

Documentation Traceability and Monitoring Practices in Agrarian Reform Implementation

June Mark D. Dalupang^{1*} and Rosalie DC. Florentino^{1,2}

¹*Northeastern College*

*dalupangjunemark@gmail.com, ¹rosalieflorentino1211@gmail.com

Date Submitted:
January 13, 2026

Date Accepted:
March 21, 2026

Date Published:
July 08, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.21272234

ABSTRACT

This study investigated documentation traceability and monitoring practices in agrarian reform implementation at the Department of Agrarian Reform-Isabela. Using a traceability-focused explanatory correlational design, the study assessed how document completeness, record authentication, routing visibility, retrieval efficiency, status updating, and responsibility tracking related to implementation tracking, progress reporting, follow-up mechanisms, coordination of pending actions, feedback use, and monitoring tool utilization. Data were gathered through a validated researcher-made questionnaire administered to personnel involved in documentation, records processing, monitoring, reporting, coordination, and implementation support. The instrument showed excellent reliability, with an overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.94. Results

revealed that documentation traceability and monitoring practices were both generally moderate, indicating that existing procedures were functional but not yet consistently strong. Stronger results were observed in document completeness, record authentication, and progress reporting, while weaker areas involved status updating, monitoring tool utilization, feedback use, and coordination of pending actions. The Traceability-Monitoring Alignment Index showed close alignment but moderate operational strength. Spearman's rho confirmed a significant moderate positive relationship between documentation traceability and monitoring practices. Ordinal logistic regression further showed that status updating, routing visibility, retrieval efficiency, and responsibility tracking significantly influenced monitoring practices. The findings suggest that agrarian reform implementation becomes more dependable when documents remain visible, updated, retrievable, and linked to clear accountability points. Strengthening unified tracking systems, scheduled status reviews, feedback integration, and personnel capacity-building is recommended to improve implementation monitoring and service continuity.

Keywords: *agrarian reform, DAR-Isabela, documentation traceability, monitoring practices, records management, service accountability*

INTRODUCTION

Agrarian reform is not carried by policy alone. It depends on documents that prove who is entitled to land, what land is covered, what action has been taken, what remains pending, and which office or personnel is responsible for the next step. In the Philippine setting, the Department of Agrarian Reform has the mandate to implement the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program through land tenure improvement, agrarian justice delivery, and support services for agrarian reform beneficiaries (Department of Agrarian Reform [DAR], 2026). These functions require a steady flow of records from field validation, beneficiary identification, land documentation, case processing, title generation, support service delivery, and post-distribution monitoring. When these records are complete, accessible, and properly tracked, agrarian reform work becomes easier to verify. When

they are fragmented or poorly monitored, implementation may suffer from delay, duplication, unclear accountability, and weak follow-through.

Documentation traceability refers to the ability of an office to follow a document, decision, transaction, or record from its origin to its current status and final disposition. This is closely aligned with the records management principles of ISO 15489-1:2016, which emphasizes the creation, capture, management, metadata, controls, assigned responsibilities, monitoring, and training needed to keep records reliable over time (International Organization for Standardization [ISO], 2016). In government work, traceability is not simply a clerical requirement. It protects the integrity of public decisions because every approval, endorsement, correction, transfer, and release must have a verifiable basis. De Mingo and Cerrillo-i-Martínez (2018) argued that transparency should be built into the records lifecycle because missing, altered, or poorly managed information can weaken accountability and create risks in public administration. In agrarian reform implementation, this concern is highly relevant because documentary gaps may affect land rights, beneficiary claims, case outcomes, and the delivery of support services.

The need for strong documentation has become more visible as the government continues major agrarian reform initiatives. The New Agrarian Emancipation Act, or Republic Act No. 11953, covers the condonation of ₱57.557 billion in principal debt of 610,054 agrarian reform beneficiaries covering 1,173,101.57 hectares of agrarian reform lands (Congress of the Philippines, 2023). The law also requires the submission of detailed information on beneficiaries, loans, locations, hectareage, and other relevant records for proper implementation. This shows that agrarian reform is deeply dependent on the accuracy and movement of documents across agencies, offices, and levels of administration. A beneficiary may be legally covered by a program, but the actual benefit can still be delayed if the supporting documents are incomplete, difficult to retrieve, or not properly monitored.

The same concern can be seen in the Support to Parcelization of Lands for Individual Titling Project, commonly known as Project SPLIT. The World Bank (2024) reported that the project supports the parcelization of about 139,000 collective Certificates of Land Ownership Award into individual titles, covering approximately 1.3 million hectares and benefiting around 750,000 agrarian reform beneficiaries. The project also includes capacity building, project management, and monitoring and evaluation at the central, regional, and provincial levels (World Bank, 2024). These components show that parcelization is not only a technical land-titling process. It is also an administrative process that depends on coordinated records, updated status reports, clear document routing, and timely monitoring. Delays in implementation further point to the need for closer attention to how documents are traced, checked, corrected, and acted upon throughout the process.

In Cagayan Valley and Isabela, agrarian reform implementation remains active and document-heavy. The Philippine Information Agency reported that DAR Region 02 distributed individual regular and electronic titles under the Land Tenure Security Program and Project SPLIT, including activities in Cabagan, Isabela and Cauayan City, Isabela (Philippine Information Agency [PIA], 2024). The Presidential Communications Office also reported the distribution of land titles, infrastructure facilities, and farm machineries for agrarian reform beneficiaries in the Cagayan Valley Region, with the activity held in San Fermin, Cauayan City, Isabela (Presidential Communications Office [PCO], 2024). These developments show the continuing importance of DAR-Isabela in the actual delivery of agrarian reform programs. At the same time, they point to the practical burden placed on provincial offices to maintain accurate records, track the status of transactions, coordinate with partner agencies, and ensure that beneficiaries receive what has been approved for them.

Previous research has already recognized the value of improving records and land information systems in agrarian reform. Galang (2022), in a study published by the Philippine Institute for Development Studies, noted that the parcelization of collective Certificates of Land Ownership Award could support the productivity of agrarian reform beneficiaries, but also recommended the adoption of a modern cadaster and record system to improve agrarian justice delivery and the implementation of the parcelization program. This recommendation is important because it links land distribution outcomes with the quality of documentation systems. However, there remains a need to examine how documentation traceability and monitoring practices are experienced and carried

out within implementing offices, especially at the provincial level where records are received, processed, validated, endorsed, released, and followed up.

The study is anchored on the view that sound documentation and consistent monitoring are necessary for credible, timely, and accountable agrarian reform implementation. It gives attention to how records are created, routed, updated, retrieved, verified, and monitored in relation to land tenure improvement, support services, and related implementation activities. By looking into these practices, the study can provide evidence that may help strengthen internal controls, improve document tracking, reduce avoidable delays, and support a more dependable service process for agrarian reform beneficiaries in Isabela.

Literature Review

Records Integrity and Accountability in Agrarian Reform Administration

Records integrity is central to agrarian reform administration because land-related decisions must be supported by documents that can be verified, retrieved, and connected to specific actions. In land administration, records do not merely serve as office files; they establish the documentary basis of tenure rights, institutional responsibility, and public accountability. The World Bank (2017) emphasized that land administration involves determining, recording, and disseminating information about land tenure, value, and use, which means that weak documentation can affect both service delivery and public confidence. In the Philippine land sector, the need for integrated and reliable land records has been repeatedly noted because fragmented land information across agencies can slow down transactions and weaken coordination (Ballesteros & Ramos, 2017). For agrarian reform implementation, this is especially important because the movement of documents from field validation to approval, release, and monitoring must remain traceable. When records are complete and consistent, government personnel can explain the status of claims, locate delays, and justify decisions. When records are incomplete or poorly linked, the implementation process becomes vulnerable to confusion, repeated verification, and disputes over responsibility.

Document Traceability and Land Information Systems

Document traceability is strengthened when land information systems allow offices to connect documents, parcels, beneficiaries, actions, and decisions within a clear administrative trail. The United Nations Committee of Experts on Global Geospatial Information Management (2020) explained that effective land administration requires reliable data, standards, institutional arrangements, innovation, and accountable processes that support the recording and management of land rights. This view is relevant to agrarian reform because land distribution and support service delivery require both textual records and spatial information to be accurate and consistent. Bennett et al. (2021) also stressed that land administration systems should be designed in ways that are usable, fit for purpose, and responsive to governance needs, particularly in contexts where land rights affect vulnerable groups. In this sense, traceability is not limited to knowing where a paper document is located. It also means being able to follow the history of a transaction, identify who processed it, determine what evidence was used, and confirm whether the required action was completed. For DAR-Isabela, this points to the value of organized document routing, updated tracking tools, and consistent record matching between field data and office files.

Monitoring Practices in Land Governance and Implementation

Monitoring practices are important in agrarian reform because implementation does not end with the issuance of documents or the completion of one administrative step. It requires continuing attention to pending claims, beneficiary status, landholding information, support services, and compliance with program requirements. Azadi et al. (2020) argued that monitoring land governance should consider historical land issues, institutional arrangements, governance rules, and land-use changes, showing that monitoring must go beyond counting outputs and should examine how land-related processes actually function. In a similar direction, Mbogo et al. (2024) described land monitoring as a necessary activity for the continuous implementation of land reforms because it helps identify problems affecting sustainable land development. In agrarian reform offices, monitoring becomes

meaningful when records are regularly updated, delays are flagged, follow-ups are assigned, and implementation gaps are documented. Without these practices, reports may show activity but fail to reveal whether beneficiaries received complete, timely, and properly supported services. For this reason, monitoring should be viewed as an administrative discipline that strengthens both internal control and beneficiary-centered implementation.

Inter-Agency Coordination, Data Quality, and Service Continuity

Agrarian reform implementation often involves several layers of coordination, including field personnel, provincial offices, regional offices, land registration agencies, local government units, and beneficiary organizations. This makes data quality and service continuity necessary conditions for effective implementation. The OECD (2019) noted that public-sector data governance requires authority, control, shared decision-making, planning, monitoring, and enforcement over data assets, which is useful in understanding why agencies need clear rules for managing information across offices. In the land sector, Chehrehbargh et al. (2024) observed that global land administration frameworks increasingly emphasize institutional coordination, evaluation, and information reliability as conditions for effective land governance. These ideas are relevant to DAR-Isabela because agrarian reform documents often move across offices and are affected by field realities, legal requirements, and beneficiary concerns. If data are inconsistent or monitoring responsibilities are unclear, service continuity may be interrupted and beneficiaries may be required to repeat submissions or follow-ups. Strong documentation traceability can therefore support smoother coordination by ensuring that every office works from the same verified information, while monitoring practices help keep transactions moving until the required service or decision is completed.

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a traceability-focused explanatory correlational design. This design was selected because the study did not only describe the existing level of documentation traceability and monitoring practices but also examined how the movement, verification, retrieval, updating, and follow-through of records were associated with the monitoring of agrarian reform implementation activities. The design was appropriate because the study dealt with actual administrative processes in a government office setting where records, routing, status tracking, and monitoring practices formed part of the daily implementation structure. It allowed the researcher to measure the extent of documentation traceability, determine the level of monitoring practices, and test whether stronger documentation processes were linked with more organized monitoring in agrarian reform work. Unlike a purely descriptive survey, this design treated documentation as an operational trail and monitoring as a process-control practice, which made the method more suitable for a study centered on agrarian reform implementation.

Research Locale

The study was conducted at the Department of Agrarian Reform-Isabela. The locale was chosen because the office was directly involved in the implementation of agrarian reform programs, including land tenure improvement, support services, documentation processing, beneficiary-related transactions, and monitoring of program activities within the province. As a provincial implementing office, DAR-Isabela handled records that passed through several stages, such as validation, verification, endorsement, reporting, tracking, and follow-up. These processes made the locale relevant to the study because documentation traceability and monitoring practices were part of the institutional work required to ensure that agrarian reform services were properly recorded, acted upon, and monitored.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The participants of the study were personnel of the Department of Agrarian Reform-Isabela who were directly or indirectly involved in documentation, records processing, program implementation, field validation, monitoring, reporting, and coordination of agrarian reform activities. The study used stratified purposive

sampling. This sampling technique was applied to ensure that participants were drawn from relevant functional groups within the office while still considering their actual involvement in the processes being studied. Personnel whose duties were connected to document handling, program tracking, monitoring, coordination, and implementation support were considered appropriate participants. This approach was suitable because the study required responses from individuals who had sufficient working knowledge of documentation flow and monitoring practices in agrarian reform implementation.

Research Instrument

The study used a researcher-made survey questionnaire that was developed based on the objectives of the study and the major concepts of documentation traceability and monitoring practices. The instrument was composed of two main parts. The first part measured documentation traceability in terms of document completeness, record authentication, routing visibility, retrieval efficiency, status updating, and responsibility tracking. The second part measured monitoring practices in terms of implementation tracking, progress reporting, follow-up mechanisms, coordination of pending actions, feedback use, and monitoring tool utilization. The instrument used a Likert-type scale to capture the participants' level of agreement with each statement.

The questionnaire underwent content validation by a panel composed of an agrarian reform practitioner, a records management specialist, and a research methods expert. Their review focused on clarity, relevance, alignment with the research objectives, appropriateness of language, and suitability to the DAR-Isabela context. Comments from the validators were incorporated before the pilot testing was conducted. The validation process produced a content validity index of 0.92, which indicated that the items were highly relevant and acceptable for measuring the intended constructs.

A pilot test was conducted among personnel from a comparable public office involved in land-related documentation and monitoring functions. These participants were not included in the actual data gathering. The pilot test helped determine whether the items were understandable, properly sequenced, and appropriate for administrative personnel. After the pilot test, minor revisions were made to improve item clarity and remove possible repetition.

The reliability of the instrument was tested using Cronbach's alpha. The documentation traceability scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.91, while the monitoring practices scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.93. The overall reliability coefficient of the instrument was 0.94. These results indicated that the questionnaire had excellent internal consistency and was reliable for use in the actual study.

Data Gathering

The data gathering procedure began after the researcher secured permission from the appropriate authority of the Department of Agrarian Reform-Isabela. After approval was granted, the researcher coordinated with the designated office personnel regarding the schedule and manner of administering the questionnaire. The purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, the confidentiality of responses, and the expected time needed to answer the instrument were explained to the participants before the questionnaires were distributed.

The questionnaires were administered in a manner that did not interrupt regular office operations. The participants were given enough time to read and answer each item carefully. Completed questionnaires were retrieved, checked for completeness, and encoded for statistical processing. Responses with incomplete or unclear entries were reviewed according to the established data screening procedure. The researcher ensured that no identifying information was used in the data file and that all responses were treated only as grouped research data.

Data Analysis

The study used both descriptive and inferential statistical treatments. For the descriptive analysis, the weighted mean and standard deviation were used to determine the level of documentation traceability and monitoring practices. The weighted mean described the general tendency of responses, while the standard deviation showed the degree of consistency or variation among the responses.

To provide a more process-sensitive interpretation, the study also used a Traceability-Monitoring Alignment Index. This index compared the mean ratings of documentation traceability indicators with the mean ratings of monitoring practice indicators to determine areas of close alignment and areas where implementation monitoring appeared stronger or weaker than documentation support. This treatment helped identify which documentation components supported monitoring well and which areas required administrative strengthening.

For inferential analysis, Spearman's rho correlation was used to determine the relationship between documentation traceability and monitoring practices. This statistical treatment was selected because the data were gathered through an ordinal Likert-type scale and the study measured the degree of association between two process-related variables. To determine the predictive influence of documentation traceability on monitoring practices, the study applied ordinal logistic regression. This treatment was appropriate because the dependent variable was interpreted according to ordered levels and the analysis aimed to determine which traceability components significantly influenced stronger monitoring practices. The level of significance was set at 0.05.

Ethical Consideration

The study observed ethical principles throughout the research process. Permission was first secured from the appropriate authority of the Department of Agrarian Reform-Isabela before data gathering was conducted. The participants were informed about the purpose of the study, the nature of their participation, and their right to decline or withdraw without any consequence. Informed consent was obtained before they answered the questionnaire.

Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained. No names or personal identifiers were included in the data analysis and reporting. The collected responses were used only for academic research purposes and were presented in summarized form. The researcher also ensured that participation did not affect the work status, office standing, or professional relationship of any participant. All data were stored securely and were accessed only by the researcher. The study was conducted with respect for the participants, the institution, and the public nature of agrarian reform service delivery.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Level of Documentation Traceability

Documentation Traceability Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
Document completeness	3.63	0.55	High
Record authentication	3.70	0.52	High
Routing visibility	3.18	0.68	Moderate
Retrieval efficiency	3.22	0.71	Moderate
Status updating	3.09	0.73	Moderate
Responsibility tracking	3.28	0.66	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.35	0.64	Moderate

Legend: 4.21 to 5.00, Very High; 3.41 to 4.20, High; 2.61 to 3.40, Moderate; 1.81 to 2.60, Low; 1.00 to 1.80, Very Low.

The findings show that documentation traceability in agrarian reform implementation was generally moderate, with an overall mean of 3.35. This means that DAR-Isabela had working documentation procedures, but these procedures were not yet consistently strong across all stages of implementation. The highest rated indicator was recording authentication, followed by document completeness. This suggests that documents were generally checked, signed, validated, and supported by required attachments before they moved to the next processing stage. This is a positive finding because agrarian reform transactions depend heavily on the credibility of land records, beneficiary records, endorsements, and official reports.

However, the moderate ratings in routing visibility, retrieval efficiency, status updating, and responsibility tracking reveal areas that required attention. The lowest mean was obtained by status updating, which indicates that while documents existed and were authenticated, their current condition, location, or level of action was not always updated in a timely and uniform manner. This can create practical problems in agrarian reform implementation because staff may need to make repeated follow-ups just to determine whether a document has already been reviewed, endorsed, returned, corrected, or completed. Retrieval efficiency also obtained only a moderate rating, showing that files may not always be located quickly when needed for reporting, beneficiary inquiries, or office coordination.

The result suggests that the main issue was not the absence of documents but the uneven traceability of documents after they entered the implementation flow. In a provincial agrarian reform setting, this is a significant concern because field validation reports, landholding records, beneficiary documents, title-related papers, and monitoring reports often pass through different personnel and offices. When document movement is not clearly visible, delays may become difficult to trace. The finding therefore points to a need for stronger document tracking, clearer accountability points, and more regular updating of transaction status.

Table 2. *Level of Monitoring Practices*

Monitoring Practices Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Interpretation
Implementation tracking	3.32	0.61	Moderate
Progress reporting	3.58	0.56	High
Follow-up mechanisms	3.17	0.68	Moderate
Coordination of pending actions	3.11	0.70	Moderate
Feedback use	3.05	0.72	Moderate
Monitoring tool utilization	2.96	0.75	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.20	0.67	Moderate

Legend: 4.21 to 5.00, Very High; 3.41 to 4.20, High; 2.61 to 3.40, Moderate; 1.81 to 2.60, Low; 1.00 to 1.80, Very Low.

The overall mean of 3.20 indicates that monitoring practices in agrarian reform implementation were also moderate. Among the indicators, progress reporting received the highest mean of 3.58, interpreted as high. This shows that DAR-Isabela was able to prepare and submit reports on implementation activities, which is a necessary part of government program accountability. Reports were likely prepared for completed activities, periodic accomplishments, land tenure concerns, and support service implementation. This finding shows that reporting as a formal requirement was being practiced with reasonable consistency.

Despite this positive point, the remaining indicators were rated only moderate. Monitoring tool utilization obtained the lowest mean of 2.96, followed by feedback use and coordination of pending actions. These results suggest that monitoring was more active at the reporting level than at the real-time tracking and corrective-action level. In other words, the office may have been able to document accomplishments, but it still faced limitations in using monitoring tools to identify bottlenecks, act on pending items, and feed beneficiary or field-level feedback back into the implementation process.

The moderate rating for follow-up mechanisms also indicates that pending documents or activities may not always be pursued through a systematic schedule or assigned follow-up responsibility. This can affect the pace of agrarian reform implementation because unresolved documents, delayed signatures, missing attachments, uncoordinated field updates, or unclear beneficiary concerns may remain pending longer than necessary. The results show that monitoring was present, but it was not yet fully integrated as a continuous management practice. This means that monitoring needed to move beyond periodic reporting and become a more active tool for tracking delays, correcting gaps, and supporting timely action.

Table 3. *Traceability-Monitoring Alignment Index*

Documentation Component	Related Monitoring Component	Traceability Mean	Monitoring Mean	Alignment Gap	Alignment Interpretation
Document completeness	Progress reporting	3.63	3.58	0.05	Closely aligned
Record authentication	Implementation tracking	3.70	3.32	0.38	Moderately aligned
Routing visibility	Coordination of pending actions	3.18	3.11	0.07	Closely aligned
Retrieval efficiency	Follow-up mechanisms	3.22	3.17	0.05	Closely aligned
Status updating	Monitoring tool utilization	3.09	2.96	0.13	Closely aligned
Responsibility tracking	Feedback use	3.28	3.05	0.23	Moderately aligned
Composite Alignment		3.35	3.20	0.15	Closely aligned but moderate in strength

Interpretation Guide: 0.00 to 0.20, Closely aligned; 0.21 to 0.40, Moderately aligned; 0.41 and above, weakly aligned.

The Traceability-Monitoring Alignment Index shows a composite alignment gap of 0.15, which means that documentation traceability and monitoring practices were closely aligned. However, both areas were only at a moderate level. This means that the two systems moved together, but they were not yet operating at a strong level. The close alignment does not necessarily mean that implementation was highly efficient. Rather, it suggests that where documentation was strong, monitoring also tended to be stronger, and where documentation was weak, monitoring was also likely to be limited.

The closest alignment appeared between document completeness and progress reporting, as well as between retrieval efficiency and follow-up mechanisms. This means that when files were complete and retrievable, reporting and follow-up were easier to perform. The finding is reasonable because progress reports depend on available documents, and follow-up actions depend on the ability to locate the file or determine its last recorded action.

The widest alignment gap appeared between record authentication and implementation tracking. Although authentication was rated high, implementation tracking was only moderate. This indicates that even when records were verified and accepted as valid, their movement through the implementation process was not always tracked with the same level of consistency. This is an important operational finding. A document may be authentic, complete, and acceptable, but if its processing status is not actively monitored, it can still become delayed. The result shows that DAR-Isabela had stronger controls at the document-checking stage than at the continuous tracking stage.

Responsibility tracking and feedback use also showed a moderate alignment gap. This suggests that the assignment of responsibility was not always matched with systematic use of feedback from field personnel, beneficiaries, or office monitoring activities. In agrarian reform implementation, this may lead to repeated follow-ups, unresolved concerns, or slow response to beneficiary-related issues. The result highlights the need to connect documentation responsibility with feedback-based monitoring so that concerns are not only recorded but also acted upon.

Table 4. *Relationship between Documentation Traceability and Monitoring Practices*

Variables	Spearman's rho	p-value	Strength of Relationship	Decision	Interpretation
Documentation traceability and monitoring practices	0.614	0.018	Moderate positive relationship	Reject the null hypothesis	Significant relationship

Level of significance: 0.05

The result shows a Spearman’s rho value of 0.614 with a p-value of 0.018. Since the p-value is lower than 0.05, the relationship between documentation traceability and monitoring practices was statistically significant. The strength of the relationship was moderate and positive. This means that better documentation traceability was associated with stronger monitoring practices in agrarian reform implementation.

The finding confirms that documentation and monitoring cannot be treated as separate administrative activities. When documents are complete, authenticated, traceable, retrievable, and updated, monitoring becomes more reliable. Personnel can identify where a document is, what action has already been taken, who handled it, and what needs to be done next. In contrast, when documentation traceability is weak, monitoring becomes dependent on verbal follow-ups, personal memory, repeated checking, or informal coordination. This creates a greater risk of delay and inconsistent action.

The significant relationship also supports the idea that monitoring practices improve when there is a clear documentary trail. Agrarian reform implementation involves several steps that must be supported by records. These include validation, beneficiary documentation, land-related processing, program monitoring, and support service coordination. Without traceable documents, monitoring reports may still be submitted, but the accuracy and usefulness of those reports may be affected. The result therefore suggests that improving documentation traceability can directly support better monitoring performance in DAR-Isabela.

Table 5. Ordinal Logistic Regression on the Influence of Documentation Traceability Indicators on Monitoring Practices

Predictor Variables	Estimate	SE	Wald χ^2	p-value	Odds Ratio	Interpretation
Document completeness	0.421	0.228	3.414	0.065	1.52	Not significant
Record authentication	0.337	0.241	1.955	0.162	1.40	Not significant
Routing visibility	0.684	0.279	6.012	0.014	1.98	Significant predictor
Retrieval efficiency	0.596	0.263	5.136	0.023	1.82	Significant predictor
Status updating	0.731	0.286	6.528	0.011	2.08	Significant predictor
Responsibility tracking	0.552	0.267	4.271	0.039	1.74	Significant predictor

Model Fit: $\chi^2 = 31.486$, $p = 0.006$

Pseudo R²: Cox and Snell = 0.284; Nagelkerke = 0.319

Level of significance: 0.05

The ordinal logistic regression result shows that the model was statistically significant, $\chi^2 = 31.486$, $p = 0.006$. This means that the documentation traceability indicators, when taken together, significantly influenced the level of monitoring practices in agrarian reform implementation. The Nagelkerke pseudo-R² value of 0.319 indicates that the model explained a meaningful portion of the variation in monitoring practices. While this does not mean that documentation traceability was the only factor affecting monitoring, it shows that it was an important contributor.

Among the predictors, status updating had the strongest influence, with an odds ratio of 2.08. This means that stronger status updating increased the likelihood of having better monitoring practices. This finding is highly relevant because monitoring depends on updated information. If the office does not know whether a document is pending, completed, returned, endorsed, or awaiting correction, it becomes difficult to monitor implementation accurately. The result shows that regular status updating should be treated as a core monitoring support mechanism rather than a simple clerical task.

Routing visibility was also a significant predictor, with an odds ratio of 1.98. This means that clearer visibility of document movement increased the likelihood of stronger monitoring practices. This finding suggests that staff need to know where documents are, who handled them, and what office action is currently required. In agrarian reform implementation, a document may pass through several stages before completion. If routing is unclear, monitoring becomes reactive rather than planned.

Retrieval efficiency and responsibility tracking were also significant predictors. These findings mean that monitoring became stronger when files could be accessed when needed and when responsibility for action was

clear. In practice, this points to the importance of organized filing systems, clear routing logs, assigned personnel, and properly maintained tracking sheets or digital records. Monitoring cannot be effective if the required documents are difficult to retrieve or if no one can clearly identify who should act on pending concerns.

Document completeness and record authentication were not significant predictors in the regression model, although both received high descriptive ratings. This result does not mean that they were unimportant. Rather, it suggests that these two indicators were already relatively established in the office, so they did not explain much of the variation in monitoring practices. The more critical predictors were those connected with movement, updating, retrieval, and accountability. This means that DAR-Isabela's challenge was not simply to produce complete and valid documents but to ensure that these documents remained visible and actionable throughout the implementation process.

Table 6. *Consolidated Summary of Findings*

Targeted Result	Main Finding	Interpretation
Level of documentation traceability	Overall mean of 3.35	Moderate
Level of monitoring practices	Overall mean of 3.20	Moderate
Alignment between documentation traceability and monitoring practices	Composite alignment gap of 0.15	Closely aligned but moderate in strength
Relationship between documentation traceability and monitoring practices	Spearman's rho = 0.614, p = 0.018	Significant moderate positive relationship
Predictive influence of documentation traceability on monitoring practices	Model fit $\chi^2 = 31.486$, p = 0.006	Documentation traceability significantly influenced monitoring practices
Strongest predictor of monitoring practices	Status updating, odds ratio = 2.08	Regular updating was the most influential traceability factor
Key problem areas	Status updating, monitoring tool utilization, feedback use, coordination of pending actions	These areas required administrative improvement

The consolidated findings show that DAR-Isabela had functional documentation and monitoring practices, but these practices were not yet consistently strong. The strongest areas were document completeness, record authentication, and progress reporting. These results suggest that the office had established formal procedures for preparing, validating, and reporting documents. However, the more process-oriented areas, especially status updating, routing visibility, monitoring tool utilization, coordination of pending actions, and feedback use, remained moderate.

The results further show that documentation traceability and monitoring practices were significantly related. This means that improvement in document movement, retrieval, updating, and accountability can contribute to stronger implementation monitoring. The regression results provide a clearer picture of the issue. The most influential predictors were not the existence or validity of documents, but the ability of the office to keep those documents visible, updated, retrievable, and assigned to responsible personnel. This finding is important because it identifies the actual administrative gap. The concern was not merely about compliance with documentation requirements. The deeper concern was whether documents could be followed and acted upon continuously until implementation requirements were completed.

Overall, the findings indicate that documentation traceability served as a practical foundation for monitoring agrarian reform implementation. However, the moderate ratings suggest that DAR-Isabela still needed to strengthen its document tracking system, update practices, feedback mechanisms, and monitoring tool use. These improvements would help reduce repeated follow-ups, support faster retrieval of records, clarify responsibility for pending actions, and improve the dependability of agrarian reform service delivery.

CONCLUSION

Documentation traceability and monitoring practices in agrarian reform implementation at the Department of Agrarian Reform-Isabela were functional but still needed strengthening, particularly in the areas of status updating, routing visibility, retrieval efficiency, responsibility tracking, monitoring tool utilization, feedback use, and coordination of pending actions. While the office showed relatively stronger performance in document completeness, record authentication, and progress reporting, the results indicated that valid and complete documents did not automatically lead to strong monitoring unless they were continuously updated, traceable, retrievable, and linked to clear personnel accountability. The significant positive relationship between documentation traceability and monitoring practices further confirmed that stronger documentation systems contributed to better monitoring of agrarian reform activities, while the regression results showed that status updating, routing visibility, retrieval efficiency, and responsibility tracking were the most important factors influencing monitoring performance. It is therefore recommended that DAR-Isabela strengthen its document tracking system by adopting a more unified and regularly updated monitoring log, assigning clear responsibility points for every document movement, improving file retrieval protocols, using monitoring tools more consistently, and integrating field-level feedback into office follow-up actions. Regular internal review of pending documents, scheduled status checking, and capacity-building sessions on records traceability and monitoring procedures should also be institutionalized to reduce delays, prevent repeated follow-ups, and support more accountable agrarian reform service delivery. For future researchers, similar studies may be conducted in other provincial agrarian reform offices using mixed methods or comparative designs to further examine how documentation systems affect implementation efficiency, beneficiary service experience, and inter-office coordination.

References

- Azadi, H. (2020). Monitoring land governance: Understanding roots and shoots. *Land Use Policy*, 94, Article 104530. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104530>
- Bennett, R. M., & Alemie, B. K. (2016). Fit-for-purpose land administration: Lessons from urban and rural Ethiopia. *Survey Review*, 48(346), 11-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00396265.2015.1097584>
- Casadesús de Mingo, A., & Cerrillo-i-Martínez, A. (2018). Improving records management to promote transparency and prevent corruption. *International Journal of Information Management*, 38(1), 256-261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2017.09.005>
- Congress of the Philippines. (2023). *Republic Act No. 11953: An act emancipating agrarian reform beneficiaries from financial burden by condoning all principal loans, unpaid amortizations and interests and exempting payment of estate tax on agricultural lands awarded under the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program*.
- Department of Agrarian Reform. (2026). *Citizen's Charter 2026*. Department of Agrarian Reform.
- Galang, I. M. R. (2022). Boosting the productivity of agrarian reform beneficiaries through parcelization of collective Certificate of Land Ownership Awards. *Philippine Journal of Development*, 46(2), 1-21.
- International Organization for Standardization. (2016). *ISO 15489-1:2016: Information and documentation: Records management: Part 1: Concepts and principles*. International Organization for Standardization.
- Jahani Chehrehbargh, F., Rajabifard, A., Atazadeh, B., & Steudler, D. (2024). Identifying global parameters for advancing land administration systems. *Land Use Policy*, 136, Article 106973. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2023.106973>
- Mbogo, C. M., Wanyonyi, A., Murugi, E., Macharia, M., & Koech, R. (2024). Monitoring land administration and management in Kenya: Inclusive land governance. *African Journal on Land Policy and Geospatial Sciences*, 7(1), 400-411. <https://doi.org/10.48346/IMIST.PRSM/ajlp-gs.v7i1.45990>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *The path to becoming a data-driven public sector*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/059814a7-en>
- Presidential Communications Office. (2024, April 16). *DAR to distribute lands, support services to Cagayan Valley farmers*. Presidential Communications Office.
- Tumabao, M. D. C. (2024, June 26). *DAR awards land titles to thousands of Cagayan Valley farmers in 2 years*. Philippine Information Agency.

- United Nations Committee of Experts on Global Geospatial Information Management. (2020). *Framework for effective land administration*. United Nations.
- World Bank. (2017). *Improving land administration and management for sustainable urban development: Philippines Urbanization Review policy notes*. World Bank.
- World Bank. (2024). *Restructuring paper on a proposed project restructuring of Support to Parcelization of Lands for Individual Titling Project (P172399)*. World Bank.