



# Distribution of SLLC: Strategic Recommendations

Social Impact Assessment and Policy Analysis Corporation

September 2017



## Contents

Acknowledgements.....	2
Executive Summary.....	3
Introduction .....	4
Review of Evidence .....	5
Summary of Findings.....	10
Distribution Strategy – Recommendations .....	10
Next Steps: .....	13

## Acknowledgements

This research was commissioned by LIFT but has been conducted by an external consultancy and does not necessarily represent the views of LIFT

This material has been funded by UKaid from the UK government; however, the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies

## Executive Summary

*Strategic Recommendations for Distribution of SLLC* examines the LIFT programme's current understanding of the progress on, and constraints to, certificate distribution and collection. It comprises an analysis of survey data and current and historic SLLC progress data, supported by observations from the field and input from LIFT stakeholders. A number of strategic recommendations are proposed so that the LIFT programme and Government of Ethiopia may meet the following objectives:

- • Continue to maintain the current certificate distribution momentum
- • Ensure a high-quality product is delivered
- • Obtain maximum 'buy-in' from land holders
- • Ensure distribution activities are durable and may continue to be supported by Government of Ethiopia in the longer term (post-LIFT)
- • Ensure all activities are correctly monitored.

The analysis of survey and SLLC data reveals that the main constraints to distribution are supply, rather than demand. The main recommendations are categorised as follows:

**Procedural recommendations:** these mainly relate to the continued delivery of SLLC services after LIFT support is discontinued at the woreda. Appropriate procedures must be elaborated and rolled-out, and the transition from SLLC activities to RLAS at woreda level must be streamlined.

**Monitoring recommendations:** distribution activities must be systematically monitored, both by the LIFT programme and by government at all levels. Improved guidance on this has been incorporated into LIFT SIGN 2.1.

**Public awareness and communications recommendations:** LIFT's Public Awareness and Communications Strategy will be updated to strengthen its approach to distribution activities. In particular, the Communications Strategy must tailor its messages to appeal to the concerns of land holders and the value they attach to Second Level Land Certification.

**Procurement recommendations:** these include region-specific procurement actions for the purchase of SLLC-related materials, and also a brief commentary on the bottlenecks experienced through LIFT procurement.

The LIFT ITSP presented this paper to representatives of Federal and Regional Governments at a workshop in late September 2017; their feedback has been incorporated into this final version of the paper.

## Introduction

The LIFT programme has an Outcome target for the distribution of SLLC certificates. In order to access credit or to transact in RLAS, land holders need first to have collected their certificates.

### LIFT Outcome Indicator 3 – Certificates Distributed

Outcome Indicator 3 Milestones	31 Aug 2016	31 Jan 2017	30 Sep 2017	31 Jan 2018	31 Jan 2019	31 Jan 2020	Aug 2020
<b>Certificates Distributed</b>	814,000	1,160,062	3,100,000	4,218,000	6,808,000	10,138,000	10,360,000

Certificate distribution is an Outcome and not an Output because varying factors outside of the programme's control can mean that the rate of distribution does not meet the expected trend. The reasons for this may include a perception among farmers that the certificate is more secure when held at the woreda office, farmers' fears of being asked to pay additional taxes if they collect their certificates, a lack of awareness about the collection procedures, lack of understanding of the value of the certificate, and a lack of strong leadership at the Land Administration offices.

The LIFT ITSP, Government of Ethiopia (GoE) and DFID E have to demonstrate not only their best efforts in distribution of certificates but must also achieve a good understanding of why farmers do or do not collect their certificates. This will allow the results to influence implementation and the targets set at the programme Outcome level.

This document examines the LIFT programme's current understanding of the progress on, and constraints to certificate distribution and collection. It comprises an analysis of survey data, current and historic SLLC progress data, supported by observations from the field and input from LIFT stakeholders.

Ultimately, LIFT and the Government of Ethiopia must work towards the following objectives:

- Continue to maintain the current certificate distribution momentum
- Ensure a high-quality product is delivered
- Obtain maximum 'buy-in' from land holders
- Ensure distribution activities are durable, and may continue to be supported by Government of Ethiopia in the longer term (post-LIFT)
- Ensure all activities are correctly monitored.

This document provides a number of strategic recommendations so that these objectives may be met.

### Background

Certificate distribution is one of the end points of SLLC (the other being the migration of SLLC data onto IWORLAIS). The key step for SLLC is when the Woreda Administration legally approves the land holder's rights, which takes place before certificate printing and distribution. This means that the land holder's rights are secured and confirmed no matter when they collect the certificate, if at all.

However, the land holder must possess the Second Level Land Certificate in order to make land transactions in RLAS, or to access credit. For the sustainability of LIFT, and to reach the objective of increased income, it is important that land holders collect their certificates as soon as practicable.

Certificate distribution is not wholly within the control of DFID E, GoE and the ITSP and therefore can only be predicted with a reduced level of certainty when compared to the approval or demarcation processes. This is because there are a variety of issues which could mean that certificate distribution will not meet the expected trend if land holders are unwilling or otherwise not prepared to collect their certificates. DFID E, GoE or the ITSP should address these issues cautiously and sensitively to invigorate the collection process in order to maximise the impact of the SLLC.

Factors which may influence certificate collection include (but are not limited to):

- Planning, communication and delivery of distribution events
- Location of the distribution area

- Timing of the distribution events in regard to farmers' priorities. e.g. harvest etc
- Knowledge that the event is occurring / why it is good to collect
- Fear of further taxation
- No immediate desire to be involved in RLAS / Access to Finance, with the possible intention of collecting the certificate at a later date
- Perception of where the certificate will be most securely stored (at home, at kebele office, woreda office)
- Readiness and leadership of the Land Administration offices and kebele offices to institutionalize the certificate distribution process
- Mobility restrictions or problems accessing a distribution event
- Lack of decision-making power of women in male headed households.

Only some of the factors above can be influenced by ITSP, GoE or DFID E. This document describes our findings in relation to the constraints to certificate collection in Ethiopia.

Certificate collection is an Outcome because the rate of collection may be influenced by factors outside of the programme's control and demonstrate different rates of collection than expected. There is evidence from past experience that time is a factor, and that farmers only see the importance of collecting the certificate for RLAS / Access to Finance a few years after the SLLC process has concluded in that woreda.

It is important that DFID E, GoE and ITSP present a clear strategy on how best efforts can be made in order to encourage collection, supported by their understanding of the situation and influencing factors. This will then allow the most appropriate measures to be deployed to achieve an optimal level of certificate collection. If, for example, it is demonstrated that farmers do not want to collect certificates for reasons that need to be respected, DFID E, ITSP and GoE need to not only be aware of this, but also to allow for this when setting targets and directing interventions.

## Review of Evidence

### Overview

To arrive at a strategy for certificate distribution and collection, the LIFT ITSP examined the following evidence and data:

- The LIFT Baseline survey, conducted in early 2016, which enquired into the reasons for non-collection of First-Level Land Certificates
- A specially commissioned Certificate Uptake Survey, conducted in March 2017
- Current status of certificate delivery and past performance
- Field visits and discussion with LIFT stakeholders.

This analysis is underpinned by international experience of similar systematic registration programmes.

### Review of the LIFT Baseline Survey

The LIFT baseline survey enquired into the reasons for the non-collection of First Level Land Certification (FLLC). Around 67% of the respondents collected the FLLC. Of those who did not collect, the baseline report stated:

*"The reasons why households had not been reached are uncertain, but three points are relevant for LIFT: 1) a significant number of households had been missed by the FLLC process; 2) some of the households that had been reached with FLLC had gone to collect their certificates but were told that they were not available, highlighting the importance of timely availability; and 3) not all households that had received their certificates had retained them, despite noting that they were of value, highlighting the importance of certificate utility in encouraging retention of the FLLC certificates."*

Analysis of the results suggest that:

- The main reason for non-collection was that the office did not have the certificate. This accounted for 34% of the respondents, and this held for both Male and Female Headed Households and across the regions (it was most acute in Amhara and SNNPR)
- The response for "No Need to collect" and "Did Not Know the Household Needed to collect" accounted for almost 14% of respondents in the treatment areas and held across MHH and FHH. This response was

particularly common in Oromia and SNNPR. Very few respondents (0.6%) suggested that they would not collect due to a fear of possible collection fees, suggesting that the “No Fee” principle is understood

- The response for “A new household, so missed the FLLC process” and simply “Missed the window for collection” accounted for almost 16% of the respondents in the treatment area. These responses were common across all regions
- Fears of additional taxes or being incriminated for informal transactions accounted for less than 2% of the responses. Most of this was accounted for by land taxation (1%). The majority of respondents with a fear of taxation were found in Amhara and SNNPR.

Analysis of the baseline data and other relevant studies suggests that to increase collection LIFT needs to:

- Ensure the collection events take place following strong awareness raising activities informing farmers of the need to attend. Further collection events or means to collect after the event also need to be in place in case farmers miss the process
- Implement awareness raising on the importance of collecting the certificate and the process involved
- Ensure that Federal, Regional and Woreda Government Land Administration Offices support the process, providing leadership, ownership, and encouragement to Woreda staff, as the distribution of certificates will be delivered through Woreda and Kebele offices.

It should be noted that the baseline survey was not designed to specifically investigate issues around the uptake of certificates.

### LIFT Certificate Uptake Survey

This survey was conducted in March 2017 with the specific intention of investigating perceived low levels of certificate uptake under SLLC in the LIFT Programme area. The focus was on providing indicative data to enable a better understanding of the reasons for second level land certificate uptake, and what factors might hinder certificate uptake. The survey also examined whether a household’s perception to collect the certificate for a second time is different to the first time. A household may possess the FLLC and feel that this is enough and do not see the need for collecting the SLLC.

The survey comprised a quantitative questionnaire administered to 320 households across 32 kebele over 8 woreda in the LIFT Programme area (Amhara, Oromia, Tigray and Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples). This information was complemented by key informant interviews with officials serving on Kebele Land Administration Committees.

*Note that the woredas sampled were the initial 8 LIFT woredas. Progress in more recent woredas to date shows substantially higher levels of certificate collection than was reported in these woredas.*

Respondents had strong perceptions that SLLC offered benefits over and above FLLC. 90% agreed that SLLC increased security of tenure, with 86% agreeing that SLLC helps to prevent boundary disputes. In addition, there is a general belief that SLLC is better at addressing the inheritance rights of orphans and clarifying rights in complex polygamous households. 57% of respondents felt that FLLC did not sufficiently consider the rights of women.

In summary:

- There is little evidence of demand limitations in certificate uptake. These quantitative findings from households are consistent with qualitative findings from key informant interviews with KLAC members;
- Deficiencies in certificate uptake are almost entirely due to problems in the supply of certificates. There was no evidence of certificate uptake varying across male- and female-headed households, nor across poorer and wealthier households. There was evidence that extensive efforts were made to ensure the engagement of all landholders, with particular attention to ensuring the involvement of landholders who might otherwise not be reached (e.g., disabled);
- SLLC was highly valued, with few viewing FLLC as sufficient to meet their needs compared to SLLC. There were particular concerns that FLLC did not go far enough to ensure the rights of women, while SLLC was felt to be especially important in preventing boundary disputes in a manner that FLLC was not able to resolve. Only 5.8% of all respondents felt that FLLC was ‘sufficient’.

Of the households in the survey, 54.7% had collected all of their second level land certificates, and 45.3% had not collected all of them. As many households had collected at least some of their certificates, the proportion

of all parcels certified is much higher, at 80.1% of all certificates collected. A total of 954 parcel certificates had been collected, and 228 had not been.

Reasons given for collection (respondents were allowed to choose multiple responses):

- 44.3% - concern over boundary dispute so wanted certificates
- 41.3% - were instructed to do so
- 40.4% - this is what you do once SLLC takes place
- 30.6% - it will increase land security tenure
- 21.7% - it will improve land management
- 11.5% - need for investment without fear of dispossession
- 11.1% - need it for collateral to secure credit.

Almost half of the respondents argued that they felt that SLLC would help to resolve, or prevent, boundary disputes, and one-third argued that having SLLC would increase tenure security. One-fifth mentioned improved land management and one-tenth mentioned land to secure credit. While only 5.5% noted that SLLC would protect them from a rentee taking their land, this may be indicative of the fact that very few households rent out land. Sharecropping dispossession was much less of a concern, at 1.3%, despite sharecropping being a more common practice.

### **Main Perceived Benefits of SLLC:**

Respondents were asked to note the main benefits of SLLC; as with the previous question, this was multiple response. Findings are as follows:

- 52.6% - will reduce boundary disputes
- 47.4% - can use the certificate to secure access to credit
- 40.2% - protection against boundary encroachment
- 30.3% - protection from dispossession, allowing investment in property
- 20.9% - increased land tenure security in general
- 17.1% - protection from land taking by rentees.

These findings underline the belief among many respondents that boundary disputes will be less common under SLLC than before second level certification, along with SLLC offering protection from boundary encroachment and heightened security of tenure allowing greater investment on the land. A surprisingly high number of respondents noted that certified land could be used to secure credit.

The findings also indicate that land holders are most concerned about security and reduction of boundary disputes. Access to credit is also frequently mentioned.

### **Reasons for Non-Collection:**

45.3% of all households had not collected all of their certificates, but a total of 80.1% of all parcel certificates had been collected. This means that non-collection fell across a number of households. For those who had not collected all of their parcel certificates, by far the most common reason was that the certificates were not ready at the time (57 cases), followed by errors on the certificates (14 cases). In 6 cases, the certificates were not issued due to outstanding disputes. Only 1 household argued that they did not collect the certificate because 'we did not need it', while in 7 cases concerns were raised about the costs associated with collecting certificates. A later question on factors behind non-collection underlined this, where households had gone to collect certificates but found they were not ready (35.6% of those households who had not collected all of their certificates), an expectation that they would receive notification of the arrival of the certificate (30.9%), or that the certificate had errors (9.7%). Almost all cases involved *supply side* issues, not demand for certificates.

Key informants at kebele level were presented with six possible reasons for non-collection of certificates:

- Lack of effective outreach to the public
- Lack of listening to questions and concerns of the public
- Lack of respect by some in the process for landholders
- Conflicting and/or confusing messaging
- A bias against reaching and involving women



- Exclusion of disadvantaged groups.

The key informants did not agree with any of these as reasons for non-collection. As one key informant from Amhara Region put it, and two others noted similarly, ‘none of the reasons indicated here, I believe, are reasons affecting the distribution of the SLLC in our *kebele*’. Instead, the key informants raised a number of supply issues, notably lack of effective outreach especially to remote areas, and confusing messaging coming to them from above. Key informants in *kebele* where certificates had not arrived in a timely manner from the *woreda* noted that the real issue was the absence of the certificates in a timely manner, and that none of the points raised above mattered.

When asked directly about non-collection by landholders, the majority of key informants said that this was not an issue in their areas. As one key informant in Tigray put it, ‘I think if people, once properly informed of SLLC, they do eagerly come and collect their certificates. We have seen that they do badly need it’.

None of the KLACs noted problems with secure storage, not necessarily because safe storage was available, but because if it was not the KLACs made other arrangements.

## Analysis of SLLC Monitoring data

### Current Situation (August 2017)

LIFT is expected to meet and possibly exceed the 30<sup>th</sup> September 2017 distribution target (approximately 95,000 remain to be collected during the month of September 2017 in order to reach the target). If certificate collection is expressed as a percentage total printed certificates (that is, with printed certificates as the denominator), the programme has distributed a greater proportion of printed certificates than expected (81%, against a target of 74%). However, this is because there is a significant printing backlog due to serious delays in the procurement of consumables, most notably certificate templates. Some of these procurement bottlenecks were removed in late August, and LIFT has started to work with the regions to remove the printing backlog.

The regionalised figures at the end of August 2017 are as follows:

Region	Percentage of printed certificates collected
Amhara	70.9%
Oromia	86.8%
SNNP	73.3%
Tigray	94.9%

These figures can be misleading, however, as they do not reflect a huge printing backlog (>200,000 certificates) in Tigray resulting from the procurement bottlenecks.

A more detailed regionalised analysis of the *woreda* level data reveals that in Oromia and particularly Amhara, the percentage of distributed certificates in the early LIFT intervention *woredas* is considerably lower than in later *woredas*, where the distribution rate is typically above 95%. These early LIFT *woredas* are summarised below:

Region	Woreda	% of printed certificates collected
Amhara	Enebse Sar Midir	86.8
	Hulet Eju Enese	77.3
	Jabi Tehinan	67.1
	Woneberema	89.3
Oromia	Hitosa	87.0
	Dodota	85.9
	Sire	98.1
	Tole	79.7
SNNP	Meskan	98.6
	Sodo	91.6
	Silti	94.4
	Doyogana	76.5
Tigray	Emba Alaje	99.4

Region	Woreda	% of printed certificates collected
	Raya Alamata	98.4
	Hintalo Wajirat	96.6
	Seharti Samre	93.6

This indicates that LIFT and Government of Ethiopia have improved the delivery of certificates since these early woredas were completed, but (at least in Oromia and Amhara) the post-SLLC follow up activities need to be strengthened to ensure that as many available certificates as possible are distributed.

### Analysis of Historical Situation (August 2016)

Analysis of SLLC certificate distribution data from one year ago (to 19<sup>th</sup> August 2016) shows that the distribution target was a long way from being fulfilled, with fewer than half of printed certificates being collected (524,397 certificates collected: 42.9% of the 1,222,401 printed).

Further analysis of the SLLC monitoring data reveals that in kebeles where certificates were made available for collection at a distribution event, the uptake by land holders was high.

### August 2016 – Certificate Collection:

Region	# of kebeles	Percentage of certificates collected after being made available	Total Collected
<b>Oromia</b>	63	86%	150,004
<b>Amhara</b>	15	80%	40,751
<b>SNNPR</b>	26	86%	53,007
<b>Tigray</b>	35	80%	280,635
<b>Total</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>524,397</b>

The issue facing LIFT in August 2016 was not the willingness of the household to collect, but was the number of distribution events taking place.

The table below sets out the number of kebeles which had the certificates available at the woreda office, but had not distributed them at the kebele level:

Region	Total number of kebeles with certificates printed	# of kebeles which have distributed SLLC	% of printed kebeles which have distributed SLLC
Oromia	84	63	75%
Amhara	94	15	16%
SNNPR	124	26	21%
Tigray	37	35	95%

Overall, only 41% of kebeles which could distribute had done so. This data therefore suggests that certificate collection was originally held up by the lack of distribution events at the kebele, rather than the willingness of the people to collect.

### Reflections from Field Visits and Discussions with SLLC Stakeholders

In September 2016 and March 2017, LIFT's senior management presented the issues around the backlog in certificate distribution to the LIFT Programme Steering Committee. The presentation highlighted the delays in collection, and emphasised some key actions required to ensure that certificate distribution receives a higher degree of attention and priority. Government of Ethiopia at Federal and Regional level confirmed and reiterated their commitment to ensuring the distribution process is successful and that LIFT targets are met.

At this time, Government was advised to focus, with support from LIFT, on the planning, communication and delivery of distribution events. A particular focus was given to the location of the distribution area, and the timing of distribution events with regard to landholder livelihood priorities (such as harvest periods). Government of Ethiopia has prioritised resources – vehicles and staff – for certificate distribution, with LIFT supporting on an ad hoc basis when vehicles are available.

SLLC progress monitoring to date demonstrates that this high-level influence at Programme Steering Committee level has had an influence on delivery at regional and woreda level. LIFT is now on track to meet certificate collection targets.

Since these Steering Committee Meetings, other constraints to effective certificate distribution have started to emerge. LIFT's technical advisors and senior management held a number of meetings and field visits with officials at all Government level (Kebele to Federal level) to discuss the constraints to distribution and collection of certificates.

In all regions, delays in the procurement of consumables for public display materials have delayed the overall SLLC progress. While the impact on certificate distribution has been managed in order to meet the targets (human and vehicle resources compelled to be idle due to the absence of consumables can be redeployed to cover distribution activities), the overall time elapsed between the initial demarcation of a parcel and the certificate being presented to the landholder becomes unnecessarily extended, undermining land holder faith in the process.

In Tigray and Oromia, delays in the procurement of consumables and certificate templates have built a backlog of printed certificates, once again extending the overall certification time, and putting pressure on woreda authorities to deliver large volumes of certificates all at once, rather than as they become available.

In SNNP region, certificates must be issued with an accompanying 'Blue Book'. This Blue Book is provided by the regional government and is often not available in large enough quantities in time for certificate distribution. Regional Bureau leaders report that this issue has to large extent been resolved, but that the process of filling out the Blue Books is time-consuming, and woredas do not have sufficient resources to complete this task. This is reflected by the relatively smaller percentage of certificates collected in SNNP at the present time.

In Amhara region, the distribution of printed certificates is delayed by the perceived requirement to hand write all of the registration details into green books and an associated record in a paper registration book, thus replicating the information that is already contained in the computer system. This process, referred to as 'attachment', takes a considerable amount of time, hence the comparatively low certificate collection rate in Amhara at the present time.

All regions report that while most Woreda Administrations are engaged in SLLC, some woredas demonstrate lower levels of commitment. In these woredas the leadership are focused on other issues on the political agenda which are perceived as being more important or beneficial than SLLC.

## Summary of Findings

The key findings from the above analysis are as follows:

- Certificate collection is currently on track to achieve LIFT programme targets
- Constraints to collection are on the supply side rather than the demand side
- Delayed procurement of consumables for public display is a major bottleneck in the preparation of certificates
- Delayed procurement of certificate templates is a major bottleneck to certificate preparation in Oromia and Tigray
- Completion of Blue Books in SNNP causes delays to certificate distribution
- Superfluous and time-consuming back-office procedures in Amhara cause a delay between certificate printing and distribution
- Land holders are incentivised to collect certificates by the perceived additional protection from boundary disputes and the potential for using the certificate to access credit.

The following section gives recommendations for how these findings can be addressed and translated into action.

## Distribution Strategy – Recommendations

While the present rate of certificate distribution is currently 'on track' and meeting targets, LIFT's earlier experiences with low-uptake and the findings of the Certificate Uptake Survey suggest that the main constraints are around the supply of certificates to woredas and kebeles for distribution. There is high demand for certificates, though demand-side issues will appear more acute as supply issues are resolved. If supply issues are not resolved, demand may also drop off as land holders lose trust or interest in the process.

LIFT and the Government of Ethiopia must work towards the following objectives:

- The current certificate distribution momentum is maintained
- A high-quality product is delivered
- Maximum 'buy-in' from land holders is obtained
- Distribution activities are durable, and may continue to be supported by Government of Ethiopia in the longer term (post-LIFT)
- Activities are correctly monitored.

Implementing **procedural recommendations** will help to ensure a consistent, timely and high-quality supply of certificates for distribution. Procedures must also consider how distribution activities may proceed after LIFT support has ceased in a woreda, and how regional land institutions may continue to deliver SLLC services after the LIFT programme is complete. Related to these are **monitoring recommendations**, which aim to improve both the frequency and accuracy of reporting.

From an **administrative and procurement** perspective, a number of recommendations are presented which examine the non-technical constraints to certificate distribution. These recommendations will help to better guarantee the flow of certificates to the field and ensure quality of materials are consistent.

There are a number of key **Public Awareness and Communications** recommendations which will help to address any residual reluctance by land holders to collect certificates. This stage of the SLLC process is critical from a communications perspective, not only to ensure good uptake of certificates, but also to convey important messages around the Rural Land Administration System, and the rights and obligations of rural land holders.

The following recommendations for action apply to both Federal and Regional Government, to LIFT, and to DFID.

### Procedural Recommendations

**Post-SLLC Activities.** While woredas are now distributing certificates officially once they are printed, it is clear that once LIFT support and resources depart the woreda there is a lack of clarity on how newly approved certificates, and any outstanding certificates, should be processed at kebele and woreda level. This is particularly clear in Oromia and Amhara, where uncollected certificates from early LIFT woredas remain uncollected, or at best unreported.

At the time of writing, LIFT is developing a series of procedures (to be issued initially as an SLLC Implementation Guidance Note, or SIGN) for how land holders may easily collect their certificates after the main kebele-level certificate issuance events are complete.

Issues around the reporting of post-SLLC collection, and the approval and preparation of new certificates after SLLC (e.g. for resolved disputes) would normally come under the roll out of RLAS procedures. However, delays to the procurement of equipment for RLAS have become normalised, and the smooth transition from SLLC to RLAS in woredas has not been possible. Post-SLLC guidance will also examine how this procedural vacuum can be filled.

*These procedures will require Regional-level agreement before they may be rolled out.*

**Amhara – manual recording bottleneck.** A specific procedural recommendation concerns the approach used in Amhara to manually complete all green 'holding books' and paper registers before distributing certificates. Presently the Amhara Regional Bureau claims that this activity may be completed using cost savings from data entry. This has not been demonstrated, however, and despite offers of support from LIFT, Amhara region has not committed to a target date for delivery.

It is recommended that completion of holding books be performed at the point of certificate distribution in order to save time, and to give the process legitimacy in the presence of land holders.

The practice of handwriting the registration details of each holding into a paper register is time-consuming. A register of landholdings may be obtained as a printout in a matter of minutes. An updated version on the register is held electronically (ultimately by WORLAIS/NRLAIS, but presently by the functionally limited ISLA). The LIFT ITSP recommend that the practice of keeping a handwritten paper register be discontinued. Amhara regional bureau has agreed to further dialogue with LIFT on this issue.

**SNNP – completion of Blue Books.** The process of completing 'Blue Books' in SNNPR is time-consuming, and the human resources available to woredas to dedicate to this process are scarce. LIFT will work with

SNNP regional bureau to explore how this process may be incorporated into the public display and/or post-public display corrections process in order to capitalise on LIFT programme staff resources.

These changes to the procedure require regional agreement before they may be rolled out.

### Monitoring Recommendations

Data on current collection rates is provided by the kebele land administration and reported back to the Regional Coordinator. This data is verified through the following means:

- Spot checks by visiting staff from RLAUD, ITSP and DFID E, speaking to both the KLACs and land holders
- Systematic document-check carried out by ITSP M&E team when visiting households, KLACs and woreda offices.

LIFT have been making spot checks and have found the data to be correct and generally well kept. It is not clear or well reported how often the Federal and Regional responsible agencies perform similar checks. The frequency of data verification checks should be agreed at Federal and Regional level. It is strongly recommended that at least one check is performed per woreda by a Federal or Regional Agency during SLLC.

The recently issued SIGN 2.1 contains specific checklist items for the monitoring and reporting of certificate issuance data by LIFT's Regional Coordinators.

### Public Awareness and Communications Recommendations

While demand for certificates is not currently perceived to be a problem, there is a benefit to adapting LIFT's public awareness strategies to echo the issues which landholders clearly associate with the value of SLLC.

Given that the uptake survey shows that land holders initially perceive the added-value of SLLC to be around protection from *boundary disputes and access to credit*, this may be a theme worth examining when preparing public awareness and communications messages around the continued use of RLAS to maintain the land register and update certificates. These same land holder perceptions may motivate them to engage with RLAS.

While there is no significant difference in certificate uptake between male and female headed households, the Certificate Uptake Survey does suggest that women are generally less involved in SLLC activities and discussion around these activities. This would typically be the time when women land holders will pick up information about the value of SLLC.

LIFT's communication strategy needs to be reviewed, with specific attention given to the approaches and messages used for certificate distribution. Evidence from the Certificate Uptake Survey suggests that in addition to a lack of availability at the appropriate office, land holders also missed collection because they were unaware it was occurring, were unaware that they needed to collect the certificate, or were confused by the messages communicated from the woreda.

LIFT should review the communications strategy to ensure that the messages are clear and address the concerns of land holders, and new communication materials should be prepared accordingly. Once this communications strategy is revised, agreement needs to be made on who carries out the communication strategy (ITSP or Regional Governments).

The benefits of SLLC must also be reinforced at the level of the Woreda Administration, with a view to obtaining greater political buy-in at this level. LIFT will raise this at the Programme Steering Committee meeting, and will review the communications strategy accordingly.

### Procurement Recommendations:

**Procurement of equipment and consumables by LIFT.** This issue has been problematic for LIFT since the beginning of the project. LIFT have supplied DFID and the procurement agent with a clear 18-month timetable for procurement, but the procurement agent has consistently failed to meet this timetable.

The performance of the procurement agent is a matter for discussion between DFID and the procurement agent, and it is not appropriate for the LIFT ITSP to comment formally on this relationship. It is strongly recommended that DFID-E takes steps to address the procurement issue, as it is not just the distribution of certificates which demonstrably suffers through these delays.

Until such a time as the delivery performance of the procurement agent improves, it is recommended that DFID continue to allow the ITSP to make emergency local and international procurements when there is an urgent requirement and the procurement agent has not met their commitment.

**Procurement of blue books in SNNP.** The absence of a stock of blue-coloured registration books at woreda level has caused demonstrable delays to certificate distribution in SNNP Region (the only region where this practice is observed).

The Regional Bureau reports that this issue has recently been resolved. However, it is recommended that the Regional Bureau continues to purchase these books in bulk in order to have sufficient quantities in stock and take advantages of economies of scale. The books may then be allocated to woredas. Woredas would put in requests for blue books at the start of public display when the approximate requirements can easily be verified. This will give a reasonable lead time for delivery in time for approval.

### **Next Steps:**

Guidance on the continuation of monitoring of SLLC activities at woredas after LIFT support has moved on is currently in preparation and will be available for review and consideration by the regional authorities in early November 2017.

LIFT will review the current public awareness approach to certificate distribution and share public awareness specific recommendations with all levels of government. Improved public awareness messages may be rolled out as materials are developed and made available.

All other recommendations, along with this document, should be presented at the next steering group meeting for consideration by the regional and federal level responsible authorities.

Monitoring and reporting of SLLC collection will continue on a weekly basis.