

Mindanao Lands for Agri-Investments or Agri-Colonialism?¹

The Need to Ensure Food and Land Security in Mindanao

16 September 2009, Cha-Li Beach Hotel, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

Executive Summary

On 16 September, a half-day information sharing and discussion., which keyed in on the highly relevant topic on commercial pressures to land in the specific context of Mindanao island in the Philippines, was organized by the Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ANGOC), with the Philippine Development Assistance Programme (PDAP), the Archdiocese of Cagayan de Oro (ACDO), South East Asia Rural Leadership Institute (SEARSOLIN) and Xavier University College of Agriculture (XU-CA). Participants from the Philippine government, Asian and Philippine civil society organizations, the Catholic Church through the regional CABUSTAM network, and local media, came to: discuss issues and challenges on food and tenurial security of poor rural sectors (e.g. small farmers, indigenous peoples, forest communities) vis-à-vis the plans of agri-related agencies; and present possible measures of safeguarding local communities rights over their land vis-à-vis agri-investments.

The global “land grab” phenomenon reflects intense competition for land, especially in developing countries. It requires a re-examination of rules for food security, particularly whose food security is being achieved. The context is changing – with food shortages, the inclusion of agriculture in international trade, and the expansion of economic opportunities in agriculture. The strategy of agricultural investments – can be seen as one of “agri-colonialism” as the private sector is increasingly involved, with governments subsidizing private corporations on a global scale. Although agricultural investments in theory provide many opportunities for developing countries leasing their lands, in practice these present threats to the food security of farmers and local communities.

In the Philippines, the Government is presently promoting an agribusiness strategy through its agriculture, agrarian reform, and environment departments. Existing legislation on investment policies on agribusiness and agri-investments include lease agreements, production/contract growing schemes, and joint venture agreements between corporate investors and individual cooperative associations. Part of the government’s strategy is to help enhance the sale and productivity of commercial farms and transform agrarian reform beneficiaries into farmer entrepreneurs producing globally competitive products.

*Mindanao is a stage for various conflicts on food security and land rights. The island has been targeted for expansion of agri-fuel production, heightening the food versus fuel conflict. Lands devoted to food crops are being converted to produce agri-fuel crops like *jatropha*. In addition, increasing demand for land among different stakeholders has exacerbated conflicts between two land-poor sectors: landless farmers and other land-based laborers and indigenous peoples seeking legal tenure or recognition for land.*

In sum, different stakeholders seek to achieve the same goal of food security. In assessing the pros and cons of land grabbing, the chief consideration should be whether local farmers are benefiting or are being exploited or dominated. The danger signs lie in changing land policies – in land reconcentration and land conversion, and the trading of farmers’ rights as manifested in sectoral conflicts.

Through a range of advocacy strategies like community empowerment, community mobilization, and lobbying with government, as well as local agricultural development, market participation and rural industrialization, NGOs not only in the Philippines, but across Asia, are addressing issues on food security and access to land. The way forward would consist of clearer policies, an inclusive and comprehensive approach, and dialogues and exchanges.

¹ Prepared by Tess Debuque, Catherine Liamzon, and Shem Toledo.

Overview

In recent years, commercial pressures on land – popularly known as the land grabbing phenomenon – have attracted global attention. Large tracts of arable land are leased or sold by developing countries to developed countries or to large private corporations. Agri-investments are generally made for two purposes: first, for food security, for meeting domestic consumption requirements, as espoused by developed countries; and, second, for financial returns, which mainly drives players from both finance and food industries.

Although such transactions have been going on for decades, the speed at which it is occurring, as well as its consequences, is great cause for concern. Acquiring lands for food security has called for the re-examination of the rules for food security, and for answering the question: *Whose food security?* The intention to provide food may be noble, but is clearly not when the rights of farmers and indigenous peoples (IPs) from developing countries are trampled on. Some communities are exploited by land grabbers. In worst cases, their food security is put at risk, even as their respective governments boast increases in revenue. Almost the same can be said for agri-ventures hinged upon financial returns. In the attempt to make fuel production ‘greener’ or to increase food production, these companies encroach on farmers’ and IP’s rights, particularly tenurial rights, to the leased or purchased lands.

In both agri-investments tracks, the private sector plays a huge role, with the government providing subsidy to their ventures in some cases. Moreover, insufficient investments and decreasing development assistance in agriculture has impelled the government to rely on the private sector for much needed agricultural investments. Another problem is that agri-investments have resulted in farmers and IPs losing their already ‘insecure’ access to land. Such transactions are said to increase employment in the targeted areas, but this cannot really replace the permanency land tenure can give. Lastly, and most alarmingly, is the lack of transparency in such investments, often leaving relevant stakeholders such as farmers and CSOs in the dark.

The Philippine Context

The Philippines has not escaped the land grab phenomenon. Mindanao finds itself in the middle of the food vs. fuel conflict. Regarded as the country’s food basket, most of Mindanao’s farmlands are used for food production. However, given the influx of investments for agri-fuel production, lands for food have been converted for agro-fuel production. This rising demand for land has also exacerbated conflicts between land-poor sectors: landless farmers and other land-based laborers, as well as IPs seeking legal tenure or recognition for their land.

Land Watch² Philippines is initiated by the Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ANGOC), together with the Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Areas (PhilDHRRA) with the Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID), the People's Campaign for Agrarian Reform Network (AR Now!) and Sentro ng Alternatibong Lingap Panligal (SALIGAN) as sectoral lead convenors. As a network of land rights advocates, Land Watch Philippines is particularly concerned with the following critical issues pertaining to land grabbing:

- No international rules or protocol for global land leases (taking advantage of corrupt governments, small countries, weak policies and safeguards)
- The national policy framework encourages and facilitates such arrangements with virtually no safeguards; who will win the clash between policies and programs?
- Synergetic relationship between foreign interests and rent-seeking tendencies of local elite (foreign corporations; land reconsolidation); foreign land interests dovetail with local elite interests
- Which national government agency is responsible for inspecting and approving such agreements? During consultations on agri-business deals, government agencies have given conflicting responses:
 - Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR): distributed lands will be covered by these deals.
 - Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR): forest/timber lands will be covered by these deals.
 - National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP): unsure if ancestral lands will be threatened or directly impacted.
- Sectors (small farmers, IPs, fisher folk and forest groups) are concerned that any gains made in enhancing access to land are being done to actually facilitate the reconsolidation of land for further land leases
- There is little assurance that the gains in asset reform (agri-lands to farmer, ancestral domains to IPs/forest dwellers, and municipal waters to small fishers) will be adequately protected. The remaining forests will continue to feel pressure, as agri-business deals will most likely target areas suited for agro-forestry. The entry of such deals will intensify land conflicts, especially in areas where the overlap of tenurial instruments over the same piece of land is well documented and mapped.
- With the failure to pass a national policy on land use (the National Land Use Act [NLUA] bill has languished in Congress for the past 20 years), it is difficult to reconcile the "bullish" aggressive attitude of the agri-business sector on where to source lands, with the real frustration of the poor sectors to finally own their lands. With the triple threat of the food, fuel and climate crises, maintaining a balance for lands (and their appropriate use) that adequately addresses such issues will only be possible if a rational identification of appropriate land use is in place at

² Land Watch Asia (LWA) is a regional campaign that aims to ensure that issues of access to land, agrarian reform, and equitable and sustainable development for the rural poor are addressed in national and regional development agenda. The campaign has thus far involved civil society organisations in six countries – Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Nepal and the Philippines. LWA aims to: i) take stock of significant changes in the policy and legal environments; ii) undertake strategic national and regional advocacy activities on access to land; iii) jointly develop interventions, approaches, methods and tools; and iv) encourage the sharing of experiences and lessons on coalition-building and actions pertaining to land rights issues.

the national level. However, what is emerging is the aggressive entry of foreign interests in directly accessing natural resources.

It is in this context that the forum on ***Mindanao Lands for Agri-investments or Agri-colonialism: The Need to Ensure Food and Land Security in Mindanao*** was organised by ANGOC, together with the Philippine Development Assistance Program (PDAP), the Archdiocese of Cagayan de Oro (ACDO), *South East Asia Rural Leadership Institute (SEARSOLIN)* and Xavier University—College of Agriculture (XU-CA).

Forum Design

The forum was designed with the following objectives in mind:

- Provide a venue where stakeholders (CSOs, church, government and local media) can be updated and discuss on the current and future plans of agri-related agencies on the rising phenomenon of agricultural investments and the implications on Mindanao lands
- Discuss issues and challenges on food and tenurial security of poor rural sectors (e.g., small farmers, indigenous peoples, forest communities) vis-à-vis the plans of agri-related agencies
- Present possible measures of safeguarding the rights of local communities over their land vis-à-vis agri-investments

Participants came from various sectors –the Philippine government, Asian and Philippine civil society organizations, the Catholic Church through the regional Cagayan, Butuan, Agustan, Surigao, Tandag and Malaybalay (CABUSTAM) network and the local media. Civil society comprised representatives from small farmers’ groups, IP communities, forest communities, advocacy groups, among others. Around 60 individuals participated in the event.

The forum began with an overview of the land grabbing phenomenon, followed by updates on overseas farm investments made in the Philippines. The discussion then turned to Mindanao, specifically on the local implications of CARPER in terms of targets and challenges, the expansion of agro-fuel production, and increasing land conflicts. Land rights advocates from India and Indonesia took the time to share cases and experiences in land grabbing and the struggle for land in their respective countries. Given the importance of sustaining agricultural communities, PDAP’s Promoting Rural Industries and Market Enhancement (PRIME) program was highlighted as one such alternative. In-depth discussions and open forums punctuated the event – with the different groups explaining and defending their respective perspectives. Ways forward were identified, before a synthesis of the discussion capped the event.

For the list of topics and presenters, kindly refer to the Program in Annex 1.

Agricultural Colonialism in the Philippines? – Highlights of the Discussion

Taking land from the poor to feed the rich³

In recent years, the competition for land, especially in developing countries, has become quite intense. This is clearly manifested by the slew of land deals, either between governments or between governments and private interests, whereby farmland in developing countries is bought or leased to produce food for the buyer or lessor country.

The New Landgrabbers

According to Olivier de Schutter, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, in the last three years, 40 million hectares of land in developing countries have been targeted for acquisition by foreign investors from countries such as China, South Korea, Japan, India and Saudi Arabia.

This phenomenon has been attributed mainly to the need to secure present and future food supplies. For instance, China has 20% of the world's population but only about 7% of the world's farmlands. India, which is seeking to acquire land in Burma and Indonesia, is investing in these countries because of declining agricultural productivity--the result of large-scale conversion of farmlands into Special Economic Zones (SEZs).

The major investors from Japan are private corporations. Hitotsu and Sumitono, for instance, are leasing farmlands for organic food production. Some reports indicate that Japanese firms have already leased 12M hectares of farmland abroad for food production.

In the case of the Gulf States, a statement from Salim Allowzi, Director General of AOAD (Arab Organization for Agricultural Development) is indicative of private sector interest in Arab countries to step up investments in farming projects. Allowzi said "sufficient investments in Sudan, which is the most fertile country in the region, could already meet the region's need of cereals and other basic food items. Further, if there is a real interest and seriousness for the investors in the farming sector , then [all of the Arab world's requirements] for cereal, sugar, and other essential foodstuffs could be met by Sudan alone."

Already, private Arab interests have made inroads into the Philippines. Reports have it that Saudi Arabia, the UAE and Bahrain have been securing lands in the Philippines to supply their food needs.

Apart from food crops, investors are interested in the money to be made from large-scale production of crops that would be converted to biofuels.

³ From "Does the world need new rules for food security?" presented by Dr. Faina Lucero – Diola, ANGOC.

Developing countries that sign on to such land deals are enticed by the huge payouts, which presumably would go towards financing the country's infrastructure development. Currently "idle" lands, for example, in Africa, would be "opened up;" the export market would get a boost from biofuel production; and new jobs would be created.

The downside is that most of the lands being "sold off" are tenanted lands. As a result, many farmers are being evicted from land that they have been cultivating. The other commodity that is at stake is water, which is also being commodified.

Contracts for these land deals rarely specify the obligations of the investors, but are generally clearly in their favor. Moreover, the targeted countries usually have no legal or procedural mechanisms to protect the rights of the farmers and local communities whose access to land for local food production would likely be threatened.

In fact, many countries have begun to change their laws and policies in regard to land ownership to pave the way for land deals. In China, one major reform has made it easier for peasants to use their land rights as collateral for loans. In Kazakhstan, the government implements land share policies. Sudan allows foreigners to own land permanently.

Pressure on developing countries to enter into land deals is also coming from development agencies. Recent policies of the World Bank, the European Bank for Rural Development, the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) have been observed to encourage the flow of investment and to relax land ownership laws to facilitate such investments.

Frail Defense

How are the targeted countries dealing with investor incursions? The Thai government claims that its laws provide sufficient protection. Thailand's Foreign Business Act allows foreigners to set up shop in the country but requires that nationals own 51% of the company. The government further claims that it does not need foreigners to invest in the country, particularly to grow rice, because Thailand can meet their export requirements.

In Brazil, the legislature is considering a draft law to make land deals more transparent. The draft legislation mandates the government to determine how much foreign ownership is involved in agri-business contracts, for instance. Paraguay enforced a law in October 2008 prohibiting foreigners from buying domestic farmlands.

Nevertheless, the trend of private-government ventures to buy up farmlands in developing countries appears to be unstoppable. This is already undermining efforts to promote agrarian reform and indigenous people's rights.

Some Updates on Overseas Farm Investments in the Philippines⁴

Overseas farm investments in the Philippines are directed at fulfilling the mandate under the Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP) for 2004 -2010 to fight poverty and build prosperity for the greatest number of the Filipino people, by focusing on strategic measures and activities to spur economic growth. In view of this, the Government is promoting an agri-business strategy it calls the Convergence Initiative through the Department of Agriculture (DA), in close coordination with the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). This venture is expected to generate 2 million new jobs and develop 2 million hectares of idle lands for agri-business, and enhance the productivity and income of Filipino farmers.

DA Secretary Arthur Yap is at the helm of promoting agri-business as a more holistic approach in reducing rural poverty in the Philippines. Agri-business will address agriculture production bottlenecks, providing solutions to expand the production base and increase farm productivity while revitalizing the Philippine Agricultural Development and Commercial Corporation (PADCC), which seeks investments in agri-business lands to increase production intensity and diversification. It is hoped that such investments in agri-processing come, so Filipino farmers are not limited to the traditional production system, but rather, can expand to both farm and non-farm enterprises.

To move towards creating a new class of farmers and fisher folks agri-entrepreneurs, the Philippine Agribusiness Center (PAC) was established. It is managed by the PADCC and is a project of the National Convergence Initiative. It collaborates with the private sector and rural communities in undertaking capacity building programs and enterprise development to manage and sustain viable operations with organizations and businesses, identifying agribusiness plans and establishing strong farm firm linkages, and extending marketing assistance and facilitation services. Its Agribusiness Land Investment Centers provide information assistance on investment opportunities, commodity profiles, and new lands; provide assistance in selection of ideal investment locations; joint venture matching services; and the facilitation of surveys, permits and clearances.

At present, investments being undertaken in the country include:

Food production:

- San Miguel Corporation - rice, corn, cassava, oil palm, livestock, and dairy production. The company is looking at leasing 1 million ha. of land. For this, a Memorandum of Agreement was signed last July 2008.

⁴ From "Updates on the Overseas Farm Investments in the Philippines," presented by Larry Paraluman, Department of Agriculture – Region X.

- Qatar – seeking 10,000 ha. for agri business development with rice as the primary commodity but as yet there is no formal agreement between the concerned parties.
- Saudi Arabia – focus on rice, wheat, barley, corn, banana and pineapple; 100,000 ha. of new lands for agri-business development. No formal agreement yet.
- Bahrain – focus on banana production; looking for 10,000 ha. of land but at present no agreement has been formalized.

Biomass and bio-fuel production

- Global green power PLC – looking for arundo donax production, needing 6,000 ha. They are now in agreement with PADCC for the identification of idle lands for biomass energy generation in Panay Island.

Agricultural investments in the country are being guided by several policies:

- Department of Agrarian Reform Administrative Order (DAR AO) 09, series of 2006
- Department of Environment and Natural Resources Administrative Order (DENR AO) Number 25, series of 2005
- Republic Act 8371 or the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA)

(For more information, please refer to the section on Legislation Concerning Agricultural Investments in the Philippines).

DAR's thrusts and directives on agribusiness for CY 2009 promote:

- Clustering or consolidation of agribusiness/enterprises efforts for higher level agrarian reform communities (ARCs);
- Expansion, scaling up and/or intensification of operations of existing competitive and viable medium-scale micro-enterprises (MSMEs) in agrarian reform (AR) areas
- Agribusiness venture arrangements between agrarian reform beneficiaries (ARBs) and investors in AR areas covering high value crops or commodities;
- Broadening the implementation of credit and micro finances program to support the small and medium enterprises; and
- Extending the market viability in the ARC clusters.

Given the opportunities, the most pressing question is the readiness of farmers and relevant stakeholders to engage in agribusiness farming with local and overseas farm investors. This is a necessity to harmonize the country's investment policies into a win-win situation. Likewise, it is imperative to protect the interests and integrity of farmers while safeguarding the investment of investors which provide economic stability in the country.

CARPER and Mindanao: Targets and Challenges*

The Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) targets the land acquisition and distribution (LAD) of 1,058,001 hectares under the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program Extension with Reforms (CARPER). The accomplishments so far, as well as the program targets, are disaggregated by region:

Table 1: DAR Land Acquisition and Distribution Accomplishments and Targets

Region	Cumulative LAD Accomplishment (ha.)	LAD target under CARPER (ha)	% share to Mindanao
Region IX	205,112	46,069	10.3
Region X	280,453	62,558	14.0
Region XI	225,033	27,922	6.3
Region XII	477,264	126,791	28.4
Region XIII	214,054	38,697	8.7
ARMM	197,129	143,792	32.3
Mindanao	1,599,045	445,829	42.1 % of total area for distribution
Philippines	4,119,196	1,058,001	

The criteria for the establishment of Agrarian Reform Communities (ARCs) include: a large number of beneficiaries, big land holdings, presence of an NGO or a people's organization, and support from local government. In Mindanao, 9 ARC clusters have been identified for agribusiness development.

Table 2: ARC Clusters for Agribusiness Development

Region	Number of ARCs	Number of ARBs	Crops	Production area (ha.)	Potential area (ha.)
Region IX	3	117,203	Coconut, banana, corn, rubber	21,099	22,242
Region X	2	158,944	Sugarcane, corn, rice	87,314	10,027
Region XI	2	159,927	Coconut, rice, corn, Cavendish banana, cacao	87,541	30,738
Region XII	2	204,202	Corn, coconut, coffee and jatropha	12,418	3,668
Mindanao	9				

Mindanao represents vast opportunity for development, but such opportunities are counterbalanced by the serious challenge of poverty. Most of the poorest provinces in the Philippines are situated in the region: Tawi-Tawi (ARMM), Zamboanga del Norte (Region XI), Maguindanao (ARMM), Surigao del Norte (CARAGA), Lanao del Sur (ARMM), Misamis Occidental (Region X), and Agusan del Sur (CARAGA).

Table 3: Poverty in Mindanao

Region	No. of Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries	Number of poor families	Remarks
Region IX	117,203	218,473	All provinces considered poor
Region X	158,944	158,944	Camiguin, Lanao del Norte, Misamis Occidental considered poor
Region XI	159,927		Extent and depth of poverty is 30.6% and 11.5% respectively
Region XII	204,202	226,521	All provinces considered poor
ARMM	62,535		All provinces considered poor
CARAGA	104,811	186,083	All provinces considered poor

The depth and breadth of poverty in Mindanao is alarming, and implies the great need for attention and action, in meeting CARPER targets and ensuring that the new demands for agricultural investments actually serve to address poverty in the most deprived areas.

* From "CARPER AND MINDANAO: TARGETS AND CHALLENGES," presented by Dir. Felix Aguhob, Director, Department of Agrarian Reform – Region X.

Legislation Concerning Agri-Investments in the Philippines⁵

The following enabling legislation has been passed to facilitate implementation of the Convergence Initiative:

Department of Agrarian Reform Administrative Order (DAR AO) 09, series of 2006 provides for the following investment modes:

- A. **Joint venture agreements between a corporate investor and an individual cooperative association**, whereby the farmer/landowner cooperative contributes the use of the land held individually or in common while the investor provides the capital and technology for the production, processing and marketing of agricultural goods or construction, rehabilitation, upgrading and operation of agricultural capital assets, infrastructures and facilities.
- B. **Production/contract growing schemes**, whereby the investor and the individual cooperative enter into a commitment to produce and buy certain crops at pre-arranged terms, such as volume, quality and selling price (may come in the form of production and processing agreement together with a marketing contract wherein the investor will be the one to determine the market into which the produce will be sold)
- C. **Lease agreements**, whereby the lessee is given the exclusive use and cultivation of a piece of land for agricultural production purposes, while the lessor maintains the full ownership of the land. The lessee also provides the capital to develop, cultivate, harvest and process products and crops and extend all technical management services for the efficient operation of the farm.
- D. **Management contracts**, whereby an individual, partnership or corporation is hired to assist in the management and operation of the farm, for purposes of producing high-value crops or other agricultural crops in exchange for a fix wage or commission. The land will remain in the control and ownership of the individual landowner and the management contractor shall receive a fix compensation or commission or other forms of remuneration for the services stipulated in the contract.
- E. **Build operate transfer (BOT) schemes** whereby the investor builds, rehabilitates, or upgrades at their own cost, capital assets, infrastructure and other facilities used in the production, processing and marketing of agricultural products. Meanwhile, the individual landowner or association cooperative receives a reasonable amount in terms of rent, profit-sharing arrangements, or any other arrangements *that ought to be* advantageous to the individual, association or cooperative for the use of the land where the investor operates the infrastructure.

Furthermore, AO 9, series of 2006, aims to mobilize private sector investments in developing agrarian reform areas; provide adequate support and facilities to agrarian reform beneficiaries (ARBs); ensure security of tenure of participating ARBs; enhance the sale and productivity of

⁵ From "Updates on the Overseas Farm Investments in the Philippines," presented by Larry Paraluman, Department of Agriculture - Region X; and "CARPER and Mindanao: Targets and Challenges," presented by Dir. Felix Aguhob, Director, Department of Agrarian Reform – Region X.

commercial farms; and hasten the transformation of agrarian reform beneficiaries into farmer entrepreneurs to produce globally competitive products. Coverage of lands awarded and distributed under CARP would refer to individual ARBs and cooperatives or associations who are bona fide holders of Emancipation Patents, Certificate of Land Ownership Awards, or similar tenurial instruments issued by DAR.

Department of Agrarian Reform Administrative Order (DAR AO) 2, Series of 2008 provides for policies governing the lease of lands that have been awarded to ARBs for agri-business venture agreements

Department of Environment and Natural Resources Administrative Order (DENR AO) Number 25, Series of 2005 provides for the following investment arrangements:

- a) **Joint Venture Agreements or Memorandums of Agreement** between the applicant (investor) and the DENR for the development of agro forestry farms and plantations in areas identified and made available for the said purpose shall be covered by a Joint Venture Agreement or Memorandum of Agreement between the applicant and the DENR.
- b) **Socialized forest management agreements** which aim to provide opportunities to a wider segment of society to participate actively in forest resources development, and thus promote equitable access to and sharing of benefits from natural resource development and utilization. In particular, these agreements pertain to timber and other forest products, including food.

Republic Act 8371 or the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA)

Rule VIII, Part II, Section 4. Management of undertakings within ancestral domains

- a) Indigenous cultural communities (ICCs) shall have the priority rights in the harvesting, extraction, development and exploitation of natural resources within the ancestral domain lands. Should the indigenous peoples give their free consent to any development activity projects, program or plan to be implemented by any government or private entity, this shall have the following rights:
 - The right to an informed and intelligent participation in the formulation and implementation of the project;
 - The right to receive just and fair compensation for any damage or loss which may be sustained as a result of such project;
 - The right to benefit sharing; and,
 - The right to exercise visitorial powers and take appropriate actions to safeguard the rights of the community under the same contract
- b) Said persons and entities can be allowed to perform activities as are expressly authorized for the development of ancestral domains and cultural identity of the ICCs and IPs.
- c) ICCs and IPs shall maintain the right to impose penalties for the violations of the conditions in accordance with their customary laws, the Act or its rules and regulations.
- d) ICCs and IPs' leaders, with the assistance of the NCIP, shall take appropriate actions to ensure the implementation and enforcement of these rights.

Agrofuel Production Expands in Mindanao⁶

Agrofuels—also called biofuels—are fuels manufactured from biomass and from the by-products of large-scale crop plantations and agro-industries. There are two types of agrofuels, namely, ethanol, which can be used as a direct substitute for petrol in vehicles with adjusted engines; and biodiesel, which is either used in place of hydrocarbon diesel, or blended with diesel.⁷

Ethanol can be manufactured from three types of raw materials: (1) crops with high sugar content (glucose, saccharose), such as sugarcane and sweet sorghum; (2) crops with rich starch content, such as maize, wheat, barley, cassava and rice; and (3) materials rich in cellulose, such as wood and agricultural residue (this is the “next generation” agrofuels). The “next generation” agrofuels is not yet commercially available. Biodiesel in turn comes from oil crops, such as rapeseed, palm oil, moringa, coconut, castor oil, and jatropha.⁸

The production of agro-fuels has been booming in recent years because these are being marketed as the cleaner alternative to fossil fuels, and thus important to any climate change mitigation strategy.

In the same manner that the global demand for land is being driven by food security concerns in developed countries, the potential revenues from agro-fuel production are prompting investors—both private and state—to get hold of lands in developing countries and turn these into agro-fuel crop plantations.

In 2006, the Philippine Government passed into law Republic Act 9367, or the Bio fuels Act of 2006, to promote the gradual shift to using bio-diesel and bio-ethanol, and thus to reduce lessen the country’s dependence on fossil fuels. The law likewise outlines the strategy for promoting of investments for agro-fuel production, particularly through tax incentives and financial packages for investors.

The Philippines’ Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Law and the IPRA prohibit the sale of lands awarded under the agrarian reform program, on the one hand, and of ancestral lands, on the other. However, both laws allow holders of CARP-awarded lands and of ancestral lands to enter into business contracts involving the lease of their lands for up to 50 years. This is virtually equivalent to selling away their lands and giving the lessor unlimited access, management and use of land resources.

Some 2 million hectares of land in the Philippines have been identified/ targeted for agro-fuel expansion. Mindanao is a priority area for such expansion, and as much as 1.2 million hectares in this region has been tagged for the purpose. Of the 1.2 million hectares, 700,000 hectares

⁶ From “Agrofuel Expansion in Mindanao,” presented by Anna Marie Quines, Alternate Forum for Research in Mindanao (AFRIM).

⁷ Pelegrina, Wilhelmina, “Agrofuels and the food emergency in the Philippines,” SEARICE Notes, September 2008.

⁸ Ibid.

are allotted for the cultivation of jatropha. In Northern Mindanao, some 160,000 hectares have been identified, with this area increasing to 260,000 hectares in the next three years.

Another expansion target is the South Cotabato – Sarangani – General Santos (SOCSARGEN) area, where 200,000 hectares will be put under jatropha plantation by Eco Global Bio Oils, a Malaysian company. The same company is trying to persuade a local tribal council to give it a lease over 74,804 hectares of freshly titled ancestral land in Malungon (South Cotabato).

In Marilog and Paquibato districts, 269,000 hectares are targeted for jatropha plantation through a joint venture agreement between a Malaysian company and the Davao City Multi-culture Development Corporation. In Bukidnon, 23,000 hectares are already planted with cassava—another agro-fuel crop. Another 20,000 hectares in South Cotabato are being used for cassava plantation. Meanwhile, the land of a Higaonon community in Binasan, Iligan City has been reserved for use as a jatropha plantation by a US-based company called Green Gold Ray Energies, Inc.

AFRIM's study of agro-fuel expansion in Mindanao, particularly in Lumbia (Cagayan de Oro City), La-a (Compostela Valley) and Sarangani (South Cotabato) has shown that lax financial and environmental regulations have facilitated the expansion of the investments. Oil palm, for instance, has been reclassified as a reforestation crop; hence, applications from oil palm producers for environmental compliance certificates are automatically granted.

Fuel vs. Food

The targeted provinces contribute significantly to the island, and even to the country's food supply. For example, Bukidnon is the key rice and corn producing province in Mindanao, while South Cotabato produces 65% of the country's corn supply. Maguindanao and Lanao are also corn producers together with the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM). Maguindanao is the fifth corn producer in the country. Hence, targeting these provinces for agro-fuel production clearly threatens food production in the region.

In Lumbia, Cagayan de Oro, an IP community—the Higaonon—entered into a 25-year contract growing arrangement with a private investor. However, only three tribal leaders were consulted during the signing of the contract. The company offered to pay for the seedlings, and farm and labor costs. The company would also be the sole buyer of the produce of the farmers, besides providing employment, technical assistance and livelihood support. In the course of the agreement, 65 hectares of ancestral lands were put under jatropha plantation. However, after two months, the company folded, leaving the farmers to dispose of the crop, which was not yet ready to be harvested. The rest of the land was left idle. The farmers found themselves without a job; nor were they given technical nor livelihood assistance. The private investor is connected with the Philippine government-owned Philippine National Oil Company Alternative Fuels Corporation.

Contrary to government assurances that only marginal lands are targeted for expansion, it is the ancestral domains and agriculturally productive lands that are used as the *actual* expansion areas. For instance, in Saranggani and South Cotabato, farmers are under contract with Eco Global Bio Oils to jatropha in exchange for food crops, such as corn and vegetables. In Cagayan de Oro, the Higaonon, who used to grow white and yellow corn, vegetables, banana and coconut, have converted their ancestral lands into jatropha plantations. Meanwhile, in La-a, Compostela Valley, coconut trees were cut down to make way for an oil palm plantation, as directed by their mayor.

Expansion activities threaten protected areas such as the Liguasan Marsh in the ARMM and Mt. Kitanglad Natural Park in Northern Mindanao. The diverse natural resources and ancestral domains are threatened because of land conversion which could reduce the quantity and quality of water from watershed areas.

It is ironic that agro-fuel production, which is supposed to mitigate climate change, is bringing about the destruction of the country's biodiversity and vital natural resources.

Poor vs. Poor: the Struggle for Land Rights in Mindanao⁹

The rising demand for land is intensifying conflicts between two land-poor sectors in Mindanao: landless farmers and other land-based laborers and indigenous peoples who are seeking legal tenure or recognition for the land.

In most cases, ancestral domains and agrarian reform areas sit side by side and sometimes on top of each other, causing tension in the areas involved. In Bukidnon, the indigenous community of the Manobos and agrarian reform beneficiaries have found themselves in direct competition for the same piece of land. The Manobos claim that they have prior rights to the land as mandated by the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act and by virtue of de facto ownership "since time immemorial." The same area is being claimed by landless farmers, who have been awarded the land under the government's agrarian reform program.

Agro-industrial corporations are another contender for lands which are considered as ancestral domains by the indigenous peoples. For instance, some areas which have been formally recognized as ancestral lands through a Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title (CADT) are right smack in the middle of a big agro-industrial complex.

In the face of competing claims to land, who should have access and control? How should the laborers relate with indigenous peoples, who are just as poor they are? These questions would be resolved only after the conflict between the two tenurial instruments has been untangled.

⁹ From "Increasing Sectoral Conflicts on Land," by Dave de Vera, Philippine Association for Intercultural Development, Inc.

Dialogue between competing sectors

The conflict among sectors dependent on land is slowly escalating through the years. Conflicting laws, policies and jurisdictions among the responsible government agencies have contributed to the problem. Fortunately, this is resolvable through continuous dialogue. Unless a lot of these issues are discussed and resolved, problems will continue to arise. In the coming years, more and more land titles will be issued in Mindanao, due to the entry of new commercial ventures. Hopefully, these issues can be resolved by clearer policies from the government.

A more transparent consultation and a very inclusive process must be established. Sadly, there is a propensity to come up with memoranda, circulars and new policies forged among concerned government agencies without prior consultation with the most affected.

Lastly, opportunities for positive engagement among sectors have to be encouraged to build confidence and foster collective action. At the moment, there is very little opportunity for indigenous peoples and farmers to interact and thus redefine their notions of each other. There is very little chance for farmers and indigenous peoples to understand that both sectors have problems and that at the end of the day they both have legitimate land claims.

Alternative Solutions to Conflicts Arising from Commodification of Land

Strategy Combining Political and Legal Action¹⁰

From 1965 to 1968--a period infamously remembered in Indonesia for the brutal anti-communist purge undertaken by the military--some 1,110 hectares of land in West Java were seized by the armed forces and civilian officials of the Suharto government. The land consisted of two former Dutch-run tea plantations called the Ganjartemu and Pasirpadang estates, which former plantation workers had "seized" from the Japanese in 1945, with the help of Indonesian freedom fighters. The farmers formed themselves into a group called "first tiller farmers" (FTF).

Following the seizure of the estates, FTF asked help from the *Forum Kerakyatan Indonesia (FORKI)*, which participated in the fight to overthrow the military regime in 1978. An advocacy team was put together to conduct thorough research at the location. Then followed three years of struggle in which the FTF themselves were involved, a struggle that resulted in the return of 400 (out of 600) hectares of tilled FTF lands. The period 2000-2005 was marked by recurring tensions between the FTF and the landgrabbers.

FORKI responded to FTF's appeal for help by first holding an internal forum discussion which

¹⁰ From "A Case Study of the First Tiller Farmers (FTF or PETAWA) in Ex-Dutch Estates in West Java, Indonesia," presented by Noviar Safari, Bina Desa (Indonesia).

included students from various universities. A visit was made to the areas where FTF lands were seized; various data and findings were noted down, then discussed among the members of a newly-formed Advocacy Team for FTF.

Aside from the thorough research conducted by the team, meetings and discussions were carried out in the villages concerned. Each village formed an organization with a Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary, Treasurer, and a General Assistant. A Coordinator was appointed by the five village leaders in a democratic manner. This process was carried out during the span of a year, in 1999.

A long-term plan was made for reclaiming the lands by the FTF and a strategy was formulated to carry out two types of actions: political and legal.

Through a general meeting among the members of FTF, FORKI Presidium and the student organizations, the emerging obstacles were identified and discussed. The objective was to unite all the interested farmers who had ever been supported by FORKI in West Java. After thorough consideration, all agreed that **a district-level farmers organization** would be established.

A farmers organization named Serikat Tani Kerakyatan Sumedang was established and its leadership was formed, with membership consisting of farmers' groups which had linked up with FORKI during the struggle for various farmers' interests in Sumedang district. The early planning had successfully raised the struggle of FTF to the level of a national issue, even prompting former Vice President Megawati Soekarno Putri to pay attention to the land seizure case (according to the Agrarian Law, after 20 years of tilling, such type of lands could become private).

The strategy also called for such approaches as demonstrations, correspondence, and other activities addressed to the central government level—particularly with regard to abolishing the invalid certificates held by the land grabbers. Political actions were mostly changed to the filing of civil lawsuits in the courts against the land grabbers.

After seven years of hard struggle, 60 percent of FTF lands have been reclaimed, although attacks and various dirty tactics have been used by the land grabbers to retake the lands. It is significant to note, however, that they avoided direct violations of the law in order not to be hated, and to win the sympathy of the authorities and the community.

Community Empowerment¹¹

Social Development Foundation (SDF) is a land advocacy group which seeks to build alliances within Indian states with a view to forming a national alliance that would promote land conflict resolution.

¹¹ From "Land and Dignity," presented by Leena Dabiru, SDF.

SDF has identified the following issues surrounding land conflicts:

- **Non-implementation of the Land Ceiling Act.** This law is supposed to limit the size of land that any person could own. In Uttar Pradesh, for example, land that is under the name of one person is in reality owned by several people. This happens when farmers mortgage their land and eventually forfeit it. Some farmers have been known to mortgage their land for as little as 200 rupees. In the Tarai area, land mafias are snapping up huge land areas. These land mafias are people that live outside India but have powerful connections among India's political parties and officials.
- **Land expropriation with or without compensation.** The state government takes over land to build infrastructure, while neglecting to compensate farmers, who, unfortunately, have no legal title to the land.

At other times, the displaced community receives compensation, but nowhere close to the market value of their land. In Andhra Pradesh, one of the Southern States, a group of farmers sold their land to the government, which wanted to build an airport. Their land is worth almost 4M rupees but they were given only 16,000 per acre.

In Chengaral, Kerala, about 5,000 Dalit families were driven out of land which they had been occupying for one and a half years and which they refused to lease out to an international tea company. Private corporations also buy up lands to build housing complexes and other infrastructure which do not benefit the poor.

- **Denial of land rights to women and Dalits.** While most women are involved in tilling the land, they are not given titles to such. The government's land reform program requires that land be titled to both spouses, but in reality, women have little or no control over the disposition of land. The situation of the Dalits, India's lowest caste, is similar with that of women.

SDF's response to these land related issues has consisted of:

- Community empowerment processes, such as training and workshops on land administration; dialogue and consultation with people from the remotest places; provision of legal assistance to farmers;
- Community mobilization, particularly protest marches;
- Lobbying with government and policy reform initiatives.

Making the Market Work for Farmers¹²

Implemented by the Philippine Development Assistance Programme, Inc. (PDAP), *Promoting Rural Industries and Market Enhancement (PRIME)* facilitates market participation of the rural poor through engagement in rural micro enterprises and industries. PRIME hopes to augment household incomes, create jobs and enhance food security of farmers, to reduce rural poverty. It is a five-year program (2005-2010) directly supported by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). PRIME is a response to the challenges of the changing global environment, addressing the changing market for agricultural products and the potential of organic agriculture.

PRIME's "Rural Industry Development (RID)" approach is a framework for poverty reduction and a strategy for organic agriculture development in selected Philippine provinces. It attempts to validate the link between industry development and poverty reduction and to explore how this link can be enhanced, especially in agriculture. RID looks into the entire process of a given agriculture-based commodity from production to post-harvest processing and distribution.

The PRIME Program works with rural enterprising communities (RECs), defined in the Philippines as micro-enterprises. Further, PDAP defines REC as a community producing surplus, willing to engage the market, and has potential to scale up production and enhancing product quality. These are communities that have organized themselves into small enterprises, with strong entrepreneurial capacities. They are the building blocks of PRIME. But to get into PRIME, RECs should fulfill the following criteria: substantial production volume; active links to the value chain; and viability in technical and marketing aspects.

PRIME believes that its industry approach yields better coordination among stakeholders, avoids duplications, improves efficiency in transactions, and enhances transparency. Also, to better face the challenges such as tough market requirements, PRIME works with allied organizations including Business Development Service (BDS) providers, marketing groups, private businesses and financial institutions. It also collaborates with Local Government Units (LGUs), central or national government agencies and donors to pursue a favorable policy environment.

In a nutshell, PRIME facilitates the rural poor's market participation through the RID approach in five ways. First, it bridges the gap between producers and consumers by connecting the value chain from production to distribution. It links together the various players of a given commodity with the end view of reaching the market – in an approach PDAP calls *clustering*. Second, PRIME reorients REC's micro-enterprises towards satisfying market requirements by fostering entrepreneurship practices and mindsets. Third, RID executes a *market consolidation* strategy, which entails the consolidation of production outputs into a scale that reduces transaction

¹² From "Promoting Rural Industries and Market Enhancement (PRIME Program 2005-10)," presented by Jing Pacturan, Philippine Development Assistance Programme, Inc.

costs, making communities more competitive. Fourth, RID facilitates the flow of timely and relevant information for RECs to meet the demands of the market. Fifth, PDAP links the industry stakeholders with appropriate government agencies and support institutions for policy and program support including research and extension.

Discussions

The ensuing discussion was brief and mainly served to clarify questions. Land grabbing is a phenomenon clearly not limited to the Philippines; it has spread in other Asian countries. There was also a short discussion on how to safeguard IPs' rights, since their ancestral lands are often encroached upon by agricultural investors. Finally, given the Philippine political system, there has been need for the private sector and civil society to play a greater role in national and local development.

Participants from other countries confirmed that land grabbing has in fact spread rapidly in other Asian countries. For instance, the Arab countries are exerting pressure on the Pakistan Ministry of Agriculture for the latter to open its agriculture to corporate farming, to help sustain the food necessities of the former. But Pakistani society also receives pressure from the private sector for bio-fuel investments. The lease of the land is allowed for 50 years and can be extended for another 49 years. These are the top issues Pakistani CSOs contend with.

In the Philippines, the Department of Agriculture undergoes a certain process before venturing into agri-business investments. They prioritize ancestral domain areas or areas under stewardship certificates when suggesting potential areas for expansion. However, prior to this, the DA consults with communities first and solicits feedback before letting investors come in.

For IPs in the Philippines, the concept of 'native title' came from a judicial decision. Though it was expressed by a U. S. Court, Philippine laws still upheld the decision and it is what the IPs have used during court battles. The story traces back to the early 1900s when the Philippines was still a United States colony. An IP from an Ibaloi tribe, Mateo Cariño, claimed the American people encroached upon his land and put up an illegal base in the area, namely Camp John Hay. Since he did not have recourse in the Philippine government, he filed his case before the US Supreme Court and won. In the decision, the Justice wrote that native land titles have existed since time immemorial, regardless of the authority of the Governor-General in the Philippines. Thus, Cariño's right over the land has never been extinguished and the land has always belonged to the Ibaloi tribe.

Another existing law is the Philippine Constitution which clearly affirms the existence of ancestral or traditional lands. This declaration gave way to the creation of the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA), which recognizes the free, prior and informed consent of the IPs, giving them the right to veto any development project to be carried out in their lands. Also, the Philippine government has ratified International Labour Organisation (ILO) Indigenous and

Tribal Peoples Convention (Convention No. 169). In fact, ILO has been very active in supporting the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) in many ways.

It was also presumed during the discussion that political parties play a significant role like in other countries. Unfortunately, this is not the case in the Philippines. Though every political party has a say in land ownership and agrarian reform, the issue resides in their level of commitment to the issue. The Philippine political party system has always been uncertain; there are no clear demarcation lines to help distinguish one from the other based on principles. Thus, political parties have remained volatile. This has hardly helped in conflict and issues resolution.

Because of the instability of the public sector (i. e. the government and the political parties), people have turned to the private sector and civil society for development. Cooperatives and development institutions have swelled in numbers; many have been effective in providing support and aid to the “small” people. These institutions try to factor market forces into development while advocating for sustainable agriculture and other development policies. They help communities start up with small and medium enterprises, with assistance extending from the earlier stages (e.g. planning and canvassing) to securing financing and marketing. Though these institutions contribute largely to the small communities, the decision-making powers, especially those concerning development, still resides in the community.

For example, PDAP provides aid and support to small communities in the form of marketing strategies. They come into the picture when surpluses are too much to handle for the communities and the local market. PDAP helps communities find other markets where their products can be sold at better prices. However, PDAP does not provide financing for enterprises; they can only provide references and recommendations for communities and serve as mediator in the negotiation process.

The Way Forward: Prioritizing the Poor¹³

Over the past years, various investments have grown in Mindanao, with some positive impacts on the region’s inhabitants, who mostly live in rural areas. The influx of investments has created hope for trade and commerce, as rural communities representing Mindanao’s vast force of economic resources re-emerge. These have also helped strengthen national food security, as the region accounts for 40% of the country’s total agricultural production.

Notwithstanding the progress they bring – by encouraging modernization – these investments tend to disregard traditional economic practices and culture, specifically in traditional provinces and municipalities. New technology makes agriculture more profitable, leading to an appreciation in land values. However, these investment opportunities are only open to those

¹³ From the Response by Secretary Domingo Panganiban, Lead Convenor, National Anti Poverty Commission (NAPC)

who already have the wherewithal; those who can acquire large landholdings assume the role of landlords. It is no secret that some of Mindanao's biggest landlords who own corporate farms are involved in rent-seeking activities to secure property and contract rights. Such rent-seeking behaviour politically destabilizes the country, and hinders local autonomy and self-reliance.

For most of Mindanao's people, the benefits of modernization have been limited. 2006 statistics bear witness to this. More than 8.9 million people in this island region live in poverty and hunger. At the same time, 6 out of the 10 poorest provinces in the country are found in the region. This will continue with a business as usual agenda. Thus, we need to replace it with a social reform agenda - with a clear call for equal opportunity and good governance - transparency, accountability and people's participation.

Synthesis¹⁴

Land grabbing is a highly controversial topic. Truly, agriculture needs investment; but we must also be aware that a wrong investment can worsen the problem. It would be safe to assume that all groups have a common goal – that of food security, employment generation and poverty reduction. The context is changing, with the occurrences of food shortages on the rise, the inclusion of agriculture in international trade, and the expansion of opportunities in agriculture. The strategy of agri-investments seems popular and pragmatic in the midst of these trends; however, we are worried that these agri-investments are turning into “agri-colonialism.” The new features of this agri-investments strategy are: the involvement of private sector, government subsidized private corporations, and their global scale.

On one hand, agri-investments can be considered a means of bolstering agricultural productivity. The private sector and governments provide investments that translate to improvements in infrastructure, increased employment, and higher revenues for the host country (or community). Not only does the agricultural sector benefit from these agreements; they have a ripple effect on uplifting the lives of other sectors.

On the other hand, the negative consequences of the land grab phenomenon may greatly offset its positive impacts. Food shortages (due to unbalanced development), land rights trading (which results in sectoral conflicts) and the changing land policies (some of which are questionable) are some of the effects of agri-investments that have earned for it the labels “agri-colonialism” and “land grabbing.”

There is still much to study and know where land grabbing is concerned; the main problem lies in the lack of hard data regarding the transactions. Dealings between governments and between government and private corporations were not made public while they were being processed. People have learned of the agreements when these have already been finalized.

¹⁴ From “Highlights and Reflections on Forum” by Dean Roel Ravanera, College of Agriculture, Xavier University.

Stakeholder participation has been negligible, which is unacceptable as people have the right to be informed and the right to consent.

In understanding land grabbing, an assessment of pros and cons should be made. The primary consideration should be whether local communities are benefiting – or are being exploited or dominated. Who benefits and who controls the lands and resources are critical questions to answer.

Danger signs mark the road – in the form of changing land policies, particularly land reconcentration and land conversion; and the trading of farmers' rights as manifested in sectoral conflicts.

And yet we are left with options. We can encourage local agricultural development and community empowerment. We can also participate in the market and in rural industrialization programs of different institutions.

No matter what option we choose, there are some things that we must initially achieve. We must ask the government to champion the cause of the people and be vigilant concerning the business agreements they enter into. They must also provide clearer and direct policies governing these agreements, not only for transparency but also to avoid conflicts among sectors. There must be an inclusive and comprehensive approach which involves the community members; we have to engage them to actively participate in program planning and implementation. We also have to increase our efforts in facilitating and initiating dialogues and exchanges at all levels so that different perspectives can be resolved.

Annex 1

Mindanao Lands for Agri-investments or Agri-colonialism?

September 16, 2009, Cha-Li Resort, Cugman, Cagayan de Oro City

Program

12:00	Lunch and Registration	
01:30	Opening Session National Anthem, Invocation Remarks, Rationale, Introduction of Participants	Fr. Francis Lucas Chairperson, ANGOC
	Overview of Global “Land Grab” Phenomenon	Dr. Faina L. Diola Deputy Executive Director, ANGOC
	Updates on Overseas Farm Investments in the Philippines/ State of Agriculture and Investment Policies related to Agribusiness Ventures	Mr. Larry Paraluman Department of Agriculture Regional Field Unit X
	CARPER and Mindanao: Targets and Challenges	Director Felix Aguhob Region X Director, DAR
	Panel Presentation: CSO Perspectives vis-à-vis Food Security and Land Rights in Mindanao	
	- Agrofuels expansion and land rights in Mindanao	Ms. Anna Marie Quines Program Officer, Natural Resources Management Program, AFRIM
	- Increasing land conflicts among sectors	Dave De Vera Executive Director, PAFID
	Coffee/Tea Break	
	Open Forum	Moderator: Dean Roel Ravanera College of Agriculture, Xavier University

Sharing of experiences from our Asian neighbors: The Asian Land Grab

- Land and Dignity (India)
- The First Tiller Farmers in Ex-Dutch Estates in West Java (Indonesia)

Moderator: Rachel Polestico
Deputy Director, SEARSOLIN

Leena Dabiru, SDF

Noviar Safari, Bina Desa

Sustaining agricultural communities: Some alternatives

- PDAP: The Case of PRIME

Jing Pacturan, Executive Director,
PDAP

Response: Way Forward

- National Anti-Poverty Commission

Hon. Sec. Domingo Panganiban

Lead Convenor

Highlights and Reflections on Forum

Dean Roel Ravanera
College of Agriculture, Xavier
University

07:00 p.m.

Closing Session

Closing Remarks

Rolando Modina, Asia Regional
Node Coordinator, ILC

Nathaniel Don E. Marquez
Executive Director, ANGOC

Jing Pacturan
Executive Director, PDAP

Cocktails Reception