

The Implementation of the Right-of-Way Infrastructure Projects in the First District Engineering Office of the Department of Public Works and Highways, in the Province of Albay

Imee Monica P. Bristol¹

¹University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: Right-of-Way Acquisition Republic Act 10752 DPWH Stakeholder Perceptions Land Acquisition Albay Kendall concordance	This study examined the reported implementation of Republic Act No. 10752, the Right-of-Way Act, in the First District Engineering Office of the Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH), Albay, for calendar year 2025. Using a descriptive–evaluative survey design, the study gathered responses from 42 participants: 14 DPWH field engineers, 19 project-affected persons, and nine barangay officials. The researcher-developed questionnaire addressed five modes of property acquisition, 11 dimensions of right-of-way implementation, and five categories of constraints. Descriptive weighted means and Kendall’s coefficient of concordance assessed perceived implementation and rank agreement. The original summary reported overall means of 4.38 for acquisition practices, 4.33 for implementation, and 4.24 for constraints. Donation was the highest acquisition mode (4.55); appropriations for right-of-way led the implementation dimensions (4.51); and social and technological constraints were jointly highest (4.28). All five acquisition rank-agreement tests and the five constraints tests were reported nonsignificant. Of the 11 implementation tests, only appropriations for right-of-way exceeded the stated chi-square threshold at .05 ($\chi^2=17.691$, $df=9$). The ratings describe stakeholder perceptions, not independently audited procedural compliance, causal impacts, or documented rates of timely compensation. Findings point toward transparent valuation, timely compensation, meaningful consultation, and improved interagency coordination. Original inconsistencies in verbal interpretation, measurement reliability, and selected table cells require author review prior to submission.

1. Introduction

Infrastructure planning depends upon access to appropriately located land. Property acquisition is not simply a technical prerequisite to construction: it implicates just compensation, social safeguards, public participation, administrative coordination, and the quality of project scheduling. Where these processes are delayed or contested, a project may face financial, legal, and community-relations risks.

The Philippine Right-of-Way Act, Republic Act No. 10752, establishes a statutory framework for acquiring right-of-way sites or locations for national government infrastructure projects. Its central policy recognizes the constitutional requirement that private property not be taken for public use without just compensation, while seeking prompt payment and expeditious land acquisition ^[1]. DPWH’s Right-of-Way Acquisition Manual supplies additional implementing procedures ^[2].

The policy challenge lies in reconciling speed with due process. Negotiated sale, donation, expropriation, public land arrangements, and other lawful modes carry different documentation, valuation, and stakeholder-interaction requirements. An office may score highly on one mode and encounter persistent bottlenecks on another, even within the same implementation program.

International safeguards similarly emphasize the risk of physical and economic displacement associated with land acquisition. The World Bank’s Environmental and Social Standard 5 calls for avoidance or minimization of involuntary resettlement and mitigation of adverse economic and social effects ^[3]. ADB’s safeguard principles underline consultation, livelihood restoration, and assistance for affected persons ^[4]. These frameworks inform the discussion; they do not substitute for the specific requirements of Philippine law. The First District Engineering Office in Albay provides a bounded setting for evaluating how different stakeholders view the right-of-way process. Field engineers may focus on project logistics and procedural steps, project-affected persons on compensation and fairness, and barangay officials on community coordination and local disputes. Comparing these perspectives can identify areas where expectations diverge.

The thesis operationalized implementation through acquisition modes, detailed procedural dimensions and cross-cutting constraints. This manuscript retained those three levels of analysis and focused on descriptive patterns and agreement in rankings. It did not recast the cross-sectional self-report data as an independent compliance audit or as evidence of project-level causal effectiveness.

2. Methods

Design and setting. The study thesis employed a descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey design for the Albay First District Engineering Office, DPWH, in calendar year 2025. The term “correlational” in the original is operationalized by Kendall rank concordance across respondent categories; no individual-level correlation between acquisition practice and measured infrastructure delivery outcome was supplied.

Sampling and participants. The engineering district was selected purposively and the available respondents were described as having been enumerated within the selected groups. The sample comprised 14 DPWH field engineers, 19 project-affected persons, and nine barangay officials (N=42). This is a three-stratum stakeholder sample and should not be construed as a probability-representative sample of all landowners or projects in Albay.

Instrument. The researcher used a self-developed questionnaire with three parts: (i) five acquisition modes, (ii) 11 implementation domains, and (iii) five constraints domains. The methods described pre-survey development, expert feedback, and revisions by personnel with relevant engineering knowledge. The source mentions Kuder–Richardson reliability despite an ordinal five-point response structure; suitability and numerical reliability evidence need verification with the author and raw dataset.

Analysis. Original tables provided group-specific weighted means and category-level overall means. Agreement of indicator rankings across the three respondent categories was reported as Kendall W with chi-square approximation and degrees of freedom. The manuscript reproduced original numerical values. For statistical decisions, χ^2 and df were interpreted at $\alpha=.05$; where the original verbal labels contradicted the numerical scale, the report preserved the means and separately identified the inconsistency.

Ethics and administrative permissions. The folder included a permit and associated supporting materials, but approval identifiers, individual informed-consent verification and the de-identification protocol require direct author confirmation. No respondent-level data were fabricated or imputed in preparing the manuscript.

Table 1. Distribution of study participants

Stakeholder group	n	Proportion
DPWH field engineers	14	33.3%
Project-affected persons	19	45.2%
Barangay officials	9	21.4%
Total	42	100%

3. Results

Table 2. Original respondent-group means: Acquisition modes

Dimension	Engineers	Affected persons	Barangay	Overall
Donation	4.73	4.83	4.08	4.55
Negotiated Sale	4.48	4.64	3.87	4.33
Expropriation	4.72	4.54	4.21	4.49
Public Land Act	4.32	4.40	4.04	4.25
Any other mode of Acquisition as provided by Law	4.30	4.32	4.14	4.25

The acquisition summary placed donation highest (4.55), followed by expropriation (4.49) and negotiated sale (4.33); use of the Public Land Act and other lawful acquisition modes both averaged 4.25. The grand mean was 4.38. The original table calls this overall result “Very Much Evident” despite its methods describing 3.50–4.49 as “Much Evident”; the numerical value is preserved, but that verbal category should be corrected by the author or reconciled with a revised, documented scale.

The respondent strata did not evaluate the processes identically. Project-affected persons gave high assessments in several modes while barangay officials were generally more reserved. These group differences are descriptively relevant, but no inferential group-mean difference test was reported. They therefore justify stakeholder dialogue rather than an assertion that one stakeholder category was statistically more satisfied than another.

Table 3. Original respondent-group means: ROW implementation domains

Dimension	Engineers	Affected persons	Barangay	Overall
Rules Negotiated Sales	4.79	4.18	3.82	4.26
Guidelines for Expropriation Proceedings	4.54	4.52	4.11	4.39
Standards for Property Valuation Assessment	4.47	4.73	4.03	4.41
Ecological and Environmental Concerns	4.47	4.61	4.00	4.36
Relocation of Informal Settlers	4.22	4.46	4.07	4.25
Appropriations for Right-of-Way	4.74	4.36	4.43	4.51
Regulations of development within Right-of-Way	4.48	4.29	3.84	4.20
Sanctions for Violations	4.29	4.19	3.96	4.14
Compliance with policies	4.56	4.64	3.83	4.35
Efficiency in Right-of-Way	4.62	4.71	4.07	4.46
Impact on Project Implementation	4.49	4.55	3.73	4.26

The 11 implementation domains produced an overall mean of 4.33. Appropriations for right-of-way was highest (4.51), followed by efficiency in right-of-way (4.46), property valuation standards (4.41) and expropriation guidelines (4.39). Sanctions for violations (4.14) and regulations of development within right-of-way (4.20) were among the relatively lower domains. These numbers describe perceptions of procedural implementation and should not be equated with independently documented legal compliance.

The field engineers and project-affected persons reported summary means of 4.51 and 4.47, respectively, compared with 3.99 from barangay officials. The difference invites attention to how information is conveyed locally, including how community representatives understand compensation schedules, enforcement and dispute channels. The underlying tables do not establish whether the observed variation results from knowledge differences, administrative contact, or actual disparities in implementation.

Table 4. Original respondent-group means: Constraints

Dimension	Engineers	Affected persons	Barangay	Overall
Economics	4.35	4.46	3.85	4.22
Social	4.45	4.35	4.04	4.28
Political	4.43	4.19	4.09	4.24
Technological	4.62	4.19	4.03	4.28
Ecological	4.34	4.19	4.07	4.20

The study categorized five types of constraints and reported an overall mean of 4.24. Social and technological challenges tied at 4.28, followed by political (4.24), economic (4.22), and ecological challenges (4.20). These constitute substantial perceived challenges, rather than measures of project delay in days, litigation incidence, or verified compensation shortfalls.

The economic and social dimensions matter especially in right-of-way implementation because delays in payment, uncertainty about valuation, weak communication, and perceived unequal treatment can undermine confidence in public projects. The original descriptive survey gives a useful screening map of perceived risks, but priority-setting would benefit from triangulation with grievance logs, acquisition schedules, actual payments, and independently recorded resettlement outcomes.

Table 5. Kendall W for acquisition modes (original statistics)

Indicator	W	Reported χ^2	df	p (χ^2 , df)
Donation	0.14	4.62	11	0.948
Negotiated Sale	0.23	7.59	11	0.749
Expropriation	0.17	5.61	11	0.898
Public Land Act	0.16	5.28	11	0.917
Any Other Modes of Acquisition as provided by law	0.35	10.86	11	0.455

All five acquisition concordance tests were below the relevant 5% critical values, consistent with the source decisions of no statistically significant rank agreement. The nonrejection of the null hypothesis should not be interpreted as proof that the groups fundamentally disagree, but only as insufficient evidence of consistent rank ordering under the stated test at the chosen threshold.

Table 6. Kendall W for implementation domains (original statistics)

Indicator	W	Reported χ^2	df	p (χ^2 , df)
Rules Negotiated Sales	0.116	3.127	9	0.959
Guidelines for Expropriation Proceedings	0.562	15.164	9	0.087
Standards for Property Value Assessment	0.389	10.509	9	0.311
Ecological and Environmental Concerns	0.554	14.945	9	0.092
Relocation of Informal Settlers	0.261	7.036	9	0.633
Appropriation for Right-Of-way	0.655	17.691	9	0.039
Regulations of Development within the declared right-of-way	0.560	15.109	9	0.088
Sanctions for violations	0.256	6.909	9	0.647
Compliance with policies	0.292	7.891	9	0.545
Efficiency in right-of-way	0.531	14.327	9	0.111
Impact on Project Implementation	0.431	11.636	9	0.235

For the 11 implementation domains, the appropriation dimension ($\chi^2=17.691$, $df=9$) exceeded the 5% critical value (16.919), whereas the other reported test statistics did not. This indicates detectable concordance of respondent-group ranks within that specific indicator set, not that appropriations were objectively adequate or that compensation payments occurred on time.

Table 7. Kendall W for constraints (original statistics)

Indicator	W	Reported χ^2	df	p (χ^2 , df)
Economic	0.59	19.47	11	0.053
Social	0.43	11.61	9	0.236
Political	0.29	7.83	9	0.551
Technological	0.34	9.18	9	0.421
Ecological	0.44	11.89	9	0.220

The five constraint-domain concordance tests were reported as nonsignificant. The economic dimension approached, but did not cross, the 5% reference threshold: $\chi^2=19.47$ versus χ^2 critical 19.68 for $df=11$. Near-threshold findings reinforce the need to report exact p-values and avoid making a binary decision carry more explanatory weight than the design permits.

Table 8. Selected item-level findings: Documentation and donation

Indicators	Engineer	Affected	Barangay	Mean
The current Deed of Donation process is clearly documented with written procedures.	5.00	5.00	4.11	4.70
The implementation of RA 10752 (The right-of-Way Act) has significantly improved the efficiency of land acquisition for DPWH projects.	4.43	4.79	4.67	4.63
Existing office policies provide adequate guidance for resolving disputes that arise during the donation process.	4.79	4.84	4.22	4.62
Delays in processing Deeds of Donation are commonly caused by internal procedural requirements.	4.86	4.95	3.11	4.31

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicators	Engineer	Affected	Barangay	Mean
Continuation of Table 3 7. The processing of Deeds of Donation is significantly affected by insufficient staffing.	4.57	4.84	3.78	4.40

In documentation and donation, the highest selected item was “The current Deed of Donation process is clearly documented with written procedures.” (mean 4.70), whereas a comparatively lower item was “Continuation of Table 3 7. The processing of Deeds of Donation is significantly affected by insufficient staffing.” (mean 4.40). The spread identifies what respondents believed was more or less evident or serious, as relevant to the item wording. These are not audited transaction-level measures and do not establish that the practices were implemented uniformly in every right-of-way case.

For practical governance, the result suggests that administrative leaders should check whether documentary guidance, explanations of valuation, grievance access, and coordination procedures are understandable to property owners and barangay stakeholders. A process review using actual records would identify which of these perceived concerns correspond to remediable bottlenecks.

Table 9. Selected item-level findings: Negotiated sale

Indicators	Engineer	Affected	Barangay	Mean
Current office policies are effective in preventing conflicts of interest during price negotiations.	4.71	4.63	4.33	4.56
The valuation methods used for negotiated purchases are standardized and consistently applied.	4.57	4.74	4.11	4.47
There are clear, written guidelines for conducting negotiated sales in this office.	4.43	4.68	4.22	4.45
Landowners are generally willing and cooperative in engaging in negotiated sales with the agency.	4.57	4.58	3.00	4.05
The lack of specialized negotiation training for personnel hinders the effectiveness of the process.	4.50	4.63	3.56	4.23

In negotiated sale, the highest selected item was “Current office policies are effective in preventing conflicts of interest during price negotiations.” (mean 4.56), whereas a comparatively lower item was “The lack of specialized negotiation training for personnel hinders the effectiveness of the process.” (mean 4.23). The spread identifies what respondents believed was more or less evident or serious, as relevant to the item wording. These are not audited transaction-level measures and do not establish that the practices were implemented uniformly in every right-of-way case.

For practical governance, the result suggests that administrative leaders should check whether documentary guidance, explanations of valuation, grievance access, and coordination procedures are understandable to property owners and barangay stakeholders. A process review using actual records would identify which of these perceived concerns correspond to remediable bottlenecks.

Table 10. Selected item-level findings: Appropriation and compensation

Indicators	Engineer	Affected	Barangay	Mean
The right-of-way budget specifically includes adequate allocations for the support and relocation of informal settlers affected by the project.	4.93	4.53	4.89	4.78
The processes for accessing and utilizing right-of-way funds are clear, straightforward, and free from excessive	4.86	4.42	5.00	4.76
Right-of-way funds are released in a timely manner, ensuring compensation payments to property owners are not delayed.	5.00	4.58	4.56	4.71
The budget allocated for land acquisition and compensation is realistically calculated to match current fair market values.	4.07	4.26	4.11	4.15
The right-of-way budget sufficiently covers all related costs, including surveying, titling, legal fees, and administrative expenses, not just compensation.	4.79	4.26	3.89	4.31

In appropriation and compensation, the highest selected item was “The right-of-way budget specifically includes adequate allocations for the support and relocation of informal settlers affected by the project.” (mean 4.78), whereas a comparatively lower item was “The right-of-way budget sufficiently covers all related costs, including surveying, titling, legal fees, and administrative expenses, not just compensation.” (mean 4.31). The spread identifies what respondents believed was more or less evident or serious, as relevant to the item wording. These are not audited transaction-level measures and do not establish that the practices were implemented uniformly in every right-of-way case.

For practical governance, the result suggests that administrative leaders should check whether documentary guidance, explanations of valuation, grievance access, and coordination procedures are understandable to property owners and barangay stakeholders. A process review using actual records would identify which of these perceived concerns correspond to remediable bottlenecks.

Table 11. Selected item-level findings: Administrative efficiency

Indicators	Engineer	Affected	Barangay	Mean
Property owners are provided with realistic and reliable timelines for each step of the acquisition process.	4.64	4.68	4.67	4.66
The steps and requirements for the right-of-way acquisition process are clear and straightforward for all parties involved.	4.79	4.79	4.33	4.64
Digital tools and streamlined systems are effectively used to accelerate paperwork and track right-of-way cases.	4.57	4.63	4.67	4.62
The DPWH effectively manages its resources to handle multiple right-of-way acquisitions without compromising quality or speed.	4.50	4.58	3.44	4.17
The process from initial offer to final payment is completed within a reasonable and expected timeframe.	4.43	4.74	3.67	4.28

In administrative efficiency, the highest selected item was “Property owners are provided with realistic and reliable timelines for each step of the acquisition process.” (mean 4.66), whereas a comparatively lower item was “The process from initial offer to final payment is completed within a reasonable and expected timeframe.” (mean 4.28). The spread identifies what respondents believed was more or less evident or serious, as relevant to the item wording. These are not audited transaction-level measures and do not establish that the practices were implemented uniformly in every right-of-way case.

For practical governance, the result suggests that administrative leaders should check whether documentary guidance, explanations of valuation, grievance access, and coordination procedures are understandable to property owners and barangay stakeholders. A process review using actual records would identify which of these perceived concerns correspond to remediable bottlenecks.

Table 12. Selected item-level findings: Social constraints

Indicators	Engineer	Affected	Barangay	Mean
Exacerbating social tensions.	4.86	4.42	4.56	4.61
Making it difficult to secure support for the project.	4.21	4.26	4.78	4.42
Conflict and resistance, hindering the smooth implementation of the right-of-way.	5.00	4.53	3.67	4.40
Limited resources and awareness among communities regarding their rights further hindered the process.	4.21	4.42	3.33	3.99
Inadequate consideration of indigenous peoples' rights and cultural practices.	4.07	4.16	4.22	4.15

In social constraints, the highest selected item was “Exacerbating social tensions.” (mean 4.61), whereas a comparatively lower item was “Inadequate consideration of indigenous peoples' rights and cultural practices.” (mean 4.15). The spread identifies what respondents believed was more or less evident or serious, as relevant to the item wording. These are not audited transaction-level measures and do not establish that the practices were implemented uniformly in every right-of-way case.

For practical governance, the result suggests that administrative leaders should check whether documentary guidance, explanations of valuation, grievance access, and coordination procedures are understandable to property owners and barangay stakeholders. A process review using actual records would identify which of these perceived concerns correspond to remediable bottlenecks.

3.1 Further interpretation of implementation and constraint dimensions

The prominence of property valuation assessment (4.41) warrants more than an aggregate judgment about fairness. A useful procedural evaluation would compare the valuation basis used in each acquisition, the clarity of individual valuation notices, the documented opportunity for owners to ask questions, and the actual time between appraisal and settlement. If these indicators are not linked to case records, favorable survey ratings risk obscuring severe problems concentrated among relatively few affected households.

Expropriation guidelines (4.39) should be interpreted in light of the exceptional nature of compulsory acquisition. Relevant administrative indicators would include the completeness of documentary records, clarity of notice, coordination with legal counsel, and the status of judicial proceedings. Nothing in the present survey establishes the number of cases initiated or adjudicated, so the descriptive results are best understood as respondent impressions of the apparent process.

Ecological and environmental concerns (4.36) form a distinct implementation domain because road access can generate effects on drainage, vegetation, access routes and adjoining settlements. Monitoring should distinguish concerns during land acquisition from the separate construction-stage requirements governed by project-specific environmental permits. The survey scores do not identify which of these stages was chiefly responsible for the reported assessment.

Relocation of informal settlers (4.25) calls for particular attention to the definition and identification of project-affected persons, the adequacy and timing of assistance and the accessibility of grievance arrangements. A high or moderate mean cannot demonstrate that households had acceptable alternatives, that livelihoods were restored, or that vulnerable persons were protected. These outcomes should be examined separately and, where legally appropriate, tracked after displacement.

Regulations of development within declared right-of-way (4.20) and sanctions for violations (4.14) were comparatively low in the implementation ranking. A response should begin with the quality of information supplied to local officials and residents about lawful uses, notice and enforcement procedures, rather than assume that more frequent sanctions necessarily indicate stronger governance. Consistency, proportionality, and documented due process matter as much as enforcement frequency.

Compliance with policies (4.35) and impact on project implementation (4.26) represent broad categories that can conceal divergent underlying processes. A subsequent study could construct separate operational indicators for acquisition completion, timely compensation, possession, construction mobilization and grievance closure. This would help determine whether a participant who reports strong “compliance” is assessing legal procedure, administrative service, construction schedules or another aspect altogether. Economic constraints (4.22) include concerns about market valuation, delayed payments and negotiation costs. The thesis does not provide actual household income losses or payment delays, so the observed mean is a prioritization signal rather than a monetized estimate. An implementation dashboard should link owner-level claims, scheduled payments and dates of receipt while protecting privacy and the confidential elements of negotiation.

Political constraints (4.24) may involve coordination, priority setting and the handling of constituent concerns. Rather than view all public participation as administrative interference, a rights-based interpretation recognizes that meaningful engagement can improve legitimacy and identify site-specific issues early. Transparent escalation protocols can protect both implementing personnel and affected persons when claims are contested.

Technological constraints (4.28) suggest the value of well-governed digital records, but digitization alone does not resolve problems of property valuation, missing documentation or contested ownership. Any digital case management tool should include access controls, audit trails, versioned documents and a non-digital alternative for affected parties who cannot readily access online services.

The constraints results also require attention to the difference between types of risk. Ecological issues (4.20) are not interchangeable with social or economic concerns and should be evaluated by specialists using suitable evidence. Combining them into a single grand mean is a useful presentation device, but it should not replace project-specific risk assessments or permit compliance reviews.

4. Discussion

The three result blocks tell a nuanced story. Participants broadly rated the existence or implementation of acquisition practices positively, while simultaneously rating several economic, social and technological constraints as serious. These findings are not inherently contradictory: an office may have established procedures and yet experience resource constraints, communication gaps or uneven execution in specific cases.

Donation's higher mean is an observation about ratings, not proof of the prevalence or legal suitability of donation in actual projects. Decisions about the acquisition method should be consistent with statute, just compensation and informed consent. The Office must not translate a high donation rating into a presumption that voluntary land transfer should be preferred regardless of landowner interests.

Appropriations for right-of-way was the highest-rated implementation dimension and the one with significant rank concordance. This is encouraging as a perception of administrative priority, but the underlying survey does not permit conclusions about actual budget sufficiency, the proportion of claims paid, or days between valuation and payment. Administrative records should be compared with reported experiences before declaring the process efficient.

The relative reserve of barangay respondents is analytically important. Barangay officials may encounter affected residents after engineering decisions have been made, especially where information-sharing is late or grievance procedures are unclear. Strengthening two-way communication, written notice, barangay-level orientation and response tracking may reduce avoidable mistrust, though the current survey cannot isolate the causes of differing ratings.

The identified social and technological concerns can be mapped to the safeguards literature. The ADB guidance emphasizes meaningful consultation and minimizing harm in resettlement^[4], while the World Bank's ESS5 articulates risks to livelihoods and community institutions^[3]. These principles provide a practical lens to assess compensation explanations, relocation support, grievance access and post-acquisition monitoring. They are interpretive benchmarks here, not a claim that all such standards legally apply to the projects studied.

The original results use Kendall W appropriately to ask whether rank ordering is consistent across the three stakeholder groups. The nonsignificant results in acquisition and constraints should not be recast as proof of equal perceptions, nor should the lone significant implementation test be confused with objective effectiveness. A follow-up design should use transaction records and affected-person interviews, and where feasible assess delays and outcomes over time.

Limitations and author-verification issues. The study represents 42 purposively chosen or enumerated participants in a single engineering district. It relied on a researcher-made Likert survey. Although the study describes Kuder–Richardson reliability, its suitability for polytomous items and the underlying coefficient should be checked; Cronbach's alpha or ordinal reliability methods may be more appropriate. Several original tables classify means below 4.50 as "Very Much Evident" or means below 4.50 as "Very Much Serious," contrary to the printed legend. These discrepancies were not silently corrected in reproduced numerical columns. A few study statements and table cells also differ and should be reconciled against the master spreadsheet before submission.

Policy implications therefore warrant a limited but constructive response: maintain transparent acquisition records, institute routine cross-stakeholder feedback, monitor valuation and compensation timelines, assess socio-economic consequences of relocation, and publish aggregate indicators of resolution of grievances. Future research should examine actual acquisition cases and independently validate participant-level survey patterns against project documentation.

The sampling structure raises an additional issue in interpreting stakeholder comparisons. The three participant groups are unequal in size, and the reported overall means appear to be arithmetic summaries of group means rather than demonstrably respondent-weighted pooled estimates. Without the original case-level responses and the precise aggregation formula, the manuscript cannot legitimately transform the three numbers into an alternative pooled estimate, confidence interval or effect size. The quantitative patterns are therefore reproduced as published in the study tables. An author-led reanalysis should specify whether each stakeholder group was intentionally given equal analytical weight, how item nonresponse was handled, and whether the survey dimensions were scored as simple or weighted averages. These choices matter because agreement in a rank order can coexist with substantially different group averages. They also influence what the word "overall" means in a study covering engineers, affected persons and barangay personnel. A stronger journal submission would add instrument validation details, item reliability by dimension and a sensitivity check comparing equal-group and respondent-weighted summaries where individual responses are available.

A further issue concerns the statistical interpretation of Kendall concordance. The number of objects being ranked differs across item sets, so the corresponding chi-square degrees of freedom differ as well. Accordingly, a W of similar magnitude need not result in the same p-value when the number of ranked indicators is different. This manuscript has used the study W and χ^2 figures rather than generate alternate statistics from unavailable item-level rankings. For the appropriations dimension, the test crossed the stated critical threshold, but that is a conclusion about consistency of ranking among three stakeholder groups. It does not validate the truthfulness of every individual statement in that domain. In domains with nonsignificant tests, the correct conclusion is a failure to demonstrate reliable agreement under the model and threshold, not definitive evidence that groups are opposed. Because several related hypotheses were tested in the same study, a revised article should also state whether the p-values were intended as exploratory and consider a multiple-testing strategy if strong confirmatory claims are contemplated.

An operationally useful next step is to design a concise right-of-way performance register that distinguishes the legal mode of acquisition, project stage, documentary completeness, valuation status, notice date, payment date and outstanding grievance. Such a register would make it possible to compare perceived implementation with externally reviewable milestones while keeping confidential owner-level documents secure. Instead of interpreting a high rating as a claim that all cases progressed efficiently, the

office could determine whether missed milestones cluster in particular modes of acquisition, localities, stakeholder situations or phases of project preparation. These are recommendations for future measurement, not additional findings from the survey.

Any implementation improvement should also protect substantive fairness. Consultation with project-affected persons should be documented in language they understand, compensation procedures should be explained without overstating certainty, and affected communities should have access to a clear channel for questions or objections. The original stakeholder pattern makes these practices relevant because barangay officials assessed many domains less favorably than engineers and project-affected persons. The study did not establish the specific cause of that pattern, so a fair response would include listening sessions, interviews and review of case records rather than presume lack of awareness or resistance on any party's part. Such triangulation would be capable of revealing whether perceived procedural strengths correspond to timely and lawful outcomes.

5. Conclusion

The descriptive evidence from 42 respondents indicated generally favorable perceptions of right-of-way acquisition and implementation in the Albay First District Engineering Office and simultaneously identified notable social, technological and economic constraints. Donation ranked highest among acquisition modes, appropriations and efficiency among implementation dimensions, and social and technological factors among constraints. Agreement analyses offered little evidence of consensus on most rank orders; appropriations for right-of-way was the one implementation domain with statistically significant agreement under the stated reference test. These observations support strengthening compensation transparency, interagency coordination, communication and social safeguards but do not establish causal or audited outcomes. Before submission to a scholarly journal, the author should reconcile verbal rating classifications, instrument reliability evidence, detailed numerical discrepancies and ethics documentation.

References

- [1] Republic of the Philippines. (2016). Republic Act No. 10752, The Right-of-Way Act. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2016/pdf/ra_10752_2016.pdf
- [2] Department of Public Works and Highways. (2017). Department Order No. 152, s. 2017: DPWH Right-of-Way Acquisition Manual. https://www.dpwh.gov.ph/dpwh/sites/default/files/issuances/DO_152_s2017.pdf
- [3] World Bank. (2017). Environmental and Social Framework: Environmental and Social Standard 5—Land acquisition, restrictions on land use and involuntary resettlement. <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/383011492423734099/pdf/114278-WP-REVISED-PUBLIC-Environmental-and-Social-Framework-Dec18-2017.pdf>
- [4] Asian Development Bank. (2009). Safeguard Policy Statement. <https://www.adb.org/documents/safeguard-policy-statement>
- [5] Bristol, I. M. P. (2026). The implementation of the right-of-way infrastructure projects in the First District Engineering Office of the Department of Public Works and Highways, in the Province of Albay [Unpublished MPA thesis, University of Northeastern Philippines]. (Primary source of the survey and results tables).