REFLECTIONS ON LAND TENURE SECURITY INDICATORS

KNUT LAKSA AND NOHA EL-MIKAWY

Abstract:

This is a reflection note on the existing state of the art on land tenure security indicators. Without being exhaustive nor comprehensive, this reflection note maps some key existing initiatives at measuring tenure security, highlighting key challenges. It goes on to underline the major weakness of the existing state of the art, namely the dearth of poverty relevant and gender sensitive indicators as well as the scarcity of measurement processes which could enhance national ownership beyond cross country comparison and foster societal empowerment and domestic accountability over project monitoring and evaluation.

Discussion Paper 11
UNDP Oslo Governance Centre

**United Nations
Development Programme**
Oslo Governance Centre
Democratic Governance Group
Bureau for Development Policy

Borggata 2B, Postboks 2881 Tøyen
0608 Oslo, Norway

Phone +47 23 06 08 20
Fax +47 23 06 08 21
oslogovcentre@undp.org
www.undp.org/oslocentre

INTRODUCTION

Access to secure land and shelter is widely accepted to be a precondition for securing basic living conditions, livelihood opportunities and a necessary means to reduce poverty. Indeed access to land is directly and indirectly related to the ability to achieve MDG 1, 7 and 3. In order to achieve this, the provision of security of tenure is important in order to create incentives and ensure that poor people are given a fair chance to invest in land- and housing markets.

Making land tenure more secure is a process, not a single event. Consequently, there is a need to enhance focus on assessment of relationships, decision-making processes and management practices.

Local perceptions of how to define and measure tenure security are also important, and there is subsequently a need to strengthen national ownership and local relevance of indicators, rather than comparability on a global level. Within such a framework, particular emphasis needs to be stressed on how pro-poor and gender sensitive indicators may be developed in an inclusive process involving all stakeholders – in particular stressing the need for a local understanding of *security*.

In accordance with needs and suggested interventions proposed by UNDP Country Offices (COs) through the Cross Practice Initiative (CPI), this concept paper aims at outlining a framework for Land Tenure Security (LTS) indicators, as part of OGC's ongoing work and experience from the Governance Assessments Project and Land Governance. The purpose is to establish a framework that applies principles of sensitivity to the poor and to gender within land governance. Such a framework may provide support to COs in assisting national partners to build an effective monitoring system for national development plans, wherein local understandings of land tenure security are promoted to assist national ownership in policy making processes.

BACKGROUND

Land policy is a broad area which may cover a wide array of different topics. However, issues such as management of public land, governance of the commons, access, transaction and registration procedures, accessibility of land markets to the poor, women and vulnerable groups are cross cutting issues.

Land policy indicators usually relate to general topics such as access, security and governance of natural resources. These issues are all regulated through various types of rights, which together form the system of land tenure. For the sake of clarity, this paper will operate with the term Land Tenure Security indicators, in which land tenure encompasses:

A land tenure system can be formal or informal. It is vital to note that there is a difference between *formality* of a tenure system and *security* of tenure. The former refers to formal ownership as defined by law, while the latter may also encompass informal relationships among people defining their affiliation to the land. *Security* comes from the fact that the rights in question are underwritten by a known, and generally accepted, set of rules:

Land Tenure *consists of the social relations and institutions governing access to and ownership of land and natural resources. It is usually defined in terms of a "bundle of rights" – specific rights to do certain things with land or property (Bruce, 1993). In brief, tenure determines who can use what land and how (Lastarria Cornihel 1995).*[i]

Security of Tenure, Formality and Customs

Formality – informality is often confused with security – insecurity. For some, security of tenure *describes a continuum of formal and informal legal arrangements that are highly context specific. They range from full land titling to local customary rights of tenure.[ii]*

Customary rights are not really "legal arrangements" as such, but encompass various social practices which regulate people's access to land. Hence, most countries have a variety of tenure systems, depending on religion, customs, traditions, level of income, etc. This again, creates substantial controversies, misunderstandings and disputes over land, which may affect basic living conditions, livelihood opportunities and levels of poverty. Ultimately, all governments need a comprehensive land tenure policy addressing local issues at stake, in order to truly provide people with a sense of security. In order to do so, it is vital to have tools at hand which can enable policy makers to provide a strategic and efficient policy related to poverty alleviation and gender equality.

By measuring tendencies over time and provide accurate information, LTS indicators may be such a tool – if adapted properly to the local context, that becomes sensitive to security seen as a bundle of rights and of evolving institutional arrangements.

Further, such a framework of security needs to identify and assess capacities of duty bearers versus claim holders. This would help enhancing transparency and accountability of the government and help empower community management and community vigilance.

Land Tenure and Conflict

Land tenure security is intrinsically linked to the issue of conflict. Indeed, the DAC Guidelines on *Helping Prevent Violent Conflict* refer to land as one of the main causes of violent conflict. Violation of land tenure rights may lead to conflict and violence, in particular when the rights in question are limited in breadth and scope, too short in duration, sustain unresolved conflicts between formal state law versus informal/customary claims, and lead to overlapping and inadequate rights, etc. People with insecure rights are often removed from their land by force. And whenever forced evictions take place, violence is generally used - both for enforcement and defence of the eviction.

An increasing number of UNDP country offices are involved in activities relating to conflict prevention, peace building, disaster risk reduction, early recovery and other crisis-related issues. One such example is the UNDP/FAO-led public debates in Sudan on "*Land Tenure and the Root Causes of Conflict"[iii]*, aimed at paving the way for a common approach to resolve the land and property related tensions - which are at the heart of the conflict.

EXISTING MEASUREMENT TOOLS / INITIATIVES

Widely used indicators of governance include the World Bank's Governance Indicators and Doing Business Index, UN-Habitat's Urban Governance Index, the Bertelsmann Transformation Index and Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index. Over and above, a number of intergovernmental institutions are involved in developing indicators on land issues, and there is a growing interest among development practitioners in identifying indicators to measure changes in land tenure security for poor households - as many are concerned with how to meet the Millennium Development Goals.

While common LTS indicators are not currently used, the perceived need for it is shown by the number of different initiatives in existence. Indeed, a great variety of organizations use land-related indicators particularly for project Monitoring and Evaluation:

Indicators

IFAD: Collects studies and expert opinions on the access of land by poor and vulnerable households, tenure security, land market functioning, and management of common property in rural areas. A number of indicators on land exist at each level. Some project-level indicators are developed specifically for each project. Senstivity to gender issues and to the integrative nature of security (including access to education, capacity for organization etc.) is demonstrated. http://www.uneca.org/eca_programmes/sdd/documents/land-policy/IFADland%20indicators-Sum.pdf

UN-Habitat: Elaborates a household survey and groups together expert opinions on the tenure security to property in urban areas, with the goal of monitoring progress on objective 11 of MDG 7 (improve the lives of urban slum dwellers).

International Property Rights Index: Produced by the International Property Rights Alliance in Washington D.C.. Includes three sets of measurements of political / legal rights, physical property, intellectual property, access to loans, and registration using existing indicators from Governance Matters & Doing Business. http://www.internationalpropertyrightsindex.org/UserFiles/File/PRA_Interior_LowRes.pdf

World Bank Doing Business Survey: Collects precise information on access to land, tenure and administrative processes that cover only urban commercial property. Publishes information on the basis of this information for the purpose of informing and stimulating policies. http://www.doingbusiness.org/

World Bank Initiative on Land Governance Assessment Framework: presented in 2008, this framework establishes five broad areas of governance, twenty two indicators and some 80 dimensions of governance. The five areas are legal and institutional, land use and planning / management / taxation, acquisition / management/ disposal of public land, public provision of land information and dispute resolution and conflict management. The 80 dimensions are based on quantitative information. This framework compares scores across countries, identifies areas for immediate action and feeds into existing mechanisms such as APRM, assistance strategies etc. http://www.landcoalition.org/ppt/08_LRI_Workshop_Childress_Rome_long.ppt

USAID/Inter-American Alliance for Real Property Rights Blueprint: Establishes standards and indicators for the evaluation of rights to property, land markets and systems of land administration in the Americas.

Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC): Land Rights and Access Index. MCC relies upon a set of indicators identified from those already used by other organisations, including WB (IFC), IFAD and others. http://www.mcc.gov/selection/indicators/indicators_extended_descriptions.pdf

Natural Resources Institute (NRI): Has developed sets of indicators through work with other organizations such as UN Economic Commission for Africa (http://www.uneca.org/sdd/meetings/LandPolicy/IssuesPaper.pdf).

Other initiatives:

AU-ECA-ADB Land Policy Initiative: aiming at developing a pan-African land policy framework that will lead to the development of viable indicators and mechanisms for monitoring land policy/land reform implementation. http://www.uneca.org/eca_programmes/sdd/documents/land-policy/EGM%20Land%20Indicators_Objectives%20of%20the%20meeting2.ppt

FAO: Guide on good governance in land tenure and administration, including some discussion on indicators and what should be monitored. ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/010/a1179e/a1179e00.pdf

The International Land Coalition - ILC in partnership with UNDESA, UNIFEM, Habitat and the CSO Major Groups convened a seminar on "indicators of secure access to Resources" in 2005 during the UN Commission on Sustainable Development. ILC also participated in the above mentioned initiative of the African Union.

ILC is coordinating the **Land Reporting Initiative** based on the existing work of civil-society and IGO members in order to produce a coherent framework on land indicators http://www.landcoalition.org/program/lri.htm. ILC work is aimed to stimulate debate and ideas about indicator development, and also be a step towards developing a standardised set of indicators, establish consensus on relevance, purpose, methods, roles and responsibilities, intended publication and use, etc.

Challenges

The aforementioned list is not exhaustive, but indicative. In many instances, key challenges manifest themselves while using any such indicators. Those challenges are operational, methodological, conceptual and institutional.

Operational

Scarcity of readily collected data in some critical land related areas of governance presents an operational challenge. For example. despite a growing interest among many stakeholders, the current efforts of UN and international donor agencies has not translated into readily and adequately available data which focuses on tenure security as it relates to common property settings, or to the ways that households which rely on common-pool resources may define secure/insecure rights[iv].

Also, pro-poor/gender sensitive land governance indicators remain scarce, as there is no common strategy and operational method for measuring, monitoring and assessing security of tenure with a strong poverty and, especially, gender equality purpose and policy objective. This is mainly due to the tricky task of operationalising highly complex issues into simple, quantitative indicators.

As much as comparison at an aggregated level exist, attempts on monitoring tenure security by organisations such as UN-HABITAT has shown that there is a lack of data on security of tenure at country and city levels, and when data are available, it is often fragmented, discontinued, and not comparable (collected and processed by different institutions, for different purposes, using different methodologies, etc).

Methodological

Indices provide tools for comparison and are useful for identifying trends, but they also have limitations and should be interpreted with caution. There are many complexities involved in developing indicators on land issues. Land is viewed through different lenses (economic, political, legal, administrative, social, cultural), and many different actors are involved (multilaterals, bilateral, governments, indigenous people etc). Diversity of tenure situations makes it difficult to agree on a set of global indicators, and indicators that are effective and meaningful for local use, may lose significance when aggregated.

As an example, the MCC Corporation uses IFAD indicators on access to land (including land tenure), emphasising broad country coverage, cross-country comparability, and broad consistency in results from year to year. However, despite a focus on the poor and vulnerable groups such as women, the indicators are largely encompassing formal aspects such as law, land titling, land markets, etc. In other words, the indicators are more focused on the *formality* of a tenure system, rather than the actual *security* of tenure. Although a legal framework is important in providing security for people, the informal sector may be equally important. Also, there could be other issues affecting perceptions of security such as investments and slum-upgrading which does not provide legal protection *per se* - but gives a sense that the government is politically investing in the security of slum dwellers.

Furthermore, often the focus on tenure security is colored by outputs for monitoring and evaluation purposes. The focus on security outcomes would mean methodologically a focus on indicators of conflict, dispute, evictions, investment and perceptions. These issues though conceptually feasible to measure seem in some country contexts politically and institutionally challenging and hence methodologically difficult to develop.

Finally, most land governance issues can only effectively be assessed using household surveys which are usually expensive. Furthermore, certain important issues (e.g. women rights with households, effective rights and security in customary law etc.) can only effectively be assessed using sensitive and expensive qualitative research mehods.

Conceptual

The issue of secure tenure does not have a universal, operational definition. This ambiguity makes it difficult to determine what to specifically measure and how. A tenure system can easily be operationalised in terms of the existing legal framework. But, as already explained, what is more challenging is how to define *security*, in particular if there are factors outside the formal land policy framework, which may affect people's sense of security. Hence, tenure situations may impact differently on security of tenure depending on historical and cultural factors, administrative practices, conflict, political choices, balance of power, etc. The same tenure situation in a given settlement may or may not provide security of tenure. Several case-studies suggest that notions of tenure security rely more on infrastructure, school/health facilities, access to markets, etc, than formal property registration only. Depending on the context, this issue may vary greatly.

Hence, obtaining appropriate information to quantify LTS is problematic. In the few cases in which data exists, it is neither rigorous nor internationally comparable. For this reason, security of tenure is neither included in the Habitat Agenda and MDG monitoring systems[v], nor – for the time being - in the set of indicators proposed by UN-Habitat for defining a slum.

The EC supported the Nicaraguan government to develop indicators for the annual production of the Report on the Land Tenancy Security (ISTT)[1]. This report is based on the analysis of different indicators related to the country situation, the institutions and the household's perception. In the case of Land Tenancy Security in Nicaragua (ISTT), the concept of land security has been explored linking three dimensions:
1. Country official data: cadastre coverage allows an understanding of how to advance land formalisation processes on the basis of official data
2. De Jure data: institutional arrangements related to juridical services provided by the government to regularise land property rights reflect country normative and regulative position, and capacity (annual cadastre area; annual land parcels regularised).
3. Household perception: reflects the sense of security as well as its influence on access to resources, services and incentives for investments (fear to be evicted; availability of land formal documents, access to potable water, access to financial services and improvement in the houses).

Institutional

While land related tenure and security issues may seem quite focused, the reality speaks of diverse and overlapping mandates between line ministries and public authorities. Often this translates into different national line ministries and different local authorities seeing themselves as mainly responsible. Though that may encourage collective responsibility, it

---

[1] http://www.prorural.net.ni/?q=node/658

is often a policy challenge to decide on the constellation of inter-ministerial committees or on the reporting lines (to Prime Minister directly, or to any one minister etc.). These institutional challenges often do not bode well for coordination of measurement tools and knowledge management of indicators and findings.

Finally there is an issue of political will. Often, lack of data collection is a reflection of lack of will to collect certain types of data. This is often related to weak capacity to deliver and or weak capacity to manage conflicts once findings are made public

WHAT IS MISSING? OWNERSHIP AND EMPOWERMENT

There are a lot of existing indicators, the real question is how those indicators are put to use, by whom and to what purpose. The technical aspects of measurement and aggregation is of less concern to this paper, but rather to focus on how indicators may be of use to national mapping exercises of governance, in which such indicators can have an impact on the empowerment of weak groups such as the poor and women.

Firstly, what is most important is to note that indicators on land tenure security are normative and consequently need to be adapted by the organisation/s driving them. There will always be problems with information source bias, which concern both the availability of information and the possible biases stemming from the type of organisations that produce the information. Multiple sources of information reduce possible biases and provide a more comprehensive portrait of the situation.

Secondly, indicators oriented toward *protection of rights* need to detect who are the duty bearers and the claim holders, in order to be of any use to policy makers. In short: who is responsible for whose security of tenure? What are the power relations underwriting rights or violating them? Can it be measured through indicators? And how can a stakeholder analysis benefit a more equitable and sustainable land policy, sensitive to cultural, social and economic rights?

Thirdly, it is essential to focus on the variety of reasons that may provide women and the poor with security, rather than to be overly focused on formal provisions of a given tenure system and comparability on a global level. A framework for LTS indicators is useful because it emphasises the process of developing indicators fit to a local context, as opposed to a "one size fits all." Existing indicator systems may provide technical and operational input, but will have to be adapted to a local reality and possibly combined with other indicators that are equally relevant.

Fourthly, indicators have different levels of applicability: some may allow for comparison across countries, whereas others may only have applicability on a local, national or subnational level. This concept paper is more focused on national ownership and adaptation of indicators to a local context, because a national policy is ultimately what will have a concrete impact on local communities; poor people - and women. At the same time it is important to note that indicators which may provide precision, detail and in-debt analysis in certain areas, will potentially also provide losses in the ability to perform comparison and generalisation on an aggregated level.

Emphasis is thus put on the process of developing indicators and the process of establishing an information management system that reinforces domestic accountability over time, rather than the indicators themselves. This could potentially add value to ongoing mapping exercises of governance, as well as national land reforms, in which monitoring of processes is vital - in particular monitoring the impact on the poor.
There is an incredible gap in assessing the impact of land governance on poverty reduction and democratic processes.

> "The collection and availability of land governance data is improving. Nonetheless, despite the changing context, data is at best patchy, and in many important areas largely absent. Land governance data can be categorised according to inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. These categories translate roughly into: laws and policies; administration and implementation processes; outputs such as land registries and rates of title possession; outcomes such as rates of landlessness and conflict; and impacts on factors such as poverty. These distinctions are important because while there is an increasing focus and effort directed at monitoring administration processes and outputs, there is a severe lack of available data on outcomes that would allow a better analysis of the impacts of land governance policies, and also on the particular outcomes for women, and for groups that do not access land through formal property systems[2]".

It is also extremely important to understand the negative correlation between formalisation and poverty reduction. There are cases where the land titling processes induced an increase of land transaction not necessarily beneficial to the rural poor. This is the reason we believe that formalisation of land titling processes should always be associated with empowerment processes of individuals and local organisations. Therefore an important element will be to monitor the correlation of land security and its impact on poverty over time.

A PRO-POOR AND GENDER SENSITIVE PERSPECTIVE

Most indicators of democratic governance in poor countries have been developed by external stakeholders for the purpose of comparing and ranking countries. These stakeholders include risk assessment agencies working in and for the private sector, as well as international organisations concerned with evaluating the performance of countries receiving overseas development assistance. These indicators have not been designed primarily as tools to assist individual countries undertake governance reforms and even fewer of them adopt a pro-poor, gender sensitive approach. The UNDP *Governance Indicators: a Users ' Guide* (2004) presents an overview of currently available and frequently used indices related to democracy, governance and human rights.

In many countries, even when governance indicators have been developed by national stakeholders, they do not explicitly include a focus on poorer groups in society or on the different experiences that men and women have of government institutions and governance processes. Owing to differences in gender roles and to the impact of gender stereotypes, women and men are likely to have different perspectives and different experiences in many areas of governance. The core components of governance — transparency in decision-making, access to information, accountability of both public and private sectors through mechanisms such as a free press and freedom of expression, efficiency and effectiveness of public administration, popular participation through democratic institutions, and the rule of law based on universally recognized principles of human rights — are important to all. However, they tend to mean different things to different individuals and social groups (extract from "Measuring Democratic Governance: A framework for selecting pro-poor and gender sensitive indicators," OGC, 2006).

Tenure security has impact on gender. A variety of legal, administrative and social norms, block increased access to or control over land, by women. Debates on the issue seldom involve all local stakeholders, in particular women. And the degree to which quantitative measurement of land tenure security will actively represent women's rights remains unclear. Land rights are based in culture and custom, and whether such indicators are interpreted from a women's rights perspective or from a family-, welfare- or poverty improvement perspective will ultimately affect their ability to assess gender equality. The diversity and complexity of the issue is likely to be more than what can captured by a limited num-

---

[2] http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTIE/Resources/A_Mauro_Final.pdf

ber of quantitative indicators. Two possible approaches to look at are OECD's social institutions index and the Oxford Poverty and Human Development OPHI empowerment indicators.

Paying attention to the needs and concerns of women in areas of economic empowerment and equitable access to land related services (including registration services and police protection) are part and parcel of a land tenure security monitoring system. An OGC users' Guide to Measuring Gender Sensitive Service Delivery makes this point clear.

Land tenure security considerations also have an impact on sustainability of development. The presumed negative impact of common property ownership on conservation of natural resources needs to be refined ("tragedy of the commons"), as common pool resources are in many cases more efficiently managed as common property than open-access, state or private property[vi]. This is important, because a large extent of the rural poor in developing countries rely on common pool resources to generate income as well as livelihoods. According to the World Bank[vii], approximately 90% of the world's 1.1 billion poorest people depend on forests for at least some of their income.

Estimates of the importance of common-pool resources to livelihoods

Common-pool Resource	Global Impact
Pastures	Just less than half the world's usable surface is covered by grazing systems, with 703 million people living in the grazing system area
Forests	1.6 billion people depend on the forests, with 60 million wholly dependent and 350 million dependent to a high degree
Fish	Excluding fish farmers, there are over 28 million fishers around the world

Source: "Quantitative Indicators for Common Property Tenure Security", Wilusz/ILC (2006)

HUMAN RIGHTS BASED APPROACH, INCLUSIVENESS AND PARTICIPATION

Although the right to land is not a human right in itself, the issue of land is still a human rights issue. Many human rights such as the right to food, non-discrimination, life, freedom of movement and residency, protection and assistance of families, social security, work, property, minority culture, women's rights, etc, are intrinsically linked to the issue of land. Without land, many of these rights cannot be fulfilled. Secondly, human rights are protected under international law, and are consequently part of the "bundle of rights" constituting a given tenure system. Hence, a framework for LTS indicators needs to include this perspective, building on OGC's previous experience from human rights based approaches to development programmes for UNDP Country Offices.

Human rights can be measured either as principles (law, state commitment, etc) or practice (those rights actually enjoyed and exercised by groups and individuals regardless of the formal commitment made by a government). There is a wide range of indicators across different categories and dimensions of human rights that may be useful for measuring tenure security. Depending on the context, it is important to assess the relevance of different indicators and to use the variety of information available in order to establish an overall picture of the human rights situation.

From the civil society perspective, the elements to be considered in monitoring land governance are also related to:

- the type and level of land conflict (many civil society organizations are monitoring conflicts through media or collaboration with human rights offices to understand land conflicts and violence);
- the type and quality of popular participation, through civil society organisations, in land policy design and implementation.

ILC registers an increase of democratisation in land governance due to an increase of active land-concerned civil society organisations working at local, national, regional and global levels.

The recommendation here is to seek a basket of indicators that are de facto and de jure as well as indicators that capture perceptions and experiences, especially of the poor and marginalized. It is also advisable that those suffering from violation of rights are included in the entire cycle of evidence creation and evidence use. Participation by the people (and / or those who represent them) is still lacking in the midst of predominantly expert – based monitoring tools. Using participatory methods of designing indicators, collecting data and disseminating evidence needs to be encouraged and revitalized (see Robert Chamber work at Institute for Development Studies, London.) or making civil society organisation developing their owns land indicators (ILC approach in support of land watches)

In summary, monitoring plays a critical role in promoting pro-poor land governance. It is critical in demonstrating the need for land governance reform and in putting land issues on national and international agendas. It also informs the development of appropriate policies, helps make governments accountable for the quality of administration services and the implementation of programmes, and enables the evaluation of policies and legal frameworks in terms of their effectiveness is providing tenure security and access to land for the poor, and their impacts in reducing poverty and improving food security and sustainability. In fact, when land governance is seen in the broader sense of how society governs the use of its land resources, monitoring can be seen as an essential component of the land governance process itself. It provides inputs for a governance process that is meaningfully inclusive.

CONCLUSION

It is important to have a broad approach towards land tenure security, focusing on four core issues to be assessed:

- Nature of rights held (or breadth of rights)
- Duration of rights
- Respect, enforcement and protection of rights (duty bearers vs. rights holders)
- Sensitivity to in-country dynamics of discrimination and disempowerment whether based on income, gender, demography, geography or power relations.

In order to support an inclusive process and ensure a holistic approach to measuring land tenure security, it may be useful to look into applying the principles of the Governance Assessments approach of UNDP http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/docs08/Global_Programme_on_DG_Assessments.pdf and http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/docs08/UNDPoslobrochureEN.pdf :

- The democracy/governance assessment system is anchored in the national development plan or other political commitment such as the PRSP or, for example in the African continent, the African Peer Review Mechanism.
- Indicators are selected and generated through a transparent, participatory and inclusive process.
- There is an institutionalized procedure to collect data from a variety of sources (surveys, administrative data, national statistics, Civil Society) and an institutional base for storing this information and making it publicly accessible.
- The data sources are politically acceptable to all key stakeholders.
- The data sources enable disaggregation in terms of the poor, and also in terms of gender.

- National institutions including academia are used to develop the system so that national capacity is strengthened.
- There is a targeted approach to developing the capacities of national stake-holders including government policy makers, Civil Society, the media, parliament, political parties as well as the national statistics agency or office.
- Resources are available to ensure the sustainability of the system through repetition of the assessment to enable monitoring of improvements in democratic governance

Ownership & Alignment to National Development

This paper showed that there are a lot of existing indicators, mostly developed by international agencies. The real question is how those indicators are used in countries, by whom and to what effect. The technical dimension of measurement of land tenure is important, but this paper shed light on other aspects of ownership and alignment to national development processes which need to be further enhanced if land tenure security measurements are to serve as guiding input into policies that benefit the poor. Firstly, this paper noted that indicators are normative and consequently need to be adapted by the organisation/s, political economies and cultures driving them. Secondly, measurement tools need to detect the challenges and opportunities in the environment surrounding duty bearers and claim holders. Thirdly, measurement tools need to help identify factors which maintain ineffective and unfair institutional arrangements of land tenure. Finally, using evidence provided by measurement tools should feed into assessments which help identify incentives that provide tenure security in ways that protect the poor and vulnerable as well as encourage sustainable management of natural resources.

This can best be done by harnessing partnerships between global and local. International knowledge on measurements of land tenure security are best put to use when put in the hands of local and / or regional institutes. These could be state surveying agencies in cooperation with land-interested CSOs. National roundtables that encourage a participative process of definitions, of indicator selection, of data collection, of data analysis and dissemination of findings seem to be a good modality of cooperation that is being tried in various countries in the area of governance assessments. Support from international experts and organizations is important in this regard. The result is likely to be country sensitive measurements that may not serve the purpose of country comparison, but can provide guidance to in-country reform initiatives that are poor and gender sensitive. This approach is being currently promoted and assisted by the UNDP Governance Assessment Global Program http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/flagship/democratic_governance_assessments.html and the OECD Global Initiative on Measuring Progress http://www.oecd.org/document/19/0,3343,en_2649_201185_38882515_1_1_1_1,00.html .

As the management of natural resources, especially land, can have direct and indirect impact on several MDGS (e.g. 1, 3 and 7), it is strongly recommended that land governance become a key dimension of MDG-based development plans. It is also strongly recommended that parliaments, political parties and media be sensitized to the land tenure situation in countries, to the linakge with MDGs and to the existing evidence collected in country as well as internationally which sheds light on land tenure security and helps inform thinking on policy options.

---

[i] *"Land Tenure and Food Security: a review of concepts, evidence and methods"*, Maxwell and Wiebe, 1998. See also http://www.leap.org.za/concept/default.asp and http://www.leap.org.za/concept/indicators.asp

[ii] UN Millennium Project (2005)

[iii] Note from UNDP/FAO "Rule of Law Seminars El Fasher, Nyala and El Geneina," May/June 2006

[iv] See ILC review of existing efforts to develop indicators of common property tenure security.

[v] Except Indicator 32, which refers to "Proportion of households with secure tenure"

[vi] "Quantitative Indicators for Common Property Tenure Security", Wilusz, 9: 2006

[vii] "The Environment and the Millennium Development Goals", World Bank, 13: 2002