

ACRONYMS

AD	Ancestral Domain
ADR	Alternative Dispute Resolution
ADR-MRS	Alternative Dispute Resolution-Monitoring and Results System
ADRO	Alternative Dispute Resolution Officer
BARC	Barangay Agrarian Reform Committee
CAM	Court-annexed Mediation
CARL	Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Law
CBFMA	Community-based Forest Management Agreement
CENRO	Community Environment and Natural Resources Office
CIAC	Construction Industry Arbitration Commission
CO	Central Office
DAO	Department Administrative Order
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DMC	Department Memorandum Circular
DOJ	Department of Justice
EDRMP	Empowering Dispute Resolution/Management Processes
EO	Executive Order
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FLA	Foreshore Lease Agreement
FLUA	Forest Land Use Agreement
FOD	Facilitator of the Day
GIZ	Deutsche Gesselschaft fur Internationale Zusammerarbeit
ICC	Indigenous Cultural Community
IFMA	Integrated Forest Management Agreement
IP	Indigenous Peoples
IPRA	Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act
IRA	Internal Revenue Allocation
IT	Information Technology
JDR	Judicial Dispute Resolution
LMB	Land Management Bureau

MedNet	Mediators Network for Sustainable Peace, Inc.
NCR	National Capital Region
OADR	Office of Alternative Dispute Resolution
OCA	Order of Compromise Agreement
PADRO	Pool of Alternative Dispute Resolution Officers
PENRO	Provincial Environment and Natural Resources Office
RLGM	Responsible Land Governance in Mindanao
SO	Special Order
DAR	Department of Agrarian Reform
ZOPA	Zone of Possible Agreement

TRAINING REPORT
***Roll-Out of the Alternative Dispute Resolution Manual
of the Land Management Bureau***

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Roll-out Training on Alternative Dispute Resolution in Public Land Disputes was conducted from January 23, 2023 to February 3, 2023. The direction to conduct the training came about after discussions on a review of the ADR Manual, and an assessment of the readiness of the Alternative Dispute Resolution Officers (ADROs) to use the manual. To build this readiness, capacity building measures were recommended to address the needs of the ADROs. One of the capacity - building measures identified was the Roll-out Training. Participated in by 23 participants from Regions 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7,8, 10, 11, 13 and the National Capital Region, there were five (5) OADR accredited Trainers who were present from beginning to the end of the training. The sessions were conducted with a mix of lecture, role play, games, videos, debate, and reflections.

While the goal of the training was to mainly develop the ADROs' know-how in mediation, and related topics plus build their skills- both technical and people skills- in applying the sessions' learnings by doing mediation role-play, an important aspect of the training was also to establish a particular way of doing things that would help them become more effective in their work. The training framework operationalized in the 10 day-session was "Learning by Doing", with several case work and workshops distributed throughout the sessions, and an assessment every end of the role play that looked into each step of the mediation process done by the mediator. The opening, the facilitation on the issues and concerns of the parties, the problem-solving process, and the closing, the identified strengths and gaps were discussed both as a group and in plenary. This mixed approach presented a diverse set of training methodologies for the ADROs, helping build their capacity to plan, research, execute the processes, facilitate communication and engagement between both parties better, understand more clearly conflicting interests according to specific needs, and consequently mediate from a more wholistic lens as part of building their readiness to use the manual, and give inputs on how it can help them better. With the discussions on actual field situations during role plays, the participants were able to validate which portions in the ADR manual would be both useful and relevant, and which sections needed more detail or improvements. The discussions naturally led to how the DENR Guidelines on ADR could be improved, and how specific topics could be added or detailed more.

The final chapter of this report enumerates the points raised by the participants in relation to improvements of the ADR manual, as well as the ADR guidelines that need to be reviewed and improved. These suggestions covered assessment of the ADR techniques being used by the ADROs in relation to effectively resolving conflicts, harmonizing support systems so that mediation is pursued across all regions as the first step in conflict management, the review of the order of the process steps, forms used, and rules so that these are aligned with one another

and would not result into confusion. The cited improvements also include looking into necessary technology support and assistance for virtual conferences, and the ADR monitoring system.

In terms of participant engagement, all regional participants engaged actively across different sessions including the ice-breakers. With 5 trainers on site for 23 participants, the ratio of trainer to participant is ideal at 4-5 participant per trainer. Therefore, the workshops conducted as a follow-through to the input session gave each participant the opportunity to be monitored closely by the group facilitating trainer.

All in all, following are the conclusions and recommendations of the Training Team:

1. The use of role play where actual field scenarios were depicted by the participants was very useful to cull out difficulties of the ADROs when mediating particular cases, and therefore helped zero in on the gaps of the capabilities of the ADROs in alternative dispute resolution.
2. These gaps included the capability to do a more in-depth conflict mapping or conflict analysis to help facilitate more meaningful discussions with both parties. The discussion of the stages of conflict, what their sources are, and how they can be categorized proved to be useful to the participants to understand how conflicts can be masked, and how important it is to unpack these, and help facilitate discussion of the true sources of conflict.
3. Although there were conflict cases which were more present in particular regions, there were several conflicts that were common across regions, but they still necessitated a different approach that incorporated the area's culture, beliefs, and traditions. This approach is made more relevant in relation to land use conflicts involving the indigenous peoples. It is, therefore important for the ADROs to also have a good understanding of particular sectors' culture and beliefs to facilitate communication between parties better.
4. The participants had expressed that they had only been exposed to values-based mediation, and the presentation of other types of mediation allowed them to see how different types of mediation can be used for different cases or how some types of mediation can be used together to address differences and conflicts better.
5. The different stages of the mediation approaches including a presentation of negotiation techniques gave the participants a broader understanding of the skills needed in mediation. A skillful mediator in terms of technique, approach, and process includes knowing how both parties will negotiate, and this know-how allows the mediator to ask the correct questions, to probe correctly so that

hidden positions can eventually put to light so both parties are able to appreciate and understand the full extent of the other party's stand.

6. The ADROs verbalized exhaustion, and being drained from recurring conflicts, and parties who were difficult to control at times, parties who can be very adversarial, and non-participatory. The topic on healing and reconciliation was identified by the participants as part of the full process for them, and not just for the conflicting parties.
7. Given the responses of the participant ADROs in this 10-day training, it is gleaned that the ADROs of the other regions also have these gaps in their own skills, and know how, and therefore, to help support developing better techniques and approaches in the field, undergoing this same training is recommended for ADROs of the other regions.
8. It is also recommended that a monitoring program by MedNet of those who attended the training can be put in place after three months to assess how the trainees have been able to use the new skills and know-how learned, and secure both success stories and cases where mediation failed so these can be shared to the group for continuing learning of the trainees. The visit after three months can help jumpstart a Continuing DENR-ADRO Learning Program that may be a hybrid of onsite and virtual.

The Roll-out training brought about the discovery of new methods, new approaches, and new skills to the ADROs. While they have learned the lessons in the sessions, a support system of regular coordination between LMB-DENR and MedNet should be in place for continuing discussions and learning towards more resolved disputes on the ground.

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
ANNEXES	viii
TRAINING REPORT	1
Introduction and Rationale	1
Basic Information on the Training	2
Training schedule and venue	2
Purpose of training	2
Training Design	2
Training Participants	3
Training Team	3
Training Methodologies	4
Contextualization of ADR needs	4
Classroom-type Lecture	5
Simulation/Role Play	5
Games	5
Materials	5
Consultation	6
Co-management	6
Evaluation	6
Limitations	7
Training Highlights	7
Opening Session	7
ADR in DENR: Statutory Landscape	10
Comments and Recommendations on DAOs	13
Conflict Diagnostic Tools	15
The ABC of Conflict	15
The Circle of Conflict	15
Sources of Power	16
Stakeholder Analysis	17
Functional Ingredients Analysis	18

Force Field Analysis.....	18
Steps in Conflict Diagnosis.....	18
Conflict Mapping.....	18
Dynamics of Communication, Active Listening and Probing .	20
Non-Violent Communication.....	20
Introduction to Interest-Based Negotiation	20
Approaches to Negotiation	20
Introduction to Mediation	20
Mediation Roadmap	21
Harmony Approach in Mediation.....	23
Ethical Dilemmas on Mediation, Qualities of a Good Mediator	25
Evaluation.....	25
Pre-test and Post-test	25
Daily Assessments.....	25
Training Evaluation	26
Synthesis and Conclusions	27
Recommendations and Next Steps	30
Level of Effort of the Consulting Team.....	30

ANNEXES

Annex	Description/Title
A	Training Design
B	List of Participants
C	Pre-Test/Post-Test
D	Training Evaluation Form

TRAINING REPORT

Roll-Out of the Alternative Dispute Resolution Manual of the Land Management Bureau

Introduction and Rationale

Responsible Land Governance in Mindanao (RLGM), emerged from lessons in implementing measures that promote sustainable rural development, while integrating climate, conflict, and gender-sensitivity in asset management. It recognizes the increasing complexity of jurisdictional and land management issues due to the lack of land use and tenure information as well as maps and zoning definitions. The project seeks to address the above-mentioned issues in a multi-level approach working with national agencies on regulatory and policy issues with regard to public lands as well as the transparency and availability of geodata. In this case, the project works with the Land Management Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (LMB-DENR). In response to the partner's need, RLGM supported the development of a systematic sourcebook/manual in carrying out the DENR's Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms, including a description of the tools and processes.

As its title suggests, this engagement pursues the roll out of the aforementioned manual. Regions 10, 11 and 13 being the focus sites of the RLGM project, most of the participants to this activity are from said regions. Its objectives were as follows:

1. To formulate and implement a roll-out strategy and plan
2. To validate/pilot-test the application of the manual in actual field conditions
3. To recommend improvement in the ADR Manual based on pilot-test result (e.g. content and process) in support to the on-going review of DAO No. 2016-30 or the DENR Guidelines in the conduct of ADR

The training ran for 10 days as programmed in the Training Design, which was especially prepared for this engagement by the Consulting Team. In addition to the delivery of training topics, the Training Design also gave room for inputs for the improvement of the ADR Manual and the review of the ADR policy framework of the DENR.

This Training Report is being submitted by the Consulting Team as a documentation of the conduct and results of the aforementioned training and to present recommendations in pursuit of the objectives of the consultancy engagement.

Basic Information on the Training

Training schedule and venue

The training, entitled "Roll-out Training on Alternative Dispute Resolution in Public Land Disputes", was conducted at the One Pacific Place, Salcedo Village Makati City, on January 23 to February 3, 2023. The training ran for 10 days, with a rest day on January 29, which was a Sunday.

The decision to hold the training in Metro Manila (Makati City) was agreed upon during the Inception Meeting held at the LMB Office on January 11, 2023. It was realized that although majority of the participants would be coming from Regions 10, 11 and 13, with more participants coming from other regions, traveling to a venue in any of the focal regions would prove challenging because of limited direct flights. Thus, bringing them all to Metro Manila would be the most convenient, logistically efficient and financially wise option. The venue was chosen and engaged by the GIZ..

Purpose of training

The training was conducted not only as a retooling strategy for Alternative Dispute Resolution Officers (ADROs) of the DENR, but more importantly, to test the appropriateness and effectiveness of the training design as a capability-building tool for present and future ADROs who shall make use of the ADR Manual being rolled out through this engagement.

Training Design

Conduct of the 10-day training was guided by the Training Design put together by the Consulting Team and approved by GIZ's Principal Advisor for RLGM.

The Training Design is patterned after the 14-day Basic Empowering Dispute Resolution/Management Processes (EDRMP) training courses of the Mediators Network for Sustainable Peace, Inc. (MedNet). Said Basic EDRMP was shortened in consideration of the limited time of target participants as well as the short term of the consultancy engagement. Nevertheless, some topics that are normally delivered in MedNet's advanced ADR training were included to be better suited to the needs of the training and to advance the promotion of peace and non-violence. For example, it was said that ADROs find it challenging mediating disputes involving IPs, thus, the Harmony Approach in Mediation was included. For peacebuilding, the topics on Non-Violent Communication, Healing and Reconciliation were added.

In addition, the Training Design also included sessions to enable the participants to give inputs relative to the roll out of the ADR Manual and the ongoing review of the DENR policies on ADR.

A copy of the Training Design is attached as **ANNEX A**.

Training Participants

The training was attended by 23 ADROs from various regions, with the bulk of them coming from Regions 10, 11 and 13. In line with the purposes of the engagement in general and the training in particular, the participants were selected by DENR based on a criteria, which are enumerated in the Inception Report, to wit: (1) experience in the practice of mediation, particularly the application of DAO No. 2016-30; (2) experience in handling mediation cases involving IPs (IP v IP; IP v non-IP); (3) gender balance; and, (4) balanced representation among Regions 10, 11 and 13 (although the LMB may choose to include representatives from other regions, subject to agreement by GIZ). The participants also included those coming from the DENR Central Office (CO).

Given the above criteria, MedNet and GIZ requested the DENR Regional Offices to identify their participants.

The following table shows the number of participants from each region and the CO.

Region	No. of Participants	
	Female	Male
1		1
2		1
3	1	
CALABARZON	2	
MIMAROPA	1	
5	1	
6	1	
7		1
8	1	
9	1	
10	2	2
11		1
13	2	
NCR		1
CAR		1
LMB	3	1
Sub-total	15	9
TOTAL	24	

The list of participants is attached as **ANNEX B..**

*Participants not included in Annex B belonging to the Land Management Bureau are: Nico Benedict P. Balilo, and Jessica R. Cerilo

Training Team

The Training Team is led by the Consulting Team of Atty. Allan Barcena, Atty. Jun Quicho and Ms. Rachel Aquino. All of them are certified as trainers in Mediation by the Office of Alternative Dispute Resolution (OADR) of the Department of Justice (DOJ).

In addition, the Consulting Team engaged the services of two seasoned EDRMP trainers in the persons of Ms. Marides Gardiola and Mr. Floro Astillo. Ms. Gardiola, who also chairs the Board of Trustees of MedNet, has a long history of EDRMP training behind her. She has written several papers and manuals including "Taking Peace into their Own Hands". External Evaluation of Tumikang Samasama, a local mediators' body in Sulu, Philippines. September 2012 and "Empowering Communities for Self-Determination". CO Manual. published by the LGSPA Task Force Mapalad and Kadtuntaya Foundation, January 2010. On the other hand, Mr. Floro Astillo continues to be the Alternate Vice President for Mindanao, and works with the Department of Agrarian Reform

The Training Team was supported by the administrative and technical team of MedNet. Ms. Gemma Regina Cunanan, Executive Director, documented the proceedings. Ms. Nelia Flores, Administrative and Finance Officer, took care of the financial aspects assigned to the care of the Consulting Team. Mr. Kiefer Sy, M&E Specialist, encoded and synthesized the results of the evaluations. Mr. Zeto Eguia, Jr., IT Specialist, ensured that the technological requirements of the sessions were satisfied. Mr. Clent Vinluan, Administrative Assistant, provided additional administrative and logistical support.

In addition, a number of LMB-DENR personnel lent administrative and technical support as well.

Training Methodologies

The training methodologies used took into consideration the main purpose of the engagement (roll out the ADR Manual) and the specific purposes for which the training was held, i.e., to retool ADROs and to test the appropriateness of the Training Design as a capability-building tool for ADROs. To address these needs, the methodologies explained in the following paragraphs were used.

Contextualization of ADR needs

Among the first activities in the training was drawing up an inventory of the mediation experiences of the participants, which was done through a workshop.

The participants were grouped according to regions, and were asked to present a case most encountered in their area, and role play the Mediator, and the two parties. Role play cases included those involving overlapping of land title, land succession, encroachment, boundary disputes. The conflicting parties were role played to be adversarial with both parties having difficulty reaching an agreement.

The groups reported the overriding atmosphere of the cases, and expressed the ADRO's difficulties in these cases. The session was a quick scanning of what each region's current realities in terms of mediation challenges.

The exercise informed the Training Team on the choice of examples given during lectures and the selection of cases for simulation.

Classroom-type Lecture

Each topic was first delivered through a classroom-type lecture by a trainer who has had extensive experience in the practice of such topic. A PowerPoint Presentation accompanied each lecture. An open forum followed each lecture where the participants were able to relate the lecture with their experiences.

Copies of the PowerPoint Presentations are attached in this Report.

Simulation/Role Play

In pursuit of its "Learning by Doing" approach, the lessons and skills learned during lectures were put to use by the participants through simulation exercises. The participants were divided into groups - Luzon, Visayas/NCR, and Mindanao - and were given cases to simulate. They played all the roles of the parties to the cases being simulated, i.e., disputants, mediators.

In every simulation exercise, each participant was given a feedback sheet where s/he wrote her/his observations and insights on the manner each case was simulated. The observations were shared in the group. A member of the group was then assigned to report the lessons learned to the plenary, which took place immediately after each breakout session.

In addition, a member or two of the Training Team sat down with each group to guide and critique the exercise. The critique basically consisted of pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of the simulation, followed with pointers to further improve the participants' knowledge and skills.

The role play was important not only for the participants to exhibit mediation skills. Quite important as well is for them to understand, or more aptly to empathize with, disputants. The latter helps build their capacity for qualities and skills that are essential in mediation, such as, active listening, fairness, compassion, non-violent communication.

Games

The game WIN AS MUCH AS YOU CAN sought to have the trainees experience how individual interest plays a role in particular decisions. Each team was composed of 4 members with the game presenting the team member with an option to win as much as he can individually or allowing the team to win as much as it can but with the individuals or team members sacrificing some of his or her winnings.

The game elicited reflections on how conflicting parties may opt to win as a separate party with some trade offs. But the biggest realization was that all parties can actually win if there is communication, active listening, and a clear understanding of what one needs, and not what one is interested in.

Materials

Copies of the PowerPoint Presentations were given the participants in hard copies. These were distributed on the last day.

Consultation

In line with its purpose, the training also included consultations on the adequacy of the ADR Manual being rolled out as well as to elicit inputs relevant to the review and updating of DENR's ADR policies. The consultations were done FGD style where the participants were asked to narrate how the policies are being facilitative and challenging to their practice of ADR.

Co-management

The participants were divided into four groups of Host Teams, each acting as such for a whole training day. This was done to enable them to help manage the training. Their tasks include providing the synthesis of the previous day's proceedings, concocting and leading ice breakers for the day, opening the day's sessions, and managing the participants. It is hoped that the experience taught them how to run ADR trainings as some, if not all, of them may be developed to become ADR trainers of DENR.

Evaluation

There were four ways by which evaluation was done, to wit:

1. Pre-Test and Post-Test. At the start of the training, the participants were made to take a pre-test - a quiz - to measure their knowledge of ADR. The same test was given to them at the end of the training to see whether their knowledge has increased. A copy of the Pre-Test/Post-Test document is attached as **ANNEX C**.
2. Daily Assessment of Feelings. At the end of each training day, the participants were asked to rate their emotional state for the day through a simple and quick exercise. The participants had three choices: (1) happy; (2) ambivalent; (3) unhappy. They were then asked to explain their responses. This was important for the Training Team to determine whether the training resonates with the participants so that adjustments can be made where necessary.
3. Team Assessment. To augment the next preceding technique, the Training Team sat down every end of the training day, often with the support staff of LMB whenever they were available, to assess the day's processes, including their observations of the participants' reception thereof. As in the Daily Assessment of Feelings, this was done to determine whether adjustments have to be made in the training approach.
4. Post-training Evaluation. At the end of the penultimate day of the training, the participants were asked to fill up an evaluation form, entitled Training Evaluation, for them to assess the training as a whole. Said form consists of two parts. The first part adopts the standard evaluation questions of MedNet, where respondents are asked to rate from 1 to 10 (1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest) their assessment of the various elements of the training. The second portion asks open-ended questions relative to the topics taken

up in the training and how they were delivered as part of the roll out of the ADR Manual. A copy of the Training Evaluation is attached as **ANNEX D**.

Limitations

MedNet's EDRMP philosophy, which is necessarily reflected in its training program, promotes Interest-Based Mediation. It is understood that the participants to the training were earlier trained in Value-Based Mediation, which is the advocacy of their past trainers. In designing the training, the Consulting Team endeavored to take hold of the training materials used in their previous training. However, the same could not be shared, according to LMB due to Intellectual Property Rights considerations. Thus, the same could not be integrated in the Training Design. In any case, it is hoped that this training served to expand the ADROs' menu of mediation approach options.

The target number of participants was 35, with five each coming from Regions 10, 11 and 13, and one each from other regions, plus some from the CO. Unfortunately, only 24 could make it. The Consulting Team was informed of two possible reasons why only a few could make the training. First was the short notice. Considering the procedures of DENR (government, actually), a number of prospective participants were not able to complete the processing of their travel documents. In fact, a couple of participants arrived one day late because the processing of their travel documents were not completed in time for the opening day. Second, the funds for 2023 have not yet been remitted to the field offices. Thus, some of the offices had no funds to support the travel of their prospective participants. This was opportunity lost to get inputs from those who could not participate. The training would have been an ideal venue for ADROs from all regions to be heard.

Training Highlights

Opening Session

The training started in the early afternoon of January 23. After the invocation and the singing of the National Anthem, Atty. Marlou Alutaya, head of the LMB legal office, welcomed the participants. Atty. Allan Barcena, Vice-President for Special Concerns of MedNet, introduced the Training Team and gave a quick glance of the 10-day training. The participants and the members of the Training Team were then given time to personally introduce themselves.

Ms. Che Aquino then did an expectation check. Meta cards were distributed to the participants on which they wrote down their expectations. The results showed the following:

1. Substance of the training:

- a. Inputs on how to deal with disputant indigenous peoples
 - b. ADR policies be more suited to the realities on the ground
 - c. Resource persons to cite real-life experiences
 - d. Exercises to focus more on the usual cases handled by them
2. Group dynamics:
 - a. Lively and productive discussions
 - b. Free sharing of knowledge and mediation techniques based on each participant's experiences
 - c. Time to rest because 10 days of training can be exhausting
 - d. Resource persons to not be boring
 3. Administrative and logistical concerns:
 - a. Good, healthy food
 - b. Provision of training materials
 - c. Flowing coffee

Ms. Aquino assured them that all their expectations shall be met in the process. More particularly, she mentioned the following:

1. The Harmony Approach shall be discussed to provide them tools on how to deal with IPs
2. The training has been designed to give emphasis on the typologies of conflicts they encounter, which shall figure well in the discussions and exercises
3. Participants were chosen to ensure that they have considerable experience in mediation to enrich the discussions and elicit worthwhile inputs for the review of ADR policies
4. The lecturers come from different backgrounds and can thus provide a wider perspective to the participants; they have vast experience in conflicts involving women, IPs, farmers, natural resource allocation, lands, agrarian reform, intra-organizational disputes
5. Time allocation for inputs and exercises is such that participants can have quality time to absorb lessons
6. There will be one free day (Sunday)

Ms. Aquino then explained in detail the Training Program, its objectives and flow. She pointed out that after the 10-day training, the participants are expected to do the following:

1. Explain the laws and administrative orders on ADR for public lands.
2. Explain the nature and dynamics of conflict, and demonstrated the use of conflict diagnostic tools.
3. Demonstrate Active Listening, Probing, and Non-Violent Communication (NVC) skills.
4. Demonstrate interest-based negotiation and interest-based mediation skills;
5. Explain harmony-based mediation skills.

6. Explain concepts on healing and reconciliation, and shared dilemmas and qualities of a good mediator.
7. Provide comments and inputs to the LMB Manual on ADR and relevant DAO revisions.

The participants were then divided into Host Teams that will function as described in the Training Methodologies above.

A representative of the hotel was then invited to lay down the house rules to enable the participants to enjoy the venue.

The opening session ended with the participants taking the Pre-test. Unfortunately, only 17 of the participants were able to take the Pre-test as the other six came in later yet.

Baseline of Mediation Experiences of Participants

The participants were divided into three workshop groups: Visayas + NCR, Mindanao, and Luzon (Regions 1, 3, 4A and 5). Each group role played actual conflicts handled in their respective areas. Two hours were spent for the workshop after which group reporters presented ideas and insights culled from the workshop.

The Mindanao group showed that there is a growing claim by IPs of ancestral domains in protected areas resulting in overlapping of land claims, and consequently boundary disputes. The implementation of the provisions of Republic Act (RA) 7586 or the National Integrated Protected Area System (NIPAS) of 1992 which falls under DENR jurisdiction and RA 8371, the Indigenous people's Rights Act (IPRA) of 1997 which falls under a different agency's jurisdiction, the NCIP or the National Commission of Indigenous Peoples present overlaps in both policies that have affected resolution of the cases. Apart from NCIP, another agency, the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) also has jurisdiction over all alienable and disposable lands of the public domain devoted to or suitable for agriculture. From the ADRO's perspective, once claimed as covered by CADCs, they lose the potential to reach their targets for DENR to beef up conservation and protection efforts in the country's protected areas. The group, however, presented ways and means to resolve conflicts emanating from boundary disputes involving Indigenous Peoples. The discussion focused on seeking to properly understand the culture of the IP's in order to use mediation to build trust towards both parties. There was also a discussion on the usefulness of mediation in demarcation, and the Joint DAR-DENR-LRA-NCIP Administrative Order clarifying and interfacing the jurisdictions, policies, programs and projects of the four agencies in order to address jurisdictional and operational issues among said agencies. The Joint DENR-NCIP Circular on Policy Reconciliation of the NIPAS and the IPRA was also mentioned.

A participant commented that there are various IP rituals on conciliation and mediation. This is called Pamaas in Mindanao, and Inayan in the Cordilleras. Meanwhile, Samaya is the compensation of damage done.

The Visayas and NCR group highlighted the use of location surveys, the need to establish the legitimacy of the claim, and holding private caucuses in the ADR process. The group also pointed out that ADROs should do constant reality checks to ensure that the mediator is not leading the parties towards his/her own decision. After the parties have reached an agreement, a compromise agreement should immediately be drafted and signed. Foreshore areas have also already been included in the areas falling under the jurisdiction of the DENR. The Joint DAR-DENR Administrative Order No.09, series of 2021 entitled “Rules Governing the Management of Collective Certificates of Land Ownership Awards (CCLOAs) Falling within Land Classified as Forestlands/Timberland, National Parks, and Mineral lands or within Unclassified Public Forests” was also brought up in relation to overlaps of DENR and DAR in cases on land ownership.

The Luzon Group discussed particular steps to take in mediating the cases shown such as safe space communication, the importance of confidentiality of the discussions which the mediator should bear in mind, and use of the dialects/languages of both parties to make mediation more comfortable for the parties. In the Cordilleras, a particular ritual called “Inayan” among the IPs is practiced in addressing conflicts. There are cultural traditions and approaches that need to be taken into consideration to help facilitate communication and understanding between disputants.

ADR in DENR: Statutory Landscape

The first lecture was on ADR in DENR: Statutory Landscape, delivered by Atty, Jun Quicho. Atty. Quicho opened the lecture by saying that ADR is fast gaining ground in resolving legal and related conflicts and disputes. He said that the use of ADR has moved forward from mere informal settlement to an administratively sanctioned practice and a judicially recognized resort. To exemplify, he referenced a number of statutes that mainstream ADR in the realm government policy and practice. These are: the Local Government Code of 1991, which provides for Lupon Tagapamayapa; IPRA, which recognizes IP rights to their customary laws and ways of resolving conflicts; CARL, which strengthened the BARC; Labor Code, which has long institutionalized arbitration in claims arising from labor relations; Construction Industry Arbitration Law of 1985, which created the CIAC; ADR Act of 2004, which promotes the use of ADR to achieve speedy and impartial justice and de-clog court dockets, and which created the OADR under the DOJ; Special Rules of Court on ADR, which covers the proceedings relative to the ADR Act of 2004; Special Rules of Procedure for Environmental Cases, which incorporates the use of ADR in every stage of court proceedings; 2020 Guidelines for the Conduct of CAM and JDR in Civil Cases, which provides guideposts for the conduct of Court-Annexed Mediation and Judicial Dispute Resolution; EO 523, 2006, Instituting the Use of ADR in the Executive Department of Government, which directs all administrative bodies to promote the use of alternative modes of dispute resolution.

Consistent with the ADR mainstreaming policy, the DENR has issued several policy instruments on the matter, to wit:

1. **DAO 2005-18**, Adoption of Alternative Dispute Principles and Procedures in the Resolution Appropriate Environment Natural Resources Conflicts
2. **DAO No. 2016-30**, Guidelines on the Conduct of Alternative Dispute Resolution in Land Management and Disposition
3. **DAO No. 2016-31**, Procedures in the Investigation and Resolution of Land Claims and Conflicts Cases
4. **DAO No. 2021-01**, Guidelines on the Conduct of Virtual Alternative Dispute Resolution Proceedings in the Resolution of Land Claims and Conflicts
5. **DMC No. DMC No. 2021-01**, Guidelines on the Establishment of Pool of Alternative Dispute Resolution Officers (PADROs) in the DENR and the Referral of Land Claims and Conflicts Cases and Other Disputes
6. **DMC No. 2021-03**, Adoption of Alternative Dispute Resolution-Monitoring and Results System and its User Manual

DAO 2005-18 integrates ADR in administrative procedures. All bureaus, attached agencies and regional offices are mandated to adopt ADR principles in their current procedures, and, where apt, adapt an applicable ADR system. Similarly, all quasi-judicial bodies within the DENR system are to create or modify their rules of procedure, where appropriate, to incorporate ADR principles. By adopting ADR in its administrative procedures, DENR hopes to facilitate mutually-acceptable solutions for appropriate cases, and minimize the number of cases raised for formal administrative or judicial resolution. The following cases, however, cannot be subject to ADR: (1) those where applicable regulations are conflicting and would thus require resolution by a body higher than the bureau, attached agency or regional office; (2) those whose resolution would require policy change; (3) those involving criminal liability; (4) cases involving the issue of jurisdiction of DENR or the courts; (5) administrative cases against DENR officials and employees; and, (6) cases that by law cannot be compromised.

DAO 2016-30 lays down the procedures to realize the intents of DAO 2005-18. It integrates ADR in land management and disposition to achieve efficient, speedy and economical procedure in the resolution of claims and conflicts, reduce incidence of claims and conflicts cases and unclog case dockets, while at the same time ensuring party autonomy or the freedom of parties to land disputes to make their own arrangements to resolve their disputes. It enumerates 11 themes of disputes that may be taken cognizance of, to wit: (1) Agricultural Free Patent; (2) Residential Free Patent; (3) Homestead Patent; (4) Sales Patent; (5) Lease of Public Lands; (6) Proclamations covering A&D lands; (7) Special Patents; (8) Survey/Delineation of Public Lands; (9) Friar Lands disposition; (10) Disposition of Patrimonial Properties; and, (11) Others. It provides for the ADR Committee, which is in-charge of the overall implementation of ADR for matters pertaining to land management and disposition. It also provides for the qualifications of ADROs, including the requirement for them to first undergo ADR training.

The same DAO warrants the use of ADR at various stages of controversies: (1) Conciliation at the onset of land investigation on Public Lands Application when there exists potential conflict/s; (2) Mandatory ADR (Mediation) at CENRO; (3) ADR (Mediation) at PENRO; (4) ADR (Mediation) before judgment by RED/RD; and, (5) Mediation on Appeal.

As a procedural policy, DAO 2016-30 contains a model Preliminary ADR Conference sequence, which, according to Atty. Quicho, already covers the whole process. The steps are: (1) Introduction; (2) Opening statement to encourage parties to settle; (3) Discussion of the conflict/dispute by each party; (4) Identification of issues; (5) Exploring for amicable solution; (6) Joint negotiation; (7) Formulation of compromise agreement; (8) Signing of compromise agreement; and, (9) Submission of compromise agreement for approval. Atty. Quicho emphasized that an Order of Compromise Agreement (OCA) has the effect of a final and executory Decision, and can cause the dismissal of the case with prejudice. He explained especially to non-lawyers that dismissal of the case with prejudice means the case can no longer be refiled. However, a party may file a Petition to Vacate/Modify/Correct the OCA should there be ground/s therefor.

Atty. Quicho also mentioned that ADR proceedings should end within 30 days from date of referral to ADR Officer, with 1-3 sessions, and with no lawyer of any disputant present. The proceedings are strictly confidential, with no records. However, the ADRO may take down personal notes.

DAO 2016-31, meanwhile, provides room for use of ADR in cases of claims and conflicts involving unpatented or unregistered lands. These cases shall be referred for Mandatory ADR after the issues have been joined and the ocular inspection conducted. Land Investigation Officers (LIO) may be designated to mediate these cases where there are no other qualified and trained ADROs available.

DAO 2021-01 was issued as a COVID response, this DAO allows the conduct of online ADR proceedings on land claims and conflicts and other ENR disputes in appropriate cases. While the process remains consistent with the provisions of DAO 2016-30, there are nuances considered, to wit: (1) Willingness of parties to discuss online; (2) Technological factors; (3) Logistics; (4) Ensuring privacy and confidentiality; and, (5) Preserving the integrity of agreements. In light of these considerations, said DAO drew up the steps for doing an online ADR process:

1. Referral to ADRO, see DAO 2016-30
2. Determination by ADRO of suitability of virtual process
3. Determination of parties' agreement to undergo virtual process, in writing
4. Determination of virtual platform
5. Ground rules, which must be agreed upon by the parties
6. Advisory on platform link
7. Introduction by the ADRO
8. Joint sessions and private caucuses
9. Consensus-building
10. Drafting of Agreement
11. Signing of Agreement
12. Order of Compromise Agreement
13. Termination of process

DMC 2021-01 creates the Pool of ADR Officers (PADRO) in every Region, the LMB and the Central Office, which shall be headed by an ADR Focal Person who is under the direct control and supervision of the ADR Committee. The objective is to ensure the constant availability of ADROs from a wider jurisdictional coverage

who can take on ADR work in situations where an ADRO in a particular area is unavailable, suffers from conflict of interest or not preferred by the parties. Central to this is the referral system contained in Secs. 7-10, which are self-explanatory.

DMC 2021-03 establishes the ADR-MRS to strengthen and improve the institutionalization and implementation of ADR in the DENR through: (1) a monitoring and reporting system of disputes referred to ADR; (2) a database helpful in analyzing and evaluating the implementation of ADR; (3) an automated and real time system of recording data and status of cases; (4) a case tracking system for parties and neutrals; (5) a process of regenerating reports and data; and, (6) ensuring transparency, accountability and integrity of records and data of cases.

The following are the features of the ADR-MRS:

1. ADROs/users shall **register** and create their user accounts, for approval by the Committee
2. Users shall **encode/enter data** into the System
3. The **Dashboard Menu** presents data in graphs, tables and comparisons, data correlation, trend and period of the process and handling ADROs that shall generate reports
4. The **File Attachment Menu** allows user to upload evidence
5. **Record Account Management/Report Generation**, which only allows the “end-user” to enter, manipulate and retrieve data, and generate reports
6. The system provides **Transmission of ADR Records** from the ADROs that shall provide basis for administering officer/s to take action

Comments and Recommendations on DAOs

Atty. Allan Barcena then took over the session. He conducted the session in FGD fashion to elicit the reactions and recommendations of the participants on DENR's ADR policies as presented by Atty. Quicho. The following are the comments and recommendations gathered from the participants:

Atty. Barcena presented the results of the consultation on DAO 2016-30 and DAO 2016-3, which he also conducted in the xxx in Tagaytay City on xxx. The participants validated all the recommendations gathered from there. Thus, the discussion focused on the other policy issuances.

In relation to DAO 2005-18, there is need to assess the effectiveness of ADR in DENR to determine whether the ADR techniques used are effective. Also, information in the DENR website, the batting average of case resolved is between 45% and 60%. There is, therefore, a need to continuously implement training programs on ADR.

There is also need to assess the applicability of mediation in the mining, forestry and other ENR sectors. There is need to harmonize these systems as the intervention used in mining is still arbitration. Mediation needs to be done before arbitration. LMB is very active in pushing ADR in land management. This needs to be supported in the regions.

In relation to DAO 2016-03, there is need to think about the wisdom of applying ADR to a wider menu of cases, e.g., disputes related to land surveys, political boundary surveys (especially considering IRA), tenurial instruments (e.g., IFMA, CBFMA, FLA, FLUA).

There is also need to harmonize rules on investigation with rules on ADR, e.g., rules of procedure on conducting land surveys.

There is need to clarify voluntary and mandatory mediation under different stages and levels. There is also need to review the order of the compromise agreement, order of settle agreement, effectivity, finality and grounds to question order of agreement. There is need to streamline appeal process. ADR forms should also be revisited to make them consistent with the provisions of the DAO. This DAO needs to be harmonized with the policies of DAR and NCIP.

For DAO 2021-01, there is need to provide technological support in terms of computer equipment, internet and virtual meeting room. The concern of electronic signing of documents needs to be addressed.

For DMC 2021-01, there is need to complete pool and capacitate; clarify role of ADR officers and land investigation officers. We need to understand why a Land investigator can do arbitration but an ADRO cannot.

There is also need to update the list of ADROs at least on a yearly basis. The formation of PADROs should be prioritized.

For DMC 2021-03, there is need to review and update the ADR-MRS to help assess the status of ADR cases. This is supposed to be institutionalized, and all cases should be entered into the database. When an ADRO transfers location, there is no scanner making it difficult to ensure inputting of all cases in database.

Once a case is received, one needs to input in the ADR-MRS within 30 days then submit for resolution. There is a turn-around time which requires ADROs to check regularly lest they exceed the 30-day limit. The challenges in the Monitoring system need to be addressed. There is no account in PENRO and no IT person assigned, who can help ADROs to access if there is a transfer of location. Usually, regional offices do trouble shooting and field offices have no internet. An actual scanner is needed because phone scanners are not allowed. There is need to allocate budget for this. Even when case has already been referred, it is still retained with ADRO in database. We can get best practices of MGB in database management. Perhaps we should put in place a barcode and watermark for document protection.

The LMB ADR manual needs to include operational procedures, and also needs to improve its lay-out and design. Principles of ADR need to be expanded.

There is need to encourage more registration of titles and include resolved cases with the benefits to the parties in a brief. There should be three reference materials for ADR: the manual which presents the process and the steps of what ADROs need to do, the handbook which should be a guide for the public so that they know what needs to be done in similar conflicts needing the help of ADROs, and the brief which shows the accomplishments of ADROs in terms of specific cases resolved.

.

Conflict Diagnostic Tools

This topic, which took one full day to discuss, was co-presented by Ms. Rachel Aquino and Ms. Marides Gardiola. Six diagnostic tools were imparted to the participants, to wit:

1. ABC of Conflict
2. Circle of Conflict
3. Sources of Power
4. Stakeholder Analysis
5. Force Field Analysis
6. Functional Ingredients

Each of the abovementioned diagnostic tools has a specific purpose (diagnostic objectives and action objectives) in determining whether a conflict or dispute is ripe for mediation or if mediation is the appropriate approach to resolving the dispute. The general rule is that while mediation (or ADR for that matter) is an effective approach, not all cases can be subject to mediation or ADR.

A quick discussion on Conflict Mapping was also included.

The ABC of Conflict

The ABC of Conflict is used basically to characterize the conflict as it manifests. It helps conflict managers to determine whether a dispute can be or can still be mediated. The "ABC" is actually an acronym for Antecedents, Behavioral and Social Manifestations of Conflict, and Consequences. Antecedents refer to events, situations, and other factors that caused the conflict and its manifestation. Behavioral and Social Manifestations refer to observable indicators of conflicts. Consequences refer to the effects of the conflict on individual persons, and on groups/communities/societies. The participants were tested on the understanding of this concept through a workshop on a case that would use diagnostic tools to identify where the conflict was coming from.

The Circle of Conflict

The Circle of Conflict is used to establish the source/s of conflict. According to authorities in conflict management, there are only five reasons why conflicts arise:

(1) data problems; (2) relationship problems; (3) values differences; (4) structural problems; and, (5) conflicting interests.

Data problems come about due to lack of information, conflicting information, conflicting interpretation of information/data and lack of credibility of information.

Relationship problems are caused by past unresolved misunderstanding and quarrels, strong emotions and incompatible personalities.

Values differences refer to differences in belief systems that lead people to judge what is right and wrong. These values manifest in their political, social and cultural beliefs.

Structural problems are caused by external factors, which cannot be resolved through negotiation between/among disputing parties such as, the law and its requirements, limited resources, natural conditions (e.g., weather, disasters).

Interests, meanwhile, refer to the needs, aspirations and fears of disputing parties that are threatened due to the acts or omissions of the adverse party/ies, thus, giving rise to a conflict or dispute. Each disputant has three aspects of interest, called the Triangle of Needs Satisfaction, that the mediator must look out for. Substantive interest concerns tangible outcomes, such as, money, jobs, land, percentage in share of crops. Procedural interest represents a disputant's desire for how the mediation process should be conducted, e.g., fair, participatory, consultative, chance to be heard, speedy. Psychological interest refers to how the disputants want to feel or be treated in the mediation process, e.g., respected, appreciated, trusted.

The questions being asked here are: (1) the different interests, structural problems, value differences, and relationship problems at play in the conflict; and, (2) whether these differences can be used as an opportunity for parties to use mediation.

Sources of Power

A crucial problem in mediation -- and this is usually pronounced in natural resource allocation conflicts -- is the power imbalance amongst disputants, e.g., moneyed businessman v. poor farmer, high-ranking public official v. unlettered forest dweller. It is thus important for the mediator to know the sources of power of the disputants in an attempt to close the power gap, so to speak. The presentation identified various sources of power and characterized each of them, as shown in the following table:

Source of Power	Characteristics
Formal Authority	Derived from a formal position which a structure confers certain decision-making prerogatives
Associational or referent power	Derived from association with other people with power

Source of Power	Characteristics
Resource power	Control over valued resources (money, materials, labor, goods or services)
Sanctions	The perceived ability to inflict harm or interfere with another's ability to realize his/her interests
Habitual	Power of the status quo; tendency to maintain a particular arrangement than to change it
Expertise or Information	Derived from having expertise in a particular area
Procedural	Control over procedures by which decisions are made
Moral	Derived from an appeal to widely held values
Personal	Derived from personal attributes like self-assurance, articulateness
Nuisance	Derived from the ability to cause discomfort to another

Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholders are individuals, groups, sectors, etc. who are affected and affecting the movement of the conflict. An analysis of the stakeholders to the conflict involves identifying the affected and affecting individuals, groups, sectors, etc. and determining their positions, interests, level of influence and power relations with other stakeholders. This will be a good guide for the mediator to ensure an exhaustive coverage of the conflict intervention that s/he will conduct. Having known the stakeholders, the mediator is wont to ask the following questions: What will be done to involve the stakeholders? What will be the substantive focus of conflict intervention?

Stakeholder analysis includes understanding of the positions and interests as well as the motivation and influence of the stakeholders in relation to the conflict intervention.

Positions refer to the demands or proposed solutions/actions of each party to resolve/manage a conflict. Interests, on the other hand, refers to the underlying reasons for the disputants' positions.

Meanwhile, the level of motivation refers to the extent to which a party desires to manage/resolve the conflict in an amicable way. This is normally rated as high, moderate or low. The level of influence (also rated as high, moderate or low) refers to the ability of a party to affect the direction of the conflict towards management, resolution or escalation.

Findings in the stakeholder analysis and sources of power can be summarized in a 7-column matrix (Stakeholder Analysis Matrix), with the elements: Stakeholders, Storyline or Positioning of Self and Others, Position, Interests, Level of Motivation

(High, Moderate, Low), Level of Influence (High, Moderate, Low), Sources of Power.

This leads to the Link Analysis, which in turn addresses the following concerns: (1) the different positions, interests and demands at play; (2) the Zones of Possible Agreement (ZOPAs); and, (3) how the creation of ZOPAs may be catalyzed.

Functional Ingredients Analysis

This diagnostic tool covers four areas of inquiry, and identifies the condition that can be best for mediation to work, as follows:

1. Mutual positive motivation to manage/resolve the conflict – both have the drive to resolve or manage the conflict;
2. Balance in situational power – power imbalances tend to inhibit the disputant from advancing their respective views in a clear and forceful manner;
3. An optimum level of tension – the tension is moderate in such a way that the disputants are still open to consider alternatives; and
4. Synchronization of confrontation efforts – both parties must be ready to confront the conflict.

Force Field Analysis

Force Field Analysis is the process of assessing the internal (intra- and inter-stakeholders) and external environment (social, cultural, political, economic environment, etc.) of the conflict. It involves identifying the factors that can trigger/facilitate conflict management/resolution or escalation and hinder conflict management/resolution.

Steps in Conflict Diagnosis

All the diagnostic tools discussed above should be used to gain a good grasp of the conflict and be able to draw up a plan for conflict intervention. The following steps are recommended:

1. Define the issues and their sources through the ABC of Conflict and the Circle of Conflict analyses
2. Identify the parties by doing the Stakeholder Analysis
3. Identify power distance, and influence on the primary conflicting parties by doing the Link Analysis and Sources of Power Analysis
4. Assess the willingness of parties to resolve conflict amicably through Functional Ingredients Analysis
5. Assess environmental factors that are helping or hindering the resolution of the conflict by doing the Force Field Analysis

Conflict Mapping

The diagnoses resulting from the application of the tools discussed above shall result in a Conflict Map. A Conflict Map is a communication tool that guides the mediator/conflict manager in dealing with the dispute/s at hand in a more systematic manner. Given the diagnoses, the mediator may now decide whether to proceed with the mediation, and thereby prescribe the manner by which the mediation intervention should proceed. The table below provides a simple guide to formulating a Conflict Map.

Diagnostic Tools	Diagnostic Objectives	Action Objectives
Conflict ABCs	What happened? What are the antecedents, the manifestations, and effects of the conflict?	Is EDRMP the appropriate approach?
Circle of Conflict	What are the different interests, structural problems, value differences, and relationship problems? What are the problems on data?	Can the differences in interests, values, and structural and relation problems be used as an opportunity for parties to use EDRMP?
Stakeholder Analysis	Who are the stakeholders? What are the areas of dissonance (per column of SA matrix)? Are there data/information gaps?	What will be done to involve the stakeholders? What will be the substantive focus of conflict intervention?
Link Analysis	What are the different positions, interests and demands? What are the ZOPAs (Zone of Possible Agreement)?	How to catalyze the creation of ZOPAs?
Force Field Analysis	What can trigger conflict escalation? What can trigger/hinder conflict management/resolution?	How to control factors that are triggering the escalation of conflict? How to tap factors that can help in conflict management/resolution?
Functional Ingredients	Are stakeholders ready to use EDRMP?	What can be done to persuade parties to try EDRMP?

Workshop on Conflict Diagnostic Tools

The groups were divided into three groups, namely NCR and Visayas, Luzon and Mindanao with each group being given a case to identify the diagnostic tool used in the conflict. Each group had to look into and assess positions, interests, information gaps, and other key parameters that needed to be considered in diagnosing the conflict to apply what had been discussed in the earlier lecture on conflict mapping. With some guidance by the trainers on distinguishing the diagnostic tools for some cases, the groups were able to identify where the conflicts were coming from.

Dynamics of Communication, Active Listening and Probing

The same grouping was maintained with members of the group asked to have a dialogue role play of a case they chose to show active listening and probing. The two actors took on the role of listener and speaker with the listener trying to depict active listening and probing to the audience. After the dialogue role play, the members of the groups identified what they observed in the one who took on the listener's role in the role play. The group members identified particular actions and responses taken on by the listener which showed active listening and probing. Both strengths and gaps were identified and discussed in order to build on the strengths and address the gaps or weaknesses.

Non-Violent Communication

The groups were again asked to role play how non-violent communication could be practiced in the cases of the ADROs. Particular cases experienced by the ADROs were used, and there was a realization of the trainees that being reactionary had no place in their work in ADR. Instead, what was important was to take a step back so that the full extent of the conflict could be better seen. It was also verbalized by the trainees during discussions that non-violent communication begins with a mindset.

Introduction to Interest-Based Negotiation

The game "Win as Much as You Can" was used to show how each player even within a team had his own interest to win the game regardless of the outcome of the team. However, upon realization that the individual player can only win if the entire team wins, complications come in on who among the team members can be willing to sacrifice some of his own winnings so that he still wins in the end even if there were some sacrifices made. Some groups continued to struggle in the game with some members wanting to win individually, but because no one was willing sacrifice a little, the whole team lost bringing with it all of the players.

Approaches to Negotiation

The session began with an excerpt from the movie "The Negotiator". It was mentioned that a mediator cannot be good enough if he does not know how to negotiate. Apart from this, other quick videos were shown to show the principles of negotiation, and its key dimensions,

Introduction to Mediation

The Introduction to mediation utilized the case of "Mario and Julian" where groups were formed with particular members assigned the roles of mediator and arbitrator but were disallowed from mentioning they were mediators or arbitrator. Other members of the group had to identify if there was a mediator within the group merely by listening to who among the members were executing actions that were those generally done by a mediator.

Mediation Roadmap

Mr. Floro Astillo started the session with the showing of short films depicting cases at the barangay level mediated by the Lupon ng Barangay. The films showed theft cases, and other sources of conflict between neighbors.

He then proceeded to present the mediation roadmap. He said that there are basically seven steps to mediation, to wit:

1. Preparation for Mediation
2. Mediator's Opening Remarks
3. Parties' Sharing of Perspectives on Issues and Concerns
4. Mediator's Summary of Issues to be Addressed
5. Problem-solving on Each Issue or Set of Issues
6. Reaching Closure
7. Written Agreements

Mediators should come to the mediation process prepared. They should have a good idea of what the case is about; the parties involved; the particular legal provisions attending the case, among others. They should draw up possible scenarios that might happen in the process and the possible ways of managing these scenarios. Mediators must do their homework before going into the process.

The Opening Remarks must establish a positive atmosphere, inform the disputants of the goals of the process, the stages thereof and the roles of the parties especially the role of the mediator as a third party neutral and as facilitator of the process, lay down the ground rules, and ultimately get the commitment of all parties to the mediation process, emphasizing for that matter the voluntary and confidential nature of the mediation process.

The stage of the Parties' Sharing of Perspectives on Issues and Concerns intends to draw for the parties a common picture of the situation, identify the issues as well as the parties' interests, empower the parties by giving them the opportunity to be heard and express their feelings, engender empathy by helping the parties begin to understand and respect each other's perceptions and needs and reduce the parties' adversarial mind-set. In the end, the parties should start seeing themselves as joint problem solvers.

To attain the above goals, Mr. Astillo said that the mediator should give time exclusively for each disputant. Beginning with the petitioner/complainant, the mediator allows time for the party to present his/her case. To fully understand the cause, the mediator should ask open-ended questions and extract from the statements the key points raised by the party. Too, the mediator should reframe negative statements to help de-emphasize the adversarial nature of the proceedings. Thereafter, the mediators should make a summary of the whole presentation of the party, underlining the issues raised and the interests involved. Then, the mediator calls on the other parties to ask clarificatory questions and the presenting party to respond to each of them.

After all the parties have articulated their issues and defenses, the mediator summarizes/enumerates all the issues and asks the parties to agree on his/her enumeration. Thereafter, the mediator sets the agenda for problem solving.

After this step, the mediator should start assessing if there is a need for a caucus. A caucus is a private meeting or cliniquing called by the mediator with any or each of the parties for any reason that blocks the mediation process or that might help facilitate it. For instance, a mediator may call a party to a caucus to check strong emotions, give advice in the way matters are being articulated, encourage the party to think up and consider a wider menu of options to address specific issues or problems, put in perspective some matters raised in the process. Note that the mediator may call for a caucus at any point of the process, as needed. It is thus important for the mediator to introduce the concept of a caucus from the very beginning to show that it is a helpful tool rather than a strategy to be bias to any party.

With all the issues and the interests of the parties articulated, the mediator then leads the parties to the problem-solving stage. Here, it is important that the mediator has isolated each issue so that the parties are enabled to address them separately from the other issues. Similarly, if there are issues that are related to each other, the mediator should have already grouped them together so that they can be addressed by the parties exhaustively.

The mediator then seeks the agreement of the parties in the order that the issues shall be addressed. Normally, the low hanging fruits are prioritized. This encourages the parties by realizing that their issues can indeed be resolved through the mediation process. The mediator must bear in mind and emphasize that the solutions MUST come from the parties themselves. It is thus important for the mediator to focus on his/her facilitation work rather than putting in his/her five cents' worth. For the parties to own the solutions, the mediator starts by reviewing the problems and the interests of each party and then ask the parties to agree on the principles and objective criteria to qualify the appropriate solution to the problem. The mediator then leads the parties in framing the issue at hand in such a manner that the parameters for the possible solutions are set. Mediators are wont to bear in mind that a single problem can have very many solutions. This step therefore streamlines the list of possible solutions that will be generated. Thereafter, the parties list down their options. Having exhausted the list of possibilities, the mediator leads the parties to evaluate each option ending up with the most acceptable one to all of them.

The ultimate measure is the mutual acceptability of the solutions agreed upon by the parties. This ensures that the outcome is not a simple compromise settlement but is a product of a principled negotiation participated in by all parties. A mutually acceptable solution is one that meets the needs of all parties concerned, that parties can and will implement and that does not circumvent the law.

The agreements of the parties now at hand, the mediator now puts all the agreements in a package. S/He leads the parties in reviewing/evaluating them, making sure that they do not contravene each other. Having done that, the

mediator gets the agreement and commitment of the parties to jointly implement each of the agreements, expressing in detail their role/s in the implementation thereof.

The mediator then drafts the written agreement. A written agreement is important because it clearly spells out each of the agreements of the parties. As such, it enables the mediator to insist that the disputants review the details of each issue and commit themselves out loud. It also gives the parties a real sense of closure and accomplishment. To be effective, a written agreement should be clear, enforceable and neutral as well as positive in its language.

Harmony Approach in Mediation

Atty. Quicho, who lectured on this topic, opened his discussion saying that there are groups of people who value good relationships. He said that this is most characteristic of Indigenous Peoples because their communities or societies are made up of clans, each member related to each other by blood or marriage. It is therefore important that their family relationships are preserved. Conflict is thus negative as it disrupts their community life. It is understandable that their response to conflict situations is to avoid issues, save face and extend apologies and forgiveness.

Given this situation, the mediator is someone who has a good grasp of and represents their community values that underlie the social stability of the group or community and is capable of playing an advisory role to the parties. As such, the dispute becomes a community conflict. In fact, the mediator should be able to call on other members who can speak for community values. The manner of communication in the proceedings follows the style that clearly reflects the third party's elevated role in the community and his or her desire to nourish parties' relationships. Thus, the mediator, who is normally an elder does not only become a facilitator, s/he also assumes an advisory role. Atty. Quicho then cited an example in a Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) process where community members could not agree with each other. The highest of the elders called on the members of the tribe and advised them that the disagreements cannot divide the tribe. They must talk the matter over thoughtfully with respect towards each other, especially towards the elders. Should they not be able to agree, the elders shall decide in accordance with their customary laws.

The Harmony Approach usually sees the mediator holding separate party meetings to avoid untoward incidents that might further damage relationships. The mediator actively establishes a conciliatory environment, advises the direction and nature of the conflict, contains the parties' interaction, and encourages face-saving, apologies, and forgiveness.

Atty. Quicho advised the participants to consider applying the Harmony Approach in cases where IPs are concerned, more especially in cases of conflicts where both

or all disputants come from the same ICC/AD. He opined that the Harmony Approach is most applicable to IPs.

He pointed out that per definition of IPRA, ICCs are groups of people or homogenous societies who have continuously lived as organized community on communally bounded and defined territory, sharing common bonds of language, customs, traditions and other distinctive cultural traits, and who retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions. He said that among the rights of ICCs recognized by IPRA is the right to resolve land conflicts in accordance with customary laws of the area where the land is located, and only in default thereof shall the complaints be submitted to amicable settlement and to the Courts of Justice whenever necessary. It is therefore necessary that whenever cases involve IPs, it is best for ADROs to coordinate with the NCIP in resolving cases.

Nevertheless, Atty. Quicho stated that, technically speaking, the quasi-judicial power of the NCIP is limited only to cases where the disputants belong to the same ICC. The case of *Unduran v. Aberasturi* (GR No. 181284, 10/20/2015) should be enlightening. In this case, the Supreme Court ruled that Sec. 66 of IPRA is clear on this matter as it provides a qualifying provision that "no such dispute shall be brought to the NCIP unless the parties have exhausted all remedies provided under their customary laws", when then presupposes (1) exhaustion of remedies under customary laws of the parties, and (2) compliance certification by the Council of Elders/Leaders. Customary law being confined to a single defined ICC, it is only when both parties to a case belong to the same ICC/IP that the abovesaid two conditions can be complied with. Said ruling was again cited in the later cases of *Lim v. Gamosa* (G.R. No. 193964, 12/02/2015) and *Alcantara v. Guhay* (G.R. Nos. 231410-11, 09/11/2019).

During the open forum, a participant asked how coordination with the NCIP can be operationalized in the context of their mediation work. Atty. Quicho recognized that indeed the ADR guidelines of the DENR do not offer guidance on that. In the meantime, they can approach the local NCIP Office and ask for their recommendations. It will not be unusual that the NCIP shall assert their process, i.e., resolution by their elders first, then, elevated to NCIP if no amicable settlement is reached at the ICC level. It will be wise for the ADROs to negotiate for a co-mediation process so that they continue to have cognizance of the case.

A participant sought advice on what to do where the parties do not belong to the same ICC or one of them is not an IP. Atty. Quicho responded that by law, the NCIP has no jurisdiction over the case. However, it will be proper for ADROs to still work with NCIP to ensure that the rights of the IPs are still protected and that the mediation process is culturally sensitive.

Ethical Dilemmas on Mediation, Qualities of a Good Mediator

The participants were divided into mercy, truth, forgiveness and justice with each group defending their trait to be the most important, and the most necessary. The members explained their stance, and tried to persuade the audience to side with them. In the end, the audience were most convinced that truth was the most necessary and the most important of all. The debate made it clear that ethical dilemmas in the Mediator's work will abound but it was important to have clarity of mind in executing a mediator's task, as well as impartiality and neutrality in the actual mediation.

Evaluation

Pre-test and Post-test

The Pre-test and Post-test showed much improvement in the knowledge of the participants on various aspects of the training topics. The following table contains the comparative scores of the 17 participants who took the Pre-test and Post-test.

Questions	Pre-test Result	Post-test Result	%
1. Concept of Negotiation	2/17 (11.65%)	9/17 (52.94%)	+41.18%
2. Sources of Conflict	9/17 (52.94%)	15/17 (88.24%)	+35.30%
3. Nature of Conflict	12/17 (70.59%)	17/17 (100.00%)	+29.41%
4. Interest-Based Mediation	17/17 (100.00%)	14/17 (82.35%)	-17.65%
5. Conflict Mapping	14/17 (82.35%)	15/17 (88.24%)	+5.89%
6. Harmony Mediation	13/17 (76.47%)	16/17 (94.12%)	+17.65%
7. Function of Mediation	15/17 (88.24%)	16/17 (94.12%)	+5.88%
8. Dilemma of Mediators	11/17 (64.71%)	14/17 (82.35%)	+17.64%
9. Non-Violent Communication	15/17 (88.24%)	15/17 (88.24%)	+0%
10. Concept of Mediation	10/17 (58.82%)	14/17 (82.35%)	+23.53%

The table above shows that participants had the highest increase in understanding of the concept of negotiation, the sources of conflict, the nature of conflict and the concept of mediation.

Daily Assessments Temperature Check

As told above, the participants were asked to assess if they were happy, sad or confused so that the trainers could get a quick assessment on how the trainees felt about the day. On all days, the response of the trainees were mostly happy with a handful of sad, the reason being they missed their homes. The daily temperature check used emoticons posted on the wall where the participants gathered to select which emoticon they felt for the day.

Training Evaluation

With 10 as the highest rating, and 1 as the lowest, following was the average rating for particular training components after adding up all scores of the 22 participants:

Training met its objectives.	9.315789474
Training met my expectations.	9.315789474
Training was relevant to my needs.	9.578947368
Training content was complete.	9.210526316
Training content was well organized.	9.105263158
The presentations were effective.	9.210526316
The length of the training was sufficient.	8.631578947
The activities were effective.	9.631578947
The simulations were effective.	9.631578947
Sharing of experiences was helpful.	9.631578947
The trainers were knowledgeable about the training topics.	9.368421053
The trainers were well-prepared.	9.210526316
The trainers were well-engaged during the training.	9.473684211
The trainers were actively involved during the sessions.	9.631578947
The trainers gave clear and understandable instructions.	9.578947368
The trainers were comfortable with the pace of the sessions.	9.315789474
The trainers were comfortable with the length of the sessions.	8.789473684
The trainers shared new information.	9.210526316
The trainers shared useful information and tips.	9.421052632
The trainers were lively during the training.	9.421052632

It is noted that the areas where the ratings were highest at 9.6 were in the methodologies used in the training sessions pertaining to the activities used, the simulations, and the sharing of experiences.

The other area where the rating was as high at 9.6 was on the engagement and involvement of the trainers.

The area which was rated the lowest at 8.7 and 8.6 although still high on a scale of 1-10 was in relation to the length sufficiency of the training and the length of the sessions.

Identified lessons, insights, skills, and know-how as most helpful to the trainees included those on:

- (1) The use of conflict diagnostic tools and the need for continuous learning and professional development;
- (2) The difference between negotiation and mediation, and the importance of understanding their important features;
- (3) The role of probing techniques, preparation, and ethical considerations in mediation;
- (4) The importance of being flexible, and open, and using a variety of techniques in mediation;
- (5) The need for correct conflict diagnosis, and addressing the root causes of conflict;
- (6) The role of active listening and non-violent communication, and rapport building in conflict resolution;
- (7) The use of BATNA as a decision-making tool during mediation, and the importance of impartiality and neutrality.

As for the recommendations of the participants to further enhance the training for ADROs, following were included:

- (1) Coordinating with local centers and incorporating actual mediation cases into the training;
- (2) Include simulations with actual conflicting parties to better prepare ADROs for real life situations;
- (3) Expose ADROs to actual conflicts and cultural awareness through immersion and follow-up trainings;
- (4) Regular updates and continue learning to enhance ADRO's skills;
- (5) Introduce a range of mediation techniques, and monitoring their effectiveness;
- (6) Provide training on mindfulness, self-care and mental preparation to handle the stress of mediation;
- (7) Conduct a training needs analysis and surveys on ADRO practices and performances;
- (8) Provide training on negotiation techniques and mediation in forestry and mining cases;

The proposals emphasize the “Learning by Doing” training framework used by MedNets through more follow-through monitoring, mentoring and continuing learning that may use a hybrid of localized and Manila-based training.

Synthesis and Conclusions

The following objectives were attained during the 10-day training which utilized participatory and experiential learning methodologies focused on key topics.

1. Participants are able to explain the laws and administrative orders on ADR for public lands. To tackle the laws and administrative orders on ADR

2. Participants are able to explain the nature and dynamics of conflict and demonstrate the use of conflict diagnostic tools. As a result of the session, participants were able to apply two among the five tools shared by the resource persons. The ABC of Conflict, Circle of Conflict, Stakeholders' Map, Forcefield Analysis and Functional Ingredients which the participants appreciated as tools which can help them generate a better understanding of the nature and dynamics of conflict from different perspectives, determine the need for ADR and come up with a mediation map.

3. Participants are able to demonstrate active listening, probing, and non-violent communication (NVC). Through a structured learning exercise on dynamics of conflict, participants were able to articulate their understanding of general communications which transpires between sender (speaker) and receiver (listener). Essential skills in active listening and probing were practiced in 3 small group simulation exercises where pairs took turns in demonstrating both skills focused on a simple story which they chose.

Beyond general communications, NVC was introduced as a form of communication and conflict-resolution process developed by psychologist Marshall Rosenberg which is mindful of how one's own needs, fears, and aspirations affect expression of self (speaking) and reaction to other people (listening). This realization was arrived at through an activity on giving feedback in pairs. Simulating the process of sharing observation, feelings, needs and requests, the participants were able to appreciate the need to transform communication patterns towards a more problem-solving stance offered by the NVC process.

4. Participants are able to demonstrate interest-based negotiation and interest-based mediation skills. Simulating the case of inheritance, participants were able demonstrate their understanding and practice of the basic skills in active listening, probing and feedback giving as they attempted to apply the 5 basic principles of: analysis of conflict, focus on interest, not on positions, generating multiple options, coming up with an agreement and developing one's BATNA. Mediation was introduced as a third-party conflict resolution process which is also a form of BATNA called the third-party BATNA.

5. Participants are able to discuss the four different approaches to mediation and explain harmony-based mediation framework. Participants were able to appreciate the journey of MedNet in finding the most effective approaches to deal with different forms of conflict in a way that is value-laden, culture-sensitive and appropriate to the context of the conflict. From interest-based mediation, participants were able to expand their knowledge of approaches to harmony, transformative and narrative mediation which were described in terms of how conflict is viewed, the goal of mediation, the role of the mediator and steps involved in the mediation process

6. Participants are able to explain concepts on healing and reconciliation. A dialogue on truth, justice, mercy and forgiveness allowed the participants to identify which of these ingredients was most essential in healing and reconciliation. After discussing the universal core pillars of healing and reconciliation, increased awareness on the importance of healing and reconciliation as a process beyond simply coming up with agreements. They were able to see how their local conflict resolution outcomes need to be linked to broader peace work because of the work that needs to be done as a nation towards peacebuilding. Unfortunately, the session on transitional justice had to be scrapped because of lack of time.

7. Participants are able to reflect on ethical dilemmas and qualities of an effective mediator.

The grouping of trainees into different groups belonging to truth, justice, forgiveness and mercy made real the ethical dilemmas faced by ADROs during their mediation. The “defense” led them to look more closely into the traits of a good mediator, and foremost there is the need to be trusted by the parties.

8. Participants are able to provide comments and inputs to the LMB Manual on ADR and relevant DAO revisions.

Please see earlier section on Comments on DAO.

9. The training’s enabling factors included the following:

- Sufficient preparation on the design, logistics and resource persons’ tasks helped to ensure that the sessions are delivered effectively and the desired outcomes were achieved.
- Administrative and secretariat support was adequate especially during the breakout sessions where one IT person was assigned to each group for their technical needs in video recording and playback.
- Mastery of the content by the resource persons facilitated effective delivery of topics. Participatory methodologies used in the sessions made the sessions experiential, engaging and enabled participants to discover and articulate for themselves the key learning points identified for each session.
- Sufficient number of resource persons were mobilized by MedNet for the training. There was gender and ethnicity balance. Language did not become a barrier as there were resource persons who spoke the dialect of the group assigned to them
- The caselets developed by the resource persons and used during the simulation were familiar to the participants and this enabled them to act out the role and scenarios well.

These factors contributed to the successful achievement of the training objectives.

10. The training also had its hindering factor, and this was the decrease in number of participants from a targeted number of 35 to 22 prevented LMB from meeting its target in terms of regions which were expected to benefit from the training.

Recommendations and Next Steps

1. For future sessions, the training design needs to include an Introduction to EDRMP before conflict diagnosis **to establish a common understanding of Empowered Dispute Resolution Management Process.**
2. To deepen the knowledge, skills and attitude of the participants, topics on broader subject matters like peace writ large, healing and reconciliation, and transitional justice may be tackled in light of how understanding of these can help foster more approaches in mediation.
3. A general training kit should be prepared ahead of time and given to the participants beforehand.
4. Given the responses of the participant ADROs in this 10 day training in terms of new information, techniques and approaches learned, it is gleaned that the ADROs from the other regions also have these gaps in their own skills, and know how. Therefore, to help support developing better techniques and approaches in the field, undergoing this same training is recommended for ADROs from the other regions.
5. It is also recommended that a monitoring program by MedNet of those who attended training can be put in place after three months to assess how the trainees have been able to use the new skills and know-how learned, and secure both success stories and cases where mediation failed so these can be shared to the group for continuing learning of the trainees. The visit after three months can help jumpstart a Continuing DENR-ADRO Learning Program that may be a hybrid of on site and virtual trainings.

Level of Effort of the Consulting Team

For designing, planning, conducting and reporting the training, the Consulting Team spent the following level of effort, expressed in Person Days, reflected in the following table.

Activities	Allan Barcena	Rodolfo Quicho	Rachel Aquino
Training Design	1	1	1
Planning	1	1	1
Preparation of Training Materials	2	2	2
Conduct of Training	10	10	10
Report Preparation	1	2.5	1
TOTAL	15	16.5	15

Atty. Allan Barcena
Team Leader

ANNEX A ACTIVITY DESIGN

Preliminary Information

Name of Activity: Roll-out Training on Alternative Dispute Resolution in Public Land Disputes

Dates of Activity: January 23 to February 3, 2023 (10 days)

Venue: (Makati City)

Implementer: Land Management Bureau Legal Division and the Mediators Network for Sustainable Peace (MedNet), Inc.

Training Objectives

At the end of the 10-day training workshop, participants would be able to:

1. Explain the laws and administrative orders on ADR for public lands;
2. Explain the nature and dynamics of conflict, and demonstrated the use of conflict diagnostic tools;
3. Demonstrate Active Listening, Probing, and Non-Violent Communication (NVC) skills;
4. Demonstrate interest-based negotiation and interest-based mediation skills;
5. Explain harmony-based mediation skills;
6. Explain concepts on healing and reconciliation, and shared dilemmas and qualities of a good mediator. And
7. Provide comments and inputs to the LMB Manual on ADR and relevant DAO revisions.

Training Program Flow:

Date/Time	Activity/Topic	Person Responsible
Day 1, January 23 Monday		
	Arrival and registration	LMB Legal
2 :00- 5:00	Opening Ceremonies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MedNet Corporate AVP • Prayer • National Anthem • Welcome Remarks • Introduction of Participants and Training Team • Levelling off of expectations 	FOD: Che MedNet LMB Legal MedNet

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of Program Objectives and Flow • Formation of Host Teams • House Rules • Pre-Test 	
	End of Day 1	
Day 2 January 24 , Tuesday		
8:30-9:00	Morning Preliminaries	Host Team FOD: Jun Q
9:00 – 11:00	Baseline of conflict experiences <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshop in small groups (4-5 groups) 	Che Aquino
11:00-12:00	ADR in DENR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laws on ADR • DAOs 	Atty. Jun Quicho
12:00-1:30	Lunch	
1:30-4:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments and recommendations on DAOs (workshop) 	Atty. Allan Barcena
4:30-5:00	Synthesis and temperature check	
Day 3, January 25, Wednesday		
8:30-9:00	Morning Preliminaries	Host Team FOD: Allan
9:00-12:00	Conflict Diagnostic Tools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABC of Conflict • Circle of Conflict • Sources of Power 	Madett Che Che
12:00-1:30	Lunch	
1:30-4:30	Conflict Diagnostic Tools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder Analysis • Force Field Analysis • Functional Ingredients • Workshop on Conflict Diagnostic Tools (in 4-5 small groups) 	Madett Jun Q Jun Q Che, Madett and Jun Q
4:30-5:00	Synthesis and temperature check	
	End of Day 2	
Day 4, January 26, Thursday		
8:30-9:00	Morning Preliminaries	Host Team

		FOD: Madett
9:00-12:00	Dynamics of Communication Active Listening and Probing Simulation on Active Listening and Probing	Che Aquino Madett, Jun ,Che
12:00-1:30	Lunch	
1:30 -4:30	Components of Non-Violent Communication Simulation on Non-Violent Communication	Madett Madett, Jun and Che
4:30-5:00	Synthesis and temperature check	
Day 5, January 27, Friday		
8:30-9:00	Morning Preliminaries	Host Team FOD: Che
9:00-12:00	Introduction to Interest-Based Negotiation (Win As Much as You Can) Structured Learning Exercise Approaches to Negotiation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power-based approach • Rights-Based approach • Positional Bargaining • Interest-Based Approach 	Madett Che
12:00-1:30	Lunch	
1:30-4:30	Principles of Interest-Based Negotiation Putting it all together: Key Dimensions of Negotiation	Allan
4:30-5:00	Synthesis and temperature check	
Day 6, January 28, Saturday		
8:30-9:00	Morning Preliminaries	Host Team FOD: Jun Q
9:00-12:00	Simulation on Interest-Based Negotiation (simulation in 3-4 small groups) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land succession case • Boundary dispute case 	Che Aquino, Jun Quicho, Allan Barcena, Madett
12:00-1:30	Lunch	
1:30-4:30	Simulation on Interest-Based Negotiation (simulation in 3-4 small groups)	Che Aquino, Jun Quicho, Allan Barcena, Madett

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encroachment case • Ownership case 	
4:30-5:00	Synthesis and temperature Check	
	End of Day 5	
January 29 Sunday, REST DAY		
Day 7, January 30, Monday		
8:30-9:00	Preliminaries	Host Team FOD: Allan
9:00-12:00	Introduction to Mediation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structured Learning Exercise (Mario and Julian case) • Definition of Mediation 	Che Aquino
12:00-1:30	Lunch	
1:30-4:30	Interest-Based Mediation Approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KP Video • Mediation Road Map Simulation on interest-based mediation (Mediation Part I) (simulation in 3-4 small groups)	Floro Che Aquino, Allan Barcena, Jun Quicho, Floro
4:30-5:00	Synthesis and temperature check	
Day 8, January 31, Tuesday		
8:30-9:00	Morning Preliminaries	Host Team FOD: Floro
9:00-12:00	Simulation on interest-based Mediation (Mediation Part II) (simulation in 3-4 small groups)	Che Aquino, Allan Barcena, Floro
12:00-1:30	Lunch	
1:30-4:30	Ethical Dilemmas on Mediation Qualities of a Good Mediator	Che Aquino
4:30-5:00	Synthesis and temperature check	
Day 9, February 1, Wednesday		
8:30-9:00	Morning Preliminaries	Host Team FOD: Che
9:00-12:00	Harmony -based Mediation	Jun Quicho
12:00-1:30	Lunch	
1:30-4:30	Healing and Reconciliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 Pillars of Transitional Justice • AVPs 	Madett
4:30-5:00	Synthesis and temperature check	

Day 10, February 2, Thursday		
8:30-9:00	Morning Preliminaries	Host team FOD: Jun Q
9:00-11:00	DAOs Review	Jun Quicho
11:00-12:00	Manual Review	Che
12:00-1:30	Lunch	
1:30-2:30	Manual Review (continuation)	
2:30-3:30	Planning	LMB Legal
3:30-5:00	Closing Ceremonies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post-test • Training Evaluation • Message from the participants (representative) • Message from the training team (team leader) • Closing Remarks • Distribution of certificates 	Host Team MedNet
February 3, Friday, DEPARTURE		

**ANNEX B
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

LMB

1. Kristine F. Macandog
2. Jennifer C. Borbon
3. Mechelle D, Naboya
4. Nico Benedick P. Banlilo
5. Jessica R. Cerilo

NCR

1. Atty. Jofrank D. Riego

CAR

1. Henry M. Mayangao

Region I

1. Israel P. Espinoza

Region II

1. Jose S. Canapi

Region III

1. Arlina L. Pascual

CALABARZON

1. Claire L. Corpuz
2. Karen Q. Brila

MIMAROPA

1. Dalia G. Bigtas

Region V

1. Joy J. Balisbis

Region VI

1. Sonia L. Gimotea

Region VII

1. Norman Monungolh

Region VIII

1. Geraldine C. Dehayco

Region IX

1. Atty. Kim Ashley A. Oledan-Villaruel

Region X

1. Atty. Xanra Ysabelle T. Ebdalin-Bacus
2. Orlan A. Closas
3. Roy B. Tabamo
4. Portia B. Tulang

Region XI

1. Giovanni B. Naïve

Region XIII

1. Mitzi R. Dumale
2. Atty. Dahlia L. Bernal

ANNEX C
Pre and Post Test

Name		Pre	Post	% Change
		Score out of 10		
Canapi	Jose	9	8	-11.10%
Tabamo	Roy B.	7	8	14.30%
Macandog	Kristine F	8		
Naboya	Mechelle	5		
Monungolh	Norman	5	10	
Closas	Orlan A.	6	6	
Borbon	Jennifer Marie C.	7	10	42.9%.
Bernal	Dahlia L.	9	9	
Tulang	Portia B.	4	9	
Erdalin-Bacus	Nandra Yzabelle T.	8		
Balisbis	Joy J.	6	9	
Brila	Karen Q.	7	8	
Pascual	Arhia	8	7	
?	Geraldine	5	8	
Riego	Jofrank D.	7	10	
Gimotea	Sonia L.	8	9	
Mayangao	Henry M.	7	8	14.30%
Espinoza	Israel E.	6	6	
Dumale	Mitzi Radaza	8	9	
Naive	Giovanni B.	8	9	
Oledan-Villaruel	Kym Ashley A.		8	
Bigtas	Dalia G.		9	
Corpuz	Claire L.		8	
		6.9	8.4	22.04%.