

Document of
The World Bank

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Report No: 31728-PH

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION REPORT
(FSLT-70340)

ON A

LOAN

IN THE AMOUNT OF US\$ 4.79 MILLION

TO THE

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

FOR A

LAND ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT PROJECT

June 27, 2005

**Rural Development and Natural Resources Sector Unit
East Asia and Pacific Region**

This document has a restricted distribution and may be used by recipients only in the performance of their official duties. Its contents may not otherwise be disclosed without World Bank authorization.

CURRENCY EQUIVALENTS

(Exchange Rate Effective as of May 2, 2005)

Currency Unit = Philippine Peso (PhP)

PhP 54.58 = US\$ 1.00

US\$ 0.018 = PhP 1.00

FISCAL YEAR

January 1 – December 31

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AMC	Australian Managing Contractor
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BOO	Build, Own and Operate
CIM	Cadastral Index Map
DAR	Department of Agrarian Reform
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DOF	Department of Finance
DOJ	Department of Justice
EO	Executive Order
ERR	Economic Rate of Return
FP	Free Patent
FRR	Financial Rate of Return
GOP	Government of the Philippines
HP	Homestead Patent
IACC	Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee
ICR	Implementation Completion Report
LAA	Land Administration Authority
LAM	Land Administration and Management
LAMP	Land Administration and Management Project
LARA	Land Administration Reform Act
LGU	Local Government Unit
LIL	Learning and Innovation Loan
LRA	Land Registration Authority
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MSP	Miscellaneous Sales Patent
NEDA	National Economic and Development Authority
NLRMS	National Land Records Management Strategy
NPV	Net Present Value
NTRC	National Tax Research Center
OSS	One-Stop-Shop
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PIO	Project Implementation Office
PMO	Project Management Office
QAP	Quality Assurance Panel

ROD	Registry of Deeds
SPIS	Survey Plan Inventory System
TA	Technical Assistance/Adviser
TCT	Transfer Certificate of Title
TF	Task Force (replacing the IACC)
TWG	Technical Working Group

Vice President:	Jemal-ud-din Kassum, EAPVP
Country Director	Joachim von Amsberg, EACPF
Sector Director	Mark D. Wilson, EASRD
Task Team Leader/Task Manager:	Keith Clifford Bell, EASRD

PHILIPPINES
Land Administration and Management Project

CONTENTS

	Page No.
1. Project Data	1
2. Principal Performance Ratings	1
3. Assessment of Development Objective and Design, and of Quality at Entry	2
4. Achievement of Objective and Outputs	4
5. Major Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcome	11
6. Sustainability	12
7. Bank and Borrower Performance	13
8. Lessons Learned	15
9. Partner Comments	17
10. Additional Information	19
Annex 1. Key Performance Indicators/Log Frame Matrix	20
Annex 2. Project Costs and Financing	24
Annex 3. Economic Costs and Benefits	26
Annex 4. Bank Inputs	27
Annex 5. Ratings for Achievement of Objectives/Outputs of Components	29
Annex 6. Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance	30
Annex 7. List of Supporting Documents	31

<i>Project ID:</i> P066069	<i>Project Name:</i> Land Administration and Management Project
<i>Team Leader:</i> Keith Clifford Bell	<i>TL Unit:</i> EASRD
<i>ICR Type:</i> Core ICR	<i>Report Date:</i> June 27, 2005

1. Project Data

Name: Land Administration and Management Project *L/C/TF Number:* FSLT-70340
Country/Department: PHILIPPINES *Region:* East Asia and Pacific Region

Sector/subsector: Sub-national government administration (73%); Central government administration (27%)

Theme: Land administration and management (P); Rural markets (S); Personal and property rights (S)

KEY DATES

	<i>Original</i>	<i>Revised/Actual</i>
<i>PCD:</i> 10/13/1999	<i>Effective:</i> 01/09/2001	01/09/2001
<i>Appraisal:</i> 03/09/2000	<i>MTR:</i> 02/20/2003	02/20/2003
<i>Approval:</i> 09/26/2000	<i>Closing:</i> 09/30/2003	12/31/2004

Borrower/Implementing Agency: GOVT. OF THE PHILIPPINES/DEPT. OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Other Partners: Australian Agency for International Development

STAFF	Current	At Appraisal
<i>Vice President:</i>	Jemal-ud-din Kassum	Jemal-ud-din Kassum
<i>Country Director:</i>	Joachim von Amsberg	Vinay K. Bhargava
<i>Sector Director:</i>	Mark D. Wilson	Geoffrey Fox
<i>Team Leader at ICR:</i>	Keith Clifford Bell	Wael Zakout
<i>ICR Primary Author:</i>	Keith Clifford Bell and Surajit Goswami (FAO/CP)	

2. Principal Performance Ratings

(HS=Highly Satisfactory, S=Satisfactory, U=Unsatisfactory, HL=Highly Likely, L=Likely, UN=Unlikely, HUN=Highly Unlikely, HU=Highly Unsatisfactory, H=High, SU=Substantial, M=Modest, N=Negligible)

Outcome: S
Sustainability: L
Institutional Development Impact: M
Bank Performance: S
Borrower Performance: S

QAG (if available) *ICR*
Quality at Entry: S S
Project at Risk at Any Time: No

3. Assessment of Development Objective and Design, and of Quality at Entry

3.1 Original Objective:

The Land Administration and Management (LAM) Program is a long-term (possibly 15-20 years) commitment by the Government of the Philippines (GOP). The overall goal of this Program is to alleviate poverty and enhance economic growth by improving land tenure security and land market efficiency in rural and urban areas through the development of a land titling and administration system based on clear, transparent, coherent, and consistent policies and laws and supported by an appropriate institutional structure.

The Land Administration and Management Project (LAMP), supported by the Bank's Learning and Innovation Loan (LIL), was the first step towards the implementation of the LAM Program. The development objectives of the project were:

- (i) to assess the viability of the LAM Program; and
- (ii) to formalize the institutional arrangements needed to support its development, by testing alternative approaches to accelerated programs designed to improve the protection of rights to land, eliminate fake titles, and introduce a framework for an equitable system of land valuation.

The project objectives continue to be important for the country/sector and the Bank's Country Assistance Strategies covering the periods 1999-2002 and 2003-2005. The objectives address the GOP's medium-term goal of socially equitable modernization of agriculture and fisheries from, among other things, improved access to land tenure, extension services, infrastructure and credit to achieve sustainable increases in rural income.

3.2 Revised Objective:

The objectives of the project remained unchanged throughout the life of the project.

Assessment of the development objectives: The objectives of the project were clear and achievable. The objective of formalizing the institutional arrangements, which could be defined as the reformulation of the land-related legal framework and the reform and/or merger of land administration agencies, was expected to depend upon the Government's willingness to carry out the reforms. Based on the experience from other countries, reform was expected to be very challenging, but achievable, given the conservative and vested interests of the court system, the legal profession and other groups.

3.3 Original Components:

The project had four components including one to support the preparation of the second phase of the LAMP (called LAMP II). The estimated costs included a physical contingency provision.

Component 1: Land Policy Studies (US\$0.50 million, 4.9 percent of projected total costs). The component was to study and make recommendations on key policy areas of land administration, including: (i) land development process; (ii) land registration finance and fee structure; (iii) real property valuation framework; (iv) forest boundary demarcation and operational procedures policy study; (v) fragmented land laws and regulations framework; and (vi) institutional arrangements for land administration.

Component 2: Prototypes (US\$4.50 million, 43.7 percent of projected total costs). The component had two prototypes: the Land Titling and Administration Prototype and the Record Management Prototype. The Land Titling and Administration prototype (US\$3.25 million) was to be implemented in six

municipalities in Leyte Province and was to focus on accelerating the issuance of land titles using the existing administrative and judicial proceedings, enhancing service delivery of land registration, and improving coordination between the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) in the implementation of the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program. The Record Management prototype (US\$1.25 million) was to be implemented in Quezon City and focus on record verification and reconstitution, creation of a cadastral map base in the Registry of Deeds (ROD), elimination of fake and duplicate titles (in the prototype area), and linkage to the Land Registration Authority (LRA) sponsored Build, Own, and Operate (BOO) computerization project and other government land-related computerization initiatives.

Component 3: Institutional Development (US\$5.00 million, 48.5 percent of projected total costs). The component was to provide support to the Project Management Office (PMO) and the two Project Implementation Offices (PIO) of the two prototypes. This component was to include: technical assistance (TA), training and overseas study tours; monitoring and evaluation, including two rounds of social assessment and one development impact study; and the purchase of furniture, office equipment and vehicles.

Component 4: Phase II Preparation (US\$0.30 million, 2.9 percent of projected total costs). The component was to include the design of the long-term LAM Program, including one round of social assessment.

3.4 Revised Components:

There were no major revisions in component objectives or content.

Assessment of the Design: The overall project design was appropriate to deliver the project objectives of assessing the viability of the LAM Program and formalization of the institutional arrangements needed to support the development of the Program. It reflected the lessons learnt from other countries.

Under Component 1, following the lessons from other countries, priority land policy issues were to be studied in parallel with other activities. Under Component 2, testing of streamlined and cost-effective procedures in the pilot areas was planned for accelerating the issuance of land titles (Prototype 1) and for improving the validity and completeness of land titles in the ROD (Prototype 2). Various approaches to titling were evaluated and tested. Although the cost of obtaining a title that can be defended in the courts in the country can be more than US\$2,000, one of the highest in the world, only a few within the country found the situation unusual. Component 2 was to spearhead the process of convincing various parties that a free patent methodology, which included among other things new technology for mapping, could bring about full coverage of titling land in the Philippines as well as reduce corruption in land transactions and eventually eliminate fake titles.

Component 3 included traditional institutional development activities such as Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and Training. However, given the fragmented and complicated system of land administration and management in the Philippines, the most important aspect of the component was to indicate what was missing in the sector and then develop a consensus within the country for an improved land administration system. Paramount to this was to bring the two key land administration agencies together under a Land Administration Authority (LAA). This was initially planned to be achieved by Executive Order (EO) rather than by legislation. The legislative approach, which was pursued, was identified by DENR and the Presidential Task Force as a more effective and sustainable approach to achieving change. In hindsight, the difficulty and complexity of achieving change through legislation was under-estimated.

Component 4 was appropriately designed to ensure that the momentum built during project implementation could be carried forward to the next phase of the overall Program. In practice, the GOL chose not to use the allocated funds from the LIL for this exercise, employing instead resources from another grant fund.

The overall size of the project of about US\$10.35 million was appropriate given the exploratory nature of the task and the vastness of the Program to follow (fifty percent of the land in the Philippines has been surveyed and only twenty percent registered). Quite appropriately, about 44 percent of the projected total costs were allocated to the development of the prototypes. Similarly, the institutional development component, given its challenging task, was appropriately allocated 48 percent of the projected total costs.

3.5 Quality at Entry:

Quality at entry was satisfactory. Peer reviewers and Bank management considered the project objectives consistent with the 1999-2002 CAS objectives in two areas: (i) accelerating environmentally sustainable agricultural growth and alleviating poverty in rural areas; and (ii) promoting sustainable urban development and combating urban poverty. The key project design issues were based on experience gained in similar projects in other East Asian countries. The risks were correctly identified although the risk ratings for some of them, particularly for the institutional issues, were lower (S instead of an H) leading to inadequate risk mitigation measures. The project preparation effort led to the development of effective project management capacity including financial and procurement management.

4. Achievement of Objective and Outputs

4.1 Outcome/achievement of objective:

Outcome and Output indicators are presented in Annex 1.

The outcome of the project is rated satisfactory and the development objectives were achieved. The project identified what it will take to make the LAM Program viable. It confirmed that introducing significant improvements in the Philippines land administration system would require changes in the legal framework and institutional structure of the land administration institutions. It demonstrated that without these legal and institutional changes titling efforts would be time-consuming and costly. It demonstrated at the pilot areas that initiatives such as One-Stop-Shops (OSSs) can improve the delivery of land administration services to the community. However, the inter-agency coordination at the OSS will be achieved only at great cost and effort unless the institutional inefficiencies in the current system can be substantially addressed without legal and institutional intervention.

In the original project design the required legal and institutional changes, once identified, were expected to be brought about through EOs. However, the GOP ultimately decided to pursue legislative actions (instead of EOs) to redress the defects in the system. The project redirected its efforts towards bringing about the institutional changes without EO, and LAMP has successfully generated widespread support for the legal and institutional changes.

During project implementation, the numerical target for title production was significantly revised from 30,000 to 2,000. A total of 790 titles was distributed during the project, and the target of 2,000 was achieved by May 2005. The decrease in the target for title production was attributed to some of the prohibitive provisions in the Commonwealth Act No. 141 (Public Lands) that surfaced during the prototype piloting. However, it is important to state that the titling target of the project was not simply to distribute a

large number of titles. Rather, it was to test alternative approaches to systematic titling.

Outputs from the policy studies and the prototype activities were utilized in the consensus-building effort by the project. With support from the project, the Land Administration Reform Act (LARA) Bill was submitted to the 12th Congress. Sixteen variations of this Bill were filed. Processing of the Bill through the legislative system did not progress to completion, and ultimately the 2004 general elections prevented any further progress under the 12th Congress. However, following the election, the Bills have been re-filed in the 13th Congress and an amalgamated single Bill is being developed.

While pursuing the new strategy of the creation and the passage of the two key Bills, the project has achieved several other successful outcomes. In the pilot areas, the project demonstrated that the proposed systematic titling procedures reduced the time needed to issue titles from an average of 36 months to just 4 months. In addition, because field camps enable on-site processing of titles, the project reduced potential for conflicts thus reducing the eventual cost of litigation. Because of the OSS, subsequent transfers take less time because transactions can be completed in one location. Systematic titling procedures and improved records management have also avoided the issuance of double and overlapping titles and led to detection of duplicate titles. Other beneficial outcomes include the greater transparency and accountability in land transactions as a result of greater public access to land information; and equal access by men and women. Exit surveys and other feedback mechanisms provide evidence of increased customer satisfaction in land services in the pilot areas.

4.2 Outputs by components:

Component 1: Land Policy Studies (US\$2.38 million, 15.6 percent of project expenditure incurred). The output of this component is satisfactory. All the six key policy studies identified during preparation were completed. The component studied and made recommendations on various key policy areas of land administration. An integrated policy report was produced and concluded that the introduction and sustainability of long-term reform in land administration demands integration of functions within a single land administration agency.

The outputs from the studies are as follows:

(i) Land Development Process: Led by the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), this study reviewed the existing system of land allocation and utilization for the best use of land. It is expected to reform land use planning, land conversion, and site development procedures and processes.

(ii) Land Registration Finance and Fee Structure: Led by the National Tax Research Center (NTRC) of the Department of Finance, this study reviewed the current tax and fee structure to validate the perception that high fees and taxes act as disincentives against both initial and subsequent land registration.

(iii) Real Property Valuation Framework: Led also by the NTRC, this study looked at the current role of property valuation, its strengths and weaknesses, and the cost of running the existing system. It also identified options for and determined the cost of establishing a framework for a market-based property valuation system in accordance with the internationally accepted standards. These valuation standards were piloted in the City of Sta. Rosa. Such was the success there that the City government is now finalizing new local government ordinances to bring the new system into effect.

(iv) Forest Boundary Demarcation and Operational Procedures Policy: Led by DENR, this study developed a system for the development of a database for the general characteristics of land uses in the

uplands that will serve as a tool for planning with regard to land use. It also developed a policy framework on what to do with areas that do not conform to their existing classification.

(v) *Fragmented Land Laws and Regulations Framework*: Led by the Department of Justice (DOJ), the study built upon the previous work on laws and regulations on public land disposition, titling and registration. It examined and updated the relevance of these, and determined implications for implementation. It concluded, among other things, that the authorities should abolish the judicial process for issue and registration of titles in favor of a simple administrative process.

(vi) *Institutional Arrangements for Land Administration*: Led by the Department of Budget Management, this study examined existing institutional responsibilities for land administration, evaluated their effectiveness and appropriateness, identified gaps and effects, and made some recommendations for improvement.

Component 2: Prototypes (US\$6.61 million, or 43.4 percent of project expenditure incurred). The output of this component is satisfactory. The component had two prototypes: Land Titling and Administration prototype and Record Management prototype. In addition to testing various titling and record management procedures, this component also tested three different methods of preparing Cadastral Index Maps (CIMs). Automated mapping was found to be most efficient. A total of 497 CIMs were produced, covering 73,291 parcels in both prototypes.

Prototype 1

The Land Titling and Administration prototype was implemented in six municipalities in Leyte Province. The project tested the systematic approach to titling to demonstrate the effectiveness and efficiency of the mass approach to titling compared to the current sporadic (on demand) method. The experience from the tests enabled the project to consolidate all issues requiring policy action so that a suitable legal framework for mass titling in the next phase can be developed.

Two major approaches to titling were fully tested: the Cadastral Proceeding or Compulsory Judicial Titling under the judicial process and Free Patent (FP) under the administrative process. Homestead Patent (HP) and Miscellaneous Sales Patents (MSP) were partially tested. The project found all the available mass titling procedures under existing laws to be restrictive and inefficient. The project found the judicial process complex and inflexible. It found the best option for mass titling was the FP and has identified the administrative improvements that can be introduced to streamline the procedures and reduce the time to issue titles.

The most important restriction on the FP is that it applies to agricultural land only. The key issues that have been identified to improve the use of the FP as an acceptable instrument are: (i) allow it to be used for titling of residential, industrial and commercial lands; (ii) remove the five year restriction on transfers and mortgages; (iii) shorten the period of proof from 30 to 10 years; (iv) allow it to reflect encumbrances such as mortgages or leases entered into before the patent is issued; (v) recognize existing tenants; (vi) remove all associated costs/fees; and (vii) adopt a low-cost surveying technology.

The project issued 790 titles as of December 31, 2004. A total of 2,000 titles were issued as of May, 2005. These titles were generated using the FP process. In addition, under the FP process, 31 *barangays* have been surveyed and are ready for titling. The remaining 49 *barangays* need to have the survey plans approved before titles can be issued. The judicial titling applications did not result in the issuance of a single title. An order for the issuance of 33 titles was made by the Dagami Municipal Trial Court in May

2004 but these are currently the subject of an appeal by the Officer of the Solicitor General.

Under the project, there were no completed applications generated under HP or MSP. This is due to the lack of interest in these patents, which arises from certain specific features. The HP has many restrictions including 5-year absolute restriction on transfers and mortgages and a 25-year partial restriction where DENR approval is required for such activities. The MSP treats the land as public land and an application is, in effect, a surrender of accrued rights. Consequently, to get a title under MSP land must be purchased again at a cost no less than the assessed value even if it has been possessed for generations.

Prototype 2

The Record Management prototype was implemented in Quezon City and focussed on record verification and reconstitution, creation of cadastral map base in the ROD, elimination of fake and duplicate titles (in the prototype area), and linkage to the LRA-sponsored BOO computerization project. The project developed procedures designed to address the fundamental weaknesses in the land administration system, largely a result of the absence of: (i) a complete and up-to-date picture of all existing land parcels; (ii) a mechanism for the ready exchange of land information between land-related agencies; and (iii) a single point of contact for the public to transact land titles.

In this prototype, field validation work in barangay Holy Spirit, Quezon City led to:

- 1,472 titles found in the possession of property owners
- 676 of the Transfer Certificates of Title (TCTs) located did not have matching records in the Assessor's Office
- 134 had different TCT numbers to those held by the Assessor's Office
- 784 of the TCTs located did not have a TCT record at the cross index
- 578 parcels with informal settlements (20 percent of barangay Holy Spirit)
- testing of the *Barangay Integrated Land Information System*

For the prevention and detection of fake and overlapping titles and survey plans, the prototype: (i) established an inter-agency Technical Working Group (TWG) on Fake Titles; (ii) developed a Manual of Fake Titles; and (iii) developed a Database of Overlapping Titles and Training on Fake Title Detection. These have resulted in increased efforts not just by the TWG agencies but also by private sector stakeholders to pursue the matter more vigorously. To date, the prospect is high for a private sector-initiated publication and distribution of the Manual, especially to banks and appraisers.

The prototype has developed a Survey Plan Inventory System (SPIS) to hold information about a plan, including the *barangay* location, approval information, parent TCT, parcels and parcel area. For CIM plotting, the system provided classification as to which CIM number(s) a survey plan belongs. It also provided for the tracking of the survey plans. The system has been linked to digital copies of plans and provides easy access to survey plan information and improved records preservation, thereby improving records security. In addition, the component developed a *National Land Records Management Strategy (NLRMS)* in 2003.

Establishment of One Stop Shops

Lastly, the project also established a OSS in each prototype site. The objective was to test institutional collaboration in the provision of land administration services by providing an OSS for all land-related transactions in a manner that is transparent, cost-effective and convenient to its customers. Currently, these transactions are performed by a number of agencies and local government units and clients have to go

through different offices. Similarly, land records are dispersed in many agencies making it difficult for clients to have easy access to accurate records and other land-related information.

The establishment and operating efficiency of OSS in the two Prototypes were affected by different sets of issues. In Prototype 1, the difficulty of negotiating procedural improvements with the agencies has constrained the introduction of additional streamlining or integration of agency processes within the OSS. Thus, while all the offices are located in a single building, each agency undertakes its own processes independent of the procedures of the other agencies. The underlying causes of this are the general resistance to reforms by staff and officials of agency partners, the absence of an agreed common vision and framework for OSS operations, and the lack of customer or service orientation of the agencies.

In Prototype 2, the cooperation from the agency partners has been positive. From the beginning, there was strong interest and active participation in the development of the OSS Model and Transactions Manual, including the set up and the work flow within the OSS. Agency representatives provided inputs to the kinds of transactions that would be undertaken in the OSS, the staff requirements, and the relationships among the procedures of the agencies. The operation of the OSS, however, was delayed by the shift in the location of the site, originally within the premises of the Quezon City ROD at the local government unit (LGU) compound in 2001, after the bidding process was completed. It took a while for the LRA to identify a new location, after which there were subsequent delays in the procurement for the office renovation and purchase of equipment. In addition to this, the reluctance of some agencies in fielding staff (e.g., the Bureau of Internal Revenue) and in providing data to the OSS (e.g., by the ROD) also contributed to the delay.

The project results indicate that, under a single land administration agency, land titles offices providing OSS services should be opened, merging local DENR land services and ROD offices. Ahead of this, the LAM Program should open OSSs in selected locations where there is sincere cooperation between the local agencies. An EO is expected to provide a framework for the cooperation agreement and performance evaluation and accountability.

Component 3: Institutional Development (US\$6.18 million, or 40.6 percent of project expenditure incurred). The output of this component is satisfactory. The component provided support to the PMO and the two PIOs of the two prototypes. The component helped the PMO to manage and monitor the project. It provided TA, training and overseas study tours, M&E including two rounds of social assessment and one development impact study, and the purchase of furniture, office equipment, and vehicles. It had three sub-components: (i) project management, including TA; (ii) education and training; and (iii) M&E.

(i) Project Management. The project management sub-component performed both managerial and technical roles. It effectively coordinated all project activities and managed project finances and the procurement process. Loan funds were disbursed and used in accordance with Bank guidelines. Audited accounts have generally been maintained satisfactorily. The audit for the last year is still pending. The report for FY2003 was received very late and was qualified. Nevertheless, the qualified audit findings were addressed by the PMO. The final audit report (CY2004) is due by June 30, 2005.

Some highlights of the performance of project management are:

- Timely assignment of regular staff from key agencies such as LRA, DENR, DAR (now Department of Land Reform, and the LGU to perform key management functions in the project;
- Effective coordination with key agencies in the conduct of six policy studies;

- Effective performance as a secretariat of the Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee (IACC), later replaced by the Task Force (TF) and the TWG under it; and
- Effective coordination of the inter-agency Design Steering Committee for LAMP II.

(ii) Education and Training. The sub-component supported domestic training in the areas of management, surveying and mapping, land administration and land information system. It also supported focused study tours and overseas training opportunities that enhanced the understanding of the issues involved in modern land administration, particularly in demonstrating concretely the benefits and the functioning of the OSS concept.

The sub-component produced a core group of competent staff who can serve as the nucleus upon which to develop the capacity of other staff for the next phase to perform the following functions:

- Systematic adjudication
- Management of OSSs
- Records management
- Cadastral surveys using different technologies
- CIM production
- Management of cadastral survey contracts
- Base camp operations
- Planning of integrated technical and support programs for titling and records management
- M&E of land administration projects
- Community relations/community organizing/social development for land administration

Under the sub-component, the following training manuals were developed to supplement operating manuals and guidebooks earlier developed by LAMP:

- Training Manual on OSS
- Training Manual on Systematic Adjudication
- Training Manual on Survey
- Training Manual on Social Development
- Training Manual on OSS Tracking and Cross Index
- Training Manual on Records and Field Validation
- Training Manual on CIM
- Training Manual on Human Resource Development.

(iii) Monitoring and Evaluation. After a slow-start, the M&E sub-component developed an intricate array of activities and reports. The Implementation Completion Report (ICR) mission estimates that after the initial start-up period a quarter of the project's activities were directed towards some form of M&E. The highlights of the M&E activities include:

- Regular evaluation of technical and operational procedures as new procedures were piloted.
- Quarterly Review workshops at each site and then in a forum at the three project offices (PMO and for the two prototypes). These participatory reviews focused on progress and performance, adjusting operational plans, and identifying project lessons.
- Lessons generation, particularly in the second half of the project. A database was developed, and an integrated lessons report was prepared and validated at the project offices and at workshops with stakeholders.
- An M&E Handbook documenting all tools and procedures developed under the project has been made available for the second phase of the LAM Program.

Component 4: Phase II Preparation (Expenditures were zero: during implementation, the GOP decided that no loan proceeds would be used for this component but that resources from another grant fund would be used). Output of this component is satisfactory. The component supported the preparation of the project's second phase (LAMP II) based on the output and the experience of the project. The prime considerations were: (i) the availability of enough lessons and experiences upon which to draw the configuration of the next phase; (ii) the need to ensure a seamless transition from LAMP to LAMP II; and (iii) the need to sustain the momentum achieved through the wide consensus already reached on the reform proposals.

The following additional studies were carried out to provide inputs to the design: (i) National Training Needs Assessment, completed in September 2003; (ii) Land Markets Study, completed in March 2004; and (iii) Land Tenure Study, completed in November 2004.

4.3 Net Present Value/Economic rate of return:

It rarely makes sense to calculate the economic rate of return for a LIL and this project is no exception. A major reason for using the LIL instrument is to eliminate choices, and an options methodology to calculate the value of the LIL is more appropriate. The Project Appraisal Document (PAD) used ERR calculations more appropriate for an investment project. In arriving at an ERR of 24 percent, the appraisal had assumed that the LIL would issue 50,000 titles in rural and urban areas and improve the quality of records of about 50,000 titles in the urban area. As indicated in the PAD, even before project approval this target was revised to 30,000 which would have brought the ERR down to 14.4 percent. During implementation, as the project tested different approaches to systematic titling, the title production target was further revised from 30,000 to 2,000. The project ultimately produced 790 titles by the Loan's closing date of December 31, 2004 and ultimately distributed 2,000 titles by April 30, 2005. This would put the ERR firmly in the negative using the approach in the PAD.

However, in terms of titling, the primary purpose of this project was not simply to "mass-produce" titles. Rather, it was to test alternative approaches to systematic titling while establishing the necessary regulatory and legal framework for reform of land administration. A major part of the value of the LIL lies also in identifying the erroneous paths to be avoided. An economic analysis based on decision-tree analysis or options methodology to evaluate the value of the LIL has not been attempted. Instead, a simple analysis based on the follow-up project is offered (see Annex 3). In this approach, the benefit of the LIL is simply to bring forward the net benefits from the next phase of the program. Using this methodology, the ERR is found to be 7.95 percent.

4.4 Financial rate of return:

The ICR used the Financial Rate of Return (FRR) stream of cash flows used for LAMP II PAD and calculated the benefit of the project from advancing the benefits. The financial benefits came from the following sources: (i) income from initial registration (about US\$20 per title); and (ii) income from subsequent registration, which has three parts: (a) capital gains tax (about six percent of transaction value); (b) real property tax (about one to four percent of property value); and (c) registration fee and stamp duty (about US\$12). The financial costs are all project costs and the future management costs associated with the titling issue. Using the simplified approach, the Net Present Value (NPV), at seven percent cost of capital, is estimated to be around US\$4 million. However, the project is already generating substantial income flows to the Quezon City LGU. The project identified about 5,000 parcels that were not paying

real estate taxes mainly because the records were burned in a fire in 1988. The taxes from these parcels now produce about US\$2.5 million per year. Including these benefits, the FRR is estimated at 11.92 percent (see table in Annex 3).

4.5 Institutional development impact:

The project has had modest institutional development impact. All the capabilities at the working level, from surveying and map production to title registration and client orientation, are essentially limited to the two pilot areas and have not percolated throughout the various institutions that participated in the project. However, the project has immensely improved DENR's capability to address the sectoral issues, particularly its consensus-building activities to mobilize the legislature behind legal and institutional changes in the sector. The project has also created a TF, with high-level participation from various sectoral institutions which are firmly behind the change process.

5. Major Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcome

5.1 Factors outside the control of government or implementing agency:

In the Philippines, there is much greater use of the overloaded court system for land registration matters than in many countries. The Judicial Titling process is the main approach for residential and commercial land transactions and requires multiple reviews by lawyers. The lawyers and the courts, and all those who benefit from informal fees, resist any action to simplify the land laws and processes. Their ability to stop EOs from bringing about mass titling through simple administrative processes was not envisaged during project preparation. During implementation it was realized that the resistance could be overcome only by enacting new laws. At the time of project design, the preferred approach to systematic titling remained unproven. Therefore, in testing different approaches to systematic titling, the original target for title distribution was discovered to be unrealistic and it was significantly reduced.

5.2 Factors generally subject to government control:

The project enjoyed support at the level of the President of the Republic. However, even with this support, requisite laws and regulations could not be enacted expeditiously. In terms of financial support, the provision of counterpart funds was occasionally delayed but did not lead to serious delay of activities.

5.3 Factors generally subject to implementing agency control:

The project enjoyed support at the leadership level of all participating agencies. However, coordination at the working level proved to be difficult for Prototype 1. The multiple agencies involved in land administration and management were unwilling to assign responsibilities to the OSS. This made the OSS take the role of a facilitator rather than a provider of services to the clients. In addition, within each of the agencies reforms in the technical environment were not forthcoming. For example, in addressing the cost of new cadastral surveys, DENR was reluctant to move away from field measurement intensive methods and adopt alternate techniques tested in the Prototype.

5.4 Costs and financing:

At appraisal, the total project cost over four years was estimated at US\$10.35 million. This was to be financed by US\$4.79 million of the Bank's LIL, US\$1.36 million from GOP, and US\$4.20 million from a grant from the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID). The actual project cost over four years was US\$15.22 million, of which US\$3.69 million was from proceeds of the IBRD loan,

US\$1.51 million from GOP, and US\$10.02 million from the AusAID grant (see Annex 2). The cost over-run was in every component because the original strategy could not be executed. The new strategy of using the legislative process required more in-depth studies, did not immediately lead to gains from legal and institutional changes, and increased project management and training costs. About US\$1.1 million of the IBRD loan remained undisbursed because the GOP chose to finance the activities with grant funds. It is noted that the unavailability of GOP counterpart funds resulted in the tapping of grant funds rather than use of the IBRD loan funds in cases of training, consensus-building and additional policy studies.

6. Sustainability

6.1 Rationale for sustainability rating:

This project is part of a long-term commitment of the GOP and the Bank. Consequently, it was designed to lay the foundations for a sustainable long-term LAM Program. This involved the testing of cost-effective procedures for systematic titling and land records management and helping put in place the reforms to sustain the implementation of the Program. However, two critical issues could derail the Program and thereby affect its sustainability. They are: (i) the general resistance from the affected agencies to changes introduced and the broad reform in policies and institutions; and (ii) the legal and structural defects of the system that prevent the adoption of new improved procedures. These critical issues could lead to higher and unforeseeable GOP budgetary commitment for the LAM Program.

Passage of the LARA Bill in the Congress will require more focused effort to address the bottlenecks to its enactment. Succeeding phases of reforms will require similar (if not greater) support. Once established, the new LAA may eventually lead the next wave of reforms, depending on what would be the final provisions of the approved Bill. Built into the recommendations and proposed amendments to laws are considerations of cost recovery in services and increase in revenues by widening the tax base. A transition and implementation plan has been prepared for establishing the LAA.

The project created awareness, interest and commitment from civil society which was never there before because the sector was shrouded in technical complexities. The challenge of maintaining this participation is important for the reform, otherwise government agencies may dictate service levels and standards on their own. With exceptions, government agencies generally find civil society participation in land administration not always necessary. Institutional structures and performance measurement programs are needed to ensure that the customers are not “locked out” of the sector. Until the LAA is created, with its stakeholder policy advisory committee and other measures, the follow-on project for the next phase of the Program (LAMP II) will be needed to sustain this vital input.

If things progress as planned, the changes envisaged in the LAM Program over the next 15-20 years will require significant human resource development. The existing skills and knowledge and the education and professional development courses available are significantly insufficient. It is clear that capacity building will be required to go hand in hand with the application of new technologies, structures, relationships and work methods.

6.2 Transition arrangement to regular operations:

The OSS was envisaged as an institutional mechanism to provide more efficient delivery of land administration services to the public. While OSS can operate without the legislation to merge the agencies, the bureaucratic culture that varies greatly and the absence of a common vision and leadership to introduce changes and command compliance all contribute to the low likelihood of institutional sustainability. The

continuation of OSS operations will therefore depend greatly on the goodwill and commitment of the agencies after the completion of the LAMP. To date, this goodwill has not yet fully materialized in terms of the necessary authorities and financial delegations for the OSS to function.

On systematic titling, most of the agencies are willing and able to adopt the procedures introduced by the project. Some mechanisms have already been established to address the sustainability of the recommended systematic titling process. However, more needs to be done to ensure these changes are mainstreamed in the agencies. A draft survey regulation is in development and a regulation on mass titling by FP is beginning to be drafted, to form a framework for the detailed procedures already fully documented. Further, there needs to be institutional agreements with the ROD and DENR in relation to the processing of titles, registration of patents, and review and approval of survey plans.

On records management, some agencies have expressed interest in adopting the methodologies introduced by the project. However, others have expressed reservations based on the view that some of these methods would require legal basis or mandates to be used (e.g., use of Cadastral Index Mapping). The mainstreaming of most of the procedures would likewise require drastic modifications in the records management practices of the agencies, something which the agencies are not fully prepared to do at the moment. Moreover, these would require additional investments in equipment, records inventory, and training of staff so that these can be continued after the project. It is planned that the Quezon City OSS operations would be transferred to the City LGU ahead of LAMP II. The Mayor has subsequently committed to funding the OSS.

7. Bank and Borrower Performance

Bank

7.1 Lending:

The Bank's performance during identification, preparation and appraisal of the project is rated as satisfactory. The fact-finding mission from the Bank and subsequent preparation efforts developed the path for the long-term LAM Program. Starting with a LIL, it rightly initiated activities to address various structural defects in the sector, such as: (i) rigid and outdated land laws and regulations; (ii) weak and inefficient institutional structures; (iii) lack of transparency and accountability in the land registration system; and (iv) multiple, inconsistent and inequitable land valuation systems used in various government agencies. The risks were well identified, although the resistance to change was underestimated. Overall, the PAD, including the design summary (log-frame), made it easy during implementation to keep the focus on top issues.

7.2 Supervision:

The Bank's performance during the implementation of the project is rated as satisfactory. The regular supervision missions included Bank staff and consultants who are considered specialists, with outstanding international experience in the field. They provided advice based on the local situation and technical inputs to keep the vision of a well-functioning land management and administration system alive in the minds of the participants, particularly among those working in the Prototypes. When the EOs were unable to be supported to resolve the systemic legal and institutional problems, the Bank's supervision effort continued to support the overall objectives and the lengthy process of consultations and preparation of various Bills to address the issues. The Bank has also consistently stressed the importance of delivering tangible results to ensure the maintenance of political and community support for land administration reform.

The Bank supervision team was generally able to coordinate well with AusAID. However, progress

towards real harmonization could be improved. The two institutions still rely mostly on their own respective processes and reporting mechanisms. The institutions have different reporting requirements from the government. Areas for improved harmonization include project design (e.g., consistent component structure and higher compatibility of log-frames) and supervision (e.g., communication with government, reporting and AusAID Quality Assurance Panel - QAP). Other land projects in the region appear to have achieved greater harmonization than LAMP.

7.3 Overall Bank performance:

Based on the above assessments, the Bank's overall performance is rated as satisfactory.

Borrower

7.4 Preparation:

The Borrower's performance during preparation is rated as satisfactory. The GOP committed to a long LAM Program and built, jointly with the donors, a framework of sustainable change.

7.5 Government implementation performance:

The GOP's implementation performance is rated as satisfactory. The initiative was supported at the highest level, which permitted project personnel to maintain high morale even when facing setbacks and general resistance at the working level.

7.6 Implementing Agency:

The performance of the implementing agencies is rated as satisfactory overall. Both DENR and DOJ/LRA leadership was very supportive during implementation. The participation of the various agencies within the IACC and later in the Task Force was commendable. However, the agencies appear to overrely on foreign TA, not only for technical inputs but also for quality control. Lastly, at times, the commitment of the agencies has not been harmonious and the high level support from the agencies has not materialized at the operational level (e.g., authorizations/delegations being assigned to OSS).

7.7 Overall Borrower performance:

Based on the above assessments, the Borrower's overall performance is rated as satisfactory.

7.8 Co-financier Performance:

AusAID co-financed the project with grant funds for TA. Effective TA was provided through an Australian Managing Contractor (AMC). However, the comments made on harmonization of donor activities in section 7.2 above apply to AusAID as well. Not enough was done to build sustainable Borrower capacity in areas such as project management, procurement, financial management and M&E. In addition, there appears to be a recent approach favored by AusAID to reduce its burden of supervising the AMC through its piloting of QAP. QAP was intended to be a peer review mechanism of the AMC, and is actually engaged by the AMC itself. However, the QAP has tended to widen its scope to review many aspects of the project. This has increased the overall supervision burden to government and may also serve to confuse the government about the different roles of project supervision and quality assurance of the TA.

8. Lessons Learned

Advice to Government. There is a need for the Executive Branch of government to receive clear and consistent advice from within the respective line departments/agencies, especially when there is a need to bring about significant legal and institutional changes. In the Philippines, this has been challenging because there are multiple government agencies with overlapping mandates for land administration and management. The processing of the various Bills, initiated during the project, required complex and time-consuming balancing of interests. Several versions of the LARA Bill were filed in the Congress. Once the LAA is established, hopefully during the early part of LAMP II, the Executive Branch will be able to receive its primary advice on land administration from the single responsible line agency. This may facilitate a more efficient and effective approach to legal and institutional reform of land administration.

High Level Support. LAMP has enjoyed the highest levels of political support, including that of the President. To ensure the maintenance of high-level support in the government, it is important that tangible outputs are delivered. For a land administration project, where systematic titling is the major component, this means that titles must be distributed to land holders throughout project implementation. Distribution of titles to land holders provides a very clear demonstration of successful project achievement which is popular with both the community and politicians. Where title distribution is undertaken by leading politicians and senior government officers, profiles in the media and community may be maximized. However, to achieve and maintain this positive public profile during LAMP II there must be a consistent delivery of titles in sufficient volume. Delivery of a small volume of titles is insufficient to maintain a high political and public interest and support.

Important Role of LGUs. LGUs play a very significant role in land administration reform and the delivery of services to the community. Support for legal and institutional changes can come from building support within LGU leadership (Mayors). LGU leaders can motivate community participation in the titling process even when the number of titles being issued is small. Fairness of valuation, need for taxes, problems of fake titles, or threats from syndicates can all then be discussed frankly within the community under the leadership of the Mayor. The role of the Provincial Governor is also important. For LAMP II, it is proposed that Mayors and Provincial Governors will play key roles in implementation including participation on provincial steering committees.

Integrated Delivery of Land Administration Services. In order for OSSs to operate effectively and efficiently in the delivery of land administration services, they must be assigned the requisite administrative authorizations and financial delegations to enable them to perform their designated functions. Legislation or other appropriate instruments are necessary to empower the OSS with the requisite administrative and financial delegations to ensure integrated delivery of land administration services through an OSS. Establishment of the LAA, once the LARA Bill is enacted, is expected to facilitate the necessary assignment of authority to the OSS. Should the Bill not be passed during the early part of LAMP II, it will be necessary for a suitable EO to be issued.

Land Titling. Systematic (mass) titling is more efficient and cost-effective use of government resources and capacity than sporadic (on-demand) titling, and it is more affordable for the poor. Also, the issuing of titles under an administrative system, rather than a Judicial system is more efficient and cost-effective. The issuance of FP title was identified as the best means of issuing first time title. Although LAMP demonstrated that FP title could be issued, it was limited to agricultural areas only. Although FP had been identified as the best means for of

title issuance, the inability to achieve the necessary amendments to the Commonwealth Act precluded widespread implementation over both rural and urban lands. It is very clear that Judicial titling is expensive and takes a protracted period. The issuing of titles under an administrative system, would clearly more efficient and cost-effective than under the Judicial titling system.

Tenure Security. Tenure security through titling must be linked to broader development programs for the envisioned social, economic and financial outcomes to be fully realized.

An emphasis on post-titling activities is needed to facilitate linkages between government LAM agencies to exploit the benefits of titling and to offer the beneficiaries access to services and finances to develop the land. However, given that the emphasis under the LIL was on testing alternative approaches to titling, it is envisaged that further development on the benefits of titling will be addressed in the second phase of LAMP.

Land Records Management. Improved land records management has enormous potential for improving LGU revenue collection, and stimulating activity in the land market.

LGUs should play a significant role in supporting and sustaining these initiatives and support should be provided to build LGU capacity, and to promote best practices in records management. For the long term, development of land records databases should be guided by a national strategy, and a full understanding of key agency requirements. An appropriate data management system will be required for a more extensive development. The equipment and structures will need to be fully specified, as well as work carried out on transaction rates and file sizes in order to determine the database capacity required.

Land records management can be improved leading to better detection and prevention of fake, double, overlapping and fake/spurious titles through the introduction of new systems.

These are: (i) the cadastral index map; (ii) the cross index of records; and (iii) the record validation procedures; all designed to improve records integrity and detect inconsistencies, gaps, and missing records. The community relations aspect of the land records Prototype (Prototype 2), on the other hand, was meant to continuously educate the general public of the procedures and policies relating to land in an effort to rebuild trust in the system and to counter the work of syndicates who have taken advantage of the imperfections in the records system and the lack of understanding by the public. When introduced as part of the land administration system, these methods will have added value of providing more accurate land records information to the general public, other government agencies, and to the private sector or business community in facilitating investments in land.

Property Valuation. The reform of the property valuation system requires a definite commitment to change and the creation of a National Appraisal Authority to lead the implementation of reform. The priorities are the removal of political influence by the separation of the valuation and tax functions and capacity building across all functions and at all levels of the valuation activity. Although property valuation was initially designed as one of the key policy studies under the project, it has emerged as a priority area for LAM reform. A national uniform valuation system based on standards and regulated by the NAA is seen as essential for the implementation of a fair, equitable and transparent land taxation system. In addition, the second

phase of LAMP will need to give considerable emphasis to building valuation capacity in both the public and private sectors.

Donor Harmonization. The joint supervision missions of the Bank and AusAID were effective for monitoring the project and constructively contributed to advance LAMP's implementation. Timely, joint supervision missions provide very effective ways for the donors to undertake their respective fiduciary responsibilities. In addition to joint supervision, AusAID piloted a QAP process intended to assure quality in the performance of the TA. However, in undertaking this process the QAP also assessed many aspects of the actual project thereby appearing as a form of *de facto* supervision. This has significantly increased the supervision demands on the government. It is important that donor supervision be harmonized to ensure that it continues to be effective and does not become a burden for the government. It is also desirable that both donors adopt a common project component structure. For LAMP, full agreement between the Bank and AusAID was not reached on project design.

9. Partner Comments

(a) Borrower/implementing agency:

Comments From DENR (LAMP PMO)

After breaking through many barriers, LAMP has established a base of experience which, while still incomplete, can confidently be used as a foundation for the LAM Program. It has documented all the experience and generated essential lessons so that the next phase will be better guided in terms of the overall strategy, scope, focus, and direction. LAMP also served as a catalyst for change. It is the first major investment in the LAM sector and it has identified that there are alternatives to the current system, and that there are benefits that can be achieved if sufficient support is given in the right areas.

Overall, the project is satisfactory in terms of the following aspects:

Objectives. The objectives were mainly satisfactorily achieved. The policies and reform proposals were identified, and an overall reform agenda generally developed with strong ownership by relevant stakeholders. Replicable procedures for titling and records management were also developed, providing the opportunity to gain additional improvement in the next phase and as changes are introduced in the policy and institutions. However, some limitations were noted in the areas of OSS operations and mainstreaming of improved procedures in the agencies. Despite demonstration of the cost-effectiveness and administrative feasibility of these innovations, the general resistance to reforms, the lack of customer orientation, and the absence of a culture of performance and accountability all have compounded the difficulties in the adoption of change.

Design. The design was generally rated as appropriate. It was noted that the critical link between land titling and poverty reduction needed a stronger demonstration, i.e., linking the program to the wider growth and development agenda of the government. Likewise, there remains the need to fully develop a long term strategy or 'roadmap' for the LAM Program. Also, the reduced focus on valuation in the design meant consideration of key financial and tax elements of land administration were delayed. In hindsight the areas selected for prototypes presented significant problems during implementation. Some assumptions during design were found not valid. The assumption that the Philippines was strong in the technical areas of land administration was not true. On the contrary, there was weak capacity for surveying and information technology. The same holds true for the appraisal/valuation profession.

Project management. The management of the project was satisfactory, overall. Despite the weaknesses in procurement, financial management and challenges encountered in the initial stages associated with coordinating an interagency undertaking. The commitment of the development partners and of the government at the highest level was instrumental in ensuring that the project remained focused on its objectives. Despite the limitations in the management arrangements, the neutrality of PMO was a key factor in fostering support of different stakeholder groups and partner agencies.

LIL nature. The LIL proved to be a suitable instrument in starting development assistance for government's stated long-term program in a sector which is poorly understood; where the issues are very complex and where the existing institutions and policies are judged inadequate to make the returns on investments sustainable. Combining investment support from the World Bank, with technical assistance from AusAID was the best way of developing cost effective technical and socially responsive solutions.

LAMP sustainability, however, has to be strengthened. The reforms have to be fully in place, for the technical and administrative improvements to be sustainable and provide maximum benefits.

(b) Cofinanciers:

Comments From AusAID

LAMP formally commenced in October 2000, using US\$4.29 million from World Bank under a Learning and Innovation Loan (LIL). After twelve months, AusAID's TA co-finance contribution of up to AUD 13.7 million began with the mobilization of the Australian Managing Contractor (AMC), Land Equity International Pty Ltd. Prior to that period, AusAID provided a bridging TA from January to October 2001. AusAID also provided funding for the design of LAMP.

Project Design Issues

It was the intention that the World Bank and AusAID TA would commence at the same time, in January 2001. As this did not occur, AusAID decided to prepare its own Project Design Document (PDD) to include some important elements of land management, such as land use rights, community consultations, gender and LGU engagement, that were overlooked in the initial design. This resulted in different logframes for the AusAID PDD and the World Bank PAD. The AMC integrated the logframes of the two documents into an integrated logframe document during implementation. It would have been desirable to use this integrated logframe document for M&E purposes. This would have minimized the problems encountered during supervision missions over the criteria to be used for M&E.

In all future phases, it is desirable to have agreement on joint design, project management and operational procedures, including a common logframe for M&E. Perhaps there is need for some flexibility to adjust the PAD document to ensure that it is responsive to changes in project design and implementation.

Financial Structuring

World Bank, AusAID and the GOP financial systems were operating independently. There was lack of coordination between budgeting, disbursement and activity programming for the project. Funds were disbursed by AusAID TA to engage experts to complete specific activities, without counterpart funds being released for the procurement of essential equipment, counterparts or programmed training activities. Many delays were experienced in the running of activities; some project activities were not completed satisfactorily, and the salaries of contract staff were paid many months in arrears.

There is need for a much-improved financial structuring arrangement for all future phases. A composite budgeting and disbursement program for all partners, linked to the annual work plan for the project is necessary. This would ensure funds are disbursed for project activities and procurements in a timely manner. Improvements to GOP DBM and agency disbursement and financial management are required.

Supervision Missions

Supervision missions, involving the GOP, World Bank and AusAID occurred every six months. The Joint Missions proved useful in keeping track of overall progress and identifying key issues. However, there is need to reconsider the role of joint supervision missions to ensure greater partnership and ownership in the direction, development and monitoring of the project by the agencies involved.

Partnership issues

There are many issues related to AusAID TA and other support which are intricately linked into the World Bank loan agreement and the PAD. There is need to improve AusAID's and the Bank's understanding of each other's internal processes and procedures. In this regard, AusAID is considering the feasibility of involving the World Bank in its TA selection processes and procurement procedures.

LAMP was the first project for which AusAID trialed the QAP and Quality Assurance Contractor (QAC) arrangements. An independent review of QAP/QAC process concluded that the arrangements worked well, although there was room for improvements. AusAID is considering how to improve the sharing of QAP/QAC information with the World Bank, especially in the exchange of technical reports.

(c) Other partners (NGOs/private sector):

N/A

10. Additional Information

N/A

Annex 1. Key Performance Indicators/Log Frame Matrix

Outcome / Impact Indicators:

Indicator/Matrix	Projected in last PSR ¹	Actual/Latest Estimate
1. Government approves a time-bound action plan to set up the institutional arrangements necessary for improved and effective land administration.	Draft Bill creating the LAA submitted to 12th Congress. President of the Republic of the Philippines endorsed the Bill. Leaders of both houses indicated support to the Bill and have started deliberations.	Draft LAA Bill submitted to both the 12th and 13th Congress. Draft Bill and related policy reforms filed in Congress were consolidated into the proposed LARA Bill which is currently under deliberation by Congress.
2. IACC and key agencies approve recommendations for policy formulation in the areas of: (i) property valuation; (ii) demarcation of forest boundaries; (iii) land development process; (iv) finance and fee structures for land registration; (v) fragmented land laws and regulations; and (vi) institutional structure for land registration. Time bound action plan for implementation approved.	Policy recommendations and stakeholder inputs integrated into the overall policy and legislative framework.	All the planned policy studies supporting the needed reform in the land administration system completed. A 14-Point Land Administration Reform Agenda developed based on policy studies on institutions, laws, finance and fees, and valuation. Agenda approved by IACC/LAMP Task Force.
3. Procedures and guidelines for accelerating land titling programs tested, reviewed and endorsed by the implementing agencies and IACC.	Procedures and guidelines for accelerating land titling programs approved by the government.	Broad action plan developed on the Land Administration Reform Agenda. Implementation of recommendations of the Valuation Study already started under the project.
4. Government approves the direction of the long-term program and Phase II of the LAM Project, which includes a time frame for addressing institutional and policy reform areas recommended by the IACC and expanding the titling program and record reconstitution program to the rest of the country.	Procedures and guidelines for accelerating land titling programs approved by the government.	Procedures and guidelines for accelerating land titling programs approved by the government. Proposed amendment to the FP and draft Property Valuation Reform Bill submitted for consideration by the 13th Congress. DENR Secretary issued Department Administrative Order removing the long-standing gender bias in land titling. Recommended systematic titling procedures (given existing legislation) documented into a Field Operations Manual and Training Manual for use in LAMP II.
	Detailed design of next phase agreed by key stakeholders.	LAMP II prepared under the direction of an Inter-Agency Design Steering Committee and building on results of LAM Project experiences and policy study findings and recommendations. LAMP II negotiations completed in April 2005 and scheduled for World Bank Board approval on May 31, 2005.

Output Indicators:

Indicator/Matrix	Projected in last PSR ¹	Actual/Latest Estimate
1.1 Improved coordination mechanism among the implementing agencies.	Established IACC/LAMP Task Force, Local Advisory Group and Inter-Agency Technical Working Group for improved coordination on land administration and management.	Established IACC/LAMP Task Force, Local Advisory Group and Inter-Agency Technical Working Group for improved coordination on land administration and management.
1.2 Recommendations (those under authority of the concerned agencies) of the institutional policy study accepted and implemented.	<p>Various policies developed and integrated into the 14-Point Land Administration Agenda.</p> <p>Policy development and formulation built on partnership and broad participation and consensus building with various stakeholders such as Basic Sector of NAPC, legislative advocacy network, etc. This process generated stakeholders' support on the proposed land administration and management bill and reform agenda.</p> <p>Some recommendations in the policy studies implemented and alternative approaches tested. Results of implementation and testing disseminated/shared with relevant agencies and stakeholders.</p>	<p>Various policies developed and integrated into the 14-Point Land Administration Agenda.</p> <p>Policy development and formulation built on partnership and broad participation and consensus building with various stakeholders such as Basic Sector of NAPC, legislative advocacy network, etc. This process generated stakeholders' support on the proposed land administration and management bill and reform agenda.</p> <p>Some recommendations in the policy studies implemented and alternative approaches tested. Results of implementation and testing disseminated/shared with relevant agencies and stakeholders.</p>
1.3 A time-bound action plan to implement the rest of the recommendations is endorsed by IACC.	Action plan and schedule prepared to support implementation of the 14-point reform agenda.	Action plan and schedule prepared to support implementation of the 14-point reform agenda.
2.1 A draft action plan endorsed by the IACC to improve the process of land development and planning for the use of land in urban and rural areas.	Policy study and corresponding action plan recently prepared and yet to be presented to the IACC/LAMP Task Force.	Policy study and corresponding action plan recently prepared and yet to be presented to the IACC/LAMP Task Force.
2.2 IACC endorses the recommendations of the finance and fee structure policy study and a time-bound action plan for implementation.	IACC/LAMP Task Force approved the finance and fee structure recommendations. Firmed-up time frame for adoption under consideration.	IACC/LAMP Task Force approved the finance and fee structure recommendations. Firmed-up time frame for adoption under consideration.
2.3 IACC endorses a framework for property valuation and a time-bound action plan for implementation.	Framework and action plan for implementation of property valuation recommendations approved by the IACC/LAMP Task Force.	Framework and action plan for implementation of property valuation recommendations approved by the IACC/LAMP Task Force.
2.4 IACC endorses recommendations for changes in the legal framework for land administration and a time-bound plan for implementation.	IACC/LAMP Task Force endorsed policy recommendations and integrated these into the overall policy and legislative framework submitted to Congress.	IACC/LAMP Task Force endorsed policy recommendations and integrated these into the overall policy and legislative framework submitted to Congress.
2.5 IACC endorses a policy framework on forest boundaries demarcation and legal rights of forest occupants.	IACC/LAMP Task Force approved policy framework on forest boundaries demarcation and legal rights of forest occupants.	IACC/LAMP Task Force approved policy framework on forest boundaries demarcation and legal rights of forest occupants.
3.1 Well-functioning land titling and administration prototype, where 80% of parcels legislation type area are titled with cost around US\$60 per parcel and 80% of titles are collected and registered by the beneficiaries.	<p>Improved procedures for mass titling which are replicable and possible under existing legislation/regulations developed and tested (i.e., judicial, FP, HP and MSP titling procedures).</p> <p>Revised target of 2,000 title applications (under FP) registered and distributed to</p>	<p>Improved procedures for mass titling which are replicable and possible under existing legislation/regulations developed and tested (i.e., judicial, FP, HP and MSP titling procedures).</p> <p>790 FP titles registered and distributed at US\$61.62 per patent for un-surveyed areas</p>

	beneficiaries.	and US\$48.66 for surveyed areas. (Cost for un-surveyed areas cover survey and adjudication activities.) By May 2005, the project had fully distributed the 2,000 targets.
3.2 DENR, DAR and ROD operate a OSS, which cuts the time taken for issuance of new titles by 50% at the end of the project.	OSS established and staff from participating agencies trained on the OSS management and operations. Title processing and issuance time significantly decreased.	OSS established and staff from participating agencies trained on the OSS management and operations. Title processing and issuance time significantly decreased.
3.3 Procedures and guidelines for accelerated land titling program, including streamlined procedures among all agencies, reviewed and endorsed by the IACC to be adopted in the implementation of the long-term program.	Procedures and guidelines for accelerating land titling programs, and simplified/streamlined procedures for land transactions in the OSS approved by the government. Recommended systematic titling procedures (given existing legislation) documented into a Field Operations Manual and Training Manual for use in LAMP II.	Procedures and guidelines for accelerating land titling programs, and simplified/streamlined procedures for land transactions in the OSS approved by the government. Recommended systematic titling procedures (given existing legislation) documented into a Field Operations Manual and Training Manual for use in LAMP II.
3.4 An effective community relations and services program implemented including broad social awareness, impact monitoring, and NGOs participation.	Community relations and services program implemented using key participatory approaches which included LGU and NGO-led community organizing initiatives.	Community relations and services program implemented using key participatory approaches which included LGU and NGO-led community organizing in initiatives.
4.1 Improved procedures for reconstitution of titles developed, tested and implemented.	CIM development and records validation procedures tested and fully documented. (Replication is limited due to the technical limitations of agencies and lack of budget.) Manual on detection of fake titles developed and database of fake titles compiled from records of agencies and private sector such as banks. (Manual includes procedures for early detection of double and overlapping titles and identification of missing titles.) Inter-Agency Technical Working Group formed, with participation from the community and private sector, to coordinate efforts on fake title detection. Legislative proposals identified - aimed at improving the detection and resolution of fake, double and overlapping titles and the efficient reconstitution of missing titles.	CIM development and records validation procedures tested and fully documented. (Replication is limited due to the technical limitations of agencies and lack of budget.) Manual on detection of fake titles developed and database of fake titles compiled from records of agencies and private sector such as banks. (Manual includes procedures for early detection of double and overlapping titles and identification of missing titles.) Inter-agency Technical Working Group formed, with participation from the community and private sector, to coordinate efforts on fake title detection. Legislative proposals identified - aimed at improving the detection and resolution of fake, double and overlapping titles and the efficient reconstitution of missing titles.
4.2 The reconstitution of 80% of all titles, including damaged, lost or incorrect records.	All (100%) available titles in the prototype area crossed-indexed. Validated 39,087 parcels in five barangays, of which 38,114 title records are classified as live and 973 title records are classified as retired. Missing records confirmed.	All (100%) available titles in the prototype area crossed-indexed. Validated 39,087 parcels in five barangays, of which 38,114 title records are classified as live and 973 title records are classified as retired. Missing records confirmed.
4.3 Procedures for the compilation and updating of cadastral maps, including the sharing of data among the different departments/agencies have been tested and implemented.	Alternative methods for CIM production developed, tested and documented in the CIM Manual. CIM and cross index used by various agencies in the OSS as a spatial reference	Alternative methods for CIM production developed, tested and documented in the CIM Manual. CIM and cross index used by various agencies in the OSS as a spatial reference

<p>4.4 Procedures for interface with the BOO and other government land related computerization projects examined, reviewed, tested and implemented.</p>	<p>for land transaction.</p> <p>NLRMS developed and agreed by stakeholders (GOP, private sector, community, etc.).</p> <p>Inter-Agency Technical Working Group on NLRMS created with a mandate to develop implementation guidelines for mainstreaming NLRMS strategies in relevant agencies.</p>	<p>for land transaction.</p> <p>NLRMS developed and agreed by stakeholders (GOP, private sector, community, etc.).</p> <p>Inter-Agency Technical Working Group on NLRMS created with a mandate to develop implementation guidelines for mainstreaming NLRMS strategies in relevant agencies.</p>
<p>4.5 The NEDA Board approved the direction of the long term program and ICC approved Phase II of the project.</p>	<p>NEDA Board approved the direction of the long term program (road map).</p> <p>LAMP II approved and negotiated in April 2005.</p>	<p>NEDA Board approved the direction of the long term program (road map).</p> <p>LAMP II approved and negotiated in April 2005.</p>

1 End of project

Annex 2. Project Costs and Financing

Project Cost by Component (in US\$ million equivalent)

Component	Appraisal Estimate US\$ million	Actual/Latest Estimate US\$ million	Percentage of Appraisal
Policy Studies	0.48	2.38	495.8
Prototypes	4.11	6.61	160.8
Institutional Development	4.70	6.18	131.5
LT Program	0.28	0.00	
Total Baseline Cost	9.57	15.17	
Physical Contingencies	0.73		
Total Project Costs	10.30	15.17	
Front-end fee	0.05	0.05	
Total Financing Required	10.35	15.22	

Project Costs by Procurement Arrangements (Appraisal Estimate) (US\$ million equivalent)

Expenditure Category	ICB	Procurement Method ¹		N.B.F.	Total Cost
		NCB	Other ²		
1. Works	0.00	1.84	0.00	0.00	1.84
	(0.00)	(1.66)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(1.66)
2. Goods	0.00	0.00	0.52	0.00	0.52
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.47)	(0.00)	(0.47)
3. Services	0.00	0.65	0.00	4.20	4.85
Consultancies	(0.00)	(0.65)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.65)
4. Miscellaneous	0.00	0.00	1.53	0.00	1.53
Incr. Operating Costs	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.90)	(0.00)	(0.90)
5. Miscellaneous	0.00	0.00	1.11	0.00	1.11
Title Dev. Costs	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.61)	(0.00)	(0.61)
6. Miscellaneous	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.00	0.45
Unallocated	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.45)	(0.00)	(0.45)
Total	0.00	2.49	3.61	4.20	10.30
	(0.00)	(2.31)	(2.43)	(0.00)	(4.74)

Project Costs by Procurement Arrangements (Actual/Latest Estimate) (US\$ million equivalent)

Expenditure Category	ICB	Procurement Method ¹		N.B.F.	Total Cost
		NCB	Other ²		
1. Works	0.00	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.53
	(0.00)	(0.43)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.43)
2. Goods	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.62
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.60)	(0.00)	(0.60)
3. Services	0.00	0.59	0.00	10.02	10.61
Consultancies	(0.00)	(0.59)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.59)
4. Miscellaneous	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	2.00

Incr. Operating Costs	(0.00)	(0.00)	(1.27)	(0.00)	(1.27)
5. Miscellaneous Title Dev. Costs	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1.41 (0.75)	0.00 (0.00)	1.41 (0.75)
6. Miscellaneous Unallocated	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.05 (0.05)	0.00 (0.00)	0.05 (0.05)
Total	0.00 (0.00)	1.12 (1.02)	4.08 (2.67)	10.02 (0.00)	15.22 (3.69)

^{1/} Figures in parenthesis are the amounts to be financed by the Bank Loan. All costs include contingencies.

^{2/} Includes civil works and goods to be procured through national shopping, consulting services, services of contracted staff of the project management office, training, technical assistance services, and incremental operating costs related to managing the project.

Project Financing by Component (in US\$ million equivalent)

Component	Appraisal Estimate			Actual/Latest Estimate			Percentage of Appraisal		
	Bank	Govt.	CoF.	Bank	Govt.	CoF.	Bank	Govt.	CoF.
Policy Studies	0.50			0.02	0.01	2.35	4.0		
Prototypes	3.49	1.01		1.55	0.81	4.25	44.4	80.2	
Institutional Development	0.70	0.35	3.95	2.07	0.69	3.42	295.7	197.1	86.6
LT Program	0.05		0.25				0.0		0.0
Front End Fee	0.05			0.05			100.0		
Total Project Cost	4.79	1.36	4.20	3.69	1.51	10.02	77.0	111.0	238.6

Annex 3. Economic Costs and Benefits

Years	Costs	Net Benefit	Ben 1 "w/o"	Ben 2 "w/o"	FRR net	FRR "w/o"	ERR	FRR
1	7.34	-6.67	0	0	-3.29	0	-21.89	-18.51
2	7.80	-5.88	0	0	-3.12	0	-5.88	-2.92
3	8.26	-4.44	0	0	-2.9	0	-4.44	-5.25
4	8.71	-2.28	0	0	-2.64	0	-2.28	-2.64
5	8.90	0.9	-6.67	-7.40	-2.34	-3.29	7.57	3.45
6	0.82	8.98	-5.88	-6.66	1.82	-3.12	14.86	7.44
7	0.82	8.98	-4.44	-5.27	3.54	-2.9	13.42	8.94
8	0.82	8.98	-2.28	-3.15	3.54	-2.64	11.26	8.68
9	0.82	8.98	0.9	0.01	3.54	-2.34	8.08	8.38
10	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	1.82	0	4.22
11	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
12	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
13	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
14	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
15	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
16	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
17	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
18	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
19	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
20	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
21	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
22	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
23	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
24	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
25	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
26	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
27	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
28	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
29	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
30	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
31	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
32	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
33	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
34	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
35	0.82	8.98	8.98	8.98	3.54	3.54	0	2.50
		\$63.36	8.98	8.98		3.54	-8.98	2.50
			8.98	8.98		3.54	-8.98	2.50
			8.98	8.98		3.54	-8.98	2.50
	NPV Change 1	\$15.02	8.98	8.98		3.54	-8.98	2.50
	NPV Change 2	\$17.57	\$48.34	\$45.79			7.95%	11.92%
	LIL cost	15.22						
	LIL NPV 1	(\$0.20)						
	LIL NPV 2	\$2.35						

Annex 4. Bank Inputs

(a) Missions:

Stage of Project Cycle	No. of Persons and Specialty (e.g. 2 Economists, 1 FMS, etc.)		Performance Rating		
	Month/Year	Count	Specialty	Implementation Progress	Development Objective
Identification/Preparation					
	01/30/2001	6	MISSION LEADER (1); OPERATIONS OFFICER (1); PROCUREMENT OFFICER (1); LEAD OPERATIONS OFFICER (1); SR. ANTHROPOLOGIST (1); FIN. MGT. CONSULTANT (1)		
	07/25/2001	4	TASK TEAM LEADER (1); TEAM MEMBER (3)		
	02/25/2002	7	TEAM LEADER (1); OPERATIONS OFFICER (1); SR. ANTHROPOLOGIST (1); PROCUREMENT OFFICER (1); PROP. VALUATION SPEC. (1); INSTITUTIONAL SPEC. (1); FINANCIAL MGT (1)		
Appraisal/Negotiation					
	08/12/2002	6	TEAM LEADER (1); SOCIAL (1); LAND TENURE LAW (1); PROPERTY VALUATION (1); PROCUREMENT (1); FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT (1)		
Supervision					
	09/25/2003	5	MISSION LEADER (1); SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (2); PROCUREMENT (1); FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT (1)	S	S
	06/11/2004	6	SR. LAND POLICY SPEC. (1); SR. ENVIR. ENGINEER (1); OPERATIONS OFFICER (1); PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST (1); SR. FINAN. SPECIALIST (1); SR. OPERATIONS OFFICER (1)	S	S
	12/03/2004	5	TASK TEAM LEADER (1); CO TASK MANAGER (1); SNR FM SPEC (1); PROC SPEC (1); PROGRAM ASSISTANT (1)	S	S
ICR					
	03/28/2005	5	TASK TEAM LEADER (1);	S	S

		OPERATIONS OFFICER (1); FAO/CONSULTANT (1); PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST (1); SR. FINAN. SPECIALIST(1)		
--	--	--	--	--

(b) Staff:

Stage of Project Cycle	Actual/Latest Estimate	
	No. Staff weeks	US\$ ('000)
Identification/Preparation	-	443.5
Appraisal/Negotiation	-	-
Supervision	-	451.1
ICR	-	-
Total	-	894.6

Above included Bank-financed and Trust Fund consultants

Annex 5. Ratings for Achievement of Objectives/Outputs of Components

(H=High, SU=Substantial, M=Modest, N=Negligible, NA=Not Applicable)

	<u>Rating</u>				
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Macro policies</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Sector Policies</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Physical</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input checked="" type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Financial</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Institutional Development</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input checked="" type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Environmental</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<i>Social</i>					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Poverty Reduction</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input checked="" type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Gender</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other (Please specify)</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Private sector development</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Public sector management</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input checked="" type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other (Please specify)</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA

Annex 6. Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance

(HS=Highly Satisfactory, S=Satisfactory, U=Unsatisfactory, HU=Highly Unsatisfactory)

6.1 Bank performance

Rating

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lending | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supervision | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overall | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |

6.2 Borrower performance

Rating

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preparation | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government implementation performance | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation agency performance | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overall | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |

Annex 7. List of Supporting Documents

1. Project Completion Report, October 2004, Land Equity International (Australian Managing Contractor for TA to LAMP) and LAMP PMO.
2. Policy Studies Integration Report, August 2002, Government of Philippines.
3. Fees and Finance Policy Study Report on Finance and Fees on Real Property, July 2002, Land Equity International (Australian Managing Contractor for TA to LAMP).
4. Land Valuation Policy Study Report, June 2002, Land Equity International (Australian Managing Contractor for TA to LAMP).
5. Land Valuation Policy Study Report, Volume 2, July 2002, Land Equity International (Australian Managing Contractor for TA to LAMP).
6. Land Laws and Regulations Policy Study, Final Report, Volume 1, July 2002, Department of Justice, Land Equity International (Australian Managing Contractor for TA to LAMP).
7. Land Laws and Regulations Policy Study, Final Report, Volume 2, July 2002, Department of Justice, Land Equity International (Australian Managing Contractor for TA to LAMP).
8. Institutional Arrangements Policy Study, July 2002, Land Equity International (Australian Managing Contractor for TA to LAMP).
9. Institutional Arrangements Policy Study, Annexes, June 2002, Land Equity International (Australian Managing Contractor for TA to LAMP).
10. Land Administration Reform Bill 2003, June 2003, Government of the Philippines.
11. Land Administration Reform Act, Progress Report, June 2003, Government of the Philippines.
12. DENR Administrative Order No. 2002-13, June 2002, Government of the Philippines.
13. Country Assistance Strategy 1999-2002, Report No. 19355-PH, May 11, 1999
14. Country Assistance Strategy 2003-2005, Report No. 24042-PH, April 30, 2004
15. Informal Policy Note, May 19, 1998
16. Project Inception Report, July 29, 1999
17. Project Concept Document (PCD), October 6, 1999
18. Project Appraisal Document (PAD), September 20, 2000
19. Project Completion Report, Vol 1, & 2 December 2004
20. Integrated Lessons Report, September 2004, Report E40
21. Activity Completion Report, December 2004, Report E41
22. Aide-Memoires (January 30, 2001; July 25, 2001; February 25, 2002; August 12, 2002; February 20, 2003; September 25, 2003; March 12, 2004; June 11, 2004; December 12, 2004)
23. Project Status Reports (November 14, 2000; February 14, 2001; August 14, 2001; March 11, 2002; August 21, 2002; March 27, 2003; September 30, 2003; March 23, 2004 June 29, 2004; December 16, 2004)

