

PHILIPPINES-AUSTRALIA LAND ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT PROJECT



Interim Report

LGU Community Organizing Capilla, Pastrana Leyte

30 June 2003

REPORT C20



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	
Introduction	6
I. Objectives and Progress on the Activity	
A. Rationale and Objectives of Activity	8
B. TA Terms of Reference	8
C. TA Activities and Accomplishments	9
D. Continuing Activities	10
E. TA Deployment	11
II. LGU Driven Community Mobilization and Post Title Preparation	
A. Assumptions in the Design of LGU CO	12
B. Social Assessment	13
C. Elements of LGU CO for Free Patent	14
D. LGU CO in a Comparative Assessment of CRS Pilots	17
III. Assessment of Initial Experience and Recommendations	
A. On LGU Capacity to Implement LAMP	21
B. Operational Concerns	23
C. Management Systems	24
D. Policy Concerns	25
E. Notes on Introduced Elements of LGU CO Design	25
F. Specific Recommendations for LAMP II	30
IV. Conclusions	32
Annexes	

List of Tables

Table 1	LGU CO: Summary of Innovations and Potentially Replicable Elements of Design	14
Table 2	Comparison of Objectives of CRS Pilots	17
Table 3	General Comparison of LGU CO to Other Pilots in Relation to Resource Requirements	18

List of Annexes and Attachments

1	LGU CO Framework Plan
2	LGU CO Flow Chart for Free Patent
3	LGU CO Implementation Plan

Glossary of Abbreviations

BC	- Barangay Council
CO	- Community Organizing/Community Organizer
CRS	- Community Relations Service
CSO	- Civil Society Organizations
LAG	- Local Advisory Group
LCRS	- Local Community Relations Service Assistant
LIL	- Learning and Innovation Loan
LT	- Lupon Tagapayapa
LGU	- Local Government Unit
NGO	- Non-government Organization
PO	- People's Organization
SAT	- Systematic Adjudication Team
SCU	- State Colleges and Universities
TA	- Technical Assistant
TOR	- Terms of Reference

Executive Summary

The pilot under review is LGU-driven community mobilization for free patent titling. This is under Deliverable 26, Output 2.3 that aims to pilot test and evaluate LGU roles in titling. TA delivered part-time inputs since February 24 2003. This report covers the period since then to June 2003.

Towards developing the LGU pilot, an implementation plan was prepared including flow charts and detailed work plans. The plan covers a strategy for community mobilization for titling and for social preparation towards post-title scenarios. Thus, the plan also tries to operationalize LAMP's social program, the overall goal of which is "to alleviate poverty and enhance economic growth."

The initial social assessment indicates a social structure where titling, by itself, may not significantly advance the attainment of the project goal to contribute to poverty alleviation. There is a high percentage of landlessness, a concentration of lands on a minority and a general lack of productivity and access to social and development services.

Field-testing in Barangay Capilla, Pastrana, Leyte, commenced in the last week of April. It is in the preliminary phases of piloting. At this stage, the Barangay Council has an action plan to concretize its role in titling and post-title development. It has started to implement pre-survey activities such as land tenure profiling, validation of list of claimants, exploratory talks on protecting rights of the landless and training activities. At higher levels, preparations are underway to establish concrete mechanisms to support and sustain community development initiatives.

Based on an initial internal evaluation of design and of results of preliminary field processes, the pilot indicates positive prospects for mobilizing local government role not only in the titling process but also in pursuing post-title development initiatives. It also indicates areas where the use of Community Organizing (CO) principles and techniques can address specific problems encountered in community mobilization for titling. Furthermore, there exist local networks to support a comprehensive development plan of LGUs and communities. Access to these only needs to be improved.

Specific elements of design that were tested thus far include shortened time frame for validation of land claimants by key informant panel and then by the residents at a Barangay Assembly. Terms of LAMP-LGU partnership were altered based on CO. Concrete results include cost sharing on project activities, cost saving on personnel requirements, time efficiency on certain completed activities, and no payment of honoraria to local officials.

The Interim Report presents the status of implementation of the pilot. It also presents the result of evaluation processes by the Community Relations Services, which were conducted within the current month. In connection with this evaluation process, elements of design that innovate on existing community mobilization practices and that respond to the project's vision to be an instrument of poverty alleviation are summarized. While the focus of this report is LGU-driven CO, general observations on CRS processes were also offered, as the context for designing LGU-CO. Recommendations were made for both current operations and LAMP 2 design.

Introduction

LGU-driven community mobilization is one approach that the Community Relations Services (CRS) is piloting to increase stakeholder participation in LAMP. It is being implemented in one barangay under the Free Patent mass titling option. It is based on the Social Program Plan of LAMP and a series of reviews of earlier methods of work.

The LAMP Social Program Plan states that increased participation is important for two reasons:

“First, participatory development supports poverty reduction by creating more effective, equitable and sustainable activities. People develop a sense of ownership and commitment to activities when they have worked together to assess their problems and resources, considered and evaluated possible solutions, chosen actions, and formulated plans to initiate, manage and evaluate their project. By building and enriching social networks, participatory development enhances social capital.”

Second, LAMP requires support from the LAMP constituency on advocacy work to be carried out in Congress and Executive levels. (*LAMP, Social Program Plan 2002:12*)

A review of CRS in November 2002 specifically recommended strengthening the role of the LGU at all levels (provincial, municipal and barangay) in providing resources and usage of the structures and mechanisms that would push for a fast land-titling process. (*PA-LAMP, A Review of CRS, 2002*)

Thus, the pilot aims to test community mobilization processes that might be more effective and efficient as well as more socially acceptable and participatory, thus more sustainable, with the leadership of the LGU. The design also incorporates measures to link titling and poverty reduction.

Pilot testing commenced in the last week of April 2003 with preliminary meetings with barangay and municipal officials who accepted leading roles in project implementation.

This month, a series of evaluation workshops were conducted as part of the learning process to integrate the experience on community relations and mobilization of the past 2 years. LGU CO is in the preparatory stages of the titling process to prepare the LGU to take on lead roles in community mobilization and post-title development. Thus, the LGU CO review is limited to the experience in the initial phases and to an analysis of the design, which attempts to address problems in community mobilization that were encountered in the existing models under the Community Relations Service.

Methodology

In preparing the LGU Design, the TA reviewed the Social Assessment studies of pilot sites to understand the context of the project and of field procedures on community mobilization. She also studied reports and documents, interviewed staff and other partners and observed CRS field activities. A work plan was prepared on the basis of this initial study and validated with the concerned units (CRS, technical divisions)/NGO partner during the CO Workshop in April.

An Implementation Plan and alternative procedures were drafted to translate broad CO principles into practice in the specific context of LAMP.

CRS evaluation workshops were conducted from May to June to systematize lessons learned on community mobilization in two years of operations. The CRS compared the various designs and pilot experiences, specifically the top-down approach of CRS, a LGU CRS strategy using the same approach with increased LGU participation, and two Community Organizing pilots. The latter includes one that is implemented by PIO1 and another that is LGU-led using CO principles and methods. An NGO-implemented approach has not commenced. These pilots had different scopes and contexts (titling options, number of barangays involved) and were in different stages of implementation. The LGU CO pilot was the most recent addition to be field-tested.

Standard evaluation parameters were used with a minimum set of indicators being agreed upon by various by CRS.

I. Objectives of and Progress on the Activity

A. Rationale and Objectives

The objective of the pilot is to draw up lessons on community mobilization for titling. This is under Output 2.3 of the LAMP log frame the aim of which is “the (1) development of processes and (2) identification of barriers to EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE, COMMUNITY ACCEPTABLE AND GENDER-SENSITIVE titling process.”

The Output is that an evaluation of CRS and community participation is reported to stakeholders’ workshop and that PIO 1 documents actions and recommendations from the workshop for follow-up. In this design, the scope of Output 2.3 on landholder participation has been expanded to include social preparation of communities for post-title development through LGU-led processes.

B. TA Terms of Reference

The main tasks for the LGU Social Dynamics Adviser (Part-time), as stated in the TOR, are:

1. Design and pilot test LGU community mobilization methods
2. Develop a detailed program of work for the implementation of the pilot
3. Develop a field level CRS Flowchart for the LGU
4. Ensure training of the LGU on LAMP in general, PIO 1 and Output 2.2
5. Develop a TOR for the LGU
6. Assist the LGU to operationalize its TOR in the field
7. If appropriate, develop TORs for the LCRS
8. Ensure that the LGU and LCRS are trained to be fully conversant with LAMP, PIO 1 and land titling procedures
9. Provide support to the LGU for the delivery of community training needs they identify
10. Ensure that the LGU is facilitating maximum participation of the land claimants and barangay communities within the scope of the titling procedures being piloted
11. Support the LGU to enhance land claimants knowledge and capacities to gain title, use the One Stop Shop (OSS), and to use their land titles to economic advantage.
12. Support the LGU to consider ways that it can support the community to maximize titles for individual and community economic growth
13. Ensure that the LGU is documenting learning experiences, in particular replicable features of the pilot
14. Provide a monthly report to PIO 1, the PMO and the TA Team Leader on pilot implementation progress
15. Document learning experiences, in particular replicable features of the pilot with production of an operations manual as a final output.
16. LGU coordination.

C. TA Activities and Accomplishments

Technical assistance was provided in installing systems for the LGU CO pilot. Assistance was also given in plan implementation and in other CRS activities such as in the following areas:

1. Completed Design

TA prepared the pilot design and work plan. An LGU CO Implementation Plan (Attachment 5) had to be prepared to particularize CO concepts for LAMP and to provide a basis of unity among field implementers. Framework and work plans were also prepared that contain specific activities, milestones and indicators for the proposed plan. A CO flowchart for free patent was developed. (Annexes 2 – 3)

2. Completed CRS Evaluations

Technical assistance was also provided in the preparation and review of CO/CRS workshop evaluations and outputs from May to June. Pre-workshops were conducted with staff to agree on parameters and indicators and to apply these in report preparation.

- Developed framework for comparison of CRS/CO pilots
- Submitted assessment of LGU CRS evaluation workshop as springboard to reform methodology for other evaluations
- Submitted to CRS draft design and program for LGU CRS, LGU CO and Integrated CRS workshops
- Prepared evaluation parameters and facilitated CRS agreement to select indicators for Integrated CRS Workshop
- Preparatory workshop with CRS to apply indicators

3. Staff Preparation for CO

An initial leveling off with CO, CRS and technical team members was conducted in April, which resulted in the refinement of flow charts and CO role in titling activities. TOR was prepared for the Community Organizer. Draft TOR for municipal and barangay LGU became the basis for discussing a new set of roles and functions for the LGU in LAMP. Coaching is done especially to prepare CRS/CO for specific activities. The same has happened with the Barangay Council in preparation for field activities. TA was able to mobilize and assist SAT in the preparation of training design and materials for Training of the Lupon Tagapamayapa of 2 CO pilot sites.

4. Technical Assistance in Design and Implementation of LGU Field Activities

TA prepared training designs and workshop guide questions in consultation with CRS. Field instruments for validation of land claimants were done in coordination with SAT and CO. Field guides used for various activities are being compiled for reference.

- Meetings with Mayor and Barangay Captain and Council based on prepared Terms of Reference for LGU Barangay and Municipal levels
- Action Planning Workshop by Barangay Council to operationalize its role in project implementation
- Team orientation on CO processes in LGU pilot (with SDA Nilda Albao)
- Activation and training of Lupon Tagapamayapa to assist in land related disputes

- Development of new instrument for validation of land claimants and initial social investigation and land tenure profiling of the pilot community
- Activation of PIO 1 support towards establishment of municipal and LAG-supported mechanism to facilitate access to post-title support services through an inventory of service providers; format for directory provided
- Preparation of field materials for organizational assessment
- Draft PRA techniques for profiling and process documentation guide
- Observed negotiation between landowners and landless

5. *Evaluation Reports Preparation for CRS Pilots*

- Initial outline for CRS' LGO CO report
- Review of reports while in progress for Integrated Report, LGU CRS and LGU CO

6. *LAMP Preparations for Post-title Phase*

The post title agenda has been brought up with the barangay and municipal government. The terms tht it be LGU-led have been accepted in principal. Inventory of post-title service providers has been arranged with CRS and is underway. Initial results show that development networks exist which assist LGUs and community organizations upon request; SAT has also been requested to assist in compiling basic information on rights of landowners/landless/women and other vulnerable groups for development of appropriate IEC materials. This early, at least one partnership project in agriculture has been identified for implementation in Capilla, with the Leyte State University and the municipal government.

7. *Others*

TA provided inputs in general undertakings such as the Social Assessment II, participated in management meetings, planning LGU role in barangays where LAMP phases out, etc.

D. *Continuing Activities*

Major areas of assistance relate to plan implementation. Important systems in CO have yet to be installed. Since certain key activities in the barangay are new to CRS, the design and instruments for these have to be prepared or finalized and then implemented with the CRS. These shall be compiled into field guides/manuals to help the implementers after TA phase out. The development and systematization of new tools and procedures for community mobilization for titling and social preparation for post-title development is a potential contribution of LGU CO to CRS processes.

Post-title support machinery for LGUs and communities is a potential contribution of LAMP's titling process, which has to be activated. Finally, lessons from the pilot will be reviewed and reported to stakeholders.

Key activities include:

1. Assisting CRS in designing a plan to mobilize local authorities for titling as part of their regular functions in non-CO pilot sites
2. Preparation of training plan; design of specific training courses for LGU/PO
3. Preparation of design and tools for major activities – Community Based Monitoring and Evaluation, Participatory Rural Appraisal (for community profiling and social assessment), Barangay Development Planning workshop, workshops to convene

LGU and support network to activate linkage and firm up mechanism for post-title initiatives

4. Input into the development of appropriate IEC materials re rights and social preparation
5. Enhancement of operating systems of CRS (e.g. M and E and use of information on social assessment, process documentation)
6. Activation of post-title service mechanism
7. Conduct review of design
8. Preparation of final report

E. TA Deployment

TA engagement was for half time for a period of 6 months, which commenced on February 24, 2003. On the other hand, contract period of 78 days is completed by June.

Half time in March was used to study field conditions and prepare a design and work plan for the pilot. Pre-implementation and implementation phases overlapped in the succeeding months. Within the last three months, TA had to cope with the demands of implementation, which required designing concepts and tools for specific major field activities while also preparing a detailed LGU CO Implementation Plan. The Plan (with annexes for tools, TORs and activity guides) had to be done because a basis of unity as well as new methodologies needed to be clarified to implement the pilot, which introduced CO principles and expanded the scope of CRS operations, under terms of uncertainty.

The peculiar condition at LAMP, which was undergoing budgetary crisis and structural changes at PIO1 and CRS levels required involvement in management concerns, in the beginning, principally to ensure inclusion of CO pilots in a contracting PIO 1 work plan. Furthermore, May and June were CRS evaluation months. TA was significantly involved in 3 out of 4 of these workshops and CRS report preparations while field implementation continued at the pilot site. During the period, inputs have been prepared to reform CRS conventions for process documentation (PDR guide) and monitoring and evaluation (parameters and indicators) which are still up for discussion and installation within the unit. Also under study with CRS are ways to strengthen LGU role in survey and titling in barangays where LAMP must otherwise withdraw due to sharp budget cuts.

II. The Design of LGU-Driven Community Mobilization

CRS supports titling processes, specifically survey and adjudication, through information dissemination and community mobilization.

In a larger context, CO is a social development methodology used to facilitate the process of forming self-reliant, self-determining communities, which are able to sustain their development activities. In this sense, CO is complemented with Community Development, which addresses economic and welfare needs, for a community to be truly self-reliant and sustaining.

CO proceeds from social analysis to harness community and institutional resources to attain common goals. With LAMP, titling becomes an entry point for community development. Titling processes become both ends and means in attaining CRS objectives and projects goals.

The LGU CO pilot aims to mobilize communities and local government units for mass titling at the barangay level. It shall also initiate social preparation of communities. Support shall be given to improving access to post-title development services. It can help LGUs to explore ways of enhancing land administration and management in their localities. It will study the local context of titling to see to the rights and welfare of sectors that may be adversely affected by titling.

A. Assumptions in Designing LGU CO

The pilot for LGU-driven community mobilization was intended for judicial titling in residential areas. This was changed to Free Patent in agricultural lands in the course of site selection because available pilot areas were in agricultural lands. The shift was strategic because of conclusions on the relative difficulty of judicial titling. On the other hand, CO, as a process, is likely to be applicable under any titling option.

The following were assumptions or influences in design preparation:

1. Recognizes the need to be target oriented (time and outputs) in applying CO as process technology.
2. It was guided by the project goal of titling as an investment towards poverty reduction. Components were thus added to the current CRS focus to improve stakeholder participation in titling.
3. To establish an operational link between titling and poverty reduction, PIO1 would facilitate preparation of concrete plans by LGUs for post-title development but that it would not be directly and principally involved in implementing poverty reduction activities.
4. It would like to test the viability of a six-month time frame for conducting both titling and social preparation activities.
5. CO principles and techniques are used to support testing of simultaneous survey and adjudication under the Free Patent option.
6. It would like to test the proposition that there is a role for an external facilitator (CO) given that LGUs traditionally do not organize communities and that key officials may represent different class interests from the majority of their constituents.
7. CO looks out and responds to negative unintended effects of project implementation.

B. Social Assessment

The following social assessment provides the context of CRS and project implementation.

Initial findings from PIO field sites (for collation from Social Assessment 1 and 2) and the initial social investigation of the LGU pilot site at Capilla, Pastrana shows that there might be a need to review and operationalize links between titling and poverty reduction.

Social investigation is underway to better understand the context of titling. So far, it is known that the area is characterized by a high percentage of landlessness. Fifty land claimants, the project's target participants, comprise 64% of the households (23/35) in the barangay. Of this number, 56% live outside the barangay. There is a concentration of land among a few. Of the total land area of 72.5 hectares, over three-fourths belong to just 3 landowners who reside outside the barangay.

Moreover, the landless in the pilot sites tend to have insecure tenure arrangements. During elections, the votes of tenants and other occupants are dictated by the landed who have had occasion to evict those who did not comply. The landless fear that titling would lead to a rise in rentals or the sale of the land and their displacement. Many small landholdings have long-standing mortgages.

There is low intensity of use and productivity of rice (70%) and coconut (30%) lands. One factor is limited capital for increased production and the non-viability of rice production as a commercial venture given current cropping patterns and agro-practices. A challenge is the search for viable alternative farming systems under conditions of chronic indebtedness of farmers and the pending import liberalization of rice in 2004 which is feared to negatively impact on farmers.

Only 9 of the households earn their income from farming. Most are laborers on and off farm. Income levels at an average of P3,500 per month is below the poverty line for rural areas of P5,700 per month. There is poor access to agriculture and social development services.

The pilot municipality of Pastrana is fifth class with a budget of P17 million. Almost half of the municipal budget is earmarked for payment of wages of municipal personnel. Only P3 million is left over for the Municipal Development Fund to be shared among 29 barangays.

The major source of income for the municipality are real estate taxes and business permits but without agro-industry projects, income generation is limited. Thus, Pastrana is highly dependent on its share of national internal revenue allotment. Social services delivery is limited. Furthermore, the municipal government is constrained by the need to produce local counterpart for all national projects through the Local Government Support Equalization Fund. This takes up resources for local priorities.

On the other hand, Capilla has a development fund from Internal Revenue Allotments of P64,000 for an entire year. Over half of this has been earmarked for payment of allowances of Barangay Health Workers and Barangay Tanod. This leaves the barangay with P30,000, which has not been released, for development undertakings. The condition makes it difficult for the local governments to absorb a substantial share of the cost of mobilization for titling.

On the other hand, there are strong support services in agricultural and development in the province. Linkages with pilot municipalities and communities just need only to be activated. The barangay has community organizations and a cooperative, which can access external support for their projects.

The perceived use of titles is reserved to secure loans in case of health and other family emergencies. Key informant interviews indicate that landowners have no immediate plans for the use of their titles or to change the pattern of their use of land. Since many small landholdings are already mortgaged, these cannot be used as collateral to secure bank loans. There is the tendency that in time mortgages will be formalized as sales, increasing the class of landless. Barangay hall and church grounds are donated but without proper documentation.

C. Elements and Characteristics of the Design of LGU-Driven Mass Titling under the Free Patent Option

LGU CO introduces a major role of local government units in LAMP. CO principles are the basis for establishing the LAMP-LGU partnership. In addition to developing landholder participation, a thrust is also to activate mechanisms for post-title development.

1. Innovations on Existing Community Mobilization Processes

The pilot differs in terms of scope and in the principles of partnership and community mobilization. While key strategies (IEC, Partnership Building, etc.) are similar, these are being fine-tuned to improve on current processes and to respond to opportunities for partnership and organizing.

The design also incorporates new strategies and tools to be tested in the course of titling. These were based on an analysis of the causes of bottlenecks in community mobilization in the titling process.

The Plan would require a shift in orientation by the implementing team in terms of principles of community mobilization and in the working relations between CRS/CO and technical staff.

A list of changes are summarized in the table below:

**Table 1
Summary of Innovations and Elements of Design
LGU CO, PIO 1
Leyte**

Elements	Characteristics
Objectives	
<i>Goal of CO</i>	Maximize potential of CO to take process beyond community mobilization for titling; minimum strategy for social preparation is to include information material on opportunities and risks to title holders in IEC module; address negative impact of project on non-title holders
<i>Social Assessment</i>	Clarification of site characteristics enhances CO strategy formulation; will facilitate impact evaluation
<i>Identification of Project Beneficiaries</i>	Target participants are landowners but the project shall look out for the rights of those that might be adversely affected.
Strategies	
<i>Principles of Organizing</i>	Transparency, self-reliance and counterparting, participatory, social awareness raising

<i>IEC</i>	Content expanded to cover social preparation requirements, rights and procedures for those with adverse claims or negatively impacted, opportunities and risks of using title as credit instrument, etc.; takes advantage of local channels of communication as the preferred mode in rural communities; orient local channels of communication (BC, CO, leaders) on appropriate technical information, etc.; analysis of target participants determines appropriate mode of communication
<i>Partnership Building</i>	Strengthen non-contract aspects of partnership with LGUs, SCUs, NGOs, media, development agencies, based on complementation and clear principles of unity; tap CSO potential in addressing problems related to existing structures of poverty and land ownership
<i>Networking</i>	Local development networks exist; Operationalize LGU access to resources of SCU, NGOs, national government agencies, in local development
<i>Training</i>	Cost-sharing/cutting arrangements; use of local resources; preferably on-site training; training of Lupon Tagapamayapa
<i>Strengthen Post-Title Support Mechanism</i>	Directory of post-title service providers activates access to existing development networks at the barangay and municipal levels; universities and agencies such as the Department of Labor and Employment, TESDA, DSWD, DA, have skills and organizational development components that can be accessed by a mere request for assistance
<i>Social impact assessment and mitigation</i>	Social and stakeholder analysis allows CO to address unintended effects of project; process documentation by SAT can alert CO/project on possible rights issues; assist objectors and address concerns of those who are negatively impacted by the project (those with adverse claims, landless who fear negative impacts of titling on their tenure status, women, other vulnerable groups, etc.)
<i>Roles and Functions</i>	
<i>LGU Role</i>	Can be done without the payment of honoraria to officials; is best operationalized through an Action Plan and preparation for functions can be encouraged under any model
<i>Staff Orientation</i>	Transparency on loan; facilitate CO principles on people's participation and counterparting; use of local resources; critical analysis
<i>Multi-tasking and Improving Team Relations</i>	Develop role of BC in dissemination of appropriate information; enhance capacity of technical staff on CO and vice versa; closer coordination in planning and implementation among technical and CO team members; common tactics/problem solving sessions on bottlenecks

Operating Systems	
<i>Process Documentation, Monitoring and Evaluation</i>	Clarity of social assessment parameters; to be designed by CO in coordination with M and E; design anchors milestones on deliverables (e.g. timely installation of monuments/submission of documents, etc.) and not on activities (barangay assemblies, etc.) to attain certain objectives; need to install benchmarks for benefit monitoring and evaluation for SD; improve use of monitoring information from CBME, social assessment, etc.; continuing social analysis as a function of CO; process documentation by technical staff would be invaluable; improved analysis and use of information
<i>Community-Based Monitoring and Evaluation</i>	Simple forms can be developed with BC so it can monitor bottlenecks in titling process; process documentation and monitoring are built in functions; use information from CBME
<i>Problem Solving</i>	To link problems with strategies, one must understand the cause/s – i.e. no-show with notices
Phases	
<i>Site Selection</i>	In getting LGU commitment to take lead roles, provide basis for informed consent, then let BC decide; build LGU-LAMP partnership for CO, only with acceptors
<i>Social Investigation</i>	Aids in preparing site-specific CO strategy; stakeholder analysis shows interest and basis for participation of various sectors; identifies vulnerable groups
<i>Validation of List of Claimants</i>	Initial validation need not be house-to-house, can be done by panel validation to deter misdeclaration; household land tenure profiling can also be done then; appropriately designed PRA tools can help in the process
<i>Survey</i>	People's participation can be arranged as part of survey labor force; BC monitors quality of monuments which tend to be substandard; BC strategizes to ensure attendance in SNS, monumenting activities
<i>Interview and Adjudication by SAT</i>	Advanced identification of potential land cases for immediate assistance; it represents a bottleneck if cases are just discovered during the survey stage
<i>Updating of Barangay Development Plan</i>	A measure in aid of sustainability and organizational development is updating organizational/Barangay Development Plans.
<i>Phase Out</i>	Preparation of sustainability plan in conjunction with support network that can be implemented and monitored by the LGU

D. LGU CO in a Comparative Assessment of CRS Pilots

The Integrated Assessment Workshop for CRS pilots that was conducted on June 18 compared various CRS pilots.

1. Comparison of Scope of Project Objectives

The internal (CRS) assessment shows that LGU CO is pursuing the most objectives to embody LAMP's Social Program Plan. Moreover, the pilot has started to operationalize plans for all of its objectives and is taking the lead in initiating action on a post-title agenda for LAMP.

Table 2
Comparison of Objectives of CRS Pilots

Pilot	Objectives
PIO 1 CRS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community mobilization for titling
LGU led CRS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community mobilization for titling• Capacitating the LGU to implement CRS activities in the community
PIO 1 CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community mobilization for titling.• Initial establishment of post title support network• Social preparation for post title development• Strengthening LGU for titling• Formation of PO structure system/ mechanism
LGU led CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community mobilization for titling• Initial establishment of post title support network• Social preparation for post title development• Strengthen LGU for titling and land management• Development plan implementation and organizational development as a function of post-title support network

2. A Comparison of CRS Pilots on Time and Resources Required

The evaluation, which compared CRS pilots in relation to their resource requirements, shows areas of savings for LGU CO in comparison to other pilots. The biggest expense category for LGU CO is training but the application of cost sharing and cost saving based on CO principles should reduce projected costs considerably. Capability building can be seen as an investment in sustainability by strengthening local governance structures and processes and participants' Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes.

A summary is provided in the table below. Highlighted sections have been tested within the past period. Evaluation workshop tables on time and resources are in Annex 4.

Table 3
General Comparison of LGU CO to Other Pilots
in Relation to Resource Requirements

Parameter	Activity	Description of Project Savings	Remarks
Personnel	CO facilitation and process documentation	Cost saving on salary of process documentor: One person to do both jobs compared to separate responsibility centers for other CO pilots; in CRS, process documentation is essentially of meetings and is the responsibility of M and E	Process documentation is a function of CO and all field staff. But assistance can be secured to document meetings or other events where the CO helps facilitate barangay activity. Process documentation is not only about taking minutes of meetings. CBME is installed at the community level.
	No Local CRS Assistant	Cost saving on LCRS honoraria (P2,000/mo.)	The pilot mobilizes the BC which creates the needed structures/committees to perform various functions
	Honoraria of BC	Cost saving on BC honoraria: Barangay Captain – P800/mo; Council members – P600 each; Secretary/Treasurer – P500	Officials' honoraria increase the cost structure for personnel; cost of implementation is shared to raise stake of LGU in titling
Time	Pilot time frame	Pilot is testing the viability of a 6-month period for social preparation for both titling and community development. This is compared to 9 months for other CO pilots and to time equivalent to titling period for CRS sites.	Six months could be an optimum period for direct LAMP intervention in one barangay. Possible roles, if any, in follow-up of sustainability plans at the barangay level, have to be decided by management.

	Validation of CIM list	LGU CO shortened the process, which is done through individual validation by CRS for a period of up to 45 days per barangay. In the pilot, only 3 days were needed and a Barangay Assembly to finalize the list. Scope of output was expanded. In addition to existing list, a land tenure profile of both land claimants and other occupants was produced. Vehicle hire not necessary.	A key informant panel, in this case the BC, did initial validation of list and supplied additional information on land claimants. Key informant panels are expected to be helpful in homogeneous/rural communities. This saves time and the expense of taking a whole vehicle to approach non-resident land claimants.
	Survey, SNS, Interview and Ocular Inspection	This is a test by the technical components to be supported by CO. It makes unnecessary the multiple appearances of land claimants before the SAT/Survey team. This can shorten the period by 15 days.	Possible snags expected because of the simultaneous demand on people's time at different locations.
Quality	Landmarks Construction	Barangay Council shall negotiate a role for community members in the construction of landmarks, which is now done by the surveyor and often found to be substandard. Otherwise, BC shall monitor construction work of survey contractor.	Quality standards are enforced
Mobility	Vehicle hire to reach land claimants who reside in neighboring barangays	Cost is cut because mobilization is now a function of BC; motorcycle was loaned to BC by PIO1 for barangay assembly; rental motorcycle	Mass titling and high incidence of non-residence in the barangay (of land claimants) are the givens in the site
Community	Mass feeding	Represented a	Community counterpart

Meetings	at barangay assemblies	sizeable expense in CRS community mobilization; not done in the pilot	or token counterpart from LAMP (i.e. bread); in principle no catered food is served
Training	Cost of venue, food, materials	Increased number of training courses but on-site for community training to reduce on cost and increase local participation; budget for food has local counterpart or with no LAMP counterpart	Principle of counterparting is enforced

III. Assessment of Initial Experience and Recommendations

The pilot commenced at a time when structural changes at the levels of CRS and PIO1 occurred, when major budget cuts were also imposed.

The following are drawn from the brief experience of LGU CO. Often these are framed vis-à-vis past/current standards or CRS practices, which served as the context in preparing and assessing the LGU CO design.

A. On LGU Capacity to Implement LAMP

1. LGU Responsiveness

The LGUs are responsive to a LAMP partnership and acknowledge that they have a critical role in the implementation of national programs. These have the machinery and can create the needed committees to implement their roles in the titling and post-title phases.

The challenge lies on how to translate the goodwill into practice. LAMP can facilitate the transfer of key responsibilities to the LGU through an orientation on their roles and functions and helping these get organized for titling. The Action Planning Workshop by the Barangay Council of Capilla was the trigger to shift the responsibility to the LGU. From here, LAMP provides needed technical and material support.

2. LGU Preparedness

Certain structures are dormant and have to be activated. This includes the Barangay Development Council and the Lupon Tagapamayapa. Barangay Council members are mostly landless who look up to the Barangay Captain for leadership. The project is an opportunity to make various structures fully operational. Training and experience in the course of project implementation can give these the momentum to be functional for the long-term. The barangay officials' role in the project can be a means to enhance empowering practices in local governance and community development.

Orientation workshops are arranged for LGU partners regarding the project and the context for community mobilization at various phases of titling.

The LGUs prepare municipal and barangay development plans. These contain projects that can be funded by their meager annual budgets. These do not represent the range of strategic and operational plans to address various problems and opportunities of local development. Barangay Development Planning which is based on an analysis of the local situation and which is linked to external support can jump start local development initiatives.

3. Facilitating Factors

The distinctive characteristic of the barangay captain of Capilla as a CO practitioner is a facilitating factor. Strong leadership is a definite advantage in Capilla where most of the officials are not landowners but where there is a considerable requirement from the officials in terms of time to help facilitate mass titling.

It was part of the initial understanding with LAMP that unlike in other sites, no honoraria would be paid to local authorities to stress the CO principle that participation is less a function of monetary reward than a recognition of benefits and shared responsibilities. The idea of compensation is out. Operationalizing a system of partially sharing the burden of opportunity lost on account of some LAMP activities is under study by LAMP and barangays officials. This is in recognition of the status of many BC members who are wage earners.

4. Availability of Counterpart Resources for LAMP

The LGUs at the municipal and barangay level have limited budgets to spare for titling activities that require expenditure. For instance, tracking non-resident land claimants under a limited time frame and with no public transport poses a problem. A motorbike was detailed with the barangay for the duration of the community mobilization period for specific activities. This appears like a workable option that does not tax the cash strapped barangay for transport to contact project participants.

Most of the counterpart committed by the LGUs entails limited or no cash outlay – i.e. training venue, municipal transport for barangay training participants, mobile address system, and human resources, etc. In real terms, human resources account for a sizeable percentage of LAMP savings from the partnership with the LGU.

5. Vulnerable Groups and People's Organizing by LGU

The Barangay Council in the pilot site shall separately organize land claimants and the landless to facilitate mass titling in the case of the claimants. It is hoped to strengthen the negotiating position of the landless. Together with existing organizations, these can be the nucleus for post-title development activities.

This emerged as an option because of the composition of the Barangay Council and a significant percentage of the population without land. It is also a way to address the fears of the landless vis-à-vis possible effects of titling on them.

It shows that people's organizing can also be a function of local government. It was highly consistent with the background of the barangay chief executive as a former community organizer. In other contexts, it may not be as easy or viable, especially if officials represent a different land-related interest as their constituents.

6. Role of LAG and Municipal Government

The municipal government, like the barangay agreed to the terms of project implementation, where the LGU is expected to take on key responsibilities in titling and beyond. The municipal government of Pastrana also provides counterpart resources towards Capilla's LAMP Action Plan.

The role of the Local Advisory Group in pilot implementation has yet to be tapped. This will happen soon to activate a post-title development mechanism.

B. Operational Concerns

1. Mobility

Land claimants are characterized by a high percentage of non-residence in the barangay. Tracking of non-resident owners accounted for a third of the CRS expense due to the use of rented vehicles (P2300/day). The motorcycle appears to be a cheaper option, which was used on loan from the office for mobilization by Capilla officials. However, this is also rented (P400/day).

The Department of Budget and Management directive curtailing capital outlay is a bottleneck in the acquisition of appropriate transport. But a solution must be found around this rule. Car rentals equivalent to the acquisition cost of new vehicles (close to P7 M) represents, by any standards, poor management of resources under conditions of belt-tightening in government.

Sharing arrangements on the use of motorcycles may have to be seriously considered especially if the mass titling option is continued. A motorcycle may be assigned to a barangay, which does not have adequate resources, for the duration of community mobilization activities.

2. Field Team Coordination

New teamwork arrangements were established for SAT, survey and CRS in CO sites. It discourages compartmentalization and encourages multi-tasking and joint problem solving and analysis. Thus, CO can be a function of technical staff and vice versa. CO and other information bearers are equipped with an understanding of technical matters. On the other hand, SAT and survey apply the rudiments of CO in their work. This is in response to a situation where the Local CRS were unable

Involvement of SAT in the process flow came in earlier to develop a system to determine land cases as early as the land claimants' validation phase. Early action on cases is likely to facilitate adjudication given testing for a shortened time frame (of 3 months) for free patent.

3. Survey Deployment

The contractor could not start the survey due to non-release of mobilization fund. An option to do the survey by administration to push ahead with schedules was low on the list due to possible contractual complications.

4. Implications of Shortened Time Frame

An increasingly shortened time period for titling is expected to work against those who live away from the barangay and who could not be reached or located. Arrangements can be made for barangay assistance to these landowners who may want to file title applications at a later date.

This could raise rights issues if adjudicators favor land claimants who are here in order to achieve higher title application targets.

5. *Mainstreaming CO in CRS*

CO is a body of principles and practices for use in community mobilization and development. The scope and range of the application of these is not fixed and may differ from one practitioner to another given specific site conditions. The different conventions in CO tend to have adherents and detractors who may harbor misconceptions about one or another aspect of the process.

The need to mainstream CO for implementation by CRS under different levels of understanding necessitated the preparation of a detailed Implementation Plan. Adequate leveling off could not be achieved in one CO workshop. The Plan is but a guide to help operationalize CO within LAMP.

C. *Management Systems*

1. *Strategic Planning*

The delay in establishing the CO pilots can be partly attributed to the fact that the piloting of CO did not belong to the highest order of priority when budget cuts were imminent, contrary to LIL. There is a need to prioritize field-testing for more efficient titling methodologies.

2. *Management Style*

CRS has cohesive and hard working staff. Instead of the top-down approach, a work culture that encourages inquiry and the spirit of innovation, consistent with CO and LIL's Learning Process Approach, can be strengthened.

3. *Establishing Monitoring Indicators*

CO's contribution to facilitate the titling process (i.e. more accurate list of landowners for CIM, timely installation of monuments for survey, etc.) was not divorced from the deliverables of the other units. These were treated as milestones or performance indicators. The system allows for flexibility in the means to deliver the desired results.

In the case of CRS, the strategies for attaining outputs were treated as the milestones (i.e. conduct of barangay assembly, etc.). These tended to become fixed steps (Barangay Assembly 1 and 2, notices, etc.). This did not encourage the continuing search for more effective ways to deliver results.

PIO 1 collected no benchmark data. A few selected benchmarks on land tenure and socio-economic conditions shall be established. The design also includes the installation of a Community Information and Planning System – with land tenure and barangay profile and an action plan, which can be updated and monitored. The LGU assigns a responsibility center for its own process documentation. The full installation of participatory monitoring and evaluation system is part of the LGU CO plan.

4. *Use of Social Assessment and Monitoring Information*

This needs to be enhanced. Social Assessment I has not been used as input in formulating CRS and social marketing content and strategies. The same is true with Community-Based Monitoring results. Moreover, process documentation is a function of M and E and results are neither analyzed nor used by CRS. Staff is not familiar with the LAMP's Social Program Plan and key project documents and Bank evaluation results.

Appropriate feedback mechanisms and protocols among units need to be strengthened as critical ingredients of LAMP as a Learning and Innovation Loan (LIL). It is important that key documents, studies and evaluations are made accessible to staff and PIO1 officials through joint study as basis for strategic and operations planning.

CRS is the main link to the project's social dimension. In order to be attuned to this, the Learning Process Approach, which encourages critical analysis needs to be institutionalized in CRS work culture and processes. This can be nurtured as a practice. Scheduled Monday meetings at CRS can be used to discuss both operational and systems concerns.

D. Policy Concerns

1. Sporadic vs. Mass Titling

Strategic options may have to be considered whether to pursue mass or sporadic titling given land tenure characteristics, land use and productivity and relative costs of implementation. The acceptance of LGU role in mass titling is likely to generate savings for the project.

A. Study of Possible Rights Issues

While systematic documentation/analysis of documentation of cases has not occurred for PIO 1 sites and has not started in Capilla, TA has an impression from field visits (outside Capilla) that there are cases that might need further study and that these may be significant from both policy (e.g. legal, social justice implications, etc.) and operational (e.g. impact mitigation) perspectives.

SAT reporting can be made sensitive to the project's concern not only to produce titles but also to contribute to an empirically based understanding of land tenure issues, which may have to be considered in project re/design and implementation.

E. Notes on Introduced Elements of LGU CO Design

The following recommendations are put forward based on time-tested principles and practices of Community Organizing and Social Development.

1. Goal Clarification

The existing formulation of CRS objectives as well as monitoring and evaluation indicators does not reflect social preparation for post-title as a deliverable.

CRS orientated to facilitating the titling process. The scope of LGU CO sees titling not only as an end but also as a means to an end. In this light, the potential of CO is harnessed not simply for community mobilization for titling but towards a program of action that can help fulfill the potential of titling in poverty reduction and sustainable development.

2. Defining Target Participants and Addressing Negative Social Impacts

While titles directly benefit landowners, the social assessment indicates that many residents are not landholders. Moreover, they fear being adversely affected by the project. The landless represent a class of stakeholders whose concerns must be addressed. Project processes should endeavor to eliminate or mitigate identified adverse impacts on vulnerable sectors. In Capilla, negotiations have started to ensure security of tenure of occupants and the rights of tenants, workers, etc. in agricultural lands.

The CO strategy towards the landless may have an organizational expression. In the pilot site, the landless are being organized by the LGU to collectively address their concerns – negotiate better terms on land tenure and to later act on socio-economic opportunities.

3. Principles of Organizing

- Matching Local Capacity to CO Principles

Care must be taken so that implementation of LGU-led processes does not contribute to poverty by unduly burdening the BC/community with operating costs; cost-sharing schemes on community mobilization can be worked out consistent with CO principles (encourage self-reliance).

- Transparency

Based on the principle of transparency and informed consent, the project's funding source was divulged from the very start. This did not lead to negative reaction, as feared. The stress was on the responsibility of recipients to make use of the funds properly, as part of the national debt. LGUs are challenged to find ways to help achieve the project's long-term goal by taking advantage of partnership opportunities with agencies and other sectors.

- Self-Reliance and Counterparting

The principles of self-reliance and self-determination should be upheld. Experience shows that this can be attained if implementers observe this. Capilla shows that this can happen even in an environment where none of the usual incentives (honoraria, feeding) were offered. Participation and willingness to serve is less a function of superficial incentives than recognition of benefits and the advancement of real interests. It was clear from the start that there were expectations from the BC by way of counterpart in project costs and that no honoraria would also be paid.

The implementor (CO) can mobilize participation and local resources if she/he is able to show potential benefits of participation.

4. Design Assumptions on Time Frame

Organizational development is a key element of Community Organizing. Whereas, strengthening of people's organizations is strategic in pursuing the long-term agenda for development, the timeline for developing viable organizations cannot be reasonably expected within the project implementation period (6 months of which 3 months may be focused on titling). Thus, in the LGU design, organizational strengthening was recognized as an element of strategy but as a function of a support network including the LGUs, agencies,

universities and other support institutions. The LAMP facilitates the activation of the network at the community level by assisting in Barangay Development Planning. PIO 1 has to decide what role it takes, if any, in monitoring/following up plan implementation after the 6-month period.

5. Components

Many of the strategies and components of LGU CO are shared with the other pilots. A difference is in scope, means and content (e.g. IEC, partnership building), in specific principles for partnership building with LGUs and landowners (who are partners and not beneficiaries), in sustainability measures and in the definition of stakeholders (as not only landholders). Newly introduced components are social assessment, systems preparation for post-title initiatives and impact mitigation on vulnerable groups.

- **Social Assessment**

The land tenure profile of the barangay shows a majority of the households as landless. Moreover, those with small landholdings are chronically indebted or their lands mortgaged. Titling is feared to impact negatively on the landless. Social assessment is essential in projecting possible impacts and in planning mitigating measures for negative effects.

- **Information, Education and Communication**

While CRS-developed strategies shall continue to be used as appropriate, the LGU CO design puts a stress on interpersonal communications consistent with feedback from SA1 and monitoring results that people relied more on their officials and neighbors as sources of information. Thus, the BC and Lupon were fully oriented on the project, its vision, requirements, etc. to enable them to be effective facilitators and channels of information. Scope of information also now includes rights (of tenants, on mortgaging, risks, etc., and those that pertain to information on opportunities for socio-economic development.

- **Partnership Building**

The thrust is to promote non-contractual partnerships based on principles of unity/complementation to streamline resource sharing among LGUs and development agencies.

- **Organizational Development and Sustainability Planning for Post-Title Development**

Organizational Development is a factor in sustainability of community initiatives. This is included in the design as a function of support mechanisms for post title services that are set in place. Otherwise, this is a long-term process that would be difficult for LAMP to take on without adding to its current thrust on titling. The means to strengthen local structures and encourage productivity is the updating of the Barangay Development Plan and linking priority plans of the municipality and the barangay and its organizations to appropriate support services. This taps into the resources and development mandates of local government and other agencies.

- Land Management

A potential area of support is to encourage local government units to use land-related information in local development planning and land management. Thus, LGUs can be encouraged to update land use plans based on maps generated by LAMP including development and resource management plans.

- Scope of Free Patent Titling and Government Structures and other Institutional Lands

The Free Patent option is applicable to agricultural lands. It excludes church, residential and institutional lands. Government lands (school, barangay sites, etc.) are increasingly under threat and also need to be secured. While these may not be titled under existing provisions of FP, CO can encourage LGUs to take the move to firm up security arrangements for locations of public structures.

This is a CO milestone for the pilot. In Capilla, the Barangay Council is working to secure deed of donation papers for the church and barangay hall site.

6. *Replicability Potential of LGU CO*

Replicability was a CRS evaluation review parameter. The indicators of replicability that were looked into include advantages and disadvantages of the strategy and specific elements of plan. Observed requirements for success are also cited subject to additional lessons from on-going field implementation.

- *Advantages*

It harnesses LGU role and resources in project implementation. It addresses issues in implementation and has the potential to initiate and sustain development options with titling as the impetus.

- *Disadvantages*

CO is not a short-term process although fast-track sweeping methodologies can be used. For lasting change, the development intervention must be able to influence existing worldviews and social structures to something more equitable and conducive to development, etc. Once change processes are initiated, the challenge is how to sustain results.

On the other hand, the project can work within a defined level of contribution to enable post-title development. If support mechanisms were set in place, these would release pressure for CO to be responsible for facilitating access to support agencies on a site-by-site basis.

Unless care is taken, the process can be captured by the powerful, who might belong to the landed class, to their advantage. This risk might not be demonstrated in the pilot site due to the displayed pro-people characteristics of local leadership. But the risk is an argument for the role able external facilitation (by SAT or CO) in the titling process.

Moreover, since CO is not a traditional process of LGU, the role of an external facilitator is likely to be needed. In the pilot site, which can be said to be LGU-led, assistance is needed by the barangay relative to the titling process. In no case shall CO be “contracted out” to the LGU.

- *Applicability*

The principles of CO on community participation are applicable under any titling option. Moreover, the role of the LGU in the implementation of national programs was a recognized principle. Even LGUs that received honoraria for their services in LAMP cited that it was their function. Questions on honoraria became an issue only because such was promised by CRS.

CRS experience shows that it was not the driving force for participation in LAMP. Many officials who were paid honoraria did not function. Officials of Capilla have been perfectly willing to work without honoraria, though there is the option to consider partially compensating for opportunity cost of officials who perform full-time services at any stage of the LAMP process.

CO principles and the role of the LGU can also be harnessed in mobilizing communities for the remaining stages of the titling process in areas where LAMP withdraws due to budgetary cuts and the on-going restructure at PIO 1.

- *Requirements for Success*

A key requirement for the model to work is the acceptance by the LGUs at the municipal and barangay levels of the terms of partnership and their heightened role in project implementation. The preparation of an operating plan and capacity building, where needed, activates LGU-LAMP partnership at the barangay level.

CO is dynamic. Beyond the specific milestones or deliverables of the process, there is a great leeway for innovation. It takes advantage of entry points that are available on site. A critical requirement of the strategy is proper staff orientation on CO. Field staff should have the capacity to adapt strategies to specific requirements of the site, who can facilitate social analysis and the development of critical awareness for long-term planning and sustained action. The CO helps the LGU to translate participatory principles into operational terms given opportunities in the titling process.

An external facilitator such as the CO can ensure that the rights of secondary stakeholders including non-landowners are taken care of in the titling process where there might be vested interests by the powerful.

While it is not likely to manifest at the pilot site, project design must recognize a risk that unless there is able external facilitation to oversee LGU role in the titling process, there is the possibility that powerful interests capture the process to the detriment of the powerless.

At the minimum, social preparation can take the form of education on the rights and opportunities inherent to having a title. On the other hand, it is important that the education module point out the risks involved in using the title in open market transactions.

Using title as mortgage instrument is a most dangerous proposition in the current context. Rice and coconut-based production are hardly breakeven. Farmers are not entrepreneurs. Unless there is a program to strengthen the borrowers' entrepreneurial savvy, rates of return on most small business operations are often not high enough to maintain a good credit standing. Titled land should not be put at risk without proper preparation.

At maximum, the project can promote continuing capacity building and organizational development. This is arranged as a function of an established post-title development mechanism/network. At minimum, information must be made available on existing opportunities for development to promote access by LGUs and community organizations.

- *Elements that can be Adopted by/Adapted to Requirements of other Pilots*

Many of the introduced changes in Table 1 do not entail additional cost. These can be adapted to the requirements of other sites.

In addition, enhanced LGU role in existing CRS sites or in sites where LAMP phases out can also be arranged. However, this requires that the facilitator is able to properly explain to the LGU the shift in strategy. This would then require assistance in the preparation of an operational plan to aid the LGU in picking up its proposed functions in the remaining community mobilization activities.

- *Early Mainstreaming of LGU Role and Aspects of CO Process*

Budget cuts and structural change at PIO1 has implications on community mobilization for the remaining phases in barangays where LAMP plans to honor survey contracts or to withdraw. This could be an early opportunity to mainstream increased LGU role in titling and post-title processes. The experience in these barangays can be documented as additional learning sites for LGU involvement with minimum LAMP inputs.

The basis of this recommendation is the result of the Integrated CRS review, which cites as a lesson, the value of an increased role of LGUs in community mobilization. In addition, LGUs consistently acknowledge their mandate to implement local and national programs.

The current strategy hinges on updating development plans of Barangay and community organizations. A sustainability plan is also set in place that identifies and prepares the requirements for initiating and sustaining development activities on field. But

The LGU CO Plan for post-title social preparation can also be adopted

F. Specific Recommendations for LAMP II

1. Consider Name Change of CRS Unit

Customer/Community Relations Service connotes a client/beneficiary-agency relationship. It does not capture the nature, scope and quality of relationship that the project hopes to establish with stakeholders as partners in implementing and in attaining the project's long-term goal of contributing to poverty alleviation and sustainable development.

On the other hand, Community Organizing is all too often associated with a series of steps and less as a set of principles and a body of techniques for critical awareness and mobilizing community and institutional resources to attain common ends. In certain contexts, it is not seen as a neutral methodology. (There were misgivings on CO at PIO1 as a system that needed to be proved.) On the other hand,

The new name should capture concern for the social dimension of project implementation as a step beyond community mobilization for titling.

2. Gender Integration

Gender integration can be made concrete through:

- Promotion of awareness of land rights by women
- Information dissemination/Identifying gender sensitive policies and services
- Planning future implementation of gender sensitive processes and evaluation of this implementation
- What LAMP can do
- Guidelines for good work practice
- Guidelines for women participation in activities
- Action for Women

3. Consider Implications of Social Assessment on Project Strategy

Social assessment was not integral to project implementation in LAMP 1. The design assumptions on the link between titling and poverty reduction may not be empirically supported by the land tenure and socio-economic profile of project communities such as Capilla. Mass titling was the design option because it favors the poor who may have less access to information and titling services.

Social equity issues and the phenomenon of land concentration to a few are emerging factors to be considered. Mass titling entails cost and unless titling improves productivity and social capital, it may not be a very productive national investment if attained at an exorbitant price. In this light, the relative merits of sporadic and mass-titling options may need to be studied as with measures to reduce cost of titling and improve productivity of titled lands.

The role of CSO in addressing post-title concerns can be strengthened.

IV. Conclusions

The pilot is in its first quarter of implementation, thus the observations and recommendations that were put forward were principally based on initial operations and an analysis of design.

The CO pilot effectively broadened the scope of CRS, which focused on community mobilization for titling. CO is here introduced as a vehicle not only to improve efficiency of the titling process but also to help attain LAMP's Social Program Plan. CO uses titling as an entry point for development.

The design for LGU CO establishes LAMP-LGU partnership to facilitate titling. It tries to address community mobilization bottlenecks using CO practices. In addition, it introduces an operational plan to support post-title development consistent with the project goal on poverty alleviation.

The responsiveness of LGU has been demonstrated early on at the pilot site on and is expected to be sustained. This is based on an acknowledgment by the LGU of its role in implementing local and national programs. Action planning and orientation on functions operationalize role change and clarify the application of CO principles in plan implementation.

The comparative assessment of CRS pilots shows that time-tested community organizing principles and processes are likely to be applicable under any titling option (e.g. free patent, sporadic or mass titling) and by any implementing group (NGO, PIO1, LGU). In a sense, the LGU option is not a lesson that needs to be learned; it is a principle that is enshrined in the Local Government Code as a rational way to implement and sustain results of national programs. What is being tested are ways of operationalizing a LAMP-LGU partnership where the former assists the LGU to better perform its two-pronged role in titling and community/sustainable development.

Social investigation and analysis is an integral part of CO that should be part of project implementation under any model. It is essential to project implementation to ensure that issues are properly addressed and for the design of appropriate site-specific community mobilization and development strategies.

The initial review shows that LGU CO has potential to be a lower cost option to community mobilization for titling since it basically involves mostly principles and processes for increased and more meaningful participation. Training and social preparation for post-title options tends to raise the cost structure of CO, despite cost-sharing arrangements. But these represent an investment towards sustainability of processes (more participatory and empowering), and mechanisms and structures to support LGU/community initiatives for post-title development. The pilot gives early indications that the proper application of CO principles and practices such as encouraging self-reliance in all capability-building activities, can, as expected, reduce cost of implementation while improving overall quality of output.

Elements of the design involving LGU role and CO principles can have immediate applicability and can be adapted in varying scopes under different conditions – i.e. where the project withdraws from current sites, where only survey is programmed to occur, where base camps do not exist, where the role of facilitator is taken on by SAT or vice versa. On the whole, systems and tools that are being developed in the pilot have the potential for wider application in CRS.

Key requirements for successful implementation are willing LGU partners, affordable, streamlined systems and methods for titling and training of LGU partners to undertake their roles. Equally important is support from CO/SAT facilitators who have internalized project design and community-organizing principles and who are strong on social analysis.

Poverty reduction can only be realized if titling results in productivity and in the use of titled land as social capital. But in the local context, without social preparation and support services, improvement in land markets may even be inimical to the interest of small farmers who are chronically indebted. There are indications from the municipality and its neighbors, which need to be monitored, that titles might actually hasten the loss of land and result in the concentration of land to a few or to the creation of a new class of landowners (i.e. banks). These and other possible unintended effects have to be addressed by the project through IEC and development planning.

On the other hand, poverty reduction is a national objective that is supported by many programs. So that LAMP does not duplicate this function, communities can be linked to development agencies and service providers. Accessing services from other agencies streamlines LAMP role in post-title development. However, LAMP role in strengthening of organizations and the barangay for post-title initiatives can occur during the period of assistance.

Social preparation is a process that does not end with the filing of title applications, which can happen within 3 – 5 months for free patent. The LGU must therefore establish a mechanism that will continue to support organizational development and access to development opportunities by the people. A continuing role for the CO beyond the titling phase is foreseen while sustainability measures are put in place. The role of the LAG and local governments is critical in sustaining development initiatives.

In the light of the level of investment in mass titling, further study should be made to compare the merits of mass to sporadic titling given site characteristics where there are many who are landless, where landowners are absent, where there is limited productivity and limited plans to increase productivity after titling. Should mass titling be retained as the preferred option, strategies can continue to be worked out to reach non-resident land claimants more effectively.

This early, it can be said that LGU CO efforts in the direction of poverty reduction may be palliative. With titling as the focus, CO is not designed to reverse inequities in the structure of land ownership and poverty given the tendency of land concentration on a few. The LGU CO Implementation Plan only attempts to mitigate the impact of titling on the landless and vulnerable groups. Under such a condition, there is further need to analyze project options on titling and social development.

**Interim Report
LGU CO Pilot**

Attachments

**LGU CO Framework Plan
PIO 1**

Design Summary	Performance Targets	Monitoring Mechanism	Requirements/ Assumptions
Goal			
Titling for poverty reduction More efficient titling systems	New LAMP M and E indicators	Benchmark/social assessment and evaluation reports	Assumptions are reviewed and opportunities to link titling to poverty reduction are enhanced during project life
Purpose of CO Pilot			
Output 2.3 Existing Design The objective of the pilot is to draw up lessons on community mobilization for titling. (1) development of processes and (2) identification of barriers to EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved community mobilization processes: reduced time frame, increased quality of outputs and 	Progress reports	

<p>COMMUNITY ACCEPTABLE AND GENDER-SENSITIVE titling process.”</p>	<p>participation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced costs of community mobilization • Identification and mitigation of negative effects on other sectors • Gender integration 		
<p>Additional: Social preparation for post-title development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post title support mechanisms in place • Improved access to support services • CIM information used in development planning • Identification and mitigation of negative impacts • Land management policies and initiatives by LGU 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-based monitoring and evaluation • Social assessment reports • Progress reports 	<p>LAMP strategy is adjusted to operationalize direct project contribution to link titling to poverty reduction</p>

Outputs			
1. Guidelines for streamlined community mobilization processes thru LGU leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LGU CO Design • Pilot evaluated • Operations Manual for LGU CO: i.e CO Free Patent Flow Chart; TORs prepared • Design and instruments for key activities – Community Based Monitoring and Evaluation, Barangay Development Planning, BC Action Planning workshop, establishment of post-title development mechanism • Report on Lessons 	Project implementation progress reports	
2. Trained implementers (Barangay structures, staff)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site-level CO plan by CO • BC Action plan for LAMP 	Project implementation progress reports	
3. Sustainability structures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barangay Development and sustainability plans and mechanisms for post title 	Progress reports	Means of access to support services facilitated

	development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies on land administration and management by LGU 		
Inputs			
1. Technical Assistance	AusAid counterpart	Progress Reports Project accounts	
2. Personnel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO supervisor • CO 	Pooled cost Salary for CO Pooled cost	-do-	
3. Transport and Communications	Cost	- do -	
4. IEC materials	Targeted distribution of reading materials Strengthened interpersonal communication strategies		
5. Equipment	Computer, camera		
6. Supplies	Office supplies		
7. Training	LAMP counterpart Community/BC counterpart		
8. Contribution to Barangay Development Fund (?)	Fraction of savings from community mobilization		
9. Community, BC and Municipal Government			

counterpart			
10. Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 - 22 weeks for titling process (Free Patent) • Minimum 6 months inclusive of titling process for social preparation component 		<p>Post title support network and mechanisms in place</p> <p>Barangay Development Plan and agency service delivery providers assisting barangay</p> <p>Sustainability plan in place</p>

LGU CO PLAN
PIO 1

Phase/ Component	Activity	Responsibility Center	Time Frame	Outcome/ Performance Target	Indicator
Community Mobilization for Titling <i>(3 – 5 months)</i>					
Preliminary Phases					
1. Team organization	Recruitment Team orientation on CO and action planning workshop with CIM, survey and SAT	Management CO convenes CIM, SAT, Survey team members	1 week 1 day	Qualified staff with proper orientation on CO Enhanced capacity for multi-tasking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOR applied in selection of CO • Common action plan; streamlined procedures of coordination
2. Site selection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site reconnaissance • Secondary data gathering • Introductory briefing of municipal and barangay officials • Barangay Council decides whether to do LGU-led titling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO • Management • CO • CO and management 	2 weeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptance of LGU role in LAMP mobilization and post-title activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site selection criteria applied • TORs for partnership • MOA or LGU resolution
3. Social investigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary data gathering; integration with community; house-house visits, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO with Barangay Council (BC) 	1 week	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness raised on project • Initial social assessment of community • Increased participation in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socio-economic benchmark established • Land tenure profile • Stakeholder analysis • Site-specific CO

				succeeding activities	Plan Participation rate (number of landowners/attendance in Barangay Assembly)
4. Orientation and Action planning by Barangay Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action planning workshop by BC, Lupon, core group, if any 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO 	2 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BC understands and can operationalize roles in various processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action plan with strategies, activities, costs, time frame and responsibility centers
5. Lupon Tagapayapa activation for land cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formation, if not composed Orientation workshop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SAT with CO 	2 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Body can exercise function over land-related cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number/percentage and quality of cases mediated, arbitrated by LT
Community Mobilization Phase for Titling					
1. Initial validation of list and land tenure profiling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key informant panel workshop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BC though established structure or mechanism 	5 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of landowners validated/produced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of landowners validated; accuracy of result
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locate/notify all land claimants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See/send notice to land claimants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BC 	30 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All land claimants notified to come to assembly; those abroad are given SPA forms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage attendance/response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barangay Assembly to orient landowners on project and its requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notification of landowners Barangay Assembly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BC committee BC supported by CO and technical staff 	Half day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further validation of land claimants' profile Claimants know requirements and their responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of claimants validated Percentage land problems identified
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressing project's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BC with CO 	On-going	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved tenure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Binding

projected impact on landless or other sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> situation/options • Advocacy on rights • Groundworking with landed • Planning with landless • Negotiation between landed and occupants 	and SAT		relations; acceptable settlement reached	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> agreements formalized • Type and scope of action on potential negative impacts
2. Survey					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC levels off with survey team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC – survey team meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC with CO and survey contractor 	Half day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey team understand/agree to CO processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey coordinated with community • Local residents as support staff in survey team designated
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC monitors construction of landmarks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC committee 	1 wk	Improved quality of landmarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of output in accordance with set quality standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC mobilizes for monumenting and SNS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissemination on schedules • Collection of landmarks • Monumenting • Monitoring by BC or assigned group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC • Community • Community • BC 	1 week	Timely cooperation in survey activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage compliance with scheduled activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey with SAT interview and ocular inspection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posting and notice of schedules • Survey • Interview and ocular inspection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC • Land claimants 	4 – 8 per day	Improved attendance in and accuracy of survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage attendance an first notice or percentage of reset survey and interview schedules • Number/percentage disputes identified and later resolved out-of-court

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of erroneous surveys due to absence of land claimants
3. Systematic Adjudication					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification and pre-survey settlement of disputes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lupon Tagapamayapa mediation 	Lupon	On-going	Just and expeditious settlement of land claims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage and quality of land problems settled before SAT interview
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mobilization for interview 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barangay assembly or/and other appropriate means 	BC/committee	1 wk	Increased attendance in scheduled activity Potential problem areas and strategies identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of attendance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview and submission of documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview by SAT Ocular inspection Presentation of documents 	BC, SAT with scheduled landowners	Average 5 per day	Landowners interviewed and documents reviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage attendance and compliance with documents needed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategizing to secure lacking documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of cases and strategy formulation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BC with CO and SAT 	½ day	Specific cause of delay addressed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage with lacking documents vs. percentage of timely compliance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Filing of application 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of paper work and documentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land owners with SAT 		Timely filing of application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of claims filed on time
4. Installation of Community Based Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Orientation on process documentation and monitoring systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO and BC 	On the job coaching – on going	BC has systems for process documentation and project monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lessons were documented
Post Title Phase					

1. Case report on pilot experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process documentation by BC and team • Report preparation 	BC, SAT, verifier, CO BC CO	On going 2 weeks	Lessons analyzed and reported	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory documentation and report outputs
2. IEC on opportunities and risks of using title as social capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of education module • IEC campaign on options and service providers, etc. • Barangay development planning • Sustainability planning 	SAT with IM specialist and CO, BC BC BC with CO BC with CO	2 weeks during early phase On going during titling phase During titling phase or before phase out 3 months before phase out	Reduced risk of loss of land while increasing access to credit and development capital/service providers Increased initiatives to improve productivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and type of economic transactions using title; effects of these • Frequency and nature of problems arising from transactions • Number and type of economic and development initiatives/linkages by LGU and community organizations

Social Preparation for Post-Title Development

(6 – 9 months inclusive of titling period)

<p>1. Firm up post-title support mechanism</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish directory of service providers • Establishment of information centers (i.e. Barangay, OSS, municipality) • Meeting with LAG, network members to firm up support and establish mechanisms to improve access by communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LAMP – CO with assistance from assigned staff • Municipal government • Barangay Council • OSS 	<p>Starts during titling process – 3 months</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directory compiled and distributed • Information dissemination mechanisms in place • Network sharing agreements reached in project site (municipal/ barangay) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope of directory • Copies distributed to LGUs and community organizations • Number, type of linkages activated by LGU and community organizations
<p>2. Updating of Barangay Development/Land Use plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updating of Barangay profile thru PRA or other methodologies • Barangay Development planning Wsorkshop • Linkaging, resource mobilization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC • BC with assistance from CO • BC 	<p>2 weeks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased linkages by LGU and community organizations with support service providers for agriculture, organizational development, training, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated Barangay profile • Updated Barangay Development plan • Action plan for BDP implementation • Number of organizations with action plans for linkaging to access external support services • Policies and programs on land management
<p>3. Encourage LGU initiatives relative to land management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of issues and plans for support by municipal government and LAG 	<p>BC, CO and team MPDC, LAG, municipal government</p>	<p>2 months</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased initiatives on land management/ development • Passage of appropriate resolutions or policies • Activation of LGU linkage with support network members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and type of municipal/barangay LGU initiatives for development • Number and description of activated linkages with service providers (barangay and municipal levels) • Number of property rights of institutional lands confirmed • Number and type of resolutions passed

LGU CO FLOWCHART FOR FREE PATENT

