown, Jennifer, and Justine Uvuza. *Women's land rights in Rwanda: How can they be protected and strengthened as the Land Law is implemented?*. Washington, USA: Rural Development Institute, 2006.

¹¹ Coral, "Women's Land Rights, Gender-Responsive Policies and the World Bank (Philippines). Asian Farmers Association for Sustainable Rural Development," Slide 17. <https://bit.ly/3Pz36bp>.

¹² Although recent reforms have removed the requirement for ARBs to amortize their land, at the time of the study, ARBs on compensable land were still required to amortize the land.

because the account was not yet uploaded into the system.

b. Feeling about amortization

A common theme in the responses of the informants suggested an overall feeling of apprehension when talking about amortization. Particularly, the informants are worried about not being able to raise the needed amount and pay LBP on time. There are, however, some informants who welcome amortization because it makes it more affordable for the beneficiaries.

A 60-year-old male ARB IDI informant expressed happiness with the amortization scheme saying, "*I think the government does it on purpose, to lessen our burden since it is on an installment basis. I am happy about it.*" A 52-year-old female spouse IDI informant expressed, "*The installment basis is favorable because it will be less burdensome to the ARB.*"

c. Start of amortization

The ARB IDI informants and ARB FG Informants were asked as to which stage or when are they expected to start amortization payments. Responses indicate that the informants do not have a clear idea as to when to start amortization payment.

Some informants believe that they would start payment in two years' time; others believe that it should be as soon as they receive CLOA or the individual land title. A 47-year-old male ARB IDI informant, however, frankly professed, "*We have no idea at all. No letters or notices have been sent to us. We plan to visit DAR to follow up on this.*"

The information shared by the implementers revealed that amortization payment would start a year after the issuance of the ICLOA. This information is consistent with the provisions of EO No. 229 and RA No. 6657 that were in effect at the time of the study and which mandated that ARBs shall repay through LBP the land awarded to them. The payment shall be in thirty (30) annual amortizations at six percent (6%) interest per annum. The annual amortization shall start one year from the date of registration of the Certificate of Land Ownership Award (CLOA).¹³

All the KI implementers claimed that the ARBs understood land amortization and tax payments. The information disclosed by the informants, however, indicated contrary to what was mentioned by the implementers. However, the ARBs do have a good grasp of when they are expected to start amortization payments.

Agricultural extension services

Only the FG Informants were asked whether they have access to agricultural extension. Of the 22 informants, 5 did not answer the question. Among those who answered the question, there are more informants from Davao than from Misamis Oriental who claimed that they have access to agricultural services. When examined by gender of the informant, slightly more males than females acknowledged that they have access to agricultural extension. Not all informants provided details about the services they have availed from an agricultural extension. Among those who provided details, the most availed service from agricultural extension includes fertilizer/pesticide and seedling/planter. Few informants claimed that they were given financial support and farming tools. A comparison of the report between male and female informants shows that more females were able to name the type of service they have availed of from agricultural extension.

Reports by the FG Informants indicated that agricultural extensions that they have access to are being operated by different agencies or Non-Governmental Organizations. Among the agencies that were mentioned are the Department of Agriculture and the Philippine Coconut Authority. The *Bayanihan*¹⁴ and an unnamed NGO were also mentioned by the informants to have operated an agricultural extension service.

A male and a female informant also disclosed that they know of an agricultural extension but that they have not availed of its services.

Six out of 10 FG Informants believed that their experience with the parcelization process may have been different if they had not availed of agricultural extension services. There were more informants from Misamis Oriental than in Davao Oriental who thought that agricultural extension services made a difference. When examined by the gender of the informants, more male informants claimed that their experience with parcelization may have been different without the extension services. A male informant noted that "*There is a difference. Those services helped me develop my ability to farm. I was able to plant cacao because of the assistance extended by an organization.*"

Apart from the provision of support for agricultural inputs, in the bigger picture, the presence of agricultural services has made farmers feel the presence of the government. A male FG Informant from Davao Oriental confided that the presence of agricultural extension service helped prevent them from joining armed resistance: "*When my father was issued a notice to vacate the land within 10 days, had the government not*

¹³ Republic Act 6657. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cnkwJV>.

¹⁴ This refers to "Bayanihan to Heal as One," one of the programs of DAR to support ARBs.

given assistance, we would have gone to the mountains (meaning, they would have joined the rebel groups by going to the mountains). It was indeed a big help. People resort to other means if there are no clear services to protect the farmers.”

CONCLUSION

The study highlighted that most ARB households had received invitations to the *pulong-pulong*. However, more than a quarter of the ARB households claimed that they have not received an invitation. This claim was inconsistent with the procedure spelled by the key implementers of the program. Not receiving an invitation was the leading reason for non-attendance in the *pulong-pulong*, thus denying the ARB household the opportunity to learn more about the parcelization process, the rights, and the accompanying responsibility of beneficiaries, as well as the ability to thresh out any issue before it gets out of hand.

Attendance to the actual subdivision survey was quite high among all types of informants. Many informants were, however, thinking that the land title would be issued soon after the survey. Disclosure by both ARB informants and the key implementers revealed a protracted release of individual titles, with some taking as much as 26 years. Notwithstanding the protracted process, most informants harbored no ill feelings toward the government.

Communication between spouses about the result of the *pulong-pulong* and the subdivision survey was high. The discussion between the spouses revolves around policies and fees as well as their plans about the land.

The study shows that the informants only have a general idea of the amortization process and real property tax payment. This is inconsistent with the claim by the implementers that the beneficiaries understood land amortization and tax payments.

The understanding of the informants about the conjugal property was high. The expectation of having both their names on the title was prevalent. However, as revealed by the implementers, it appears that the identification of the land as conjugal property hinges on the declaration by the ARB—meaning, a property is tagged conjugal if declared by the ARB.

There are also knowledge and capacity gaps among designated Gender Focal Points, particularly among institutional providers of agricultural research, training, and extension services. This continues to be a barrier to the effective enforcement and implementation of such regulations.¹⁵

The understanding of the conjugal property and the change in the perception of the conjugal nature of the awarded land did not lead to greater involvement of the spouse in the decision-making on land. The involvement of female spouses in planning and decision-making about the land was generally limited to actual cultivation, such as planting, weeding, etc., and in deciding what to plant.

Having their own titled land to cultivate has made the beneficiaries optimistic about their future. Households that own the land that they till also show a greater propensity to expand their crop production. However, the information provided by the informants also shows that land ownership alone does not guarantee improvement in the quality of life. It can be gleaned from the information provided by the beneficiaries that Agrarian reform must be packaged with support services for agricultural production for it to gain traction and improve the quality of life of beneficiaries.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. ***Pulong-pulong***. With the *pulong-pulong* as a critical step in the parcelization process during which important issues are discussed, it is imperative that attendance of the ARBs and other stakeholders (e.g., adjacent landowners, BARC Chair) is ensured.

There is a need to strengthen the following:

1.1 Invitation. There should be communication informing the ARBs why they need to attend and give priority to improve their personal attendance. For the organizers, they should provide ways of making attendance convenient for the ARBs, such as choosing a venue that is accessible and appropriate for discussions. A primary concern is to ensure that all invitations are received by the concerned ARBs. After sending the invitation, a follow through will be made in all forms of media (radio through its public service announcement). Formal invitation should be sent to both the ARB and his/her spouse.

1.2 Attendance, Conduct of the *Pulong-pulong*, and Topics Discussed. In the study, it was revealed that

¹⁵ “National Gender Profile of Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods: Country Gender Assessment Series - The Philippines.” Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. 2022.

only half of the total number of informants replied that they attended the *pulong-pulong*. More male ARBs were unable to attend the *pulong-pulong*. The lack of information or invitation was the leading reason cited by the ARBs for the nonattendance. Therefore, it is the flow of information from the DAR office to the ground level that needs improvement. It is the female attendees who have better memory recall of the topics discussed rather than the male attendees. DAR personnel have a good grasp of the topics that were discussed during the *pulong-pulong*, but these were not cascaded effectively to the ARBs.

1.3 The *pulong-pulong* needs to include more detailed information on financial obligations of ARBs, including current regulations regarding amortization of compensable lands and payment of property taxes.

Respondents may have been able to recall that amortization and real property tax payment were discussed but could not provide details or specifics about these. Through this process, the ARBs are fully aware of their responsibility to pay the amortization as well as their taxes. Nevertheless, they do not know the details of their financial obligations, such as how much and how frequently they need to pay.

Although recent reforms removed the requirements for ARBs to pay amortization, clear information on financial obligations needs to be communicated and the information should be standardized. ARBs will need to be informed about the changes to their obligations under the New Agrarian Emancipation Act, as some may not be aware that they are no longer required to amortize the land, reimburse former landowners, or pay estate tax. In addition, clarity about which property taxes are still required should be communicated to avoid confusion about remaining financial obligations. ARBs need to know how, how much, and when property tax payments are due.

There was limited time given to the discussion on the timeline of parcelization because there were several representatives of different agencies who tackled the different stages of the process. There is a need to harmonize or integrate the topics to be discussed by concerned agencies to avoid calling for more *pulong-pulong* to save time. Likewise, this can make the presentations clearer and more understandable to the attendees. More preparation on the part of the facilitator and resource person will help make the *pulong-pulong* more productive and successful.

2. Subdivision Survey.

2.1 ARBs and their spouses gave priority to their attendance. Hence, putting emphasis on the importance of the agenda during the invitation will result in better attendance. In addition, stating in the invitation the role of the spouse (particularly the wife) and his/her responsibility during the *pulong-pulong* will highlight the need for them to attend. One way to address the issue of 'invisibility' of women in agriculture is to write the names of the spouses, especially the females, on the invitations.

3. Issuance of Individual land titles

3.1 Issuance.

Despite the continuing trust that ARBs have towards the government, even with the long delay of individual title issuance, there should be efforts to speed up the parcelization process and issuance of individual land titles. All agencies involved should cooperate and unify their efforts to address the long delay in issuance and avoid building up frustration among the awardees.

4. Agricultural extension services

Agricultural services are still found to be lacking to connect various inputs and activities to produce the desired effects of increased productivity, increased household incomes and investments.

5. Gender and Parcelization Process

Gender is a theme that cuts across various steps in the parcelization process and needs to be integrated in the whole process from the *pulong-pulong*, invitation extended to the issuance of the individual land title under the name of ARB and spouse as well as the availment of extension services by both male and female ARBs and spouses. As female spouses of ARBs were often not included in the invitation for the *pulong-pulong*, they missed out important information in the parcelization process. As 'knowledge is power' missing out on the *pulong-pulong* and without substantial discussion of the representative of the household that attended, they do not have an equal voice with that of the men in the parcelization decisions that shape their lives, including in their households, communities. While mainstreaming gender is a government-mandated priority, integrating gender equality and women empowerment needs to be clearly spelled out in the program from the top/policy level and the 'how tos' in cascading to the community level (A concrete Toolkit is needed in cascading, e.g., although the female spouse's name is reflected in the title, it is not translated into active participation decision-making about the land).

Although it may start with sex disaggregation with the data and with the activities conducted there is a need to go beyond attendance of both sexes in the *pulong-pulong* and in the sub-division survey, but their active/proactive participation and discussion of the issues about the land. Spousal communication needs to be promoted/ encouraged, as well as underscore the importance of acquiring the knowledge of the whole

process to be an active participant and to be able to glean the targeted outcomes and later impact.

Providers of extension services need to communicate and transmit information and technology to ARBs and spouses, and the rest of the household members. Active participation of the beneficiaries is needed.

REFERENCES

United Nations. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Ballesteros, Marife M., Jenica Ancheta, and Tatum Ramos. "The Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP) After 30 Years: Accomplishments and Forward Options ," 2017.

Reeler, D., and R. Van Blerk. "The truth of the work: Theories of Change in a changing world." *The Community Development Resource Association*. Recuperado de http://www.cdra.org.za/uploads/1/1/1/6/111664/the_truth_of_the_work_theories_of_change_in_a_changing_world_by_doug_reeler_and_rubert_van_blerk_%E2%80 (2017).

Castro-Zarzur, R., Gordoncillo, P., Gunnsteinsson, S., Jarvis, F., Johnson, H., Perova, E., & Srouji, P. (2020). Land rights in transition: Preliminary experimental evidence on how changes in formal tenure affect agricultural outcomes, perceptions, and decision-making in the Philippines.

Department of Agrarian Reform. (2015). *QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM: CONDUCT OF PULONG-PULONG* (DNC – LTP-011 Rev No. 01).

Koirala, Krishna H., Ashok Mishra, and Samarendu Mohanty. "Impact of land ownership on productivity and efficiency of rice farmers: The case of the Philippines." *Land use policy* 50 (2016): 371-378.

Mwatsi & Vargas, "Women Participation In Farming Organizations: A Case Study of Lofepaco in Beni-Lubero, Republic Democratic of Congo," Abstract. <https://bit.ly/3B1qhXQ>

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, "National Gender Profile of Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods: Country Gender Assessment Series - The Philippines." 58. <https://bit.ly/3aJePp1>.

Akter, Sonia, Pieter Rutsaert, Joyce Luis, Nyo Me Htwe, Su Su San, Budi Raharjo, and Arlyna Pustika. "Women's empowerment and gender equity in agriculture: A different perspective from Southeast Asia." *Food policy* 69 (2017): 270-279. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3AXV5IZ>.

Republic of the Philippines. DAR Administrative Order No. 01-11. Retrieved from <http://www.lis.dar.gov.ph/documents/6402>.

Brown, Jennifer, and Justine Uvuza. *Women's land rights in Rwanda: How can they be protected and strengthened as the Land Law is implemented?*. Washington, USA: Rural Development Institute, 2006.

Coral, "Women's Land Rights, Gender-Responsive Policies and the World Bank (Philippines). Asian Farmers Association for Sustainable Rural Development," Slide 17. <https://bit.ly/3Pz36bp>.

"National Gender Profile of Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods: Country Gender Assessment Series – The Philippines." Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2022.

Decker, A., P. Van de Velde, and J. Montalvao. "COVID-19: A Pivotal Moment to Support Women Farmers." *World Bank blogs* 3 (2020).

Decker, A., P. Van de Velde, and J. Montalvao. "COVID-19: A Pivotal Moment to Support Women Farmers." *World Bank blogs* 3 (2020).

"Strengthening Women's Entrepreneurship in Agriculture in ASEAN Countries." OECD, 2021. Republic Act 6657. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3cnkwJV>

ANNEXES

Annex Table 1. Summary Table of Field Work Activities

Data Collection Method	Types of Data Collection	Total Number	
Key Informant Interview (KII)	KII with DAR Implementers	Total of 9 KIIs for the two provinces 5 KIIs for Region 11 and 4 KIIs for Region 10 Distribution: 1 per regional office designated by the RD, province (1 per province) [lacking one from Regional office rep for Region 10] and 3 key personnel per province)	
Focus Group Discussion/Focus Group Interview Converted into In-Depth Interviews	ARBs (male and female) with individual land titles; ARBs (male and female) with ASP only / fieldwork complete	Planned ¹⁶	Completed
		Original Total of 8 FGIs for the two provinces 4 FGD/FGIs per province 1 ARB male FGI with individual land titles) 1 ARB female FGI with individual land titles/ 1 ARB male FGI with ASP only / FWC 1 ARB female FGI with ASP only/FWC	FGIs Converted into IDIs 4 FGIs into 12 IDIs using the FGI tool/province (tweaking the tool to convert all reference of groups into individuals). 3 IDIs of Male ARBs with ICLOAs 3 IDIs of Female ARBs with ICLOAs 3 IDIs of Male ARBs with ASP/FWC 3 IDIs of Female ARBs with ASP/FWC
In-Depth-Interviews (IDI)	IDI of ARBs (males and females) issued with individual land titles IDI of spouse of ARBs with individual land titles IDI of ARBs (males and females) listed as ASP only/fieldwork complete IDI of spouse of ARB listed as ASP only/fieldwork complete	Total of 44 IDIs (22 per province) Please see Table 2 for the Distribution. Note also on the male and female ARB distribution (if possible, equal distribution of male and female ARBs)	

¹⁶ FGIs were converted into IDIs because of the difficulty in convening altogether the ARB participants.

Annex Table 2. Distribution of Key-Informant Interviews (KIIs) for Davao Oriental and Misamis Oriental

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)	Provinces Covered		Total for both areas
	Davao Or	Misamis Or	
1. Interview: Regional Level (designated by RD.)	1		1
2. Interview: Provincial Level (PARPO)	1	1	2
3. Interview: Municipal Level (MARPO)	3	3	6
Total	5	4	9

Annex Table 3. Distribution of IDIs per Province (Davao Oriental and Misamis Oriental)

In-Depth Interviews (Davao Oriental)	Overall Total	Davao Oriental		Misamis Oriental	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
1. ARBs with individual land titles (male and female representation)	11	3	2	3	3
2. Spouse of ARBs with Individual Land Title	11	2	3	3	3
3. ARBs with ASP only / fieldwork complete (male and female representation)	11	3	3	3	2
4. Spouse of ARB with ASP only / fieldwork complete	11	3	3	2	3
Total	44	11	11	11	11

Annex Table 4. Distribution of IDI USING FGI/FGD Tool for Davao Oriental and Misamis Oriental

Categories	Davao Oriental	Misamis Oriental
IDIs of ARB male with individual land titles)	3	3
IDIs of ARB female with individual land titles/	3	3
IDIs of ARB male with ASP only / fieldwork complete	3	3
IDIs of ARB female with ASP only/ fieldwork complete	3	3
Sub Total	12	12
Overall Total	24	