

**Philippines – Australia
Land Administration and Management
Project**

**Prototype Implementation Office 2
Quezon City**

Holy Spirit Field Validation Report

October 2004

Report D40



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.

Table of Contents

1	<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>1</i>
2	<i>Overall Results For Holy Spirit.....</i>	<i>2</i>
3	<i>Evaluation of Field validation per CIM.....</i>	<i>3</i>
3.1	Analysis of the data available at the completion of the field activities.....	3
3.2	CIM 2 (14412104140)	4
3.3	CIM 8 (14412104410)	7
4	<i>Final Analysis</i>	<i>9</i>
4.1	Record location sources.....	9
5	<i>Annex 1 – Updated figures from March 2004.</i>	<i>10</i>
6	<i>Annex 2 – Updated figures from October 2004.</i>	<i>14</i>

1 INTRODUCTION

This report looks at the evaluation of the results for the field validation activities carried out in Barangay Holy Spirit, one of the 5 Barangays that are within the Prototype Implementation Office No 2 (PIO2) implementation area. The approach in Holy Spirit is different to the other four barangays. The Holy Spirit field validation was undertaken with direct management from PIO2, in the other barangays the management will be carried out using a Non Government Organisation (NGO).

2 OVERALL RESULTS FOR HOLY SPIRIT

The field validation activities carried out in the Pilot Studies returned the following:

- 167 TCTs that were found in the possession of the property owners
- 38 of the TCT's located did not have matching records in the Assessor's data.
- 63 of the TCT's located did not have a TCT record held in the cross index.

At the completion of the field activities in Holy Spirit, the overall field validation carried out after the pilots the following was found:

- 1472 TCTs that were found in the possession of the property owners
- 676 of the TCT's located did not have matching records in the Assessor's data.
- 134 had different TCT numbers to those held by the Assessor's office.
- 784 of the TCT's located did not have a TCT record held in the cross index.

Pulling lists for the TCT's not held in the cross index were produced and sent to the Registry of Deeds.

3 EVALUATION OF FIELD VALIDATION PER CIM

At the time the field validation was carried out all the CIMs were not quite complete and the office validation was well behind. Even after completing the CIMs, the office validation had many gaps as not all parcels which did not contain a Transfer Certificate of Title (TCT) had not been captured. From a potential 5570 parcels only 3115 were held in the cross index at the time that the initial data was compiled. This has been compiled in the table in section 3.1 below. To try and make some sense of the information a full report was carried out using the CIM and the database for CIMs 14412104140 and 14412104410, these are set out in sections 3.2 and 3.3 below. Some additional work was also carried out for CIM 14412104430, however due to the time consuming nature of the work this was not completed.

The limited full analysis was due to the missing parcel records on the database, however with the capture of all the parcels into the database a full analysis was carried out in March 2004, see annex 1. However with inaccuracies in the database and a lack of a CIM baseline these figures are only a guide. Only when the CIM group can supply a count of parcels on the CIM and the data in the database is quality checked and amended will the exact figures be available for Holy Spirit.

3.1 Analysis of the data available at the completion of the field activities

CIM No	Parcels	Roads	Parcels in cross index	TCT in cross Index	Held in assessor's records only	No records	Found in FV	From FV database
14412104130	8	0	0	0			4	5
14412104134	178	1	155	157*				7
14412104140	202	15	103	94	36	32	12	8
14412104143	11	0	10	10	0	0	1	1
14412104230	180	11	78	81*				16
14412104240	108	4	39	30				0
14412104241	46		0	0				0
14412104242	8		0	0				0
14412104243	212		0	0				0
14412104244	65	0	12	12				5
14412105130	34	5	90	90				46
14412105133	98	8	5	5				70
14412105310	23		1	1				0
14412105311	105	8	64	64				49
14412105313	279	30	172	172				191
14412104420	219		127	91				18
14412104422	162	20	0	0				126
14412104424	194	15	62	62				161
14412104410	344	18	316	226	84	31	28	9

CIM No	Parcels	Roads	Parcels in cross index	TCT in cross Index	Held in assessor's records only	No records	Found in FV	From FV database
14412104320	334	25	273	198				27
14412104310	176	10	145	89				17
14412104330	238	17	212	116				6
14412104340	393	19	235	212				12
14412104430	312	10	222	153	105	35	42	91
14412104431	36		34	34				0
14412104440	295	15	253	169				170
14412104442	223	23	1	1				206
14412105330	22		8	8				1
14412105331	23	0	0	0			23	23
14402104220	119		127	110				0
14402104210	269		122	122				0
14402104120	330		134	130				0
14402104110	76	5	20	16				0
14402104130	24		0	0				46
14402104140	45		6	6				0
14402104230	137		63	65				0
14402104240	18		20	20				0
14402104410	8		6	6				0
Totals	5570	259	3115	2312				1311

3.2 CIM 2 (14412104140)

CIM 14412104140 covers part of the BF homes estate and only contains established parcels (ie no informal settlers). As a result the parcel structure on the ground is the same as the registered plans shown on the CIM. BF Homes is a walled subdivision with guards on any roads which have access to the subdivision. There are two initial plans of subdivision on which the area is based (LRC)PSD 133230 and (LRC)PSD16317

BF Homes was the area where the 1st and 2nd Field Validation pilot activities took place. The Pilot studies occurred before office validation was carried out so that in many instances the parcels being field validated did not return any additional information. As the pilots were designed to help refine the field validation data collection technique there was less emphasis on having the office validation completed.

As the area in this CIM had been part of the pilots it had already yielded 5 TCTs from the field that were not yet captured in the cross index, of these only 1 TCTs found contained updated to the references which were unknown to the Assessors.

Seven folios were found in the latest field validation, 4 contained later TCT no.s that had been reconstituted, while the other three were already known.

There are 110 lot parcels and 16 road parcels which have no TCT information held in the database. When the assessor's data was captured it appears that a default value of 1996 was added to the evaluation year. From their data the following have been found:

- 31 parcels have no assessor's records
- 4 Parcels with Names held against them but no TCT data
- 70 parcels only show 1996 as the evaluation year
 - 9 with no registration date
 - 53 registered before the fire at the ROD
 - 8 registered after the fire at the ROD
- 4 parcels show 1997 as the evaluation year
- 3 parcels show 1999 as the evaluation year
- 1 parcel shows 2000 as the evaluation year
- 2 parcels show 2003 as the evaluation year

The following table below summarises the parcels where validation was carried out for this CIM.

Block No	No Parcels	OV	Pilot Studies	FV	Vacant	No Details	Comments (for all field activities)
7	10	5	1			5	No additional information gathered from the field
12	7	6	2		1	1	No additional information gathered from the field
13	10	4	6			6	Two additional TCT can be added from the field, for lots 13 and 14. The TCT found for lot 15 needs to be reconstituted.
14	21	15	6		(1)	6	No additional information gathered from the field
15	23	15	8		1 (2)	8	One additional TCT can be added from the field, for lot 16
16	11	7	5		(3)	4	Two additional TCT can be added from the field, for lots 2 and 6.
17	19	13	5		2 (4)	6	One additional TCT can be added from the field, for lot 28
19	14	9	2		1 (4)	5	Two additional TCT can be added from the field, for lots 23 and 32.
20	9	9	3		(4)	0	No additional information gathered from the field
21	13	9	2		1 (3)	4	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 32
23	5	5	4			0	Two additional TCT can be added from the field, for lots 11 and 14.
24	22	16	4		1 (5)	6	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 8
25	18	11	5		1 (3)	7	No additional information gathered from the field
26	9	3	5		2	6	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 5
27	37	31	3		1 (8)	6	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 36
28	6	1	3			5	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 5
29	7	4	2	1	1	2	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 5
30	13	11	4			2	No additional information gathered from the field
31	14	9	3	1	(1)	4	Three additional TCT can be added from the field, for lots 4, 5 and 13.
32	20	15	7		(2)	5	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 1
33	29	17	13		1	12	Six additional TCT can be added from the field, for lots 3, 4, 14, 21, 24 and 25
34	5	3	2			2	No additional information gathered from the field
35	10	6	3			4	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 3
36	2	1	0			1	No additional information gathered from the field
Totals	334	199			13 (45)	116	

The number of Parcels with no information also includes the vacant blocks within that block. The count of vacant parcels, for each block, is the number of vacant parcels where no details could be located, where a number appears in the bracket this is the total number of vacant parcels. Where the information for a vacant parcel was located this has not been counted in the totals, ie three parcels in Block 24 and one in block 27.

3.3 CIM 8 (14412104410)

CIM 14412104410 covers part of the BF homes estate and only contains established parcels (ie no informal settlers). As a result the parcel structure on the ground is the same as the registered plans within the CIM area. BF Homes is a walled subdivision with guards on any roads which have access to the subdivision. There are two initial plans of subdivision on which the area is based (LRC)PSD 133230 and (LRC)PSD16317

BF Homes was the area where the 1st and 2nd Field Validation pilot activities took place. The Pilot studies occurred before office validation was carried out so that in many instances the parcels being field validated did not return any additional information. As the pilots were designed to help refine the field validation data collection technique there was less emphasis on having the office validation completed.

As the area in this CIM had been part of the pilots it had already yielded 27 TCTs from the field that were not yet captured in the cross index, of these 4 were unknown to the Assessor's, 6 TCTs found contained updated to the references which were unknown to the Assessors.

Only two folios were found in the latest field validation, both were later TCT no.s that had been reconstituted.

There are 116 lot parcels and 18 road parcels which have no TCT information held in the database. When the assessor's data was captured it appears that a default value of 1996 was added to the evaluation year. From their data the following have been found:

- 32 parcels have no assessor's records
- 4 Parcels with Names held against them but no TCT data
- 70 parcels only show 1996 as the evaluation year
 - 9 with no registration date
 - 53 registered before the fire at the ROD
 - 8 registered after the fire at the ROD
- 4 parcels show 1997 as the evaluation year
- 3 parcels show 1999 as the evaluation year
- 1 parcel shows 2000 as the evaluation year
- 2 parcels show 2003 as the evaluation year

The following table below summarises the parcels where validation was carried out for this CIM.

Block No	No Parcels	OV	Pilot Studies	FV	Vacant	No Details	Comments (for all field activities)
7	10	5	1			5	No additional information gathered from the field
12	7	6	2		1	1	No additional information gathered from the field
13	10	4	6			6	Two additional TCT can be added from the field, for lots 13 and 14. The TCT found for lot 15 needs to be reconstituted.
14	21	15	6		(1)	6	No additional information gathered from the field
15	23	15	8		1 (2)	8	One additional TCT can be added from the field, for lot 16
16	11	7	5		(3)	4	Two additional TCT can be added from the field, for lots 2 and 6.
17	19	13	5		2 (4)	6	One additional TCT can be added from the field, for lot 28
19	14	9	2		1 (4)	5	Two additional TCT can be added from the field, for lots 23 and 32.
20	9	9	3		(4)	0	No additional information gathered from the field
21	13	9	2		1 (3)	4	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 32
23	5	5	4			0	Two additional TCT can be added from the field, for lots 11 and 14.
24	22	16	4		1 (5)	6	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 8
25	18	11	5		1 (3)	7	No additional information gathered from the field
26	9	3	5		2	6	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 5
27	37	31	3		1 (8)	6	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 36
28	6	1	3			5	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 5
29	7	4	2	1	1	2	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 5
30	13	11	4			2	No additional information gathered from the field
31	14	9	3	1	(1)	4	Three additional TCT can be added from the field, for lots 4, 5 and 13.
32	20	15	7		(2)	5	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 1
33	29	17	13		1	12	Six additional TCT can be added from the field, for lots 3, 4, 14, 21, 24 and 25
34	5	3	2			2	No additional information gathered from the field
35	10	6	3			4	One additional TCT has been added from the field for lot 3
36	2	1	0			1	No additional information gathered from the field
Totals	334	199			13 (45)	116	

The number of Parcels with no information also includes the vacant blocks within that block. The count of vacant parcels, for each block, is the number of vacant parcels where no details could be located, where a number appears in the bracket this is the total number of vacant parcels. Where the information for a vacant parcel was located this has not been counted in the totals, ie three parcels in Block 24 and one in block 27.

4 FINAL ANALYSIS

Since the completion of the activity the data capture for all parcels in Holy Spirit was carried out. The table in appendix 1 shows the figures at the end of the data capture for each CIM sheet, as well as a count of additional data held in the database for Holy Spirit. Unfortunately accurate figures for the number of parcels held on the CIM could not be supplied by the CIM group so the parcel totals were only from the database.

The same analysis has been carried out in early October in Appendix 2, the difference being that the CIM group were able to supply accurate data on the number of parcels on each CIM.

The table in appendix 2 shows that there have been activities carried out to cleanse the data and to ensure that the records for Holy Spirit are as accurate as possible. The table below shows how the clean up has been progressing by comparing the results of database analysis from March to the start of October.

	Recorded on wrong CIM	Not on a CIM	Multiple entires
Parcels - March	67	1150	12
Parcels - October	0	514	0
TCTs - March	67	989	279
TCTs - October	0	459	69

While there is still some work to be carried out it is encouraging to see that the operation is yielding results.

The CIM data has allowed the comparison between the entered records and the parcels on the CIM resulting in two new comparisons 'Parcels on the database attached to the CIM but not drawn on it' (181 parcels) and 'Parcels drawn on CIM but not in the database' (76 parcels).

4.1 Record location sources

There have been 5268 TCTs recovered for Holy Spirit, the question remains where did they come from and which methods yield the best results. While there are 4038 assessor's records only 1909 are related to a record that has a TCT, tracking from the cross index shows a further 237 records were used to locate the current record.

While it can be assumed that the other 1892 were also used as a starting point to locate the record, this is not clear from the results and the tracking of an Assessors record to .

5 ANNEX 1 – UPDATED FIGURES FROM MARCH 2004.

CIM Number	Parcels in cross index	TCT in cross Index	% of TCTs captured	Assessor's records linked in cross Index	% of Assessor's linked
14402104110	66	31	46%	32	48%
14402104112	3	3	100%	3	100%
14402104113	74	59	80%	66	89%
14402104114	44	40	91%	42	95%
14402104120	339	161	47%	151	45%
14402104121	8	8	100%	8	100%
14402104122	48	29	62%	39	83%
14402104130	33	0	0%	0	0%
14402104131	61	42	69%	46	75%
14402104132	3	3	100%	3	100%
14402104140	51	16	31%	21	41%
14402104141	6	0	0%	0	0%
14402104142	25	0	0%	0	0%
14402104210	282	157	56%	186	66%
14402104211	53	29	55%	29	55%
14402104213	6	6	100%	2	33%
14402104220	251	161	64%	128	52%
14402104223	5	5	100%	5	100%
14402104230	147	82	56%	83	56%
14402104231	10	2	20%	2	20%
14402104232	9	6	67%	9	100%
14402104234	49	33	67%	34	69%
14402104240	46	26	57%	33	72%
14402104241	8	5	63%	7	88%
14402104410	7	6	86%	7	100%

CIM Number	Parcels in cross index	TCT in cross Index	% of TCTs captured	Assessor's records linked in cross Index	% of Assessor's linked
14412104121	4	4	100%	4	100%
14412104123	5	5	100%	0	0%
14412104130	11	9	82%	6	55%
14412104134	171	164	96%	171	100%
14412104140	220	131	60%	122	56%
14412104143	11	11	100%	11	100%
14412104230	172	121	70%	110	64%
14412104240	106	55	52%	40	38%
14412104241	48	45	94%	0	0%
14412104242	8	8	100%	0	0%
14412104243	227	198	87%	0	0%
14412104244	134	126	94%	3	2%
14412104310	176	106	60%	110	63%
14412104314	15	9	60%	4	27%
14412104320	334	229	69%	232	69%
14412104324	4	4	100%	4	100%
14412104330	239	125	52%	105	44%
14412104340	412	244	59%	228	55%
14412104341	5	5	100%	0	0%
14412104342	59	59	100%	59	100%
14412104344	28	27	96%	24	86%
14412104410	325	241	74%	240	74%
14412104413	7	7	100%	7	100%
14412104420	232	141	61%	112	48%
14412104422	251	193	77%	37	15%
14412104424	344	316	92%	102	30%
14412104430	317	199	63%	184	58%

CIM Number	Parcels in cross index	TCT in cross Index	% of TCTs captured	Assessor's records linked in cross Index	% of Assessor's linked
14412104431	36	36	100%	36	100%
14412104433	47	31	66%	34	72%
14412104434	23	21	91%	3	13%
14412104440	289	216	75%	219	76%
14412104442	222	209	94%	218	98%
14412105130	33	25	75%	25	75%
14412105131	13	6	46%	0	0%
14412105133	286	84	29%	88	31%
14412105310	40	22	55%	23	58%
14412105311	138	132	96%	138	100%
14412105313	282	278	99%	279	99%
14412105330	28	19	68%	28	100%
14412105331	22	21	99%	22	100%
Totals	6958	4792	69%	4038	59%
Recorded on wrong CIM	67	67		67	
Not on a CIM	1150	989		1661	
Multiple entires	-12	279		578	
Total in Database	8,163	5,954		6344	

Notes:

- 1150 Parcels and 989 TCTs in HS are not attached to CIMs, while 67 Parcels and TCTs are recorded on the wrong CIM. These can easily be reported on and after investigation amended;
- The real problem is the 279 multiple entries for TCTs and the 12 for Parcels that are duplicated against the same preliminary CIM number. The multiple entries in the Assessor's records are the result of a record being created every time a property owner pays their property tax and are not a concern or an error. The search system links to all records for a land parcel, therefore these multiple records are available against the land parcel;
- There are a large number of parcels, TCTs and Assessor's records not recorded against the CIM. The high numbers represent the work effort left to complete Holy Spirit, however the large number of Assessor's records are either the result of multiple entries

in the remaining records or the fact that many Barangay boundaries have been reshuffled over the years and the Assessor's records do not reflect the current situation.

6 ANNEX 2 – UPDATED FIGURES FROM OCTOBER 2004.

CIM Number	Parcels from CIM	Parcels in cross index	TCT in cross Index	% of TCTs captured	Assessor's records linked in cross Index	% of Assessor's linked
14402104110	67	68	34	51%	32	48%
14402104112	3	3	3	100%	3	100%
14402104113	74	74	66	89%	66	89%
14402104114	45	44	41	91%	42	93%
14402104120	378	341	170	45%	151	40%
14402104121	8	7	7	88%	8	100%
14402104122	41	41	31	76%	39	95%
14402104124	1	1	0	0%	0	0%
14402104130	30	33	0	0%	0	0%
14402104131	61	61	51	84%	46	75%
14402104132	3	3	3	100%	3	100%
14402104140	87	83	21	24%	21	24%
14402104141	6	6	0	0%	0	0%
14402104142	25	25	0	0%	0	0%
14402104210	322	325	201	62%	186	58%
14402104211	53	53	31	58%	29	55%
14402104213	6	7	7	100%	2	33%
14402104220	222	261	163	73%	128	58%
14402104223	5	5	5	100%	5	100%
14402104230	177	187	109	62%	83	47%
14402104231	13	12	10	77%	2	15%
14402104232	9	9	6	67%	9	100%
14402104234	49	47	34	69%	34	69%
14402104240	46	45	30	65%	33	72%
14402104241	8	8	5	63%	7	88%

CIM Number	Parcels from CIM	Parcels in cross index	TCT in cross Index	% of TCTs captured	Assessor's records linked in cross Index	% of Assessor's linked
14402104410	9	7	6	67%	7	78%
14412104130	13	14	11	85%	6	46%
14412104134	169	171	165	98%	171	100%
14412104140	228	224	147	64%	122	54%
14412104143	11	11	11	100%	11	100%
14412104230	177	190	131	74%	110	62%
14412104240	95	106	61	64%	40	42%
14412104241	45	47	47	100%	0	0%
14412104242	9	9	9	100%	0	0%
14412104243	250	254	247	99%	0	0%
14412104244	181	180	178	98%	3	2%
14412104310	179	178	112	63%	110	61%
14412104314	15	15	9	60%	4	27%
14412104320	334	342	242	72%	232	69%
14412104324	4	7	6	100%	4	100%
14412104330	239	239	132	55%	105	44%
14412104340	415	413	248	60%	228	55%
14412104341	5	5	5	100%	0	0%
14412104342	62	74	78	100%	59	95%
14412104344	50	52	48	96%	24	48%
14412104410	360	353	250	69%	240	67%
14412104413	10	9	7	70%	7	70%
14412104420	209	228	136	65%	112	54%
14412104422	250	252	201	80%	37	15%
14412104424	379	373	350	92%	102	27%
14412104430	329	337	238	72%	184	56%

CIM Number	Parcels from CIM	Parcels in cross index	TCT in cross Index	% of TCTs captured	Assessor's records linked in cross Index	% of Assessor's linked
14412104431	62	70	60	97%	36	58%
14412104432	2	0	0	0%		
14412104433	72	83	67	93%	34	47%
14412104434	23	23	22	96%	3	13%
14412104440	300	306	242	81%	219	73%
14412104442	226	227	222	98%	218	96%
14412105130	28	33	24	865%	25	89%
14412105131	13	10	4	31%	0	0%
14412105133	289	286	84	29%	88	30%
14412105310	41	46	24	59%	23	56%
14412105311	139	140	137	99%	138	99%
14412105313	280	283	279	99%	279	99%
Totals	7241	7346	5268	73%	4038	54%
On db attached to the CIM but not drawn on it	181		19			
Not on a CIM		514	459		1661	
Parcels drawn on CIM but not in the db		76	N/A			
Parcels on Boundary CIMs that belong in HS*		12*				
Duplicate records			38		578	

* These are not errors the boundary plans cross two or more Barangays, in the CIMs have been noted as being in the Barangay with the most number of Parcels. This is an anomaly of the system, especially when dealing with the GIS.