

UK Land Policy Forum VIII

Benefits, achievements and consequences of DFID's Land Tenure Regularisation (LTR) Programme

March 2019

This report was produced by the Knowledge Management team under the DFID-funded Land: Enhancing Governance for Economic Development programme (LEGEND)



1 Introduction

The eight meeting of the UK Land policy forum was held on 12th March 2019 at ODI. The Forum is an initiative under DFID's LEGEND programme, convened by ODI as part of DFID's core land support team (CLST) secretariat.

The purpose of the forum is to provide a focus for debate, information and lesson sharing amongst UK stakeholders to inform DFID and wider UK policy and programming for strengthening of land governance and land rights protection. Participants included CSOs, practitioners, academic researchers, professional and private sector organisations concerned with land, including the Knowledge Management alliance and other consortium members that make up CLST,¹ and DFID representatives.

2 Summary of the discussion

Background

Since its involvement in Land Tenure Regularisation (LTR) from 2002-04 in Guyana, DFID has expanded its portfolio of programmes to support LTR in other countries, including Rwanda, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Tanzania and Mozambique, to values ranging between £5 million and £50 million.

As donors continue to sustain their interest in aiding low-income countries to improve tenure security and land administration, in-country advisors need to incorporate the many lessons from past projects into future programming and implementation. This information is relevant for future DFID programming as well as for other donors and organisations interested in supporting and rolling out land-related interventions.

For this purpose, ODI, NRI and DAI have partnered to produce a report reflecting on the experience of DFID LTR programmes across the six countries, drawing wherever possible on relevant experiences of other funders' programmes. The report, due to launch in March 2019, describes and assesses this experience to understand the drivers of LTR and land administration developments in different contexts, what comprises successful LTR outcomes, and the lessons learned on the design, implementation and follow-up of country land programmes and/or broader land support facilities.

Key messages from presentations

The forum was centred around the presentation of the main report on DFID's experience of Land Tenure Regularisation. This was followed by a panel of country-experts in Rwanda, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Mozambique and Nigeria, which were the main beneficiaries of DFID's LTR efforts.

- **There continue to be strong incentives to do LTR.** Securing tenure helps drive economic development and secure peace and prosperity. The importance of LTR is greater now than it was 10 years ago, when most programmes started. Populations are increasing and so is demand for land, especially in Africa where ownership is complex and only 10% of land is registered.

¹ The CLST comprises KPMG as programme manager, the Land KM Alliance members including ODI, NRI and IIED.

- **Political support is needed.** Political support is essential and were vital for Rwanda and Ethiopia, where there was a strong commitment. But it is not clear how to replicate this in other countries.
- **Financing LTR.** DFID money is not enough, so it is important to consider how to leverage international donor funding and make LTR sustainable.
- **Lessons from the LTR report.** LTS is necessary but not sufficient; need to take a long-term view and commitment; need to be politically smart and socially inclusive; LTR does not have to be large-scale or individual; need to use right modality of implementation; need to make the most of technology.
- **Lessons from Rwanda.** Original objective was to bring together a deeply fragmented country in the post-genocide period. This ensured a sufficient planning and political commitment. However, there is a shortage of data on outcomes and impacts so far. There have been mixed economic and social impacts, ranging from an increase in distress sales to very positive impacts on women's land rights at a relatively low cost per parcel (\$5-7). Key to success was a detailed strategic approach that took 3 and a half years to think through, and approached LTR by strengthening land markets. However, there are now serious concerned with the sustainability of the programme.
- **Lessons from Ethiopia.** The programme is a very fast, low-cost and high-volume exercise with 11.5 million plots already demarcated. From an economic point of view, LIFT will help farmers access credit. In terms of its social impact, 89% of certificates issued have a woman's name on them (either joint or individual). The implementation involves just three full-time international members of staff working, ensuring a strong relationship with the government. The main challenge is to ensure subsequent transactions of certificates, donor coordination, monitoring and evaluation of interconnected impacts on a regular basis, and the design of underlying systems to support the programme (e.g. IT).
- **Lessons from Tanzania.** The most successful impact has been in terms of village-level governance, for instance by settling disputes between villagers. There have also been positive impacts on women's land rights. However, there is less clarity over the programme's economic impact, mainly because credit markets in Tanzania have historically been weak. The programme also innovated during implementation by integrating LTA into LTSP (Mast) and strengthening transparency. Looking back, the key elements that ensured the programme's success were having a sufficient formal design period at the beginning of the programme and a simple and well-managed structured IT system.
- **Lessons from Mozambique.** The programme ensured security of land rights for large numbers of people through collective titling in 1,400 communities, benefiting approximately 2 million people. Long-term economic impacts were observed using a diverse set of measures, including economic empowerment, conflict resolution or tax revenues from natural resources use and tourism. There was a strong national consensus in government and civil society around the 1997 land reform, as well as donor commitment. However, the consensus and commitment eroded over time owing to large-scale land-based investments favouring government concessions against

community land. Government objectives also became ambiguous, with sudden efforts to individualise land rights in 2015. Other issues included the debt crisis, insufficient focus on land administration threatening sustainability and lack of donor coordination and networking.

- **Lessons from Nigeria.** Positive social and economic impacts were observed in Kano, where 160,000 properties were registered and thus improved security of tenure. However, fewer than 1,000 certificates ended up being issued due to lack of demand. However, contradictory developments emerged in the policy process with a sudden focus on collecting tax revenue, each state employing a different idea of LTR and a mixed approach to registering individual- over community-based land to facilitate large-scale rural investment.

Key points of discussion from Q&A

- **Why do we concentrate on economic impacts?** Social impact of programmes is often underestimated and undervalued. These need to be registered and highlighted and in many ways, put ahead of economic impacts. Special emphasis and credit needs to go towards strengthening women's land rights.
- **How are women's land rights strengthened?** There are complexities around measuring increased women's participation in village hall meetings or greater involvement in decision-making, but also in dealing with women who hold multiple titles. Often, patrilineal groups are not interested, as experienced in Malawi.
- **How do we encourage young people to claim land?** Older generations often have a spiritual connection whereas younger people are less interested.
- **How do we control political will?** In Rwanda, political will was too strong in the beginning and pushed the programme too fast. This contrasts with Mozambique, where donor interest was very strong but there was almost no political will. Politicians need to be briefed on the full range of risks and caveats. Many governments are also marred by lack of coordination between ministers. Is it therefore about political consensus as much as it is about political will?
- **LTR should be considered as part of wider package.** Programmes should not just aim at delivering land rights, but be part of a wider effort to facilitate community capacity and engagement, legal enforcement, social legitimacy and inclusivity. A silo approach is not sufficient and a more holistic picture is needed.