

I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

strategies for using market-based mechanisms or driven by demand and participatory processes to achieve the rural development goal. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE TENT Among the many lessons that can be learned from the CARP, some of the most important are: agrarian reform is not simply soil distribution. Poor farmers, accustomed to paternalistic forms of the old system, cannot afford to take all the risk of owning land. They should be provided with a comprehensive package (as in total) of support services before land access can result in productivity and growth, and in food security and freedom from poverty. Agrarian reform must involve cooperation and participation of all sectors. Without the involvement of other governmental bodies, civil society, the private sector, LGUs, landowners and ARB themselves through their organizations, agrarian reform cannot gain momentum; it will drag too slowly, and will have little significant impact. Land access opens up growth opportunities for farmers-beneficiaries, but it doesn't necessarily in real productivity. Beneficiaries must have access to other resources, such as credit, capital, technology, agricultural management skills and marketing information. Access to the land must be in tangible improvements in a reasonably short period of time, or there will be a great risk of the so-called beneficial deflection, in which farmers-beneficiaries abandon their share in the land and mortgage or sell it. This could lead to the reconcentration of land in the hands of new landowners and eventually in converting these lands to other uses. Public support is important to strengthen the case for agrarian reform. Lawmakers are able to block funding for the CARP because the public is not interested in the issue and is not complaining. It would probably make a lot of difference if the public, perhaps through civil society groups and other influential social sectors, made themselves heard every time lawmakers tried to slash the CARP budget. BIBLIOGRAPHY Balisacan, A. & Hill, H. 2003. The Philippine economy: development, policies and challenges. Quezon City, Philippines, Athenaeum of Manila University Press. Bautista, G. & dela Cruz, L.R. 2002. Institutional and organizational evaluation of the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Programme. Quezon City, Philippines, Institute of Filipino Culture, Athenaeum University of Manila. Bravo, M. & Pantoja, B. 1998. Beyond 2000: evaluation of the economy and the political-social sector recommendations that deals with agrarian reform. Laguna, Philippines, Institute of Agrarian Reform and Development Studies Rurban, College of Public Affairs, University of Philippines Los Baños. Deininger, K., Lara Jr., F., Olinto, P. & Maertens, M. 2000. Redistribution, investment and accumulation of human capital: the case for agrarian reform in the Philippines. Unpublished study funded by the Swiss Special Studies Trust Fund. Gordoncillo, P.U., Escueta, E.F., Peñalba, L.M. & Javier, F.A. 2002a. Evaluation of the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Programme and its impact on rural communities: domestic perspective (micro). Laguna, Philippines, Institute of Agrarian Reform and Development Studies Rurban, College of Public Affairs, University of Philippines Los Baños. Gordoncillo, P.U., Escueta, E.F., Peñalba, L.M. & Javier, F.A. 2002b. Evaluation of the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Programme and its impact on rural communities: community perspective (meso). Laguna, Philippines, Institute of Agrarian Reform and Development Studies Rurban, College of Public Affairs, University of Philippines Los Baños. Habito, C., Briones, R. & Paterno, E.M. 2001. Impacts of investment, productivity and the land market of the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Programme. Report presented to the Department of Agrarian Reform. Manasan, R.G. & Mercado, R.G. 2001. Evaluation of the fiscal aspect of the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Programme (CARP). Makati, Philippines, Philippine Institute of Development Studies, Paunlagui, M. & Rola, A. 2001. The evolution of social capital and civic entrepreneurship under CARP. Laguna, Philippines, Institute for Strategic Planning Studies and College of Public Affairs, University of Philippines Los Los Reyes, C.M. 2001. Impact of agrarian reform on poverty. (Unpublished paper) Riedinger, J. & Kang, S. 2000. Back to earth: revisiting the reasons for agrarian reform. A: The impact of agrarian reform and the change of markets in rural homes. MODE Research papers. Vol. 1, no. WB - ARCDP (World Bank - Development project for agrarian reform communities). 2000. WB - ARCDP Impact Assessment Report. Publication of the project. Quezon City, Philippines. FAO/18232/1. Villamor [1] This document was drawn up under contract with the FAO and presented at the 29th Session of the World Food Safety Committee, Rome, from 12 to 16 May 2003, an informal panel on the impact of land access on improving food security and alleviating poverty. The positions and opinions presented are those of the author alone and are not intended to represent the opinions of the FAO. [12] In 1988, the peso/US\$ (nominal) exchange rate was p21.09 = US\$1 (source: Philippines [National] Economic Indicators Online, Money and Banking, External Indicators [Annual: 1987 - 2001]), available on www.neda.gov.ph. [13] In 1998, the exchange rate peso/US\$ (nominal) was p40.54 = US\$1. [14] The exact equivalent of the US dollar of this figure could not be given because this development aid was accumulated for the period 1993 - 97. The exchange rates peso/dollar during these years varied a lot. Therefore, the equivalent peso of this aid, at the time when each allocation was extended to the Philippine Government, was added simply. [15] This total amount covers the years 1993-2002. [16] The study was conducted in 2001 and the nominal exchange rate was p50.99 = US\$1. [17] Ibid. [18] The nominal exchange rate in 1998 was p40.54 = US\$1. [19] Ibid. [20] The nominal exchange rate in 1999 was p39.09 = US\$1. [21] The nominal exchange rate for 2002 is not available, but for 2001, the nominal exchange rate was p50.99 = US\$1. [22] The nominal exchange rate of p40.54 = US\$1 for 1998 can be used here to calculate the equivalent of the US dollar. Equivalent.

normal_5f89ad1e28882.pdf , pendule de foucault exercice , photoredox catalysis review pdf , normal_5f8ea9b27668e.pdf , normal_5fb862498ec86.pdf , van morrison brown eyed girl chords , normal_5f8fa59dd5794.pdf , shep smith net worth , krups f203 instructions , factors affecting quality of healthcare pdf , sportcraft turbo air hockey table model 34012 manual , wow classic when will battlegrounds release , normal_5fc73bb5e79da.pdf ,