

Philippines-Australia Land Administration and Management Project

EXIT SURVEY FOR LAMP PIO1 ONE-STOP-SHOP

August 2004

REPORT C51



This report is a result of technical assistance managed by Land Equity International to the Government of Philippines. The TA was funded by AusAID and the views expressed in this work do not necessarily represent the views of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Executive Summary

The exit survey was conducted among 200 clients of the OSS from June to July 2004 using a structured interview schedule. The survey was supplemented with interviews of OSS staff and other clients. The study found that most of the clients were women, relatively highly educated and older and coming from nearby municipalities. They heard about the OSS from government officials and they easily located the OSS offices.

They usually came in the morning and most of them had had previous visits to the OSS. Nearly half of them completed their transactions and the most common reason for those who did not complete their transactions was the lack of required documents. The transactions were varied and the most common was to get certified copies of documents usually with the ROD. Transaction expenses included food and transportation and fees. Fees paid ranged from a few pesos to several thousand pesos. Those who had completed their transactions spent more than those who did not. Some had previous transactions with other agencies but they generally found no difference between those agencies and the OSS. Those who had had prior visits to the OSS did not notice changes in the OSS between these visits.

The staff and certain procedural aspects at the OSS were generally favorably rated by clients but they were not very impressed by the OSS as shown by their "satisfactory" rating. The CENRO was rated the least relatively and those who had completed their transactions had rated the OSS more favorably than those who did not. There were a few problems cited and the most serious was the nonissuance of receipts for fees paid. Most of these occurred at the ROD. Most clients would recommend to others the services of the OSS because they found it to be beneficial.

It is recommended that the OSS undertake the following:

1. Aggressively disseminate information on two things: (1) on the importance of titling itself and, (2) on the services offered by the OSS. The information should contain process flows, listing of required documents and processing fees. The information material can take several forms. (1) detailed pamphlets (2) posters that can be posted in municipal and city halls. Information materials should be made available at least in municipal, city and provincial assessors' treasurers' and BIR offices.
2. **Production and dissemination of Flowcharts at the front desk..** Flowcharts should also be made available in print to clients who come to the OSS aside from those posted at the lobby.

3. **Production and dissemination of lists of requirements for particular transactions at the front desk.** Since clients come to the OSS for various purposes, there should be several lists. The reception desk should be able to tick the documents submitted against this list for quicker appraisal.
4. **Production and dissemination of fee schedules at the front desk.** Charges and fees should be listed by type of service provided and document obtained.
5. **Use of standard forms.** Since many clients come to the OSS to get common documents these can be standardized and computerized templates of such documents should be made.
6. **Seminars for employees for better client orientation.** Employees can profit from a few tips from professionals on how to deal with clients.
7. **Stamp out corruption.** This can be partly solved if a schedule of fees is provided to the clients so that they can check whether the fees reflected the services provided. Another solution that can be resorted to is a complaints desk preferably in a separate section within the OSS. Furthermore, strict administrative sanctions against erring staff should be meted after a thorough and impartial investigation in order to discourage these malpractices.

Table of Contents

Title	Page Number
Introduction	
Objective	1
Methodology	1
Findings	3
Characteristics of Clients	3
<i>Place of Origin of Respondents</i>	3
<i>Gender, Age, Education and Status of Ownership of the Object of Transaction</i>	3
<i>Knowledge about the OSS</i>	5
Transaction Information	6
<i>Time of Arrival, Office Consulted and Purpose of Visit</i>	6
<i>Completion of Transaction</i>	7
<i>Output of Completed Transactions and Reasons for Noncompletion of Transaction</i>	8
<i>Expenses Incurred in the Transaction</i>	9
<i>Fees Paid and Issuance of Receipt</i>	11
<i>Perceived Reasonability/Unreasonability of Expenses</i>	11
Previous Transaction Information	13
<i>Party Involved, Number of Times Visited and Date of Last Visit</i>	13
<i>Purpose of Previous Transactions</i>	14
<i>Comparison with Other Agencies</i>	15
<i>Changes In the OSS Noticed Between Current and Previous Visits</i>	16
Assessment of OSS	17
<i>Assessment of Some Procedural Aspects</i>	17
<i>Assessment of Staff Qualities</i>	18
<i>General Assessment of the OSS</i>	19
Problems and Suggestions for Improvement	21
<i>Problems in Dealing with OSS and Suggestions for Improvements</i>	21
Conclusions and Recommendations	23
<i>Conclusions</i>	23
<i>Recommendations</i>	25
Appendices	
<i>A. Appendix Tables</i>	29
<i>B. Interview Schedule</i>	31

List of Tables and Appendix Tables

Title	Page Number
Table 1. <i>Gender, age, education and ownership of the object of the transaction</i>	4
Table 2. <i>Knowledge about the OSS</i>	5
Table 3. <i>Time of arrival, office consulted and purpose of visit</i>	6
Table 4. <i>Previous visit, completion and length of time of completion</i>	7
Table 5. <i>Previous transaction experience and completion of transaction</i>	8
Table 6. <i>Completion of transaction by office</i>	8
Table 7. <i>Result or output obtained</i>	9
Table 8. <i>Reason for noncompletion of transaction</i>	9
Table 9. <i>Total expenses incurred in the transaction</i>	10
Table 10. <i>Transaction expenses and completion of transaction</i>	10
Table 11. <i>Fees paid</i>	11
Table 12. <i>Issuance of receipts for fees</i>	12
Table 13. <i>Respondents' opinion of the reasonability/unreasonability of expenses</i>	13
Table 14. <i>Expenses and respondents' opinion of the reasonability of the amount</i>	13
Table 15. <i>Previous transactions</i>	14
Table 16. <i>Purpose of previous transactions</i>	15
Table 17. <i>Completion of previous transaction</i>	15
Table 18. <i>Previous experience in similar transactions with other Agencies</i>	16
Table 19. <i>Comparison of OSS with other agencies</i>	16
Table 20. <i>Changes noticed in the OSS</i>	17
Table 21. <i>Assessment of some procedural aspects OSS services</i>	18
Table 22. <i>Assessment of staff qualities</i>	19
Table 23. <i>General assessment of the OSS</i>	20
Table 24. <i>General assessment by office</i>	20
Table 25. <i>General assessment by amount of expenses incurred</i>	20
Table 26. <i>General assessment by completion of transaction</i>	21
Table 27. <i>Recommendation to others</i>	21
Table 28. <i>Problems met in dealing with OSS and suggestions for improvement</i>	22
Appendix Table 1. <i>Number of respondents by day of the week</i>	29
Appendix Table 2. <i>Place of origin of clients</i>	29
Appendix Table 3. <i>Completion of transaction by transaction</i>	30

INTRODUCTION

The One Stop Shop in Leyte has been operational since March 2002. With the colocation of offices, it is believed that the OSS has benefited the public in terms of cost savings in the processing of transactions in different offices. Since its operation, a number of improvements have been introduced to make the services more relevant to the public. A single lodgment counter was instituted in 2002, and a merged counter operations was introduced in June 2003, wherein representatives from different agencies have been designated to man the front desk. The intention is to provide faster, efficient service, especially for clients who are seeking advice or information on the processes and the requirements regarding their transactions. While there have been regular assessment among the agencies on the operations of the OSS, there has never been an evaluation of the overall improvement in service delivery from the viewpoint of the clients.

The intent of the OSS is to improve service delivery using as indicator, improved user satisfaction with the services provided relative to efficiency and quality of the service, the cost to the user (both financially and in terms of time and inconvenience etc), and the nature of the interaction with the front-line staff. This exit survey, supplemented with selected interviews from both staff and clients other than those in the survey was deemed an effective method of determining user satisfaction.

Objective

The objective of this survey was to determine client/user satisfaction with the services of the OSS.

Methodology

The survey was conducted following the activities listed below:

Review of the survey instrument in consultation with OSS staff. Interviews with key OSS and DENR staff were interviewed to solicit their views and concerns on the OSS and the exit survey. Their inputs were useful in formulating the interview schedule.

Training of interviewers, pretesting and finalization of instrument. As soon as the instrument was ready it was pretested under the supervision of the consultant. Four clients were interviewed and after reviewing the results it was decided to proceed with the final interviews with minor revisions. The pretest was done after the interviewer was briefed on the OSS, the exit survey and an item-by-item review of the questions and how to conduct the interviews.

Data gathering. Although the printed schedule was not translated from English into the local language, the interviews were conducted in Waray or Cebuano depending on the native language of the respondent. Two interviewers

conducted the interviews of 200 respondents spanning more or less five weeks. Additional interviews were conducted with other clients by phone and in person by the consultant to validate the results of the survey. Considering the time constraints and concerns on bias, the sampling was based on the actual number of clients per day on a one-month period using the data for April, the nearest month to the survey. It was found that on the average the number of clients who went to the OSS on a day was between 20 and 27 or an average of 23. The number of respondents interviewed per day is shown in Appendix Table 1. The lower total number interviewed on Monday was because for practical purposes, the interviews were ready to be implemented on a Wednesday and there was another Monday which was skipped because the number of clients was low due to the fiesta of Tacloban City. The lower number also on Friday was because the total number coming on a Friday was generally lower than other days.

Analysis. The data were encoded using the Excel program and analyzed using SPSS to run descriptive statistics, mainly frequency counts and measures of central tendency.

FINDINGS

Characteristics of Respondents

Place of Origin of Respondents. Nearly one half (46.5%) of the clients came from the first district which is composed of towns immediately around the OSS with a good proportion (29%) from around Palo and Tacloban City. Respondents from the second district, the next nearest towns to the OSS constituted 20 percent. The rest were generally distributed around the many towns of Leyte. There were a few (1.5%) who came from outside Leyte who also visited to OSS (Appendix Table 2). There were no respondents from 8 of the 41 municipalities of Leyte province. The preponderance of clients from nearby places was most likely due to their proximity to the OSS. This proximity predisposes more clients to avail of OSS services because of: (1) greater awareness by the public near the OSS about its existence and, (2) shorter travel time to and from the OSS which results to lower transportation cost and shorter time away from home and work.

Gender, Age, Education and Status of Ownership of the Object of Transaction. Two thirds (66%) of the respondents were females. Most (79%) of them were older than 35 with slightly more than one half (51%) between 36-55 years old. Over two thirds (67.5%) attended or completed college and post collegiate education. Slightly over one half (52%) were either owners or co-owners of the land or property they were transacting for. The rest (48%) were representatives (Table 1).

Why did women outnumber men in making the transactions? One explanation could be that women are usually sent by the family to make transactions because they are usually keepers of documents, hence, they are more familiar with these and are deemed in a better position to make relevant transactions. Another is that the men usually work and would prefer their wives even if they work too to deal with matters that would take time out of their work.

Table 1. Gender, age, education and ownership of the object of the transaction.

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	68	34.00
Female	132	66.00
Total	200	100.00
Age		
25 and below	3	5.00
26-35	32	16.00
36-45	47	23.50
46-55	55	27.50
56-65	36	18.00
Above 65	27	13.50
Total	200	100.00
Min	17	
Max	82	
Mean	49.12	
Educational Attainment		
Elementary	20	10.00
High School	45	22.50
College	126	63.00
Post College	9	4.50
Total	200	100.00
Min	2	
Max	23	
Mean	12.15	
Status of Client		
Owner/Co-owner	104	52.00
Representative	96	48.00
Total	200	100.00

One would also notice the preponderance of older clients (average age: 49). This must be because they must be old enough to personally know and be conversant about the history and other particulars of the land in question and be familiar with the documents. They should also have enough education in order to read and write in English, which is the official language of government for them to be able to go through the intricacies of the transactions and the many requirements and processes these involved. Notice also the high percentage of representatives. This can mean that they were probably selected or designated by the concerned parties to do the transactions in their behalf because of their familiarity with the intricacies of the transactions. Not a few of them were professional agents who frequently transacted with the OSS.

Knowledge about the OSS. The most common sources of information about the OSS were government officials (71%) and friends and relatives (60.5%). More than nine-tenths (93%) knew that the OSS was engaged in

processing land titles. There were a few who thought it was also engaged with matters concerning trees probably because of the CENRO. The majority (93%) said that the OSS was easy to find and they were told how to go there either by friends and relatives (46.50%) and government officials (32.5%). Drivers (17%) were also a good source of information on the location of the OSS (Table 2).

Table 2. Knowledge about the OSS.

Knowledge Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Sources of Information about OSS*		
	N=200	
Government officials	142	71.00
Friends/Relatives	121	60.50
Radio	11	5.50
Others: <i>Newspaper, cooperative</i>	4	2.00
Knowledge about OSS*		
	N=200	%
Processes/helps process land title	186	93.00
They do good work	8	4.00
OSS has complete package of services	6	3.00
Processes trees	3	1.50
Others: <i>OSS is more organized, Doesn't process without grease money, ROD is here</i>	3	1.50
Ease in Finding the OSS		
Easy	186	93.00
Difficult	14	7.00
Total	200	100.00
Sources of Direction*		
	N=200	%
Friends/Relatives	93	46.50
Government officials	65	32.50
Driver	34	17.00
Self	10	5.00
Members/Officers of Cooperative	5	2.50

* *multiple response*

Transaction Information

Time of Arrival, Office Consulted and Purpose of Visit. Generally more clients (61%) came in the morning with 44 percent coming in the earlier morning hours between 8:00-10:00 o'clock. The rest came in the afternoon with only 10.5 percent arriving after 3:00 o'clock. More than seven-tenths (72.5%) went to the ROD. The rest went to the CENRO and LAMP offices. A good number (12.5%) visited two offices such as LAMP and ROD or ROD and CENRO (Table 3).

Table 3. Time of arrival, office consulted and purpose of visit.

Transaction Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Time of Arrival		
Early hours (8-10)	88	44.00
Mid-morning (10:01-12:00)	34	17.00
Early afternoon (12:01-3:00)	57	28.50
Late afternoon (3:01-5:00)	21	10.50
Total	200	100.00
Office Consulted		
LAMP-OSS	14	7.00
ROD	145	72.50
CENRO	16	8.00
LAMP & ROD	11	5.50
LAMP & CENRO	4	2.00
ROD & CENRO	10	5.00
Total	200	100.00
Purpose of Visit*		
	N=200	
Get certified copy of document	54	27.00
Register land	38	19.00
Follow-up papers	28	14.00
Transfer ownership of land	24	12.00
Inquire about land status	18	9.00
Submit documents	13	6.50
Annotate title	6	3.00
Cancel bail bond	4	2.00
Register mortgage	4	2.00
Pay fees	4	2.00
Publish	4	2.00
Get certification of untitled land	4	2.00
Apply for survey	3	1.50
Cancel mortgage	3	1.50
Get sketch plan	2	1.00
Others: <i>Photo documentation, Land separation, Inquire rights of tenants, Transfer / Register tax declaration, Apply for free patent</i>	6	3.00

* *multiple response*

Clients had varied purposes at the OSS. The most common of these were to get certified copies of documents (25.23%), register land (17.76%), follow-up previous transactions (12.62%) and transfer ownership of land (11.21%). The rest were about various matters on land and land registration. All except one said their purpose was served by the OSS. This single individual said he could not transact his business at OSS because there were no records about the land he was referring to).

Completion of Transaction. The majority (70%) of the respondents had been to the OSS previously. The rest (30%) came for the first time. Slightly over one half (51%) of those who came had completed their transactions. More than one half (57%) completed their transaction in half an hour or less. A few (7.8%) even had their transactions completed in 5 minutes or less. Still fewer (.25%) got their transaction completed in more than half a day. The average time of completion was 54.21 minutes or about one hour (Table 4).

Table 4. Previous visit, completion and length of time of completion.

Transaction Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Previous Transaction Experience at OSS		
Had previous visits	140	70.00
First visit only	60	30.00
Total	200	100.00
Completion of Current Transaction		
Completed	102	51.00
Not completed	98	49.00
Total	200	100.00
Time Completed (minutes)		
5 or less	8	7.84
6-30	49	48.04
31-60	19	18.63
61-120	21	22.54
More than 120	5	2.94
Total	102	100.00
Min.	2	
Max.	360	
Average time of completion	54.21	

Nearly half (48.30 %) of first time visitors while slightly more than half (52.10%) of repeat visitors completed their transactions (Table 5). Slightly higher completion rates were reported at CENRO (53.30%) and ROD (53.10%) than at OSS-LAMP (50.00) (Table 6). Some transactions were more readily completed than others such as cancellation of mortgage (100.00%), annotation of title (83.30%), cancellation of bail bond (75.00%), and getting certified copy of documents (73.10%). Other transactions such as registering land (64.90%) and transferring ownership (71.40%) were not easily completed. There was a higher rate of completion by those who reported higher expenses (App. Table 3).

Table 5. Previous transaction experience and completion of transaction.

Previous Transaction Experience	Completed		Not completed		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
First visit only	29	48.30	31	51.70	60	30.00
Had previous visits	73	52.10	67	47.90	140	70.00
Total	102	51.00	98	49.00	200	100.00

Table 6. Completion of transaction by office.

Office Consulted	Completed		Not completed		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
LAMP-OSS	7	50.00	7	50.00	14	7.00
ROD	77	53.10	68	46.90	145	72.50
CENRO	8	53.30	8	46.70	16	8.00
LAMP & ROD	6	54.50	5	45.50	11	5.50
LAMP & CENRO	1	25.00	3	75.00	4	2.00
ROD & CENRO	3	30.00	7	70.00	10	5.00
Total	102	51.00	98	49.00	200	100.00

Output of Completed Transactions and Reasons for Noncompletion of Transaction. The clients obtained various results in terms of documents and services depending on the transaction. The most common documents obtained were certified copies of documents (35.29%) and land titles (12.74%) (Table 7). Those who had not completed their transactions (49%) had various reasons for such with half (51%) of them lacking documents. Yet another reason reported by 15.31 percent of current and 13.16 percent of previous transactions was the absence of personnel (Table 8). This specific cause of noncompletion can be prevented through administrative solutions. Almost all (97%) of those who had not completed their transactions wanted to come back to complete their transactions. The very few who were not coming back said the OSS was too far and they had other things to attend to.

Table 7. Result or output obtained.

Result/Output of Completed Transaction*	N=102	Percentage
Certified copy of documents	36	35.29
Information	22	21.57
Land Title	13	12.74

Other documents	12	11.76
Registered document	6	5.88
Title annotated	5	4.90
Cancellation of Mortgage	5	4.90
Tax Declaration	3	2.94
Document submitted	3	2.94
Certificate of Withdrawal of Bail Bond	2	1.96

* *multiple response*

Table 8. Reason for noncompletion of transaction.

Reason*	N=98	Percentage
Lacked documents	51	52.04
Office personnel absent	15	15.31
Still in process	13	13.26
For publication	10	10.20
Concerned party's presence required	4	4.08
Lacked time	3	3.06
Lacked money to pay fees	3	3.06
Needed lawyer's action	2	2.04

* *multiple response*

Expenses Incurred in the Transaction. One third (34%) of the respondents spent a total of less than P100 pesos for the transaction including transportation, food and fees. Two fifths (41.5%) spent between P101-P500 pesos. The average expense was P370.21 pesos (Table 9). For those who came from far towns, the expenses for transportation and food can be high. The farthest town from the OSS is Matalom and the round trip fare from there to OSS would be more or less three hundred pesos. Necessarily, clients from far towns would also spend for breakfast in Palo or Tacloban if they started early and/or lunch since they will be on the road usually until after lunch time. The largest item of expense was fees which, for some, amounted to a few thousand pesos. Generally, those who had completed their transactions spent more (ave: P469.46) than those who had not completed (ave: P266.91) (Table 10).

Table 9. Total expenses incurred in the transaction.

Transaction Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Total Expenses (pesos)	N	%
P100 or less	68	34.00
P101-P500	83	41.50
P501-1000	37	18.50
P1001-2000	9	4.50
P2001 or more	3	1.50
Total	200	100.00
Min.	P 10.00	
Max.	P 6,159.00	
Ave.	P 370.21	

Total Expenses for Completed Transaction		
P100 or less	24	23.53
P101-P500	46	45.10
P501-1000	24	23.53
P1001-2000	6	5.88
P2001 or more	2	1.96
Total	102	100.00
Min.	P 10.00	
Max.	P 6,159.00	
Ave.	P 469.46	
Total Expense for Uncompleted Transaction		
P100 or less	44	44.90
P101-P500	37	37.75
P501-1000	13	13.26
P1001-2000	3	3.06
P2001 or more	1	2.04
Total	98	100.00
Min.	P 10.00	
Max.	P 2,400.00	
Ave.	P 266.91	

Table 10. Transaction expenses and completion of transaction.

Total Expenses (pesos)	Completed		Not completed		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
P100 or less	24	35.30	44	64.70	68	34.00
P101-P500	46	55.40	37	44.60	83	41.50
P501-1000	24	64.90	13	35.10	37	18.50
P1001-2000	6	66.70	3	33.30	9	4.50
P2001 or more	2	66.70	1	33.30	3	1.50
Total	102	51.00	98	49.00	200	100.00

Fees Paid and Issuance of Receipt. More than one half (57.5 %) paid fees ranging from P21.00-P2,200.00 pesos (Table 11) and among them 83.48 percent reported they were given receipts fully. The rest did not get any receipts because they said these shall be given after the transaction will have been completed, the amount paid was for documentary stamps or did not know why no receipt was issued or did not ask for receipts. The amounts that were not receipted ranged from less than P100.00 pesos to more than P2,000.00 pesos. Nearly three quarters (73.68%) of those not issued receipts were clients of ROD (Table 12).

Table 11. Fees paid.

Transaction Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Fees Paid (Pesos)		
P100 or less	43	37.39
P101-P500	45	39.13
P501-1000	20	17.39
P1001-2000	4	3.48
P2001 or more	3	2.60
Total	115	100.00
Min.	P 12.00	
Max.	P 5,659.00	
Ave.	P 398.63	

Perceived Reasonability/Unreasonability of Expenses. A good majority (84.5%) thought the expenses were reasonable because they were contented with the service (31.36%), the fees were commensurate with the service (22.48%) and the rates were normal (21.89%). Those who thought the expenses were unreasonable said the fees did not coincide with the receipt and that the transactions were expensive (Table 13). Clients tended to consider the expenses reasonable as they spent less (Table 14).

Table 12. Issuance of receipts for fees.

Issuance of Receipts	Frequency	Percentage
Received	96	83.48
Not received	17	14.78
Received/Not received	2	1.74
Total	115	100.00
Office Where No Receipt was Issued		
LAMP-OSS	1	5.26
LAMP/ROD	3	15.79
ROD	14	73.68
ROD/CENRO	1	5.26
Total	19	100.00
Amount of Fees Paid without Receipt		
P100 or less	8	42.10
P101-P500	6	31.58
P501-1000	4	21.05
P1001-2000	0	0.00
P2001 or more	1	5.26
Total	19	100.00
Min.	P 21.00	
Max.	P 2,200.00	
Ave.	P 461.89	
Reasons for Non Issuance of Receipt		
Don't know	5	26.31
To be given later after completion	4	21.05
For Documentary stamps	4	21.05
Payment for publication	3	15.79
Others: <i>Forgot to ask, Payment for inspection, Did not give receipt</i>	3	15.79
Total	19	100.00

Table 13. Respondents' opinion of the reasonability/unreasonability of expenses.

Reasonability of expenses	Frequency	Percentage
Reasonable	169	84.50
Unreasonable	31	15.50
Total	200	100.00
Why Reasonable*	N=169	%
Contented with service	53	31.36
Commensurate with service	38	22.48
Rates were normal	37	21.89
Personal expenses only	26	15.38
Expenses receipted	12	7.10
Good service	4	2.37
Why Not Reasonable*	N=31	%
Expensive	12	38.71
Receipt did not reflect actual amount paid	9	29.03
Didn't get what was needed	6	19.35
Poor service	4	12.90
High cost of transportation and food	3	9.68

* *multiple response*

Table 14. Expenses and respondents' opinion of the reasonability of the amount.

Total Expenses (pesos)	Reasonable		Unreasonable		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
P100 or less	60	88.20	8	11.80	68	34.00
P101-P500	70	84.30	13	15.70	83	41.50
P501-1000	30	81.10	7	18.90	37	18.50
P1001-2000	7	77.80	2	22.20	9	4.50
P2001 or more	2	66.70	1	33.30	3	1.50
Total	169	84.50	31	15.50	200	100.00

Previous Transaction Information.

Party Involved, Number of Times Visited and Date of Last Visit. For the majority who have had previous transactions with the OSS, these transactions were generally done by the respondents (92.14%) themselves. Note that the respondents could be representatives themselves. Half of them had been to the OSS from one to three times before (49.99%) and the other half had been there more than three times. The most number of visits was reported by someone who said he usually came to the OSS every Thursday and Friday. Obviously, this must be someone who is engaged in these transactions as a trade or business. The majority (82.14%) of repeat visitors came within the year 2004 and mostly in May and June or a month or less prior to the interviews (Table 15).

Table 15. Previous transactions.

	Frequency	Percentage
Who did previous transaction		
Respondent	129	92.14
Other family member	8	5.71
Owner	1	0.71
Representative	2	1.42
Total	140	100.00
Number of times transacted before		
1	1	0.71
2	45	32.14
3	24	17.14
4	10	7.14
5	24	17.14
More than 5 but not more than 10	26	18.57
More than 10	10	7.14
Total	140	100.00
Min	1	
Max	50	
Ave.	4.99	
Date of last visited to OSS		
2001	2	1.43
2002	2	1.43
2003	21	15.00
2004	(115)	82.14
January	4	2.86
February	5	3.57
March	6	4.28
April	18	12.86
May	31	22.14
June	49	35.00
July	2	1.43
Total	140	100.00

Purpose of Previous Transactions. The purposes of previous transactions were not much different from those of the current. The most common of these was to follow up previous transactions, register land and submit documents (Table 16).

Table 16. Purpose of previous transactions.

Purpose*	N=140	Percentage
Follow-up previous transactions	39	27.86
Register land	24	17.14
Submit documents	23	16.43
Another transaction from present	11	7.86

Research/Inquiry	8	5.71
Get land title	7	5.00
Retitling of land	5	3.57
Get documents	4	2.86
Transfer ownership of land	3	2.14
Same as present transaction	3	2.14
Get certification of untitled land	2	1.43
Request for cancellation decision	2	1.43
Pay fees	2	1.43
Others: <i>Get certification, consolidation of title, get CSS, get COM, hearing, get clearance, get CTC of title, get incentives, transfer data from geographical to numerical</i>	9	6.43

**multiple response*

It is obvious that most (54.29%) of those who came before had uncompleted transactions and that they had visited the OSS at the time of interview precisely to complete those previous transactions. The most common (55.26%) reason for the noncompletion of previous transactions was the lack of documents as was the case of current transactions (Table 17).

Table 17. Completion of previous transaction.

Completion of previous transaction	Frequency	Percentage
Completed	64	45.71
Not completed	76	54.29
Total	140	100.00
Why not completed	N=76	%
Lacked documents	42	55.26
OSS unsystematic	12	15.79
Officials not available	10	13.16
No money to pay fees	6	7.89
Under process	5	6.58
Not enough time	2	2.63
Others: <i>Mistake in publishing; Don't know</i>	2	2.63

Comparison with Other Agencies. Nearly one third of the respondents, (30.5%) had had similar transactions with one other agency. A few had dealt with two other agencies. These agencies included the PENRO/CENRO, BIR and local ROD offices to name a few (Table 18). While many (32.79%) of them said they did not find any difference between their experience with OSS and with those agencies others had noticed some differences, generally positive about the OSS such as its relative speed and systematization. Others said the opposite: OSS was slow, more expensive, etc (Table 19).

Table 18. Previous experience in similar transactions with other agencies.

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
Had similar transaction with other agencies	N	%
Yes	61	30.50
No	139	68.50
Total	200	100.00
Other Agencies transacted with*	N=61	%
BIR	25	40.98
DENR/PENRO/CENRO	10	14.59
City/Province ROD	9	14.75
Assessor	5	8.20
DAR	5	8.20
NHA	2	3.28
Others: <i>(Bulwagan ng Katarungan, Bureau of Lands, LRA, LRC, DA, Coop)</i>	6	9.84

Table 19. Comparison of OSS with other agencies.

Comparison between OSS and other agencies*	Frequency N=61	Percentage
The same	20	32.79
OSS was faster	12	19.67
OSS was better organized	11	18.03
OSS was slower	9	14.75
OSS was more expensive	3	4.92
OSS had less requirements	2	3.28
OSS was more client oriented	2	3.28
Others: <i>Just one stop at OSS, Still had to go to OSS from that agency, Staff at OSS were more courteous, OSS can issue title, others cannot, OSS will not accept if not passed from BIR, OSS had more requirements, OSS was less systematic</i>	7	11.47

* *multiple response*

Changes In the OSS Noticed Between Current and Previous Visits.

Not many repeat visitors noticed changes at the OSS between their previous and current visits. Since many of the respondents really came within the last month or two in between, very few changes can really have happened if there were any at all. But some noticed positive changes such as the efficiency and courtesy of the staff. Others noticed negative changes such as the poor service at OSS. One can readily almost conclude that the observations of the respondents were more conditioned by the personal contact they probably had with individual staff rather than the whole OSS organization and procedures (Table 20).

Table 20. Changes noticed in the OSS.

Noticed Changes in OSS	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	26	18.57
No	114	81.43
Total	140	100.00
Changes	N=26	%
Staff were more efficient/courteous	16	61.54
More efficient system	4	15.38
Had reception service	1	3.85
Building and facilities were completed	1	3.85
Poor service	2	7.69
Staff were inefficient/discourteous	2	7.69
Total	200	100.00

Assessment of the OSS

Assessment of Some Procedural Aspects. The majority of respondents (91.5%) said they were served immediately as they arrived. Some waited only for a few minutes but a few reported that they had to wait for more than one hour before they were served. The majority (91.5%) were able to consult the appropriate staff; 89.5 percent said they were explained the steps necessary for the completion of their transaction; 88.5 percent were explained about the requirements and 65 percent were told of the time frame within which their transaction could be completed but less than one half (46.5%) were given cost estimates for the completion of their transaction (Table 21).

Table 21. Assessment of some procedural aspects OSS services.

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
Immediacy of service		
Yes	183	91.50
No	17	8.50
Total	200	100.00
Waiting time if not served immediately		
Less than 5 min.	6	35.29
6-30 min	5	29.41
31- 1 hr.	2	11.76
More than 1 hr.	4	23.53
Total	17	100.00
Ave.	48.52 min.	
Consultation with appropriate staff		
Yes	183	91.50
No	17	8.50
Total	200	100.00
Explanation on the steps for completion		
Yes	179	89.50
No	21	10.50
Total	200	100.00
Information about requirements		
Yes	177	88.50
No	23	11.50
Total	200	100.00
Information on timeframe for completion		
Yes	130	65.00
No	70	35.00
Total	200	100.00
Estimation of costs		
	N	%
Yes	93	46.50
No	107	53.50
Total	200	100.00

Assessment of Staff Qualities. The respondents' assessment of the staff was generally positive. Almost all (99.5%) rated them as friendly or very friendly, more than eight tenths (88%) rated them as fast or very fast, almost all (99%) rated them as knowledgeable or very knowledgeable and 94.5 percent rated them as honest or very honest. The worst ratings, although by a small proportion of the respondents were on speed on which 12 percent rated the staff as slow and on honesty on which 5.5 percent rated the staff as dishonest (Table 22).

Table 22. Assessment of staff qualities.

Qualities	Frequency	Percentage
Friendliness		
Very friendly	60	30.00
Friendly	139	69.50
Not Friendly	1	0.50
Total	200	100.00
Speed		
Very fast	24	12.00
Fast	152	76.00
Slow	24	12.00
Total	200	100.00
Knowledgeability		
Very knowledgeable	38	19.00
Knowledgeable	160	80.00
Less knowledgeable	2	1.00
Total	200	100.00
Honesty		
Very honest	21	10.50
Honest	168	84.00
Dishonest	11	5.50
Total	200	100.00

General Assessment of the OSS. Despite the positive remarks about some procedural aspects of the OSS and the generally positive ratings of staff qualities, in general, the OSS was rated only as satisfactory by 60.50 percent of the respondents; 14.5 percent rated it as outstanding and nobody rated it poor because the respondents perceived it rendered good service and the staff were courteous (Table 23). Note that while the majority rated the OSS positively, they seemed unimpressed. A satisfactory rating is a barely passing mark. More or less 20 percent had negative remarks with their rating. The ratings were consistent regardless of the office consulted although the CENRO was comparatively rated lower than the other offices (Table 24). In addition, expenses incurred did not affect the ratings somehow because the pattern shows that regardless of amount spent, the ratings were more or less consistent (Table 25). It is very clear, however, that those who had completed their transactions gave higher ratings than those who had not completed (Table 26).

Table 23. General assessment of the OSS.

Assessment	Frequency	Percentage
Rating		
Outstanding	29	14.50
Very satisfactory	46	23.00
Satisfactory	121	60.50

Fair	4	2.00
Total	200	100.00
Reason for Rating*	N=200	%
Staff were courteous	70	35.00
Good service	37	18.50
Satisfied with service	36	18.00
Service just ok	29	14.50
Got what was needed	15	7.50
Poor service	20	10.00
Did not get what was needed	11	5.50
Staff were discourteous/inefficient	10	5.00

**multiple response*

Table 24. General assessment by office.

Office Rating	LAMP		ROD		CENRO		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Outstanding	5	35.72	21	14.48	0	0.00	26	14.86
Very satisfactory	2	14.28	34	23.45	3	18.75	39	22.28
Satisfactory	7	50.00	87	60.00	12	75.00	106	60.57
Fair	0	0.00	3	2.07	1	6.25	4	2.28
Total	14	100.00	145	100.00	16	100.00	175*	100.00

**Total for those who visited one office only.*

Table 25. General assessment by amount of expenses incurred.

Expenses Rating	Outstanding		Very satisfactory		Satisfactory		Fair		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
P100 or less	10	34.50	13	28.30	43	35.50	2	11.10	68	34.00
P101-P500	13	44.80	20	43.50	49	40.50	1	44.40	83	41.50
P501-1000	5	17.20	9	19.60	22	18.20	1	44.40	37	18.50
P1001-2000	1	3.40	4	8.70	4	3.30	0	0.00	9	4.50
P2001 or more	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.50	0	0.00	3	1.50
Total	29	100.00	46	100.00	121	100.00	4	100.00	200	100.00

Table 26. General assessment by completion of transaction.

Transaction Rating	Completed		Not Completed		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Outstanding	18	62.10	11	37.90	29	100.00
Very satisfactory	33	71.70	13	28.30	46	100.00
Satisfactory	50	41.30	71	58.70	121	100.00
Fair	1	25.00	3	75.00	4	100.00
Total	102	100.00	98	100.00	200	100.00

Asked if they would recommend the OSS to others, the majority (96%) responded yes so that others will know and benefit from the OSS. Those very few who would not recommend said the service was poor or it was harder to transact at OSS (Table 27).

Table 27. Recommendation to others.

	Frequency	Percentage
Would Recommend OSS to Others		
Yes	193	95.00
No	7	4.00
Total	200	100.00
Why Recommend*		
	N=193	%
So others will know/benefit	89	44.50
OSS helps process land titles	64	32.00
No other agency to process land titles	33	16.50
Good service	9	4.50
Easier to transact here	1	0.50

Problems in Dealing with OSS and Suggestions for Improvements.

More than nine tenths (91%) said they had no problems in dealing with the OSS. those who said they had listed the following (Table 28). Two glaring comments albeit reported by very few were about the staff being corrupt and the loss of titles at OSS. These were very few but serious problems that should not be taken lightly. The many suggestions listed in Table 16 include both procedural and attitudinal matters that can be dealt with in the immediate and medium term and within the mandate of the OSS. One is to increase staff efficiency, another is to disseminate more information about the OSS. Having branch offices is may be impractical but having a BIR unit at OSS is fully within its mandate.

Table 28. Problems met in dealing with OSS and suggestions for improvement.

Problem/Suggestion	Frequency	Percentage
Had Problems in Dealing with OSS		
Yes	18	9.00
No	182	91.00
Total	200	100.00
Problems in Dealing with OSS		
Staff are not courteous/efficient	7	38.89
Staff are not knowledgeable	3	16.67
Staff are corrupt	1	5.55
OSS has too many requirements	3	16.67
Title was lost at OSS	4	22.22
Total	18	100.00
Suggestions to Improve OSS Services*		
	N=200	
Staff must work harder	65	32.50
Have a better system	36	18.00
Maintain the good work	26	13.00
Staff must be more courteous	24	12.00
Disseminate information about OSS services	9	4.50
Maintain good staff	5	2.50
Exercise fairness	2	1.00
Have branch offices	2	1.00
Staff must be punctual	2	1.00
Others: <i>Have branch of BIR at OSS, Issue receipt, Stick to procedures</i>	3	1.50

* *multiple response*

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The findings of the study reveal some important feedback which are useful for the OSS. These are enumerated as follows:

1. There was a preponderance of clients who came from nearby areas. This means that distance is a factor in availing of the services of the OSS.
2. Most clients heard about the OSS from government officials and relatives and friends. They also learned that it is engaged in the processing or helping process land titles.
3. Most of the clients located the OSS easily with the help of friends and relatives, government officials and drivers.
4. Clients who came to the OSS were generally more mature and educated. This means that the ability of the client to understand and follow the procedures involved in the processing of their transactions is generally higher.
5. Most clients came in the morning. This means that if all requirements are met, the client should be able to come home with the final result within a day.
6. Most clients had been to the OSS a few times before to conduct the same or different transactions. But the most common reason for the noncompletion of current and previous transactions were the lack of documents and absence of staff. This means that if the relevant office personnel were available and the clients were appraised of the steps and requirements during the first visit, they should have been able to take care of the deficiencies in the second visit. Therefore, a third or fourth visit should be superfluous not to mention the additional expenses and probably frayed nerves of both client and staff.
7. Many clients were still ignorant of the requirements for their transactions to be completed because they came lacking in one or two documents. This was probably because they had nobody to consult before they came to the OSS. Since going to the OSS just to consult about requirements and calling by phone would be impractical for some and impossible for others and expensive,

there should be a way to appraise them of these requirements in their localities.

8. Transactions were so varied and many of them were not directly related to land titling per se. Many went there to legalize certain other transactions or just merely get official copies of existing documents. These are transactions that should not take so long and can be completed in one visit.
9. Most transactions were with Register of Deeds and many of these transactions were not directly related to land titling. This may mean there should be people in the ROD working separate from the land titling process.
10. Generally, only one half of all clients completed their transactions. This means that half of the clients would have to come back for another visit in order to complete their transactions. This could mean doubling or tripling their traveling expenses and time away from home and work.
11. The transaction expenses included transportation, food and fees and the biggest part of these expenses were fees for those who paid fees.
12. Few allegations of corrupt practices have been reported, e. g., non issuance of receipts, receipts issued not matching the amount paid. Most of these were committed at the ROD. These are malpractices that can be corrected with administrative solutions.
13. Many clients had had similar transactions with other agencies and they did not find any great difference between the OSS and those offices.
14. Few minor but one very serious (loss of land title) but easily correctible problems were reported by clients in their dealings with the OSS.
15. Some procedural aspects and the staff were generally rated favorably by the clients. Yet many clients suggested for them to work still harder.
16. The OSS in general was rated favorably albeit only with a satisfactory rating by most clients. This means that they were not too happy with the services offered by the OSS. This means further, that there is so much to improve on at the OSS. The LAMP and ROD were rated relatively better than the CENRO. Generally

and understandably, those who had completed their transactions tended to rate the OSS more favorably.

17. Most clients would recommend to others the services of the OSS because they found it to be beneficial.

Recommendations

In light of the foregoing, the following recommendations are deemed in order:

1. **Disseminate information about the OSS and the land titling process.** The relatively low number of clients who came for titling attests to the fact that a good percentage of the private lands are still untitled. The data also showed that most clients who came were educated and mature, therefore, would easily grasp the intricacies of the land titling process. However, they must first be appraised of the processes, requirements and costs involved before they can fully appreciate the importance and intricacies of the land titling and related processes. If the OSS can demonstrate that it can provide faster and cheaper services, then it should aggressively disseminate information on two things: (1) on the importance of titling itself and, (2) on the services offered by the OSS. A faster and cheaper system can entice more landowners to have their lands titled. The information should contain process flows, listing of required documents and processing fees. The information material can take several forms. (1) detailed pamphlets (2) posters that can be posted in municipal and city halls. The data showed that the most frequent source of information about the OSS were government officials. Therefore, information materials should be made available at least in municipal, city and provincial assessors' treasurers' and BIR offices where local land transactions are frequently made by clients.
2. **Production and dissemination of Flowcharts at the front desk.** Flowcharts should also be made available in print to clients who come to the OSS aside from those posted at the lobby. These charts should be easier to follow and understand.
3. **Production and dissemination of lists of requirements for particular transactions at the front desk.** Note that the most common reason for noncompletion of previous and current transactions was the lack of documents. Since clients come to the OSS for various purposes, there should be several lists. For example, for titling, what are the required documents? For request for survey or for annotation of titles, certainly fewer and other types

of documents are needed. The reception desk should be able to tick the documents submitted against this list for quicker appraisal.

4. **Production and dissemination of fee schedules at the front desk.** Charges and fees listed by type of service provided and document obtained. This list will dispel doubts as to the legality of the charges. It can also forewarn clients to prepare the necessary amounts and compare the amounts paid to the receipts issued. In other words, this allows for transparency in the system.
5. **Use of standard forms.** Since many clients come to the OSS to get common documents such as cancellation of mortgage, registration of mortgage, certified true copy of documents, cancellation of bailbond, etc., these can be standardized and computerized templates of such documents should be made. In this way, only the details need be typed anew every time someone asks for such documents. This saves time in the typing and processing.
6. **Seminars for employees for better client orientation.** There had been several comments about the personal conduct of employees—that some of them were not courteous and accommodating. If the OSS is to entice clients to come to avail of its services, one important consideration to take is making the employees, especially the frontline personnel not only to be perceived as friendly and courteous but to be actually so. A conscious effort is needed in achieving this goal and employees can profit from a few tips from professionals on how to deal with clients. A client provided a hint: younger staff were more accommodating than older ones.
7. **Stamp out corruption.** The most obvious claim of a corrupt practice at the OSS, albeit by only a few clients, was the non issuance of receipts or the mismatch in the amount paid and that reflected in the receipt. One respondent revealed his prior notion about the OSS: “They don’t process without ‘lagay’”. While he/she was probably misinformed or based his perception on one incident, the reputation of corruption sticks. This can be partly solved if a schedule of fees is provided to the clients so that they can check whether the fees reflected the services provided. Another solution that can be resorted to is a complaints desk preferably in a separate section within the OSS. Furthermore, strict administrative sanctions against erring staff should be meted after a thorough and impartial investigation in order to discourage these malpractices.

Appendix A. Appendix Tables

Appendix Table 1. Number of respondents by day of the week.

Day	Frequency	Percentage
Monday	33	16.50
Tuesday	44	22.22
Wednesday	43	21.72
Thursday	44	22.22
Friday	36	18.18
Total	200	100.00

Appendix Table 2. Place of origin of clients.

Places of Origin	Frequency	Percentage
Abuyog	4	2.00
Alangalang	8	4.00
Albuera	1	0.50
Babatngon	3	1.50
Barugo	4	2.00
Bato	3	1.50
Baybay	19	9.50
Burauen	9	4.50
Calubian	1	0.50
Carigara	9	4.50
Dagami	2	1.00
Dulag	5	2.50
Hilongos	6	3.00
Hindang	2	1.00
Inopacan	3	1.50
Isabel	1	0.50
Jaro	5	2.50
Javier	1	0.50
Julita	2	1.00
Kananga	4	2.00
La Paz	1	0.50
Leyte	1	0.50
MacArthur	2	1.00
Matalom	3	1.50
Ormoc	6	3.00
Palo	29	14.50
Palompon	4	2.00
Pastrana	1	0.50
San Miguel	3	1.50
Sta. Fe	5	2.50
Tabango	2	1.00
Tacloban	29	14.50
Tanauan	11	5.50
Tolosa	5	2.50
Villaba	3	1.50
Outside Leyte	3	1.50
Total	200	100.00

Appendix Table 3. Completion of transaction by transaction*.

Transaction	Completed		Not completed		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Get certified copy of document	38	73.10	14	26.90	52	100.00
Register land	13	35.10	24	64.90	37	100.00
Follow-up papers	9	36.00	16	64.00	25	100.00
Transfer ownership of land	6	28.60	15	71.40	21	100.00
Inquire about land status	8	47.10	9	52.90	17	100.00
Submit documents	8	61.50	5	38.50	13	100.00
Annotate title	5	83.30	1	16.70	6	100.00
Cancel bail bond	3	75.00	1	25.00	4	100.00
Register mortgage	2	50.00	2	50.00	4	100.00
Pay fees	2	100.00	0	0.00	2	100.00
Publish	0	0.00	2	100.00	2	100.00
Get certification of untitled land	1	25.00	3	75.00	4	100.00
Apply for survey	2	100.00	0	0.00	2	100.00
Cancel mortgage	3	100.00	0	0.00	3	100.00
Get sketch plan	0	0.00	2	100.00	2	100.00
Total	102	51.00	98	49.00	200	100.00

*Includes only more than one transactions

Appendix B. Interview Schedule

Interview Schedule for the OSS Exit Survey

Introduction: Good morning/afternoon Maam/Sir. I am _____, a researcher. I would like to know what you can say about your experience with OSS. Can you spare a few moments to answer a few questions? Please feel free to give your opinions. Your answers will be kept under strict confidentiality.

Respondent number: _____ **Date of interview:** ___/___/04 **Day:** _____
Time of Interview: Start _____ Finish _____

I. Personal background of the respondent:

1. Where do you live: (Specify up to barangay) _____, _____
2. Sex of respondent: male ___ female ___
3. How old are you? _____
4. What grade /year did you finish? (Actual years completed) _____

II. Knowledge about the OSS

5. How did you know about the OSS (check as many)
 - a. Through friends/relatives _____
 - b. Through government officials _____
 - c. Through LAMP personnel _____
 - d. Through radio broadcast _____
 - e. Others _____
6. What do you know about the OSS? (record actual answer) _____

7. How easy was it to find the OSS? Easy ___ Difficult ___
8. Who gave you directions in finding the OSS? _____

III. Transaction Data:

9. What time did you arrive at the OSS? _____
10. Are you the: owner ___ co-owner ___ claimant ___ others _____ of the land you are transacting for?
11. For this visit to the OSS, what specifically was your purpose(s)?

1	
2	
3	

12. Was/were the purpose(s) served by the OSS? Yes ___ No ___
- a. If no, why not? _____

- b. If yes, what specific office did you transact with? _____
13. Was this your first visit to the OSS? Yes ___ No ___ (If no, include Q# 32-37)
14. Was your transaction completed? Yes ___ No ___
- a.1. If yes, what document/result did you get? (specify) _____
- a.2. How long was the transaction finished? (hrs/mins) _____
- b.1. If not completed, why not _____

- b.2. Are you coming back to complete your transaction? Yes ___ No ___
- b.3. If no, why not? _____

IV. Transaction Costs

15. How much did you spend for this visit to the OSS?

Item	Cost
Transportation (round trip)	
Food: meals and snacks	
Fees paid	
Others: (Xerox, etc.)	
Total	

16. Do you think this is a reasonable cost to pay for the service? Yes ___ No ___
 Why? _____

IV. Assessment of the Services at OSS for the current visit

17. Were you served immediately? Yes ___ No ___
- a. If no, how long did you have to wait before you were served? ___(hrs/min)
18. Were you able to see/talk to the appropriate staff? Yes ___ No ___
19. Were you explained in detail the steps necessary to complete your transaction?
 Yes ___ No ___
20. Were you explained in detail the requirements/documents that you have to submit?
 Yes ___ No ___
21. Were you given assurance that your transaction will be completed on a specific timeframe? Yes ___ No ___

22. Were you given exact estimate of the costs to be incurred? Yes ___ No ___

23. If you paid some fees, how much did you pay? (Specify amount) _____

24. Was a receipt issued? Yes ___ No ___

a. If no, how much did you pay? _____

b. Why was no receipt issued? _____

25. How would you rate the staff in terms of their:

Quality	Rating		
a. Friendliness/courtesy	Very friendly/ courteous	Friendly/ Courteous	Unfriendly/ Discourteous
b. Speed	Very fast	Fast	Slow
c. Knowledge of their work	Very knowledgeable	Knowledgeable	Less knowledgeable
d. Clarity in explanation	Very clear	Clear enough	Not clear
e. Honesty	Very honest	Honest	Dishonest

26. In general, how would you rate the services of the OSS?
Excellent ___ Very satisfactory ___ Satisfactory ___ Poor ___

27. Why would you rate the OSS services that way?

28. Would you recommend to others to come to the OSS for their land titling and related needs? Yes ___ No ___

a. Why? _____

VI. Problems Met and Suggestions for Improvement

29. Have you had transactions similar to this with other agencies? Yes ___ No ___

a. If yes, what agency? _____

b. How do you compare the OSS with that agency's service?

30. Did you have problems in dealing with the OSS? Yes ___ No ___

a. If yes, what problems did you meet in dealing with the OSS?

31. What can you suggest to make the OSS more efficient and effective?

VII. Assessment of those who have had previous transactions with the OSS: (For those who answered **No** in **Q# 13**)

32. Was it you or any other relative/representative who transacted for this lot with the OSS before? Respondent____ others (specify) _____

33. How many times have you or your representative visited the OSS before? ____

34. When was your (or your representative's) last visit to the OSS? (specify date)

35. What was/were the purpose(s) of those visit(s)? _____

36. Why were those transactions not completed? _____

37. Were there changes in the way you were served by the OSS before and now?
Yes ____ No ____

a. If yes, what are these changes? _____

Note: Don't forget to thank the respondents after each interview.