# Food Security, Agrarian Reform and Rural Development: Opportunities and Challenges for Action[1]

(Agrarian Reform: A Key Instrument in Achieving Food for All)

*Aurora A. Regalado*[2]

*Quezon City, Philippines*
*August 2000*

## Executive Summary

[1] Paper commissioned by the Project Development Institute (PDI) for the FAO SARC - TSARRD.
[2] Ms. Regalado is currently the coordinator of the Research and Advocacy Unit of the Management and Organizational Development for Empowerment, Inc. (MODE) and vice-chair of the Southeast Asian Council for Food Security and Fair Trade. She acknowledges the research assistance of John Vincent Cruz of MODE.

Food security and agrarian reform are concerns that run deep in the Philippines. But while concern for food security remains high on the development agenda at the national and international level, support for agrarian reform (AR) has significantly declined.

Is agrarian reform still relevant to development and food security? In a country where the majority of the population still depend on agriculture for their livelihood and survival, agrarian reform and the redistribution of other productive assets are crucial policy instruments in ensuring food security. As many development economists point out, the redistribution of productive assets creates the basis for economic development.

Despite the recognition of the significant role of agrarian reform in attaining development and in providing the poor the necessary entitlements and command over food, AR implementation in the Philippines has been slow. Barriers to implementation include the strong resistance by landowners, fiscal problems, inherent program weaknesses, conflicting policies, ineptness of the bureaucracy and increasing land conversions and exemptions from CARP coverage.

The present Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) faces the tough challenge of implementing AR in more contentious private agricultural farms. And if the DAR wants to remain true to its mandate, it must exert all efforts to implement a more equitable access to resources and sustainable livelihood to the poor and the landless. While land redistribution is important, this should be accompanied by a range of support services. This includes but should not be limited to access to credit, improved rural infrastructure, effective agricultural extension and research services and the development of rural industries.

Key national policy regulations and supporting mechanisms should be developed, promoted and implemented to improve the enabling institutional regulatory environment for food security and agrarian reform. These includes the implementation of progressive land taxation, the institutionalization of an effective land registration and titling, the strengthening of the institutional capability of DAR, LGUs and civil society, the strengthening of people's effective participation in governance and decision making, and the broadening of local, national and international support for agrarian reform, food security and rural development.

# Food Security, Agrarian Reform and Rural Development: Opportunities and Challenges for Action

(Agrarian Reform: A Key Instrument in Achieving Food for All)

## *Introduction*

Food security and agrarian reform are concerns that run deep in the Philippines. These issues have been at the center of national policy debates over the last decade. While concern for food security remains high on the agenda of the present administration (at least in their pronouncements) [3] and the international community, support for agrarian reform has waned. As El-Ghonemy aptly put: "where justice in property rights in land once featured prominently among questions of international human rights among the super powers, it has, in a sense been sacrifice in the pursuit of improved international relations and a probable narrowing of the gap in ideological conflicts. Land reform as a policy issue has virtually disappeared as a fundamental development issue in international debate in the United Nations forums, only to be replaced by ambiguous integrated rural development programmes and environmental concerns which avoid landed property distribution issues." [4]

As we progress into the 21st century, does agrarian reform remain relevant to (agricultural) development in general and food security in particular? Many mainstream development economists agree that the redistribution of productive assets e.g. land to the poor creates the economic basis for fast economic development (Sachs, 1987; Sobhan, 1993; Dieninger, 1998; Solimano, 1999, Rosset, 2000, Stiglitz, 2000). For civil society groups in the Philippines, the continuing unequal access to land remains a major stumbling block to rural development and poverty alleviation. But a radical redistribution of land in the Philippines seems to be impossible under the present situation. The implementation of the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP) has been so slow[5] and had and still is facing stiff resistance from the landed elite. They have been successful in emasculating CARP, which many critics viewed as a flawed program, because they have strong influence in policy formulation (by being the policy makers themselves or by having strong connections with those in power). On the other hand,

---

[3] President Joseph Estrada during his presidential campaign sorties promised that no Filipino will go hungry in his own country (Walang magugutom na Pilipino sa kanyang sariling bayan). Toward this end, the Estrada government through the Department of Agriculture is implementing Agrikulturang Makamasa Rice Program 2000 aimed at achieving self-sufficiency in rice. The Estrada administration also promised to complete land transfer in six years. Specifically, the DAR hopes to redistribute 1.3 million hectares of private agricultural lands while the DENR, 1.9 million hectares of public lands.

[4] M. Riad El-Ghonemy (1990), *The Political Economy of Rural Poverty: The Case for Agrarian Reform* (London and Oxford: Routledge), p. 3.

[5] The slow implementation of CARP, according to critics, is attributed to strong resistance by landowners, fiscal constraints, loopholes/weaknesses inherent in the program, ineptness of the bureaucracy, conflicts of operational policies, land conversions and speculations.

international institutions like the World Bank are now pushing for "a market-assisted land reform" in lands, 24 hectares and below.

This paper argues that agrarian reform remains a crucial policy instrument in the reduction of rural poverty and in addressing social injustice.[6] Agrarian reform is also a major policy option that can give landless farmers and agricultural workers more opportunities for entitlements or command over food. The implementation of agrarian reform should not be limited to just a redistribution of land but it has to be accompanied by a range of reforms in marketing and credit markets, improvement of agricultural infrastructure, research and extension services and building the capacities of people and institutions.

The first section presents the constraints in addressing food security and agrarian reform in the Philippines. The next section of the paper identifies key policy issues and recommendations that are relevant to agrarian reform and food security. The last section identifies areas for further research.

## *Neglected Agricultural Sector, Declining Food Production and Persistent Rural Poverty*

The country's food security and economic growth are very much affected by the performance of the agricultural sector. The agricultural sector (agriculture, fishery and forestry) remains an important pillar of Philippine economy not only in terms of providing food and employment to the majority (about 40 percent) of the labor force but is also a considerable source of income and foreign exchange. The performance of the agricultural sector, in terms of its contribution to the economy, fell from 23 percent in 1982 to 19 percent in 1998 (at constant 1985 prices).

### *Declining Food Production and Productivity*

Agriculture registered positive growths (though fluctuating from year to year) from 1992 to 1997 (Table 1). But in 1998, it posted a 6.6 percent decline. The production of major crops went down by 14.36 percent. Rice production declined by 24.09 percent compared to the 1997 output. The production of other agricultural crops like corn, coconut and sugarcane also went down. Only tobacco, abaca, livestock and fisheries posted positive growth.[7] The decline was attributed to a number of factors such as the Asian financial crisis, El Niño, and typhoons Emang and Gading. As admitted by former DA Secretary William Dar, however, decades of neglect had rendered the agricultural sector vulnerable

[6] According to El-Ghonemy, land reform is an "effective policy leading to rural development when it quickly reduces poverty incidence by redistributing the skewed pattern of privately owned land, transferring monopoly profit of landlords to the existing poor cultivators and by creating accessible opportunities to the rural poor." *Ibid*., p. 8. Klaus Dieninger in *Making Negotiated Land Reform Work: Initial Experience from Columbia, Brazil, and South Africa* (1998) also pointed out that "aggregate cross-country regressions as well as more micro-level evidence confirm the poverty-reducing and growth-enhancing impact of a better distribution of productive assets."
[7] Department of Agriculture, *Accomplishment Reports, various years*.

to disasters.[8] Luckily for the Philippines, the effect of El Niña was not as severe as expected. Due to favorable weather condition in 1999, agricultural production rebounded. The crops subsector posted a 10.34 percent output expansion. Both rice and corn recorded increases in output due to increased area harvested and yield. However, coconut, the country's top agricultural export and a major source of foreign earnings, and other crops (mango, tobacco, coffee) posted decreased outputs. The poultry subsector only grew by less than 1 percent.[9] It is expected that agriculture will post positive growth in 2000 due to expected increases in the livestock and crops subsectors. Negative growth is expected in the corn subsector due to unfavorable weather conditions in the main producing regions and the ongoing conflict in Mindanao. The contraction of the fisheries in the first semester of 2000 is attributed to the spiraling fuel prices and dwindling fish resources.[10]

**Table 1: Growth Rates in Agriculture by Subsector**

| | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Agriculture Sector Growth Rate (%)** | **0.730** | **2.620** | **2.970** | **1.570** | **3.790** | **3.410** | **-6.560** | **6.49** |
| Crops | 1.190 | 2.280 | 3.470 | 0.530 | 3.380 | 3.690 | -12.860 | 10.34 |
| Livestock | 0.794 | 4.660 | 4.790 | 5.180 | 6.600 | 5.340 | 4.140 | 4.23 |
| Poultry | 10.87 | 6.190 | 2.620 | 5.250 | 11.270 | 6.840 | -0.340 | 0.96 |
| Fishery | 1.170 | 1.370 | 1.140 | 3.790 | 0.480 | 0.040 | 1.210 | 2.68 |
| Agricultural Activities and Services | 4.230 | 0.740 | 1.490 | 3.550 | 5.110 | 1.960 | -5.890 | |

*Source: BAS, DA 1999 Accomplishment Report*

Recent agricultural trends are causing deepening concerns about the country's food security[11] and increased dependency on food imports. The Philippines had turned from a net agricultural exporter to a net importer by the mid-1990s.[12] In the cereal subsector, the country's self-sufficiency ratio in rice is down, from 89.49 percent in 1996 to 73.16 percent in 1998 (Tables 2). Dependency upon external food markets continued to grow. The country has to import bigger volumes of grains to meet our cereal requirements.

In 1998, the NFA imported 2,127,171.6 million metric tons of rice. Valued at around US$ 637.84 million, it was the largest amount ever imported since the end of the Second World War. More than one million metric tons of the imported rice came from China.

[8] "Philippine Agriculture in 1998: Born Under a Bad Sign," *Farm News and Views*, March-April 1999, Vol. XII, No. 2, p.3.

[9] DA, 1998 and 1999 Accomplishment Report. Available at http://www.da.gov.ph/about/performance/annual99/main.html.

[10] "Agriculture to grow 4.8 percent for the 2[nd] Quarter," DA, July 21,2000. Available at http://www.da.gov.ph/news2000/press_release/july/july18-21.html.

[11] During the early 1990s, only 5% of total milled rice production was traded in the world market; wheat at 20% and corn at 12%.

[12] Department of Agriculture, *Farms, Food and Foreign Trade: The WTO and Philippine Agriculture*. Paper presented during the National Consultation on Emerging Issues in the Next Round of WTO Negotiations, November 3, 1999, Quezon City.

The year before rice imports reached almost a million metric tons (730,710.6 MT) valued at US$ 235.10 million. Since the early 80s, the country has not been exporting rice at all except in 1991-1992. Even then rice export volume was only less than 50,000 MT.

Food self-sufficiency ratios are high in food crops like sweet potato (100%), cassava (100%), chicken (99.51%) and pork (98.89%). But the country's self-sufficiency when it comes to rice merits concern.

The grave concern over increased dependency on food imports is that it could render a country vulnerable to sudden rise and fall of food prices or to political decisions of foreign governments to sell or not to sell food. In such a situation, national sovereignty can be undermined.

***Table 2: Self-Sufficiency Ratios for Selected Crops/Food, Philippines, 1996-1998***

| CROP/FOOD | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Rice | 89.49 | 91.05 | 73.16 |
| Corn | 91.10 | 93.37 | 97.13 |
| Chicken | 99.96 | 99.81 | 99.51 |
| Pork | 99.42 | 99.05 | 98.89 |
| Beef | 83.12 | 81.68 | 85.98 |
| Cassava | 100.02 | 100.02 | 100.03 |
| Sweet Potato | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

*Source: Bureau of Agricultural Statistics, Indicators of Food Self-Sufficiency for Cereals, selected Livestock and Poultry Products and Rootcrops, 1996-1998, as cited in Regalado, January 2000.*

### *Fragmentation of Farms*

Based on the latest Census of Agriculture (1991), there were 4,770,171 farms covering 9,974,871 hectares of land in the Philippines. In 1991, the average farm size was 2.09 hectares.[13] Various census data (1971-1991) showed that the average farm size decreased from 3.6 to 2.09 hectares while the number of farms increased from 2.3 million to 4.6 million. Temporary crop areas accounted for 76 percent of total farms with the rest devoted to permanent crops composed mainly of coconut and fruit trees. Rice and corn are the dominant crops in area planted to temporary crops.

A 1990 survey conducted by the Institute of Agrarian Studies (IASt) of the University of the Philippines-Los Baños revealed that the average farm size owned and/or cultivated by the respondents was 2.22 hectares. Farm sizes vary according to tenurial status. Owner-cultivators have bigger farm sizes (3.75 hectares) than leaseholders (1.56 hectares) and share tenants (2.14 hectares). Farmers holding multiple tenurial statuses have bigger farm

[13] National Statistics Office, *Volume 2: Final Report (By Location of the Farm), 1991 Census of Agriculture*. Manila: NSO, NEDA, p. 5.

sizes (2.95 hectares for double tenure to 4.04 for multiple tenure) than farmers with just one tenure (2.14 hectares).

A re-survey (based on the IASt Survey) in 1996 conducted by the Management and Organizational Development for Empowerment (MODE), a development NGO, showed that the average farm size was 2.56 hectares but the actual area planted was smaller at 2.03 hectares. Again, farm sizes vary according to tenure and crops planted.

*Little Progress among Filipino Farmers*

The profile of a typical Filipino farmer remains basically the same. He is engaged either in rice, corn or coconut farming. He usually finished grade school, and also works as a farm worker or do off-farm jobs like tricycle driving or construction work. Most of often, he does not own the land he tills and he has to pay his landlord 50 percent or more of his harvest as rent. This profile of a typical Filipino farmer was reaffirmed by the 1996 MODE Re-survey.[14]

Moreover, of those farmers who own their land, most got it through inheritance. Their farm sizes are small, ranging from 1.4 to 1.7 hectares for rice, 1.3 to 2 hectares for corn and 2 to 3 hectares for coconut. Most of them have incomes of below PhP50, 000.

Farm production cost, as determined by the MODE re-survey ranged from a low of PhP 900 plus to a high of PhP18,289. The amount depends on the economic zone where the farm is located: lowland, upland or coastal, whether production is per cropping or per hectare and on the crop being planted. Rice is the most expensive to produce, coconut the least.

For example, the cost of production and net income for rice, corn and coconut farmers in lowland areas is shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Production Income and Cost by Crop in Lowland Farms (in Pesos)**

| | Rice | | Corn | | Coconut | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Per cropping | Per hectare | Per cropping | Per hectare | Per cropping | Per hectare |
| Income | 32,333 | 34,609 | 10,904 | 13,696 | 10,905 | 6,800 |
| Cost (with rentals) | 18,289 | 17,771 | 6,157 | 7,709 | 2,774 | 1,000 |
| Net Income | 14,044 | 14,106 | 4,747 | 5,987 | 8,161 | 5,800 |

*MODE Re-survey, 1998*

The MODE's re -survey also found that net production incomes in irrigated farms were twice larger than in rainfed farms, even with higher production costs. More strikingly,

[14] MODE and Jeffrey Riedinger, *Survey Results: Key Indicators*, The Impact of Agrarian Reform and Market Changes in Philippine Rural Households, 1998; Ricardo B. Reyes, *CARP Past the Deadline: Where's the Beef*?, MODE, 1999, Appendix A.

Owner cultivators and holders of emancipation patents registered higher incomes than tenants and leaseholders.

Production costs and income from non-traditional crops is higher than traditional crops (see Table 4). Many small farmers are, however, unable to venture into high value crops due to lack of access to credit, technology and knowledge.

**Table 4: Average Cost-Returns Ratio of Palay, Corn and Selected HVCs, 1997**

| CROP | Average Cost/ Hectare (PhP) | Average Net Return / Hectare (PhP) | Cost-Return Ratio (Profit / P1 Spent) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Palay (irrigated) | 22,494 | 4,672 | .21 |
| Palay (non-irrigated) | 13,052 | 3,580 | .27 |
| White Corn | 6,804 | 4,519 | .01 |
| Yellow Corn | 9,740 | 10,069 | .51 |
| Pineapple | 57,612 | 205,730 | 3.57 |
| Mango | 36,692 | 107,890 | 2.94 |

Source: *Bureau of Agricultural Statistics, Department of Agriculture, November 1998*

### *Under-investment in Agriculture*

The neglect and bias against agriculture can be seen from the low investments poured into the sector by both the government and the private sector.

Investment figures from both the Central Bank of the Philippines (BSP) and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) show that investors have not been keen on investing in agriculture over the years. Most investments are poured into manufacturing, public utility and business services like banking. Of the US$505.91 million dollars in BSP-registered foreign direct equity investments, only US$0.3 million went to agriculture. Most of these investments in agriculture went to the processing of high-value crops (Tables 5 and 6). Foreign direct investment continued to pour into the manufacturing sector and the financing and real estate group – 73% of all FDIs in the country. The amount that went into agriculture stood at a measly PhP 1.355 billion in 1999.

**Table 5: BSP-Registered Foreign Direct Equity Investments, 1995-1998 (in $M)**

| | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Banks & other institutions | 89.81 | 513.26 | 226.36 | 138.09 |
| Manufacturing | 337.88 | 477.69 | 172.19 | 139.07 |
| Mining | 41.9 | 3.21 | 2.84 | 5.29 |
| Commerce | 94.15 | 84.83 | 77.99 | 119.18 |
| Services | 30.26 | 34.62 | 33.35 | 9.26 |
| Public Utility | 218.77 | 120.59 | 297.76 | 5.52 |
| Agriculture, fishery & forestry | 0.16 | 1.45 | 0.16 | 0.3 |
| Construction | 2.06 | 45.36 | 242.75 | 63.76 |
| Others | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25.44 |
| TOTAL | 814.99 | 1,281.01 | 1,053.40 | 505.91 |

*Source: BSP, as cited in FNV, March-April 1999, p.4.*

**Table 6: Initial Capital Investments, January – November 1998 (in thousand pesos)**

| | 1997 | 1998 |
|---|---|---|
| All Industries | 60,719,830 | 33,223,259 |
| Agriculture, Fisheries & Forestry | 222,889 | 91,668 |
| Mining & Quarrying | 370,582 | 617,754 |
| Manufacturing | 8,097,120 | 10,464,590 |
| Electricity, Gas & Water | 707,079 | 90,761 |
| Construction | 3,705,647 | 632,853 |
| Wholesale & Retail Trade | 11,222,239 | 8,293,342 |
| Transportation & Communication | 1,097,872 | 868,754 |
| Financing & Business Services | 33,712,625 | 11,415,664 |
| Community & Personal Services | 1,585,777 | 747,872 |

*Source: SEC, as cited in FNV, March-April 1999, p.4.*

On the other hand, David showed the government's bias against agriculture in terms of its expenditures for the sector. She said that government expenditures in agriculture in the mid-1980s were almost equivalent to the 1955 level.[15] In the 1990s, the yearly budget for agriculture and agrarian reform is measly compared to other sectors such as defense and debt service. In 1991, of the total budget of P293.16 billion, only 8.8 percent (P26.52 billion) were allocated to agriculture and even went down to 6.3 percent (P20.61 billion out of P322.69 billion budget). In 1999, public expenditure for agriculture and agrarian reform was P22.799 billion compared to defense at P30.19 billion, for public order and safety, P41 billion and for interest payments, 120.7 billion.[16]

### *Persistent Poverty and Income Inequality*

Prior to the Asian financial crisis, there was a reduction in absolute poverty levels, from 44.2 percent in 1985 to 32.1 percent in 1997. Income inequality worsened as the Gini concentration ratios (the higher the level, the higher the income inequality) increased from 0.4466 in 1985 to 0.4872 in 1997 (Table 7). Many literature point out that poverty in the Philippines is a rural phenomenon (e.g.World Bank, 1998; Balisacan, 1994; Putzel, 1992). Majority of the poor in the rural areas is comprised of small producers and landless farmers and agricultural workers. They depend mostly on agriculture for their survival. By geographic area, the incidence of poverty is higher in upland areas compared to lowland areas (Table 8).

[15] Cristina C. David, *Economic Policies and Agricultural Incentives: The Philippine Case*, Philippine Institute for Development Studies, October 1995, p. 19.
[16] NSCB, *1999 Philippine Statistical Yearbook*, 15-7.

**Table 7: Poverty and Inequality Statistics**

| Year | Average Annual Income (Pesos) | Poverty Incidence of Families[a] (%) | Poverty Incidence of Population[b] (%) | Gini Concentration Ratios |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1985 | | 44.2 | | 0.4466 |
| 1988 | 40,408 | 40.2 | 49.5 | 0.4446 |
| 1991 | 65,186 | 39.9 | 45.3 | 0.4680 |
| 1994 | 83,161 | 35.5 | 40.6 | 0.4507 |
| 1997 | 123,168 | 31.8 | 36.8 | 0.4872 |

a – The proportion of poor families to total number of families.
b – The proportion of poor population to total population.
*Source: National Statistics Office; National Statistical Coordinating Board*

**Table 8: Rural Poverty Incidence by Geographic Area (for Individuals)**

| AREA | Upland | | Lowland | | Total Rural* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Magnitude (in Millions) | Incidence (in %) | Magnitude (in Millions) | Incidence (in %) | Magnitude (in Millions) | Incidence (in %) |
| Luzon | 2.00 | 58.0 | 4.56 | 45.5 | 7.87 | 50.7 |
| Visayas | 0.75 | 52.4 | 3.33 | 52.0 | 4.57 | 51.7 |
| Mindanao | 2.02 | 67.6 | 3.2 | 57.0 | 5.66 | 60.8 |
| Total | 4.77 | 60.6 | 11.09 | 50.3 | 18.11 | 53.8 |

* includes areas not classified as either upland or lowland.
*Source: WB, 1998, p.9*

The reduction in the incidence of poverty was not sustained as the country reeled from the adverse impact of the Asian financial crisis and the El Niño. Most affected by price increases and the El Niño were the poor (Table 9). The poor had to change their eating patterns, increased their work hours and took their children out of school (Table 10).

**Table 9: Impact of Economic Crisis and El Niño**

| Per Capita Expenditure Decile (1997 FIES) | Percent of Households Affected by: Price Increases | Loss of Domestic Job | Loss of Overseas Job | Reduced Earnings | El Niño |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 (Poorest) | 93.5 | 17.0 | 3.8 | 15.4 | 78.6 |
| 2 | 91.5 | 16.6 | 3.2 | 13.9 | 72.7 |
| 3 | 90.9 | 18.3 | 2.9 | 15.5 | 68.3 |
| 4 | 91.7 | 18.5 | 4.1 | 17.1 | 64.5 |
| 5 | 90.0 | 21.5 | 4.5 | 17.1 | 61.7 |
| 6 | 90.2 | 20.5 | 3.8 | 16.8 | 55.0 |
| 7 | 89.7 | 20.7 | 4.7 | 17.1 | 51.4 |
| 8 | 89.6 | 19.4 | 4.8 | 15.2 | 45.2 |
| 9 | 88.3 | 18.3 | 5.1 | 14.2 | 43.5 |
| 10 (Richest) | 84.7 | 14.7 | 4.8 | 11.2 | 37.8 |
| Overall | 90.0 | 18.5 | 4.2 | 15.3 | 57.9 |
| | | | | | |

*Source: Panel data (23,150 households constructed from the 1997 Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES) and the 1998 Annual Poverty Indicator Survey as cited in Balisacan, September 1999.*

**Table 10: Household Responses to Crisis**

| Income Decile (1997 FIES) | Total HHs Responding | Percent of Households (HHs) Responding to Crisis by: Changing Eating Patterns | Taking Children out of School | Migrating to city or other countries | Receiving Assistance from Other HHs | Receiving Assistance from government | Increasing Working Hours |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2,256 | 56.7 | 12.4 | 7.8 | 16.5 | 10.7 | 37.5 |
| 2 | 2,223 | 52.3 | 9.3 | 5.4 | 17.1 | 8.8 | 36.8 |
| 3 | 2,211 | 50.7 | 7.3 | 5.4 | 16.3 | 8.4 | 33.6 |
| 4 | 2,206 | 51.0 | 8.7 | 5.2 | 17.0 | 6.8 | 33.1 |
| 5 | 2,180 | 47.8 | 7.1 | 4.5 | 17.2 | 5.9 | 29.4 |
| 6 | 2,155 | 48.3 | 5.6 | 3.8 | 16.4 | 5.7 | 27.0 |
| 7 | 2,138 | 47.0 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 15.0 | 4.5 | 26.1 |
| 8 | 2,125 | 44.1 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 12.5 | 2.9 | 22.2 |
| 9 | 2097 | 41.4 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 13.8 | 3.9 | 23.1 |
| 10 | 2,011 | 33.3 | 1.2 | 3.5 | 12.0 | 2.6 | 18.2 |
| Total | 21,602 | 47.5 | 6.4 | 4.6 | 15.4 | 6.1 | 28.9 |

*Source: Panel data (23,150 households constructed from the 1997 Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES) and the 1998 Annual Poverty Indicator Survey.*

*Are Filipinos Eating Enough?*

The Food and Nutrition Research Institute (FNRI) conducted four nationwide surveys and found that there is a general decrease in the consumption and nutritional status of the Filipinos. Naturally such decreases affect those who cannot adjust their resources to buy more food.

A comparison of mean one-day per capita food consumption in 1987 and 1993 showed a decrease in Filipino consumption of products like cereals, sugars, fish, meat, poultry, vegetables and fruits.

For the period 1996-1998, the amount of daily per capita food supply in the country shrank by 1.2 percent, brought about by the 4.4 percent decrease in 1998, which pulled down the 2.1 percent growth recorded in 1997. Nonetheless, growths were recorded in the per capita supply of nutrients except in energy, as changes in the structure of commodities were recorded during the three-year period.

On the other hand, the energy content of the available food supply recorded an annual average decline of 0.2 percent, mainly due to the decrements posted in the per capita supply of major contributors, cereals and cereal products and sugar and syrups.

According to the National Nutrition Council, there is a high rate of malnutrition in the country. Some 22 million adult Filipinos are suffering from iron, iodine and vitamin deficiencies.[17] Moreover, the latest available data from the Food and Nutrition Research Institute (FNRI) indicate that 7 out of every 100 children aged 5 and below suffer from acute malnutrition and 9 out of every 100 are underweight. Half of pregnant women suffer form iron deficiency anemia. Three out of ten Filipinos are lacking in iron.[18]

## ***Food Security[19] and Agrarian Reform***

Ensuring food security, is a basic responsibility of governments. Hence, discussions of food security issues should not be confined only to issues related to food availability and stability of supplies but more importantly to issues of *access.* Central to the food security problem that the Philippines is lack of access to food that is still available but steadily declining. One's access to food depends on a host of factors relating to access to production resources, markets and institutions. Amartya K. Sen, the 1998 Nobel Laureate

[17] "Angara pushes for nutrition bills," *Manila Bulletin*, July 29, 1999.

[18] As cited in Aurora A. Regalado, *"State's Failure to Fulfill and Defend Its Citizens' Right to Food"* paper prepared for the Asian Consultation on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, January 27-28, 2000, Quezon City, Philippines, pp. 14-15.

[19] The usual definition of food security is "*access by all people at all times to enough food of good quality and quantity for an active, healthy life*." In this paper, food security and right to food are used interchangeably. Thus, I have adopted the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights' definition. Food security is *"the availability of food in a quantity and quality sufficient to satisfy the dietary needs of individuals, free from adverse substances, and acceptable within a given culture; the accessibility of such food in ways that are sustainable and do not interfere with the enjoyment of other human rights."*

in Economics, stressed that food availability in the market does not automatically give people access to consume this food. He argued that an individual or household (entity) "*can have legitimate command over food and other commodities … given its endowment of resources and its opportunities to produce and trade*." This implies that in looking at the problem of food access, it is important to consider the non-market determinants of the ability to command goods on the market: ownership of resources and the terms on which people come to the market and which influence their ability to trade. In the final analysis, as Gershman pointed out, there is a need to change the inequitable ownership of resources or entitlements (economic and political) in favor of the vulnerable and powerless.[20]

What are the endowments or entitlements available to vulnerable groups in the Philippines?

For farmers and farm workers, access to land and other productive resources (e.g. capital, are the vital elements that will affect their capacity to access food. However, land reform implementation in the Philippines has been disappointing.[21]

The latest agrarian reform program enacted was the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Law (Republic Act 6657). After 10 years, the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) reported that CARP already covered 57 percent out of the total scope of 8.1 million hectares as of June 30, 1998. After one and half years, the Estrada administration through DAR claimed to have distributed 222,911 hectares to 143,383 farmers and farmworkers and improved tenurial relations of 12,639 farmers tilling 21,566 hectares. [22]

When the Estrada administration assumed office, the period of implementation (ten years) was over but large tracts of private agricultural lands particularly sugar and coconut lands have yet to be distributed. The DAR hopes to redistribute 1.3 million hectares of privately-owned agricultural lands at the end of the Estrada administration. In February 1998, the implementation of CARP was extended by another six years by virtue of Republic Act 8532..

Furthermore, the government's AR program is beset by claims of deferment, exemptions and conversions.[23] The number of lands legally converted from 1991 to 1998 multiplied by 14-fold. From 4,754 hectares it jumped to 67,466 hectares. Farmer organizations and NGOs claim that the area converted is bigger than the official figure because of illegal conversions. As a means of discouraging conversions to avoid redistribution, there are calls to increase penalties for illegal conversions.

[20] John Gershman, "Beyond Markets and Protectionism: Politically Incorrect Reflections on Entitlements, Empowerment and Food Security," Paper presented at the *Conference-Consultation on Food Security*, 30-31 March 1998, Silang, Cavite.
[21] For a thorough discussion on this, read James Putzel, A Captive Land (1992).
[22] DAR, 1999 Performance Report, pp. 1,5.
[23] Commercial farms such as big prawn farms, fish ponds and aquaculture farms were given ten years to recover their investments before they are subjected to CARP.

The DAR could draw lessons and insights from the Presidential Agrarian Reform Council's (PARC) audits and the results of MODE re-survey (1996) among potential agrarian reform beneficiaries. The PARC said that the "actual land transfer has only reached 35% of the DAR's target. The discrepancy can be traced largely to DAR's practice of basing its reported accomplishments on the number of Certificates of Land Ownership Awards released rather than on the actual transfer of land titles (installed) to farmer beneficiaries."[24] On the other hand, the MODE study showed that a big number of farmers are still without access to land and that tenancy relations persist despite its legal abolition.[25] It is even worse for women farmers. The same survey found out that the land titles and other forms of ownership certificates are usually issued to male farmers despite the fact that the CARP declares that CLOAs should be issued in the names of both spouses. Government data show that only 5,145 women are holders of Certificate of Land Ownership Agreements (CLOAs) compared to 23,310 men farmers.[26] The MODE survey results also revealed that only 35% of potential beneficiaries were covered by the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program. Moreover, many potential agrarian reform beneficiaries (20 percent of respondents) were not aware of the agrarian reform program even eight years after it was passed.[27] There is also a criticism that agrarian reform was mainly implemented in government lands but not in privately-owned lands. If the objective of agrarian reform was to address land inequalities, then CARP was not successful in areas where landholding inequalities are most prevalent like Bicol and Western Visayas.

Limited access to land and other productive resources affects the capacity of women and men farmers, fisherfolks and indigenous people to command a decent income or adequate purchasing power. In terms of household income, majority of rural respondents (71.7%) earned P50,000 or less.

The land is not expanding, and not much is given away to the landless poor. Yet the Philippine agricultural sector remains geared towards the export market, and farmers are even encouraged to engage in production of supposedly winnable products like asparagus and cut flowers.[28] In fact, the local cut flower production dramatically grew an annual average of 16.8% from 1989 to 1993 yet the Philippine cut flower industry is still to gain a strong foothold in the international market. Actually Japan virtually remains as the only market, taking 96% of shipments.

---

[24] As cited in Gonzales, 1999, p.18.
[25] About 51% of the respondents says that they do not own the lands they till, 35.6% said they do and 11% said they are amortizing the land (beneficiaries of land reform). Ricardo Reyes, "CARP Past the Deadline: Where's the Beef?" *MODE Papers on Agrarian Reform*, April 1999, pp. 5 & 31.
[26] NSCB, *Statistical Series on Women and Men in the Philippines*, 15 April 1999 (source: 1990/NSO).
[27] Ricardo B. Reyes, *CARP Past the Deadline: Where's the Beef*," MODE, Q.C., p. 7; "Only 35% of potential beneficiaries covered by agrarian reform – survey," *Philippine Star*, June 29, 1998.
[28] In 1995, Republic Act 7900 (High Value Development Act) was enacted giving incentives for growing high value crops such as banana, abaca, rubber, pineapple, mango, asparagus, cutflowers. Incentives include insurance coverage, grace period in lease payment of government lands, tax rebates, duty-free importation of high quality seeds.

*Tenurial Insecurity among ARBs*

For agrarian reform beneficiaries, what are the legal, policy and regulatory constraints for securing property rights on their land?

Alchian and Demsetz (1973)[29] said that exclusivity, inheritability, transferability and enforcement mechanisms are the key elements defining property rights. Brandao and Feder (1995) categorized property rights into four types: open access, communal property, private property and state property. They said that "in an open access regime, property rights are not specifically assigned to any individual or small group." Communal property refers to the rights assigned to a specific community who can regulate and control the use of the property. Private property rights refer to rights assigned to individuals or corporations while State property means that the government (including government units) owns the property.

Under the present system of property rights in the Philippines, a Torrens title[30] (registered at the Registry of Deeds) is a prerequisite to secure property rights. Under the CARL (Chapter VII, Section 26), agrarian reform beneficiaries shall pay the Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP) in thirty (30) annual amortizations at six percent interest per year. The LBP can foreclose the land for non-payment of three (3) annual amortizations. The law also forbids the beneficiary from selling, transferring, or conveying the land except through hereditary succession, to the government, to the LBP or to other qualified beneficiaries for a period of ten (10) years. The spouse or heirs can, however, repurchase the said land from the government or LBP within a period of two (2) years).

While many farmers were covered by CARL, individual land titling have lagged behind (Table 11). Many are only covered by mother CLOAs. There were also cases that CLOAS had been issued but the farmers were not physically installed.

**Table 11: Titled Lands Distributed by Administration, 1972-1997 (in million hectares)**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DAR | 0.07 | 0.812 | 1.84 | 2.00 |
| DENR | 0.19 | 0.88 | 0.83 | 0.90 |
| TOTAL | 0.26 | 1.692 | 2.67 | 2.90 |
| | MARCOS (14 yrs.) | AQUINO (6 yrs.) | RAMOS ( 5.5 yrs.) | |
| | 1972-85 | 1986-June 1992 | July '92-1997 | End of term |

Source of data: DAR as cited by Gonzales, 1999, p. 17.

[29] As cited by Brandao and Feder, 1995.
[30] The Land Registration Act of 1902 (LRA) institutionalized the Torrens system of land titling which allowed the registration of privately held and controlled lands. Many Filipino farmers were dispossessed of their lands because they were not aware of such a law or the process of securing land titles was too complicated. The LRA was followed by the Public Act of 1903 (Homestead System) where individuals can privately-owned lands not exceeding 16 hectares while corporations, 1024 hectares. Then the Public Act of 1905 which expanded the coverage. The Cadastral Act of 1910 required the conduct of a cadastral survey before the granting of land titles (Gonzales, 1999, p. 15).

Farmers' organizations and their supporters are also claiming that there are more cancellations of land titles in the Estrada administration compared to the Ramos administration. The Philippine Peasant Institute claimed that 1,892 emancipation patents (EPs) and CLOAs covering 374,266.05 hectares were cancelled as of May 2000, based on the data provided by DAR-MIS. EPs and CLOAs covering 36,315 hectares were cancelled during the Ramos administration (1994-1997). DAR-MIS denied providing such a data claiming that their latest figures only cover up to April 30, 2000. DAR, however, affirmed that 32,598 CLOAS covering 77,094.46 hectares (from January 1994 to December 1999) were cancelled. Further, it claimed that only 1,031 EPs (3% of total) affecting 3,714.48 hectares were actually cancelled due to 'erroneous coverage, retention exemption, re-issuance of owner's title and correction of farmer-beneficiaries. The bulk of the EPs/CLOAs were supposedly just replaced not cancelled due to transfer actions, subdividing of mother CLOAs and erroneous entries.[31]

*Agrarian Reform Communities[32] and Beneficiaries*

In 1993, 1,000 ARCs were identified covering two million hectares and five million farmers. From 1993 to 1996, some 863 ARCs[33] were launched. The Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) conducted an assessment of agrarian reform communities in 1997, and found out that only 5% were highly developed. ARCs are usually classified as highly developed, developing or underdeveloped. Most of the ARCs belonged to the last category. Developed ARCs according to the DAR are mostly farming communities enjoying full ownership of the land, with a mature organization and infrastructures.

An assessment done by the Institute for Agrarian Studies (IASt) in Los Baños, Laguna found that the actual number of agrarian reform beneficiaries compared to the total CARP population is around 23-93%. The IASt found out that under CARP, the quantity and value of crops generally increased. ARBs also gained access to health facilities, and the quantity and quality of their food also improved.

The same study also discovered that ARBs felt that tenurial security was not yet fully realized or was only partially fulfilled, owing to continuing amortization and the absence of ownership documents.

---

[31] "Agrarian Reform Under Estrada: Cancelled CLOAs, Cancelled Lives," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, 6 June 2000; 'Setting the agrarian record straight," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 28, 2000.

[32] With the need to maximize limited resources and to create more impact, the Department of Agrarian Reform came out with the ARC concept/strategy. An agrarian reform community (ARC) is a geographical unit the size of a barangay or cluster of barangays where there is a critical mass of farmers and/or farm workers. The ARC strategy encompasses broad concerns -- land tenure improvement, land productivity, ecological sustainability, provision of support services, gender issues.

[33] The latest figures from DAR (1999) indicate that 869 ARCs were launched from 1993-1996 and 163 ARCs from 1997-1999.

So far, the DAR under the Estrada administration has established 111 new areas bringing the total number of ARCs to 1,031.[34]

## *Recommendations: Opportunities and Challenges for Further Action*

Food insecurity is most prevalent in rural areas. It is widely acknowledged that poverty is a major cause of food insecurity. Poverty is a condition where individuals lack the entitlements and capacities to fulfill their basic needs and aspirations. Therefore to eradicate poverty, the state must provide the enabling environment so that the poor, mostly residing in the rural areas, can have entitlements that will enable them to develop their capabilities. The Department of Agrarian Reform as a public service institution can contribute significantly in the eradication of poverty and consequently, contribute in ensuring food security for all Filipinos. DAR should focus its efforts on the following areas for reforms.

### The Imperative of a More Equitable Access to Resources and Sustainable Rural Livelihoods

The inability of the rural people to produce sufficient quantities to meet their subsistence needs and the market is a reflection of their limited access to land, water, technology, credit and markets and the failure of agricultural research and extension to provide affordable and appropriate technology, knowledge and technical assistance.

- Agrarian reform and the redistribution of other productive assets are crucial policy instruments not only in ensuring food security but more importantly, in the reduction of rural poverty and in addressing social injustice. The DAR should fast track the redistribution of privately-owned lands, whether 24 hectares and below or 24 hectares and above. Recent surveys and studies have shown that many potential agrarian reform beneficiaries can be found in lands, 24 hectares and below. Targeting redistribution in lands of 24 hectares and above only might exclude a significant number of landless farmers and farmworkers from the benefit of land redistribution. Special focus should be given on land redistribution in sugar and coconut areas (e.g. Bicol and Western Visayas) where poverty and income inequalities are quite significant.

- Measures to improve access to credit and savings mobilization should also be instituted. Philippine literature on credit has shown that farmers and other rural poor do not have sufficient savings to finance their production and consumption. They usually resort to borrowing to the informal sources of credit (e.g. traders, money lenders) usually at a high cost (higher interest rates or with arrangement to sell their produce to the lender). Formal credit

[34] DAR, 1999 Performance Report, p. 9.

institutions (e.g. banks) are reluctant to lend to them because of high transaction costs to process small loans and higher risks of no-payment of loans (defaults). Innovative ways of reducing risks and reducing cost of loan transactions (e.g. group lending, guarantee schemes) should be encouraged.

On the other hand, government experiences of providing rural credit to small farmers and other rural poor had not been quite successful. High incidence of non-repayment of loans had been observed.

Public money should be channeled via appropriately regulated and competitive intermediaries to support the acquisition and productive management of productive assets by the farmers and other rural poor. If DAR and other public institutions wish to assist the poor in accessing credit they should focus on guaranteeing the loans rather than focus on actual credit delivery. Running a successful credit program or lending business requires a different set of skills, which the present DAR personnel do not have a comparative advantage. Instead, DAR can help by linking those in need of capital or credit to financial intermediaries and by providing the financial intermediaries information (e.g. identifying organizations, cooperatives that have good track records in credit delivery) that can assist them in making rational business decisions in the rural areas.

Savings mobilization should be encouraged. Innovative savings program should be developed to encourage small farmers, ARBs and other rural poor to save.[35] However, there is a tendency that savings mobilized in the rural areas flow out of the rural areas. Measures should be taken to ensure that resources mobilized should be re-channeled back to develop agriculture and rural economy.

- While land reform will enable farmers and farm workers to have access to land, without access to a range of support services, they will have a hard time to survive. The government (including its agencies) has the vital role to play in upgrading rural infrastructure to facilitate access to markets (especially in far-flung areas); monitoring and publishing market information and statistics, in establishing and enforcing laws to regulate trade, in taking strong actions (sanctions) against monopolistic or discriminatory practices, in intervening where private sector fails to achieve certain public objectives such as maintaining buffer stocks and stabilizing prices.

  Extension services should not only provide farmers with the technical advice and knowledge (e.g. improving crop productivity, better agricultural practices) but also other services such as project planning and development, information management, monitoring and evaluating programs or projects.

[35] For example, some rural banks encourage savings mobilization by small vendors through daily collections at their place of business. Deposit could be as low as P10 a day. Others, like cooperatives, a portion of the loans is set aside as savings.

Agricultural research should be focused on areas that are relevant to farmers and local needs.

- The problem of poverty and food insecurity could not be addressed by agrarian reform alone. Agrarian reform should be complemented with a program to develop and stimulate the rural economy. Backward and forward linkages to agriculture should be developed. Some enterprises that could be initiated and nurtured are the agro-processing businesses. The DAR, especially in agrarian reform communities, can contribute in the development of rural industries by linking potential entrepreneurs to existing entrepreneurs who have already proven their capacity to establish and manage successful enterprises.

**The Need to Develop, Promote, and Reinforce National Policy and Regulatory Framework for Food and Agriculture (Providing the Enabling Environment)**

There are a number of key national policies, regulations and supporting mechanisms that the DAR and other government institutions could develop, promote and implement to provide the enabling institutional and regulatory environment for food security and agrarian reform.

- *The Need to Implement Progressive Land Taxation*. Progressive land taxation is seen as a disincentive to hold land. Moreover, as Balisacan (1994) contends, a progressive land tax would help "facilitate a more intensive utilization of land, and mobilize funds for government's program of land purchase and its provision of support services." In the Philippines, however, many legislators who have landed interests have strongly opposed the implementation of a progressive land tax.

  According to Binswanger, Deininger, and Feder (1995), a land tax can be effective if:

  > *"The administration and revenue derived from the land tax will be placed at the local level (municipalities, counties, or their equivalent so as to lower information costs, facilitate enforcement, and make the benefits of the land tax more visible to the community. Second, the tax rate must be flat or only slowly progressive so as to decrease political resistance and increase the law's enforceability."*

- *The Need for an Effective Land Registration and Land Titling*. In the Philippines, lands are ideal collateral for credit. To be acceptable as collateral, however, the right over that land has to be clearly defined through the possession of a title that is properly registered. As Brandão and Feder (1995) aptly put:

*Secure individual or corporate property rights are critical in establishing a structure of economic incentives for investment in land-based activities. The more these rights are restricted, the weaker will be the investment incentives and the lower the productivity of land* (Figure 1).

Studies and local experiences have shown that farmers with titled lands have easier access to formal credit, which are a lot cheaper (lower interest) than informal sources of credit. With a collateral, the risks are reduced.

- *The Necessity of Strengthening Institutional Capabilities (e.g. of LGUs and Civil Society).* The successful implementation of any program in the rural areas requires the active participation or involvement of local government units and civil society (people's organizations, local communities, NGOs, cooperatives).

  The actual delivery of much-needed agricultural services, infrastructure facilities, and other social services had been devolved to local government units by virtue of the Local Government Code of 1991. Yet, many personnel of LGUs (especially in poor provinces and municipalities) are not equipped with the necessary skills and expertise to deliver these services. It was already pointed out that one of the reasons for the slow implementation of CARP was the perceived lack of skills (ineptness) of DAR personnel. It is imperative that a human resource development (HRD) program be implemented to strengthen capabilities that are needed in agrarian reform implementation. Areas for improvement include (but not limited to) effective monitoring and evaluation, value formation -- developing committed public personnel. Such a HRD program should be complemented with an incentive structure so that trained personnel will not be pirated by the private sector.

  In the Philippines, the civil society sector is very dynamic and innovative. DAR Secretary Horacio Morales pointed out that the "relatively high degree of accomplishment" of land redistribution was partly attributed to the "strong social pressure to implement reforms and the support of NGOs and POs to such reforms." There is a comparative advantage of POs and NGOs in terms of social preparation (e.g. organizing, social orientation). Given the changing economic, social and political landscape, however, there is also a need for them to acquire new skills and knowledge. One such area is on entrepreneurship. Another is the capacity for cost-effective monitoring and evaluation of programs and services. Changing power relations is no easy task. NGOs must develop skills at engaging the state and its agencies as well as the international system/institutions (e.g. WTO, WB, UN).

- *The Need to Build and Strengthen People's Participation in Governance and Decision-Making*. At the center of any development effort should be the people. If development is a "question of giving people genuine choices and enhancing their ability to make those choices"[36], then the people especially the small farmers, farm workers, fisherfolks, indigenous peoples and other small producers should be able to define and initiate their own development.

The DAR should focus its efforts in supporting ARBs, other farmers and farm workers' initiatives (e.g. in agrarian reform communities) by establishing mechanisms of interaction, cooperation and opportunity to shape and influence public policies that affect them. For example, the government should ensure that (legitimate) representatives of civil society be a amply represented in the various committees and task forces to implement the Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act and other agricultural, rural development and food security programs and projects.

- *Broadening Local, National and International Support for Agrarian Reform, Food Security and Rural Development.* The problems of food insecurity, poverty and rural underdevelopment are so complex and interrelated. If we have to address them effectively, it is essential that all stakeholders must cooperate with one another. It should be emphasized, however, that the state has the primary responsibility of providing services for the public good and in establishing or creating a favorable/enabling environment for development.

  Given the magnitude of the problem, international support to agrarian reform should be mustered. Official development aid (ODA) to CARP has supported development projects such as the construction of farm-to-market roads, post-harvest facilities, conduct of policy studies, building and rehabilitation of irrigation systems. While these projects are laudable, the DAR must ensure that this will not contribute to further resistance to agrarian reform. As Putzel (1992) contends "channeling funds into such institutional strengthening projects in the absence of a re-alignment of power relations in the agricultural sector would more likely reinforce a balance of power decidedly against the rural poor."

## *Areas for Further Study*

1. There is a dearth of information and studies on how the land markets operate in the Philippines. In the context of facilitating agrarian reform implementation, policy markers, program implementors and civil society can gain insights from a thorough understanding of how the land markets operate in the Philippines. What are the current policies affecting local land markets and what are their implications or effects of these policies and regulations to the implementation of a comprehensive agrarian reform program?

[36] As cited in DAR 1999 Performance Report. David Korten defines development as "a process by which the members of society increase their personal and institutional capacities to mobilize and manage resources to produce sustainable and justly distributed improvements in their quality of life consistent with their own aspirations." Others define development as a matter of empowering the disadvantaged people. This implies a redistribution of power (economic, political, social) within society.

2. The feasibility of establishing an online-database on land information system. The cost of land registration and titling in the Philippines are costly. If vital information on land such as size, market value, ownership status, productive capacity, boundary information is readily available, it might reduce drastically the cost of registration and titling. Owners might be encouraged to register (many landowners just possess a tax declaration).

3. One area that needs further research is on the perceived pervasiveness of land conversions, legal and illegal and the seeming inability of government to prevent land conversions. This is an area of study where DAR and civil society can cooperate. A systematic monitoring system to document land conversions could be developed and implemented.

## REFERENCES


Asian Development Bank, M.G. Quibria (ed.). *Rural Poverty in Asia: Priority Issues and Policy Options (Volume1).* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Balisacan, Arsenio M. "Philippines," *Rural Poverty in Developing Asia (Volume 2*), M.G. Quibria (ed.). Manila: ADB, 1994, pp. 406-585.

Banerjee, Abhijit. "Why Wealth Distribution Can Matter for Growth: A Review of Key Issues (Summary)," Working Papers, International Conference on Asset Distribution, Poverty and Economic Growth, Brasilia, Brazil, July 14-17, 1998. Available at http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/Networks/ESSD/icdb.nsf/

Barraclough, Solon L. "Agricultural Development and food Security in the New Global Economic Order: Policy Issues for the South," Working Papers, International Conference on Asset Distribution, Poverty and Economic Growth, Brasilia, Brazil, July 14-17, 1998. Available at http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/Networks/ESSD/icdb.nsf/

Binswanger, Hans P. and Miranda Elgin. *Reflections on Land Reform and Farm Size*, paper presented at the 20th International Conference of Agricultural Economists, Buenos Aires, 24-31 August 1988.

Borras, Jun and Jenny Franco. "A Critical Review of CARP and its Accomplishments," *Philippine International Review*, Vol.1, No. 2, Autumn1998. Available at http://www.philsol.nl/pir/CARPReview-98b.htm.

Brandao, Antonio Salarazar P and Gershon Feder, "Regulatory Policies and Reform: The Case of Land Markets," *Regulatory Policies and Reform: A Comparative Perspective,* Claudio Frischtak (ed.). World Bank, December 1999, pp. 191-209.

"CARP under Erap: Off to a slow start," *Farm News and Views*, Vol. XII, No. 3, May-June 1999.

Carrera, Percivil M. "The Year 2000 National Budget: Big on Promises, Short on Resources," *Community & Habitat*, Vol.2, No.2, Issue 6: 83-107.

Deininger, Klaus. *Making Negotiated Land Reform Work: Initial Experience from Columbia, Brazil and South Africa* (Draft). World Bank, June 20, 1998.

Department of Agrarian Reform. 1999 Performance Report.

El-Ghonemy, M. Riad. *The Political Economy of Rural Poverty: The Case for Land Reform*. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). *Sustainable Agriculture* *and Rural Development: Report of the Secretary-General*. Paper prepared for the Eight Session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, 24 April – 5 May 2000.

_____________. *Strategic Framework for the Next 15 Years*. Available at http://www.fao.org/docrep/x3550e/x3550e03.htm.

Franco, Jenny and Carla Bautista. *BM and DAR: A Match to Watch*. Interview article for Tambuli (Filippijnengroup Nrderland, FIDOC) and Conjucture (Institute for Popular Democracy) January 1999.

Gonzales, Andresito Reynaldo A. *Food Security and Modernizing Agriculture: Opportunities for convergence through Small Holder Agriculture*, Philippines, 1999.

Hayami, Yujiro, Ma. Agnes R. Quisumbing and Lourdes Adriano. *Toward An Alternative Land Reform Paradigm: A Philippine Perspective*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1990.

Hofwegen, Paul van and Mark Svendsen. *A vision of water for food and rural development*. Document prepared for the 2nd World Water Forum, The Hague, Netherlands, 17 March 2000.

Homeres, Geiah, "Redistribution: a matter of law, a matter of political will," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 18, 2000.

Makabenta, Leah P. "Unfinished Business: CARP's O rphaned Reforms," *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 18, 2000.

Morales, Jr., Horacio R. *Food Security and Poverty Reduction through Sustainable Rural Development*, paper presented at the Adelaide Biennial Summit (Economic, Social and Environmental Solutions for the New Millennium, 7-9 April 1999.

"National Budget Update," *Community & Habitat*, Vol.2, No.2, Issue 6: 108-114.

Pinstrup-Andersen, Per, Rajul Pandya-Lorch and Wark W. Rosegrant (1997). *The World Food Situation: Recent Developments, Emerging Issues, and Long-term Prospects*. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. *Towards a Better Distribution of Land: The Challenge of Agrarian Reform.* Libreria Editrice Vaticana 00120 Citta del Vaticano. Available at http://www.vatican.va

Putzel, James. *A Captive Land: The Politics of Agrarian Reform in the Philippines.* Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1992.

Quisumbing, Ma. Agnes. "Agrarian Reform Alternatives for a Mixed Economy," *Economic Alternatives for the Philippines: Studies in the Framework of a Mixed Economy* (draft and unpublished). Quezon City: Philippine Center for Policy Studies, 1987.

Regalado, Aurora A. and Philippine Group. "State's Failure to Fulfil and Defend Its Citizens' Right to Food: The Philippine Experience," paper presented at the Asian Consultation on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 27-28 January 2000, Quezon City, Philippines.

Rosset, Peter M. *The Multiple Functions and Benefits of Small Farm Agriculture in the Context of Global Trade Negotiations*. Oakland: FoodFirst/Institute for Food and Development Policy and Transnational Institute, September 1999.

Stiglitz, Joseph. "Distribution, Efficiency and Voice: Designi ng the Second Generation of Reforms," Working Papers, International Conference on Asset Distribution, Poverty and Economic Growth, Brasilia, Brazil, July 14-17, 1998. Available at http://www.worldbank.org/htm/extme/jssp071498.htm.

World Bank. *The East Asian Miracle: Economic Growth and Public Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1993.

_____________. *Philippines: Promoting Equitable Rural Growth (Report No. 17979-PH).* WB, May 29, 1998.

**Figure 1: A Conceptual Framework for the Economics of Land Titling**

## Appendix 1: Adjusted Scope: Land Acquisition and Distribution and Accomplishment, as of December 1998

| Land Category | Working Scope | Accomplishment |
|---|---|---|
| **PHILIPPINES** | **8,169,545** | **4,783,753** |
| **Department of Agrarian Reform** | **4,398,134** | **2,811,838** |
| Phase I: | 2,169,331 | |
| Operation Land Transfer* | 579,520 | |
| Voluntary Offer to Sell* | 396,684 | |
| Voluntary Land Transfer /1 | 305,488 | |
| GFI-Owned Lands | 229,796 | |
| KKK Land/EO448 | 657,843 | |
| Phase II: | 1,144,393 | |
| Landed Estates /2 | 79,246 | |
| Settlements /3 | 608,559 | |
| Private Lands >30 Has.* | 456,588 | |
| Phase III: | 1,048,775 | |
| Private Lands > 24- 50 Has.* | 312,355 | |
| Private Lands > 5 – 24 Has.* | 736,420 | |
| Phase IV: | 35,635 | |
| Deferred Commercial Farms* | 35,635 | |
| **Department of Environment and Natural Resources** | **3,771,411** | **1,971,915** |
| Public A & D Lands | 2,502,000 | |
| ISF Areas /4 | 1,269,411 | |

* Compensable Lands; /1 Philippine version of Market-Assisted Land Reform per R.A. 7905; additional target of 20,746 hectares for 1997-98 added to the officially adopted interim working scope of 284,742 hectares; /2 Excess accomplishment of 7,083 hectares and additional target of 2,040 hectares for the years 1997-98 added to the Interim working scope of 70,173 hectares; /3 Excess accomplishment of 19,189 hectares and additional target of 23,038 hectares for 1997-98 added to the Interim working scope of 566,332 hectares; /4 includes Certificates of Stewardship Contract and Certificates of Communal Forestry, issued prior to R.A. 6657, covering an area of 190,587 hectares.

*Source: Department of Agrarian Reform*

**Appendix 2: Accomplishment by Administration**

| Admin/ Year | ACCOMPLISHMENT | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TOTAL | Private Agricultural Lands | | | | | | Governm | |
| | | OLT | GFI | VOS | VLT | CA | Sub-total | GOL/ KKK | SETT |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2,991,934 | 509,462 | 137,027 | 359,960 | 397,896 | 167,729 | 1,572,074 | 731,004 | 610,192 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| ***MARCOS*** (1972-1986) | 67,124 | 15,061 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15,061 | 0 | 41,022 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| ***AQUINO*** | 812,522 | 340,045 | 22,938 | 54,011 | 20,737 | 13,482 | 451,213 | 142,321 | 193,207 |
| 1987 | 44,058 | 42,811 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42,811 | 0 | 1,001 |
| 1988 | 135,693 | 113,215 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113,215 | 20,238 | 1,947 |
| 1989 | 111,665 | 92,266 | 3,987 | 959 | 497 | 0 | 97,709 | 2,303 | 10,380 |
| 1990 | 183,062 | 61,426 | 2,075 | 9,902 | 2,317 | 539 | 76,259 | 11,142 | 88,568 |
| 1991 | 279,882 | 22,188 | 15,138 | 28,937 | 12,882 | 9,698 | 88,843 | 99,031 | 77,643 |
| Jan-June 1992 | 58,162 | 8,139 | 1,738 | 14,213 | 5,041 | 3,245 | 32,376 | 9,607 | 13,668 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| ***RAMOS*** | 1,889,377 | 141,620 | 105,498 | 255,341 | 328,654 | 120,828 | 951,941 | 543,738 | 352,497 |
| **July-Dec 1992** | 201,858 | 16,339 | 14,688 | 29,386 | 15,263 | 11,516 | 87,192 | 58,561 | 36,024 |
| **1993** | **407,680** | **32,972** | **33,413** | **53,592** | **34,919** | **19,662** | **174,558** | **168,051** | **61,640** |
| **1994** | **433,678** | **31,565** | **22,212** | **43,312** | **60,439** | **14,319** | **171,847** | **165,305** | **91,918** |
| **1995** | **289,324** | **25,166** | **11,647** | **38,470** | **66,151** | **17,724** | **159,158** | **47,634** | **72,005** |
| **1996** | **300,195** | **19,398** | **17,932** | **43,873** | **78,755** | **24,248** | **184,206** | **47,452** | **66,800** |
| **1997** | **210,126** | **12,803** | **4,109** | **35,207** | **58,882** | **25,485** | **136,486** | **50,490** | **22,598** |
| **Jan-June 1998** | **46,516** | **3,377** | **1,497** | **11,501** | **14,245** | **7,874** | **38,494** | **6,245** | **1,512** |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| *ESTRADA* | 222,911 | 12,736 | 8,591 | 50,608 | 48,505 | 33,419 | 153,859 | 44,945 | 23,466 |
| Jul-Dec 1998 | 90,842 | 5,215 | 4,137 | 20,267 | 20,657 | 13,500 | 63,776 | 20,675 | 6,040 |
| 1999 | 132,069 | 7,521 | 4,454 | 30,341 | 27,848 | 19,919 | 90,083 | 24,270 | 17,426 |