Individual property rights to provide economic incentives
- Investment & sustainable resource management
- Land transfers to promote structural change
- Functioning of financial & credit markets
- Female empowerment

Basis for management of a key public assets
- Award of concessions & enforcement of contracts to maximize social benefit
- Climate change mitigation, disaster preparedness and management
- Land use planning for urban expansion; land acquisition for infrastructure
- Preservation of critical habitats & biodiversity
- Financing of local governments & effective service provision

Comparative advantage of (Bank-supported) research
- Strong links to operations & global community of practice
- Can quickly mainstream approaches to secure rights by the poor
- Address ‘hot’ issues (‘land grab’) in an objective way
- Put focus on the ‘bigger picture’ & build capacity for policy dialogue at country level
Plan of the talk

- Describe operationally relevant insights/results
  - Low-cost image-based first time rights adjudication
  - Computerizing & integrating registries (incl. conflict)
  - Strengthening female land rights

- Highlight emerging challenges we are working on
  - Fostering responsible agric. investment (private sector, Gov’t, IFC)
  - Controlling urban expansion
  - Responding to demands for urban formalization

- Focus on land governance at country level (LGAF)

- Next steps
The challenge (especially for Africa)
- Wave of legislation to recognize local rights in the 1990s
- But rights by the poor remain unenforceable & vulnerable w/o demarcation & recording
- Key concerns about land titling projects
  - Distributional impact: Unequal access to info may have made matters worse
  - Affordability: ‘Traditional’ approaches too expensive ($50-1,000/parcel)

Two precedents
- Mexico: Registered > 100 Mn ha in 1995-2002
  - Communal, housing, and individual land: Separation of powers; conflict resolution
  - Impacts on migration & productivity
- Ethiopia: Registered 20 mn parcels in local process (tape; < $1/parcel), no maps
  - No land grabbing or adverse gender effect
  - Gaps with updating, communal land

Rwanda’s reform agenda (typical time scale)
- Land issues urgent – land conflict contributed to 1994 genocide
- Legal reforms: 1999 inheritance law (females), 2004/5 land policy & law: Institutions
- 2007-9: Pilots in 4 cells (some 15,000 parcels)
- 2010/11: National scale-up (11.6 mn. Parcels)
Explaining process and map
Participatory field adjudication with neighbors
Locating parcels on the index map
Processing claims receipts
Public display for corrections
Results from (pilot) evaluation

- **Increase in soil conservation investment**
  - About 10% invested overall – 20% for treated ones despite short time span
  - Registered female headed hhs: Additional 9%
  - Suggests they suffered from higher insecurity (no displacement data)

- **Co-ownership by *legally married* females increased**
  - Approx. 20% but negative if not legally married (costs) - triggers clarification
  - Inheritance still a barrier (females unwilling to transfer to daughters)
  - Follow-up survey: Enhanced female ownership & positive

- **Challenges for sustainability (-> ESW)**
  - Maintenance: High registration fees even for urban areas
  - Sub-division restrictions below actual plot size
  - Integration with mortgage registry: High urban demand
Broader implications

- **Approach has spread widely across Africa**
  - Pilots/adaptations in Nga, Bdi, Mdg, Uga, Tzn
  - Promoted by Africa region & other partners as basis for ambitious targets

- **Political economy issues to be confronted**
  - Threatens surveyors’ rents (lucrative monopoly) & local politicians’ discretion
  - These use low precision to challenge the process

- **Bank well positioned to address this**
  - Eliminate entry barriers & administrative obstacles e.g. via DPLs
  - Outcome focus (# of people with secure rights),
  - Comprehensiveness & maintenance of information
Legal reforms for female empowerment?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Father's Name</th>
<th>Mother's Name</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>የብigte እለስ እ መስጠ እ ጋርጒ</td>
<td>መስጠ እ ጋርጒ</td>
<td>እለስ እ ጋርጒ</td>
<td>1932-01-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>የብigte እ ጋርጒ እ መስጠ</td>
<td>መስጠ እ ጋርጒ</td>
<td>እ ጋርጒ</td>
<td>1935-04-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>የብigte እ ጋርጒ እ መስጠ</td>
<td>መስጠ እ ጋርጒ</td>
<td>እ ጋርጒ</td>
<td>1938-05-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Handwritten notes on the document.
Can inheritance reform have broader impacts?
- Inheritance a key way of land access; often strongly biased against women
- 4 states amended HSA1986-1994 (AP, TN, KA, MA); daughters equal to sons
- Representative 2007 survey (8,000 hhs) allows robust identification strategy

Key results (similar to divorce legislation in US)
- Reform significantly increases likelihood of inheriting land (bargaining power)
- No equalization, although some increase in impacts over time
- Mothers benefiting from HSAA spent more on education for kids who spent more time studying, had higher reading scores and completion rates

Relevance
- Female assets ownership can have powerful second-generation effects
- Reform adopted nation-wide in 2005 – can dissemination speed it up?
Likelihood of a woman inheriting land
Why are credit effects of land titling so rarely observed?
- Presumes a liquid land markets and a comprehensive high quality registry
- With titling then reducing transaction cost of accessing information
- But this is rarely the case

Registry computerization is an opportunity to study this
- Replaces manual with automatic process of deeds registration through PPP
- Anecdotal evidence points towards positive effects
  - Elimination of backlog (up to 14 years, selective bribes)
  - Reduction in discretion & low-level bribery (auto-valuation)
  - Increased tax revenue despite lowering of stamp duty (14% to 9.5%)

Phase-in in Andhra Pradesh (AP)
- 1999-2005 in 387 AP sub-registry offices (SROs)
- Quarterly data on all bank credit disbursed at SRO level 1995 - 2007
- Annual registry data (sales, mortgages, other transfers) by SRO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour cost</td>
<td>7,380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1,230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losses</td>
<td>1,230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP expenses</td>
<td>570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,210.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labour costs of Rs. 7,380.00 were allocated for the development of the road, with Rs. 1,230.00 allocated for losses and another Rs. 1,230.00 for UP expenses. The total cost amounts to Rs. 10,210.00.
Results & implications

- **Increase in credit (10%) & no. of mortgages (30%)**
  - Back-end integration can in principle overcome institutional issues
  - Only in urban areas
  - Not surprising given rural regulations (mandated lending, debt forgiveness)

- **Size of credit-effects remains small – why?**
  - Many transactions not registered due to high stamp duty
  - Only deeds (transaction record) computerized; other claims may exist (double- and triple mortgaging widespread)
  - Legal examination of documents still required
  - Computerization only a first step: Needs to provide quality information – this is a HUGE task (0.5-1Bn rural parcels)

- **How can India confront this challenge?**
  - If records exist: Transaction-based updating: Ensure transacting person has sufficient rights, require (subdivision) survey before registration can take place
  - Urban areas (no records): Systematic collection & reconciliation of existing evidence, clear regulation & expedited government action critical (politics!!)
What drives large land demand?
- Enormous increase following 2007/8 food price spike (CSOs: >250 mn ha)
- Difficult to get ‘official’ data on anything due to weak processes
- Model of demand: Distance, colonial, agric. potential, food imports as expected
- Surprisingly, weak land governance significantly associated with higher land demand

This may justify concerns on potential negative impacts
- Neglect of local rights (historical precedents communal tenure in CA)
- Policy-induced environmental destruction fuelling corruption
- Use market power & political lobbying to make up for lack of competitiveness
- Inability to identify and/or dissolve failed ventures

Vindicated by country demand for support on
- Identifying ‘optimum’ farm sizes & land valuation
- Documenting new business models & their benefits
- Helping establish & enforce regulatory frameworks to attract responsible investors
Exploring the efficiency of large farms

- **Rationale and importance**
  - Bank policy based on owner-operated smallholders (negative FS-Py relation)
  - New technology may change this (e.g. GPS-guided machines, GM crops)
  - Ukraine with huge agri-holdings (up to 180,000 ha)
  - Since 2000: Vast increase in yields & land concentration: Causal or coincidence?

- **Approach and key results**
  - Panel data for most large farms in the country 2001-2011 (90,000 obs)
  - No economies of scale – but strong operator fixed effects
  - Part of large farms’ productivity due to soil & infrastructure quality
  - Key driver of productivity growth: Exit of inefficient & entry of efficient producers
  - High initial land concentration slowed entry/exit dynamics

- **Implications**
  - Investors’ capital less critical than management ability; policy key to attracting them
  - Property rights security different from market liberalization
  - Mega-farms pose regulatory challenges (monopsony)
Cumulative Probability

- Farm fixed effect
- Exiters Stayers
- Temporary entrants Permanent entrants

![Graph showing cumulative probability with different curves for Exiters, Stayers, Temporary entrants, and Permanent entrants.](image-url)
Yield potential based on climate etc.

Maximal Output Value
- $201 - $300
- $301 - $468
- $469 - $680
- $681 - $907
- $908 - $1,128
- $1,129 - $1,349
- $1,350 - $1,597
- $1,598 - $1,881
- $1,882 - $2,729
Bank projects provide opportunity to …
Identify areas where responsible investors can add value
  - Cluster investment close to infrastructure development
  - Locally driven rights documentation & use planning
  - Delimit state land, map its occupation, establish negotiation protocols

Increase transparency of process
  - Clear guidelines for technically competent screening of proposals
  - Investor commitment (down-payment of)
  - Incentive compatible, publicly available contractual models (output sharing)

Monitor performance
  - Make inventories consistent and allow enforcement
  - Track investors’ adherence to contracts (satellite imagery)
  - Explore which investments generate spillovers (technology, markets, finance)
**Private sector demand: New business model**

- **Context for impact evaluation in Ghana (GCAP)**
  - Operator/funds: Document benefits to attract capital for expansion
  - Value proposition: Expand beyond production into value chain
  - Nucleus: Establish presence, get volume & equity, adapt technology
  - Smallholders as key suppliers (inspired by LAC farm management companies)

- **Impact evaluation - experience thus far**
  - Strong community engagement to get nucleus lease (2,500 ha thus far)
  - Payment: 2.5% of gross prod.; 5% after year 5 (close to US$ 1,000./ha)
  - On-farm training for community members to dispel anxiety, disseminate technology
  - Lead farmer model: 1 officer/40 farmers - production contracts; inputs & technology
  - Aggregator model: Training traders; may provide inputs & production advice
  - Randomly assign (interested) farmers into treatment/control
  - Innovative features (online data collection), mobile payments
  - Smallholders as key suppliers (inspired by LAC farm management companies)

- **Institutional investors need standards to evaluate risks**
  - Need to be sure investment does not lead to trouble down the road
  - IFC/Bank backing for standard (adapt equator principles) key
  - Without these, large investment may be too risky & thus not materialize
II: Market-driven urban expansion

- **Urban expansion a key source of conflict**
  - Expropriation of peri-urban land often source of local revenue (or rents)
  - Encourages horizontal (sprawl) rather than vertical expansion
  - Makes government contribute to tenure insecurity
    - No investment in anticipation of urban expansion on very productive land
    - Patchy or strip development, high cost service provision

- **China as the most publicized (but far from only) case**
  - Expropriation of agric. land mainstay of local government finances
  - Often viewed as having contributed to over-acquisition of land
  - A key source of weak governance & complaints about rural-urban inequality

- **The Chengdu national experiment**
  - Reliance on market rather than expropriation
  - Register all land (agric., coll & hh. constr., forest, waste: 6.2 Mn parcels/1.8 Mn hhs)
  - Eliminate hukou restrictions forcing rural residents to give up land quotas
  - Introduce tradable development rights to prevent loss of agric. land
  - Ongoing evaluation using NBS panel & villages next to the prefecture boundary
Initial results and implications

- **Anecdotes & admin. data: Initial evidence on impacts**
  - 48% of agric. Land (3 Mn mu) leased long-term to investors (12% national)
  - Basis for vast investment in orchards, greenhouses, high-value agriculture
  - Benefits through wage employment and rental payments; migration
  - Exchange of development rights: Construction boom & higher land prices

- **Potentially far-reaching implications**
  - Less disruptive way of urban expansion – (rural) household welfare /amenities
  - Encouraging growth of smaller cities
  - Incipient mortgage market for construction land

- **These could be relevant for China & beyond**
  - Need to explore options for local government financing
III: Addressing urban informality

- **Challenges in Dar es Salaam**
  - 4.5% urban pop. growth - almost 70% informal (health, disaster risk, etc.)
  - Bank long supported planning & infrastructure upgrading (CIUP) but not land
  - Ministry agrees that ‘title’ (CRO) is unaffordable ($400)
  - Introduced non-transferable ‘residential license’ (RL) instead as an ‘intermediate’ step

- **Key questions**
  - Is there demand for title (and at which price) or are RLs sufficient?
  - Can males be prodded to put females on titles (social pressure/financial)?

- **Experiment in 2 sub-wards with 1,000 parcels each**
  - Did cadastral survey & got CRO for 50 randomly selected blocks (40 parcels each)
  - Reduces cost of CRO to some TSh 100K (US $ 75) by bulk contracting
  - NGO-led awareness campaign (WAT) & repayment program
  - Lottery with vouchers to vary the ‘price’ of CROs across households (20-80K)
  - Some vouchers conditional on putting woman on the CRO
  - Baseline survey before intervention (incl. who should be on document)
Results and implications

- **Good and bad news on accessing CROs**
  - CIUP layouts can be approved as town plan with minimal extra effort
  - But getting a CRO is unbelievably complicated & unpredictable: Parks latest obstacle
  - Procedural clarity, simplification, and greater competition desirable

- **Strong demand at prices consistent with cost-recovery**
  - RL added little extra value over informal documents (not transferable)
  - Take-up high of CROs high even among poor but demand quite price elastic
  - If process simplified & predictable, subcontracting to private sector possible

- **Impact of gender intervention surprisingly robust**
  - 24% said, they will put female on CRO in baseline— 89% actually did (vs. 5% on RLs)
  - Awareness campaign more influential than size of payment voucher

- **Implications**
  - Upgrading project could provide the basis for regularization
  - Bureaucratic barriers & monopolies a key impediments to reduce informality in Dar
  - Potential relevance beyond Dar; scope to combine with housing finance etc.
Towards land governance at country level

- **Countries need to have a good understanding of**
  - Where they are globally: Technical assessment political, based on existing info
  - Where they want to go: Priority areas & sequencing
  - How to get there: Sequenced priorities (incl. monitoring indicators)

- **Systematic assessment framework (LGAF) helps to get there**
  - 4-6 month country (state-) based process with technical guidance from Bank
  - Areas (6), indicators (25), dimensions (105) based on global best practice
  - Country coordinator, expert investigators, stakeholder panels to rank
  - Public validation, discussion of policy priorities, formulation of potential actions
  - Modeled on PEFA with adaptations for land

- **Positive experience thus far (crucial role of operations)**
  - Can articulate issues that would be too sensitive for outsiders to say
  - Helps establish communication across ‘silos’
  - Continuity across political regimes (Georgia)
  - Can facilitate action on policy (DPL), operations, and coherent monitoring by partners
## LGAF implementation status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilots</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>-starting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz Rep.</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
<td>India, Sudan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principles are simple...

- **Legal & institutional framework**
  Laws & institutions recognize existing rights and allows users to exercise them at low cost, in line with their aspiration, and in ways that benefit society as a whole. Policies are clear, equitable, gender sensitive, and their implementation is monitored.

- **Land use planning & taxation**
  Land use planning and taxation avoid negative externalities, allow provision of services at low cost, and support effective decentralization.

- **Management of state land**
  State land is unambiguously identified and managed efficiently to provide public goods; expropriation is used as a last resort for public purposes only with quick payment of fair compensation and effective appeals mechanisms; divestiture of state lands is done in a transparent way that maximizes public benefit.

- **Public provision of land information (registry & cadastre)**
  Spatial & textual information on land ownership is accessible, comprehensive, current, reliable.

- **Dispute resolution & conflict management**
  Interested parties have access to institutions that have well-defined mandates to authoritatively resolve dispute and effectively manage conflict.

- **Large scale land acquisition**
  Lands to be transferred to investors are identified in the context of a broader strategy, accessed on terms agreed with local stakeholders, public, create benefits for the local economy, with potential for redress where needed.
# 1. Recognition and Respect for Existing Rights: Legal and Institutional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition of a continuum of rights</th>
<th>DRC</th>
<th>GMB</th>
<th>GHA</th>
<th>MDG</th>
<th>MWI</th>
<th>MRT</th>
<th>NGA</th>
<th>ZAF</th>
<th>SSD*</th>
<th>SEN</th>
<th>BRA</th>
<th>GEO</th>
<th>PHL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land tenure rights recognition (rural)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land tenure rights recognition (urban)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural group rights recognition</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban group rights recognition in informal areas</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for tenure individualization</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enforcement of Rights

| Mapping/registration of communal land | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | B | D | B |
| Registration of individual rural land | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | A | D | A | A | D |
| Registration of individual urban land | D | A | D | D | C | A | D | A | C | D | D | A | C |
| Formal recognition of women’s right | D | D | C | C | C | A | D | A | D | D | A | C | C |
| Condominium regime | A | C | C | C | A | D | B | A | D | A | A | C | C |
| Compensation due to land use changes | D | C | C | C | C | B | B | B | D | B | D | B | B |

### Mechanisms for recognition of rights

| Non-documentary evidence to recognize rights | B | A | C | C | B | B | C | C | D | C | C | B | B |
| Recognition of long-term possession | B | D | C | A | B | A | D | C | A | D | A | A | A |
| Formal fees for 1st time registration low | D | D | C | B | B | A | C | D | C | D | C | A | A |
| No high informal fees for 1st time registration | D | D | D | D | A | C | B | D | A | A | A | A | B |
| Formalizing housing is feasible & affordable | C | C | C | D | D | A | C | C | C | B | C | A | C |
| Clear process for formal recognition of possession | D | B | C | B | B | D | C | B | C | B | A | B | A |

### Restrictions on Rights

| Restrictions on urban land use, ownership and transferability | B | A | D | B | B | C | B | B | C | B | A | C | B |
| Restrictions on rural land use, ownership and transferability | B | A | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | D | B | A | B |

### Clarity of Institutional Mandates

| Clear separation of institutional roles | B | C | B | C | C | C | B | B | D | C | A | C | C |
| Institutional overlap | C | C | C | B | C | D | C | D | D | C | A | C | C |
| Administrative overlap | C | C | B | B | B | A | B | B | D | C | B | B | B |
| Information sharing among institutions | B | D | B | D | B | D | C | D | D | D | B | B | B |

### Equity and Nondiscrimination in the Decision-Making Process

| Clear land policy developed in a participatory manner | D | B | C | B | D | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | A |
| Meaningful incorporation of equity goals | D | C | B | C | A | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C |
| Cost of implementing policy is estimated, matched, resourced | D | C | B | C | D | D | D | D | C | B | B | C | B |
| Regular public reports on progress in policy implementation | D | C | B | D | D | D | D | D | B | C | B | A | B |

... but implementation often fraught...
Challenges & good examples

- **Rights recognized on paper but not in practice**
  - Women’s rights not registered, difficult to transfers
  - Little demarcation of communal lands – no decision-making structures
  - Secondary rights (overlapping resource rights) often not recognized; disputes
  - Can be integrated in local land use planning process (Philippines)

- **Public land management often non-transparent**
  - Public/state land not clearly demarcated, often encroached, rationale not clear
  - Expropriation easy, compensation late or non-existent
  - Non-transparent processes of divestiture fail to benefit the public
  - Unclear responsibilities & overlaps (planning/rights) create uncertainty
  - Clear procedures (e.g. in Georgia)

- **Land use planning/zoning ad hoc & non-participatory**
  - Restrictions/zoning imposed without consultation – benefits often lost
  - Weak definition of rights, mis-information land-related corruption
  - Interesting approaches in South Africa, Brazil
## 2. Land Use Planning, Management, and Taxation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transparency of Land Use Restrictions</th>
<th>DRC</th>
<th>GMB</th>
<th>GHA</th>
<th>MDG</th>
<th>MWI</th>
<th>MRT</th>
<th>NGA</th>
<th>ZAF</th>
<th>SSD*</th>
<th>SEN</th>
<th>BRA</th>
<th>GEO</th>
<th>PHL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban planning based on public input</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural planning based on public input</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public capture of changes in land use</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of land use change</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency of Land Use Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned development process: Largest city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned development process: Next 4 major cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning copes with urban growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot size adherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for other uses in line with reality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed and Predictability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements for building permits are affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to get building permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transparency of Valuations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear process of property valuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public availability of valuation rolls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Collection Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property tax exemptions justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness of tax roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed property taxes are collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes higher than cost of collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Management of Public Land

#### Identification and Clear Management of Public Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DRC</th>
<th>GMB</th>
<th>GHA</th>
<th>MDG</th>
<th>MWI</th>
<th>MRT</th>
<th>NGA</th>
<th>ZAF</th>
<th>SSD*</th>
<th>SEN</th>
<th>BRA</th>
<th>GEO</th>
<th>PHL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public ownership is justified</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete recording of public land</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management responsibility for public land is clear</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions are properly resourced</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public land inventory with public access</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key information on land concessions is public</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Incidence of Expropriation

| Expropriated land is used for private purposes | A   | A   | A   | B   | A   | A   | A   | C   | A    | D   | A   | A   | A   |
| Speed of use of expropriated land | A   | A   | D   | A   | A   | A   | A   | C   | A    | D   | A   | A   | A   |

#### Transparency of Expropriation Procedures

| Fair compensation for expropriation of ownership | C   | A   | C   | C   | B   | A   | C   | A   | C    | B   | A   | A   | B   |
| Fair compensation for expropriation of other rights | C   | C   | C   | C   | C   | A   | C   | C   | C    | D   | C   | D   | A   |
| Promptness of compensation | D   | D   | D   | D   | C   | D   | D   | B   | D    | A   | A   | A   | A   |
| Independent & accessible appeal | D   | C   | C   | B   | A   | A   | D   | B   | C    | C   | A   | A   | B   |
| Time taken for a first-instance decision on an appeal | D   | D   | D   | D   | C   | A   | C   | C   | D    | C   | D   | B   | A   |

#### Transparent Processes for Divestiture

| Openness of public land transactions | D   | D   | D   | D   | D   | D   | D   | D   | D    | D   | A   | A   | D   |
| Collection of payments for public leases | D   | A   | D   | C   | D   | A   | C   | C   | C    | D   | A   | A   | D   |
| Modalities of lease/sale of public land | D   | B   | D   | D   | B   | D   | B   | C   | D    | D   | C   | C   | C   |

*Scores yet to be validated
Challenges & good examples

- **Uncoordinated land institutions**
  - Unresponsive to demands, serving only the rich
  - Silos that fail to link to existing information (tax maps)
  - Monopolies by surveyors/notaries to protect rents rather than deliver value
  - Focus on (individual) first-time registration rather than maintenance
  - Georgia shows that institutions can be turned around

- **Much potential for land tax revenue generation unused**
  - Weak systems; no capacity/incentive for updating to reflect actual potential
  - Few incentives for revenue collection for local governments

- **Large scale land acquisition brings problems to a point**
  - No integration into broader land use plan/development strategy
  - Little systematic info on existing land rights – have to negotiate ad hoc locally
  - Lack of capacity for technical vetting, community support, incentive structures
  - No publicity of contracts to clarify obligations & create security/commitment
  - Mechanisms for arbitration/redress or bankruptcy undefined
## 4. Public Provision of Land Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completeness of Registry Information</th>
<th>DRC</th>
<th>GMB</th>
<th>GHA</th>
<th>MDG</th>
<th>MWI</th>
<th>MRT</th>
<th>NGA</th>
<th>ZAF</th>
<th>SSD*</th>
<th>SEN</th>
<th>BRA</th>
<th>GEO</th>
<th>PHL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapping of registry records</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant private encumbrances</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant public restrictions</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searchability of the registry</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of registry records</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely response to requests</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reliability of Registry Records      | D   | D   | B   | D   | B   | D   | D   | C   | D    | D   | B   | A   | B   | B   |
| Cadastral/registry info up-to-date   | C   | D   | B   | C   | C   | C   | D   | A   | D    | B   | D   | D   | C   | D   |

| Cost Effectiveness, Accessibility, and Sustainability | B   | D   | C   | D   | D   | B   | D   | C   | D    | D   | A   | A   | A   | D   |
| Cost for registering a property transfer | A   | A   | D   | B   | D   | D   | D   | A   | C    | A   | A   | A   | A   | A   |
| Financial sustainability of registry  | C   | D   | C   | C   | D   | D   | D   | A   | C    | B   | D   | A   | A   | A   |
| Capital investment in the system to record rights | A   | B   | C   | B   | A   | C   | A   | D   | A    | A   | A   | A   | A   | A   |

| Transparency                          | A   | B   | C   | B   | B   | A   | C   | A   | D    | A   | A   | A   | A   | A   |
| Schedule of fees for services is public | D   | D   | D   | C   | D   | B   | B   | A   | D    | D   | A   | A   | A   | B   |
| Informal payments discouraged          | 

*Scores yet to be validated*
## 5. Dispute Resolution and Conflict Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment of Responsibility</th>
<th>DRC</th>
<th>GMB</th>
<th>GHA</th>
<th>MDG</th>
<th>MWI</th>
<th>MRT</th>
<th>NGA</th>
<th>ZAF</th>
<th>SSD*</th>
<th>SEN</th>
<th>BRA</th>
<th>GEO</th>
<th>PHL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to conflict resolution</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal dispute resolution is available/recognized</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope for forum shopping minimized</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility of appeals at reasonable cost</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Level of Pending Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land disputes in the formal court system are low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of formal resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of long-standing conflicts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores yet to be validated*
# Large Scale Land Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DRC</th>
<th>GHA</th>
<th>MDG</th>
<th>NGA</th>
<th>ZAF</th>
<th>SSD*</th>
<th>SEN</th>
<th>BRA</th>
<th>GEO</th>
<th>PHL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSLA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most forest land is mapped; rights are registered</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few conflicts generated and how they are addressed</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use restrictions on rural land parcels generally identifiable</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear, consistent public institutions in land acquisition</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for investors are clear and consistent</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit sharing mechanisms for investments in agriculture</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct/transparent negotiations between right holders and investors</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient information required from investors</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors provide required information</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual provisions on benefits/risks sharing</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of procedure to obtain approval</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social requirements clearly defined</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental requirements clearly defined</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for beneficial investments</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with safeguards is checked</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures to lodge complaints</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores yet to be validated
Land essential for development & good governance
- Investment, structural transformation, financial markets, equity, conflicts, gender
- Effectively managing public assets, providing services & global public goods (biodiversity, NRM, disaster management, REDD+)
- Private investment (infra, mining, carbon, agric., climate change)

This provides immense opportunities for Bank leadership
- Recognized at country & global level (G8, UN-VG, CSOs):
- Continuity, technical expertise
- Enlist private sector where appropriate; standards for risk management (IFC, MIGA)
- Ability to engage across sectors/silos & build local capacity; land conference
- Use land tenure as a leverage (e.g. housing investment)
- Integrate data sources (admin., hh.) for broad-based monitoring – post 2015

Strong & impartial research essential to sustain such leadership
- Why? It’s a zero-sum game and there is a principal agent problems for implementers
- Evaluate impact of public investments to secure rights & business models to sustain them
- Adapt new approaches to local realities to allow scale-up
- Assess contractual arrangements & regulatory models for effective private inv.
- Assess impact of policy reforms - ways to capitalize on these & transfer experience globally & across sectors