

*Expert Group Meeting: Using Administrative Data to  
Monitor SDG land Indicator*

**Proceedings<sup>1</sup>**

University Pompeu Fabra (UPF)

Barcelona

July 6 and 7, 2017

---

<sup>1</sup> The EGM was organized by the World Bank, UN Habitat, IPRA-CINDER, the University Pompeu Fabra (UPF) and the Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII)/ Global land Tool Network (GLTN). We wish to thank IPRA CINDER, UPF, Nicolas Nogueroles, Carlos Gomez, María García-Saúco and Marian Gili for their generous hospitality and tremendous efforts in making this EGM productive and successful.

## Executive Summary

The United Nations acknowledged the importance of tenure security for achieving the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals by adopting indicator 1.4.2: *“Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure.”* These proceedings present the recommendations made by international land experts and representatives of national land agencies on (1) the measurement of the part of the indicator pertaining to legally recognized documentation of rights and (2) ways for institutionalizing reporting at country level.

The EGM concluded that the administrative data required for measuring SDG indicator 1.4.2 can be reported in a routine way where coordinated electronic land information systems are in place (at least 100 countries<sup>2</sup>). Other countries with partial electronic systems may require technical and IT support for setting up routine reporting systems. Paper based systems dominate in 77 countries, but most of these countries are rapidly moving towards digitizing their systems, facilitating reporting on indicator 1.4.2. It was observed that administrative data have advantages for annual reporting on the SDGs, as costs for routine reporting are low, data frequency is high and can be disaggregated by gender, include individual and group rights, and are official.

The EGM identified that the following categories of formal documentation: (i) Valid and up to date formal documents addressing tenure rights, registered with a public institution; (ii) Incomplete or outdated formal document (e.g. not all steps of the process have been completed; expired, right holder has passed away etc.); (iii) Unrelated: Official document of which the primarily purpose is not to address land related rights (e.g. utility bills or tax receipts) or involving private parties only (e.g. sales receipts, will). The EGM advised to only count category 1 for the SDG (a legally recognized document of rights), but to collect data in the survey on all type of documents that land holders report as evidence of rights. The EGM recommended preparation of country specific meta data listing all legally recognized documentation and the procedures used for computing and reporting. The EGM supported gender disaggregated administrative data and observed that without inclusion in formal documents of tenure, women may not be protected in case of divorce or death of their husband.

Finally, the EGM observed that the establishment of routine reporting systems and country commitment to regularly report on progress, will incentivize implementation programs to deliver, help identify challenges and set priorities for equitable access to land.

---

<sup>2</sup> Doing Business, 2016, World Bank.

## Contents

1	Background .....	4
2	Methodology to monitor legally documented rights using administrative data .....	4
	SDG indicator process: .....	5
	Defining legally recognized documentation: .....	5
	Federal systems and decentralized land agencies .....	6
	Deeds versus titles systems: .....	6
	Discrepancies between registry records and cadastral maps: .....	7
	Condominium or strata rights: .....	7
	Indigenous people's rights – group or collective rights for customary and communal lands .....	7
	Disaggregation by gender .....	8
3	Country-specific metadata: .....	8
4	Data availability and ways of institutionalizing reporting .....	9
5	Options for building on administrative data to advocate for and measure progress with sustainability of land policy reform .....	9
	Unlocking administrative data and capacity building .....	10
	Gender disaggregated monitoring capacity and VGGT: .....	10
	Policy monitoring and analysis .....	11
	Some policy implications of SDG indicator .....	11
6	Follow up and next steps for establishing a country level and global SDG reporting mechanism .....	12
	Annex 1: .....	13
	Annex 2: Program .....	14

Proceedings

## **1 Background**

The United Nations acknowledged the importance of tenure for achieving the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals by including the indicator 1.4.2: *Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure*. This indicator is under Goal 1 (“End poverty in all its forms everywhere”), contributing to Target 1.4: by 2030 ensure that all men and women, particularly the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership, and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology, and financial services including microfinance.

An international Expert Group Meeting (EGM) was organized on the use of administrative data produced by land agencies for the measurement of 1.4.2, as input into the reclassification of this SDG indicator.<sup>3</sup> The EGM objectives are: (1) Agree on a methodology to monitor the part of SDG indicator 1.4.2 pertaining to legally documented rights using administrative data; (2) Assess availability of existing data and explore ways of institutionalizing reporting at country and regional level; and (3) Explore options for building on administrative data to advocate for and measure progress with sustainability of land policy reform (see program in Annex I).

The EGM was organized by the indicator custodians (UN Habitat and World Bank) together with IPRA-CINDER, the University Pompeu Fabra (UPF) and The Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII)/ Global land Tool Network (GLTN). The EGM was attended by land agencies from 10 countries, representatives of regional land agency networks, as well as statisticians, academics, land experts from civil society, private sector, and representatives of FAO, FIG, UN-GGIM, UN Habitat and World Bank (see annex I for list participants).

In his welcome, Carlos Gomez from University Pompeu Fabra (UPF) emphasized the importance of this EGM for the university’s research on the economic and organization analysis of property rights and political institutions. Nicolas Nogueroles (IPRA-CINDER) reminded participants that public land registries emerged to help the poor protecting their property. Oumar Sylla (GLTN/GLII/UN-Habitat) mentioned the importance for the New Urban Agenda and provided an insight on the work ahead citing the case of Cameroon with only 150,000 registered land documents for a country of 23 million people . Klaus Deininger (World Bank) showed how land indicators and performance monitoring capacity, can help mobilize support for strengthening land governance, by demonstrating its contribution to socio-economic development and gender empowerment.

## **2 Methodology to monitor legally documented rights using administrative data**

---

<sup>3</sup> Household survey data will be the other sources of data for measuring this indicator and were discussed in a previous EGM. The international Expert Group Meeting to define the essential “land” questions required for household survey programs for monitoring indicator 1.4.2 data collection mechanisms, and harmonization with other SDG indicator (5.1.a) was held on May 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> 2017, in Washington DC.

***SDG indicator process:***

Robert Ndugwa (UN-Habitat) introduced SDG monitoring principles (universality, actionability, and reporting through country systems), process for reclassification and the International Advisory and Expert Group on the SDGs (IAEG-SDG). Composed of representatives from member states' statistical agencies, this body decides whether a reporting methodology is robust. [IAEG-SDG](#) has set up a tier system, requiring that each indicator is classified as tier I by 2020 at the latest (approved measurement methodology, data collected for at least 5% of all countries). Indicator 1.4.2. is classified as tier III. The aim is to reclassify to tier II in November 2017 (methodology approved) and tier I in 2018<sup>4</sup>. The formulation of an indicator cannot be changed, but measurement methodology can be adjusted over time.

Responding to Ward Anseeuw (ILC), Mr. Ndugwa confirmed that reporting on SDG indicators is voluntary even for tier I indicators, a decision taken by National Statistical Organizations (NSO). Why reporting on this indicator is important requires awareness raising at the country level, which can be supported by networks like ILC and GLII, as well as awareness raising and capacity building through NSO networks, like for example an Africa Center for Statistics. Reporting on the administrative data requires that land agencies connect to NSO at the country level.

***Defining legally recognized documentation:***

The EGM concluded that three types of documentation issued by official agencies may be kept by land holders as evidence of occupancy and rights:

- (i) valid and up to date legally recognized (formal) documents addressing rights of groups and/ or individuals, registered with a public institution, either ultimate (title) or intermediate that provide the same range of rights (certificate of ownership, leaseholds)
- (ii) formal documents that are either incomplete because some elements are missing (e.g. not all steps of the process have been completed so that textual records have been processed but a required survey has not been undertaken or the final document has not been obtained because required fees have not been paid) or because the document is outdated (e.g. in the name of the land user's parents, possibly with a subdivision having occurred);
- (iii) Official documents of which the primarily purpose is not to address land related rights and refer indirectly to occupancy and land use, like utility use, tax receipts or only involve a private party (e.g. sales receipts, will of inheritance);
- (iv) no documents.

The EGM advised that only the first category will be measured as legally recognized documentation of right to land for SDG indicator 1.4.2, as the target is "access to ownership and control over land" requiring to narrow the gap between possession/customary rights that are not recognized by law (also referred to as legitimate rights) and legally recognized rights, and promote legal recognition for the "continuum of rights". This includes the legal recognition of customary rights, their registration by a public entity of location and textual data, but without changing the control over the right and land use.

Data collection through household surveys, DHS and census, will cover all documentation, including "incomplete/outdated land documents" and "non- land rights related official" documentation reported by land holders and users as evidence of rights. Data on the full range of documents used by land holders as evidence of rights will be important for policy design and provides more detailed information on the nature of gap between legal and possession/customary rights (also referred to as legitimate rights).

---

<sup>4</sup> PowerPoints presented at the EGM are available on request.

Given that land tenure regimes and legally recognized documentation are country specific, the EGM recommended to list all these documents in the country specific meta data, with pictures for each form. These will be used by enumerators and which will improve the quality of data collection. Collective and communal rights for which official documentation was issued, for example to a representative of the “group”, is included. This indicator should not be interpreted as aiming for individualization of land or only titling, as all official documentation providing evidence of rights is measured through surveys.

### ***Federal systems and decentralized land agencies***

In federal states, central reporting may pose challenges if land administration policies are devolved or deconcentrated, without using data standards nor central reporting. Examples are for example Australia<sup>5</sup>, Brazil, Canada, Germany, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Switzerland, United States.

Ivan do Lago Jacopetti presented the example of Brazil, which has a Federal Law on land registration, but with each of the 26 states has developed its own management system; requirements for transfer of property varies across states. Since 2009, electronic systems are introduced, with each State developing its own data structure and data hosting arrangement, varying from public registrars to local courts. Cost for software licenses are high, economies of scale are not seized and overall statistics on coverage of land administration and tenure security are not available. The Federal Government is now introducing a national registration system (ONR), digitization of records, use of standardized data systems and licenses, data protection strategy, which will enable reporting on SDG 1.4.2.

For Mexico, Maria Elena Garcia Flores explained that the 22 states are only in charge of private land, which covers 49% of the area, while the records for social property (ejidos) covering 51% of the land, are kept at the federal level. Each State developed its own land information system and most are now electronic. Currently, there is no reporting system at the State level nor reporting to the central level. Mexico has the data to report on the SDG in an electronic format, but will need support for setting up a routine reporting system, which would be highly policy relevant for the country. Currently, the country can report for Mexico City and all ejido land. For Nigeria, only a few states have developed electronic land administration systems, like Kadunaas presented by P. Richie.

The EGM decided that reporting in federal states will start with selected states/ subnational units to show the viability of reporting.

### ***Deeds versus titles systems:***

Land registries are established by governments to protect citizen’s fundamental rights to land and property and provide legal certainty for transactions. Land registries are legal institutions, holding data on rights. Judge Cuccaro presented on the differences between deed systems and title system in set up and functioning. In the deeds system a copy of the transfer document is deposited in a deeds registry. In case of dispute, priority is given on the basis of date of recording of transfer, motivating parties to record transactions. Computerization of deeds registries has enhanced the efficiency and reliability of deeds systems. In a title system, each land parcel is identified on a map and the rights associated with it are recorded in the register along with the name of the owner. Some countries operate a dual system to enhance efficiency and reliability of transfers. Jan Moerkerke of ELRA showed that both deeds and title systems can report on the SDG, since the introduction of IT systems like in Belgium. Examples of improvement in deeds systems are digitization of records, standardization of contracts and information recorded, systematic use of unique description of asset and person (unique asset number and personal identification); and data integration between registry, cadaster and other agencies.

---

<sup>5</sup> For Australia, for example, each state reported on the SDGs.

The EGM concluded that the country specific meta data need to specify the registration system in place (deeds, title or hybrid), constitutive or declaratory, and degree of computerization, as this will affect the practice of documentation and where land records and maps are held.

***Discrepancies between registry records and cadastral maps:***

Pedro Fandos Pons explained the process used in Spain to resolve inconsistencies for registries that have been developed without having cadastral maps in place, in an incremental way. A step-by-step procedure for data coordination (between Cadastre and Land Registry) is developed and regularly adjusted to incorporate lessons from application, and which will speed up the process for the remaining cases. This procedure is useful for the Land Registries that had been set up without cadastral maps as it happens in many countries. The "Colegio de Registradores" (Spanish Association of Land Registrars) has developed an electronic tool to make it possible. This tool uses mainly cadastral maps but if there are deficiencies or the cadastral map is not accurate other maps (prepared by licensed surveyors or other technicians) can be used. The decision about the coordination is entrusted to the Land registry but the maps need to be approved by the cadaster. The coordination (the use of cadastral/or alternative maps) is compulsory when a parcel is modified (division, segregation or aggregation) or in a first registration. It is not compulsory when transferring rights. On the other hand, a different procedure is the exchange of information between Cadastre and Land Registry that takes place on line reporting not only the physical alterations of the parcels but also the new owners in order to have the data bases updated.

Another example of discrepancies was presented by J. Mesa Guerra for Colombia. The country is in the process of rebuilding its land records, as part of the peace process, and includes integration of the land registry and cadastral system. This process also includes a review of all land transactions since 1990s for legality as well as legitimacy, because much land was "grabbed" during the conflict and subsequently titled, both individual and land assigned to indigenous peoples and Afro-Colombian communities.

For SDG reporting it was decided to use textual data for reporting if most land can be identified on maps and disputes are minimal and a process for reconciling discrepancies exists.

***Condominium or strata rights:***

Condominium rights relate to apartment blocks. M. Taus showed the approach used in Rumania with registration in three "books": (1) the land on which the apartment is constructed; (2) the individual property (apartment); (3) the collective title for the premise. In Belgium, associations are established to which the condominium rights are assigned. Judge Cucarro mentioned that in Italy strata rights can produce detailed contracts and cadastral maps, even identifying kitchens and parking spaces. Generally, exclusive rights are assigned for the apartment itself and shared rights for the land on which the building is constructed and all other parts of the premises used collectively. ELRA has developed a data base with a typology of condominium law for its member states

For SDG reporting it was concluded that the meta data will explain how strata title are recorded and the computing procedure used.

***Indigenous people's rights – group or collective rights for customary and communal lands***

Luca Miggiano from Oxfam laid out the importance of this issue with an estimated 2 billion people depending on collective lands, but only 20% have their ownership or user rights legally recognized (although not always backed up by a legally recognized document).

Many countries in Latin American have procedures in place enabling indigenous peoples and communities to acquire legally recognized documentation for their lands as a 'group'. J. Mesa Guerra mentioned that for Colombia, 33% of the area has collective tenure rights and is assigned to indigenous and afro-Colombian communities. As indicated above, 51% of the land in Mexico is under social tenure (ejido) for which the land and members are centrally registered. Subsequently, Ejido members agree on bye laws on

organizational structures and internal decision making, access and rights to land and land use. Ejido rights may differ between members (and non-members living in these communities), can be bequeathed but not sold. Although it is possible to convert “social” ejido rights into private property, it requires an agreement of the ejido members. A national data base of ejido rights exists, disaggregated by gender (22% women), making SDG reporting possible for this tenure type (see ppt presented by Maria Elena Garcia Flores. Miguel Sanjines explained that for Uganda common or customary land can now be registered ( Communal land Association) although none have been issued yet). The advantage of using associations is that updating the names of rights holders does not require changes in the land registry.

Tony Burns explained how Australia quickly enacted the Native Title Act in 1993 in response to the 1992 High Court decision on the Mabo case which recognized native title. A native tribunal and systems for claiming rights are now in place. In July 2011 the 160 determinations of native title covered 1.23 million km<sup>2</sup> or about 16% of the Australian land mass. Native title can be granted exclusively but can also be recognized to co-exist on Crown land held by farmers under pastoral leases. The current debate is how best to use the assigned land for development and sustainable livelihoods of indigenous communities.

For SDG reporting, reporting of area covered by group rights (indigenous peoples, collective, communal rights) can easily be included. The procedure to measure number of members needs to be added to the meta data.

### ***Disaggregation by gender***

EGM participants emphasized the importance of gender disaggregated reporting, which will show whether there is a gap between de jure and de facto rights. Women whose name is not included in formal documents may not be protected in case of divorce or death of their husband. There is also the issue of stock versus flow, making the adding of a gender field is important for both newly registered land and transfers. Rwanda is an example of the policy importance, as data show that more land is transferred to men.

Diana Fletschner of LANDESA also emphasized the importance of harmonization around gender for the SDG indicators, particularly between 1.4.2 and 5.a.1 (custodians: FAO and UN Women).

Not all registries record the gender of the right holder<sup>6</sup>. In practice, the land agencies were confident that gender disaggregated reporting is feasible, but the procedure must be country specific to be in line with legal requirements (social security number (e.g. Republic of Korea), other fields that are proxies for gender (Netherlands), etc.).

### **3 Country-specific metadata:**

The EGM recommended to prepare country-specific meta data, in consultation with land agencies, NSO and land experts, which will guide data compilation, computing and reporting, thus ensuring global comparability. Meta data include:

- (1) List of all valid legally recognized documentation of tenure, and pictures for each document
- (2) List of other official documents used by land holders as evidence of rights, like “land documents that is incomplete or outdated; or other type of official document; picture for each document
- (3) Structure of land information system; variables, geo-referencing, total number of parcels, area registered and mapped by tenure type; transactions recorded

---

<sup>6</sup> sometime even for reason of “non-discrimination” (like Netherlands and Brazil)



- (4) Procedure for data aggregation across jurisdictional levels (where relevant); computing strata data; computing population on communal and collective tenure; computing gender disaggregation
- (5) Procedure for data quality checks

#### 4 Data availability and ways of institutionalizing reporting

##### **Ability to report:**

The EGM concluded that the administrative data required for measuring SDG indicator 1.4.2 can be reported in a routine way where electronic land information systems are in place, which is the case for at least 100 countries<sup>7</sup>. Administrative data are already being reported for 65 countries to the custodians. Countries with partial and decentralized electronic land data bases may require technical and IT support for setting up routine reporting systems. Technical assistance and capacity building is required for developing the scripts for routine reporting systems, which is expected to have major benefits also for the country.

Paper based systems dominate in 77 countries, but land experts observed that even countries still running paper-based systems are rapidly moving towards digitizing their systems, facilitating reporting on indicator 1.4.2. In the meantime, census and surveys will be the main source of information for reporting on indicator 1.4.2. Finally, a few countries are in the process of rebuilding land administration/ land information systems for example because of a prolonged conflict (Colombia); or still in conflict; reporting will not be possible or relevant as integrity of registries and cadasters is not guaranteed, records may also have been destroyed.

The EGM concluded that a wealth of information is available for constructing the SDG indicator and that its measurement is feasible for most countries. The EGM confirmed that using administrative data has many advantages for monitoring the SDGs (regular availability, cost-effectiveness, official nature). The EGM also suggested to work with regional organizations of cadastral agencies or registrars. AFRIGIST, ELRA, Fédération des Géomètres Francophones, IPRA-CINDER and RCMRD, for example, can play a role in helping to institutionalize reporting and capacity building. This EGM was organized already with IPRA-CINDER, while ELRA was represented by Jan Moerkerke, AFRIGIST by Adewale Akingbade and the Fédération des Géomètres Francophones by Claire Galpin at the EGM. The Dubai land department will organize a regional workshop for Arab countries in 2018, and also UNECA and UNGGIM offered their support..

#### 5 Options for building on administrative data to advocate for and measure progress with sustainability of land policy reform

The EGM concluded that development of routine reporting systems for the SDGs will have high positive spillover effects at the country level. Digitizing paper records, “unlocking” of administrative data and developing dashboards will make the information in land records easier available to land agencies and policy makers, but will need support. Developing the monitoring system will support data exchange procedures between registries and cadasters. The dashboard facilitates data interoperability with other agencies, like for planning or property tax collection, and also with courts and the financial sector for mortgages. Up-to-date and complete administrative data can help resolve land disputes faster and at lower costs. Both Sultan Alkaraf from Dubai and Kees de Zeeuw from the Netherlands stressed in their presentations that reliable and current land records, generate trust in the system. Carmen Miguel showed

---

<sup>7</sup> Doing Business, 2016, World Bank.

how these data are being used in Spain to track mortgages and prices, and can be used to identify the risk of overheated land markets.

The monitoring system developed for SDG reporting, can be expanded into management information systems, for more expansive progress monitoring, which will introduce more rigor and discipline on implementation programs to deliver. The reports can provide an input for multistakeholder policy dialogue. The system will also allow for the monitoring of land markets and house prices, and provide a basis for impact evaluation.

The EGM explored ways for building on the effort of SDG reporting, as the aim is not the produce “international reports for dusty shelves”. The development of reporting systems has to be linked to a longer-term program to build capacity, based on interest and demonstrated progress, as part of moving this indicator to tier I

### ***Unlocking administrative data and capacity building***

The EGM recommended that if countries and development partners use internationally agreed data standards when designing (electronic) land information services. It will enable data interoperability between agencies (land use and development regulations, tax, courts and banks etc) and facilitate reporting on the SDGs. Much scope exists for sharing of experience.

Beckhee Cho (LX) Korea shared her country’s experience with integrating land agencies and land data, horizontally and vertically across a multitude of entities (e.g. 290 cities hold land data) into a single, integrated system that is used and updated by all government agencies on a continuous basis, and has a one-stop-shop for service delivery. This change became possible when new technology became available, accompanied by required policy and legal adjustment. The new integrated system holds 920 million pieces of land information. Capacity building was needed also in the private sector to ensure efficient use of the new platform and systems. LX is now sharing its experience on integrating data system and associated organizational change with other countries (like for example Jamaica and Uruguay) for which they developed a capacity assessment tool to identify appropriate training program.

Aster Deneke Yilma from the African Centre for Statistics, at the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UN-ECA) gave an overview of use of geospatial data sets and earth observation for SDG monitoring, and the collaboration with UNGGIM. She also showed how geospatial technology can support land administration. UN ECA coordinates the contribution of its different division to the SDGs and works with the African Statistical Systems to strengthen capacity for reporting on the SDGs, including use of geospatial data.

Kees de Zeeuw showed how UNGGIM supports the SDG policy agenda. UNGGIM is looking forward to having more and better data on the land area and parcels that are registered and mapped, and go beyond the “zombie statistics”. To support SDG reporting, UNGGIM is promoting the use of standards in land information systems, working with industry through the Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC). UNGGIM also promotes the “fit-for-purpose land administration approach” and help land agencies increase access to cheap, good, and fast land registration services, delivered at scale.

### ***Gender disaggregated monitoring capacity and VGGT:***

Javier Molina, FAO, reflected on the opportunities of enhanced reporting capacity for the SDGs. Land agencies’ establishment of a SDG reporting system provides a launch pad for expanding monitoring capacity to help set priorities, guide policy reform and monitor progress, which is essential also for the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines for responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT). Connecting

land agencies to national statistical organizations, and bringing in use of spatial data will further strengthen country capacity to monitor performance. VGGTs were approved in 2012 and progress has been made on awareness raising, methodology development and capacity building and providing guidance for policy reform in Colombia, Guatemala, Madagascar and Sierra Leone.

A good example of the power of monitoring is work around gender in the Balkans. When gender disaggregated, data showed that 3% of women had documented rights and 40% perceived their rights as secure, (mainly related to inheritance rights), this triggered a policy response. To encourage more joint-ownership of land, the land agency reviewed and improved its forms, tools and procedures, and undertook awareness raising and capacity building to address these issues, while using its gender disaggregated administrative data to track performance.

### ***Policy monitoring and analysis***

Denys Nizalov presented the experience of the Ukraine with putting in place a land governance monitoring system, disaggregated by subnational level and (vulnerable) groups. The monitoring system makes it possible to identify land use violations, discrepancies between textual records and cadastral data and contributes to accountability. Stakeholders use the reports for advocacy, like farmers requesting more equity in land access and transparent procedures. The monitoring system has become important for policy analysis and now provides up-to-date information on performance of land markets and service delivery. The monitoring system will also be used to track results of an upcoming mayor policy reform, and help identify challenges that may emerge, like for vulnerable groups. The Ukraine experience shows how administrative data, combined with spatial imagery and survey data, supports an analytical agenda around land policy development and regulatory change. These data also allow for testing and comparing interventions between sub-national units and land tenure types, for identifying good practice, and undertake impact evaluation of land governance reform on socio-economic development, poverty eradication and empowerment. Legislation is now in place to ensure that routine progress reporting on administrative data takes place and made available to individuals, private sector and banks (facilitate access to finance).

### ***Some policy implications of SDG indicator***

The EGM stressed that indicator 1.4.2 should not be interpreted as aiming for individualization of land or just promoting land administration interventions. More effective policy interventions may include, for example, expanding definition of legality and protection of such rights, even when not documented; prioritize registration for primary rights and group rights first, while presenting pathways to land holders for transferring from one system to another; streamlining registration processes and enhancing cost effectiveness, review fees and survey standards. New data and spatial technologies provide tremendous opportunities for land agencies to expand access to legally recognized documentation and strengthening of communal and customary rights.

Benito Arrunada stressed the importance of careful target setting, in a way that provides incentives for embarking on substantive policy change, while preventing gaming of the systems. Since countries depart from different levels, target setting needs to take this into account (ranking may not be the most appropriate way of comparing countries). He also demonstrated that in a context of low economic land values, limited land market activity and limited contestation of rights, the costs of land registration or titling may not be justified from an economic perspective (but these operations offer opportunities for rent seeking). In such cases, enforcement of rights and legal changes may be more critical and efficient than expensive registration and mapping of rights. The returns to investing in registration and titling increase where land pressure and land values rise, ahead of infrastructure investments, for women empowerment, and to reduce conflict and facilitate dispute resolution, prevent land grab/human rights abuses. Reducing the unit costs for registration will also improve feasibility. Ex-ante cost-benefit

assessment is always needed, as well as a comparison of different modalities and tenure instruments in order not to waste scarce resources on projects with limited benefits or sustainability.

## **6 Follow up and next steps for establishing a country level and global SDG reporting mechanism**

Reclassification tier III to II (July – November 2017)

- Methodology data collection administrative data, including for country specific meta data
- Prepare list of documentation (valid, incomplete/outdated, other documentation) for countries planning surveys end 2017/ early 2018, like for UEOMA survey (Benin, Cote d'Ivoire, Burkina Faso, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo) to be used for enumerator training, and survey question coding
- Continue collecting data for remaining countries with centralized electronic records

Reclassification to tier I – reporting capacity and data collection expansion (at least 50% of all countries)

- Information and capacity building workshops with land agencies; discuss results \:
  - o Organize session in meetings, side events or pre- post/meetings in the context of regular or already programmed workshops, annual meetings and conferences of land agencies (AFRIGIST (ex-RECTAS), Arab region conference, ELRA, IPRA-CINDER, OAS – cadaster network, RCMRD, WLPA/UNECE, RCMRD etc.)
  - o Country level engagement on need for collecting land data (Land agencies, NSO and Land experts/ stakeholder community); use of data for analysis and policy dialogue
- Prepare country specific meta data on documentation and procedures used for administrative data compilation
- At the request of land agencies and NSOs and depending on resource availability, support missions for help establishing reporting system (land expert/IT specialist); assess data base structure and develop scripts for routine reporting based on existing electronic data, and capacity building
- Develop reporting mechanisms between land agencies and NSO
- Discuss relevant statistics at special sessions organized by the custodians in context of land and poverty conference with country representatives land agencies.

Annex 1: Participants Expert Meeting: Using Administrative Data to Monitor the SDG Land Indicator 1.4.2				
First Name	Last Name	Organization	City	Country
Adewale. O.	Akingbade	African Regional Institute for Geospatial Information Science and Technology (AFRIGIST)	Ife-Ife	Nigeria
Jairo Alonso	Mesa Guerra	Superintendente Delegado Para La Protección, Restitución Y Formalización De Tierras	Bogota	Colombia
Javier	Molina	FAO	Rome	Italy
Sultan	Alakraf	Dubai Land Department	Dubai	United Arab Emirates
Ward	Anseeuw	ILC	Rome	Italy
Benito	Arrunada	UPF	Barcelona	Spain
Tony	Burns	Land Equity	Wollongong	Australia
Beckhee	Cho	LX	Seoul	South Korea
Michele	Cuccaro	Judge Court of Rovereto; University of Trento	Rovereto	Italy
Kees	De Zeeuw	Kadaster/UNGGIM	Apeldoorn	Netherlands
Klaus	Deiningner	World Bank	Washington	USA
Aster	Denekew	Africa Center for Statistics/UNECA	Addis Abeba	Ethiopia
Ivan	Jacopetti do Lago	IRIB - Instituto dos Registradores Imobiliários do Brasil)	Brasilia	Brazil
Nigel	Edmead	Thomson Reuters	London	United Kingdom
Pedro	Fandos Pons	Registradores de Espana	Madrid	Spain
Diana	Fletschner	Landesa	Seattle	USA
Claire	Galpin	Fédération Géomètres Francophone	Paris	France
Maria Elena	Garcia Flores	Secretaría De Desarrollo Agrario, Territorial Y Urbano		Mexico
Carlos	Gomez	UPF	Barcelona	Spain
Thea	Hilhorst	World Bank	Washington	USA
Eduardo	Martinez	IPRA-CINDER	Barcelona	Spain
Fernando	Mendez	Colegio De Registradores De España	Madrid	Spain
Luca	Miggiano	Oxfam	The Hague	Netherlands
Carmen	Miquel	IPRA-CINDER	Barcelona	Spain
Jan	Moerkerke	European Land Registry Association	Brussels	Belgium
Robert	Ndugwa	UN Habitat	Nairobi	Kenya
Denys	Nizalov	KEI -KSE	Kiev	Ukraine
Nicolas	Nogueroles	IPRA-CINDER	Barcelona	Spain
Peter	Richie	GIS/Transport	Kaduna	Nigeria
Miguel	Sanjines	Independent expert	Kampala	Uganda
Oumar	Sylla	GLTN/UN Habitat	Nairobi	Kenya
Mihai	Taus	Romanian Land Registrars	Bucharest	Rumania

## **Annex 2: Program**

### ***Meeting objective:***

- (1) Agree on a methodology to monitor the part of SDG indicator 1.4.2 pertaining to legally documented rights using administrative data
- (2) Assess availability of existing data and explore ways of institutionalizing reporting at country and regional level
- (3) Explore options for building on administrative data to advocate for and measure progress with sustainability of land policy reform

## **Agenda**

### **Day 1: Thursday July 6, 2017**

#### **8.30 – 9.00      Welcome, Introduction and workshop objectives**

- UPF
- CINDER
- UN-Habitat/GLTN/GLII
- World Bank

#### **9.00 -10.00      Land indicators in the broader SDG framework: Process and methodology**

**Chair:** Carlos Gomez, UPF

- SDG Process, indicator, data sources and envisaged next steps (R. Ndugwa)
- Administrative indicator and link to other reporting areas & global initiatives (K. Deininger)
- Discussion

#### **10.00 - 10.30      Coffee break**

**10.30- 12.00    Parallel session I: Methodological challenges & insights for reporting on legally documented rights**

**Chair:** M. Cucarro

- Spain: C. Miguel
- Mexico: M.E. Garcia
- Brazil: I. do Lago Jacopetti
- Dubai: S. Alkaraf
- Netherlands: K. de Zeeuw
- Colombia: J. Mesa Guerra

**10.30- 12.00    Parallel session II: Methodological challenges & insights for reporting on legally documented rights**

**Chair:** C. Gomez

- Korea: B. Cho
- Romania: M. Taus
- Belgium: J. Moerkerke
- Nigeria: P. Richie
- Uganda: M. Sanjines
- Algeria: C. Galpin
- Ukraine: D. Nizalov

**12.00- 13.30    Methodological challenges (plenary)**

**Chair:** Nicolas Nogueroles

**Short interventions on**

- Linking textual and spatial data: Pedro Fandos
- Strata titles and condominiums: M. Taus & M. Cucarro
- Dealing with paper records: J. Moerkerke
- Managing and reporting on land data in a federal system: M. Jacopetti & M.E. Garcia Flores
- Documenting indigenous rights & native title: L. Miggiano, M.E. Garcia Flores, T. Burns
- Addressing gender aspects: M.E. Garcia Florese
- Types of registry systems: M. Cucarro

**13.30 - 15.00    Lunch**

**15.00 - 16.30    Working groups: Reporting & expanding data availability by region**

- Latin America & Caribbean
- Middle East & Africa
- Europe & OECD
- Asia

**16.30 - 17.30    Working group reports**

- Appropriateness of indicator
- Points of contact & Data collection/validation strategy
- 'Pilot' countries to go in depth & show impact of improvement
- Issues for more detailed follow up

## **Day 2 Friday July 7**

### **8.30- 10.00 Strategies for compiling administrative data as an input in the SDGs**

**Chair:** K. Deininger

- Summary report & discussion of next steps

10.00 - 10.30 Coffee break

### **10.00 - 11.00: Making administrative data actionable**

**Chair:** A. Akingbade

- Gender disaggregation in land information systems: D. Fletschner
- Capacity building on land information systems- B. Cho
- Performance and transparency: Aggregating over sub-national units in Ukraine– D. Nizalov

### **11.00 - 12.30: Institutional linkages for monitoring and strengthening land governance**

**Chair:** O. Sylla

- VGGT: J. Molina
- UNGGIM: K de Zeeuw
- Statistical offices & commissions: A. Denekeu

### **12.30 -13.30 Workshop conclusions and next steps**

13.30 - 15.00 Lunch

### **15.00- 17.00 Concluding panel: How registry data enhance welfare: Private sector decision-making and public policy**

**Chair:** J. Sandiunenge

**Keynote:** Benito Arrunada, UPF

Regional perspectives:

- Europe: B Moerkerke, ELRA
- Latin America: C. Miguel & M.E. Garcia
- Asia: B. Cho, LX
- Middle East & N Africa: S. Alakraf, Dubai Land Department
- Global standards and the role of international institutions: K. Deininger, World Bank