The Importance and Use of a Monitoring System in Delivering and Upscaling Land Registration and Administration Programmes

Owen Edwards

March 2016

LAND INVESTMENT FOR TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME

UKaid from the British people

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

Contents

Acknowledgements

This paper was prepared for presentation at the “2016 World Bank Conference on Land and Poverty” The World Bank, Washington D.C., March 14-18, 2016.

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

Abstract

The importance of the monitoring system in the irreversible delivery of land administration is high when it is designed correctly. The design of the system needs to provide for:

- Measures of progress and achievement against a set trajectory,
- Consideration for the demand (land holders) and supply (institutions) for land administration services in order to achieve irreversible delivery,
- Change management system allowing for changes in implementation based upon the results and analysis of the monitoring system,
- The use of the monitoring system throughout the programme lifecycle, including the design phase.

Drawing on the author's experiences from large scale land registration and administration programmes from Rwanda and Ethiopia, this paper will demonstrate the importance of the monitoring system in ensuring land registration and the establishment of an irreversible delivery of land administration services from the recipient Government and how such a system should be designed.

Introduction

Land registration and administration programmes are an important intervention for alleviating poverty in developing countries. Land is an asset, especially to the rural poor. To provide tenure security through formal land rights can improve the poor's wellbeing and those of future generations. (Cotula et al 2006)

Many developing countries have appropriate regulations, policies and legal frameworks in regard to land, but do not have the capacity to deliver the rights through a large-scale land regularisation programme, or to maintain the land registry through a functioning land administration system. The challenges vary from the size of the endeavour to the financial commitment which is required.

These challenges can be overcome through a mixture of appropriate technical and managerial skill sets. The technical orientated skills (such as GIS, surveying and public awareness raising), are well documented and debated. However, the managerial, or delivery, methodologies of providing land related services to a large scale are not as well known. The conference which this paper is presented to is the 2016 Land and Poverty Conference as the World Bank. This year's theme is how to scale up responsible land governance. The vast majority of submissions will be technically orientated, or research based in order to answer this question. However, up scaling cannot occur unless efficient and effective delivery and management of responsible land governance is also explored and debated (English and Edwards 2012). In fact, the author would argue that the management of scaling up is as equally important to understand as the technical aspects. So how is responsible land governance delivered well?

The numerous answers to such a question are varied, this paper will assess one key area of the land governance delivery effort; the importance of a robust monitoring system in ensuring that the land registration and administration services are delivered to a high standard, on a large scale.

Further it will argue that the monitoring system is vital for securing the irreversible delivery of land administration services. In other words, once the programme has concluded, the Government, through consistent demand from land holders and support to the land institutions, will uphold and improve the service delivery of land administration. If this goal is not reached, then the entire registration process will have to be carried out again in the future, as the integrity of the land registry is compromised by the lack of updating the records. This will come at a great and unnecessary cost, both in financial terms and in terms of securing an improved wellbeing for the land holders.

In this paper, the argument will be made that the monitoring system is vital because it should:

- Measure progress and achievement against a set trajectory,
- Consider the demand (land holders) and supply (institutions) for land administration services in order to achieve irreversible delivery, have a change management system allowing for changes in implementation based upon the results and analysis of the monitoring system,
- Be used throughout the programme lifecycle, including the design phase.

Drawing on the author's experiences from large scale land registration and administration programmes from Rwanda and Ethiopia, this paper will demonstrate the importance of the monitoring system in ensuring land

registration and the establishment of an irreversible delivery of land administration services from the recipient Government.

Land Registration and Administration Programmes

For the context of this paper, a typical land registration and administration programme would have the following, broad, outcome and outputs (Gignoux et al 2013):

Outcome: A semi-autonomous land administration system which will continue to deliver land administration services (such as transactions on land) to the public who are fully engaged in the system.

There are usually two outputs; one for land registration, the other for land administration.

Output (Land Registration): The issuance of a certain number of legal land rights, usually as a lease, certificate or deed, to all rightful land claimants.

Output (Land Administration): The development of a land administration system which represents the law and provides a level of services which are acceptable to all land holders.

The above definitions may seem brief. For a unique programme, the outputs and outcomes would be more specific, they are general definitions and not context specific to a country or place. Equally, outputs and outcomes would usually place an explicit emphasis on women's and vulnerable people's land rights. This is important for focusing all stakeholders' attention on the rights of vulnerable social groups. But in the definition of the outcomes and outputs above, "all rightful land claimants" covers everyone who has a right to claim land under the law, be they women, vulnerable people or male. If a group of society is excluded who has a legal right to land, then the programme has not been delivered correctly, it has failed. In other words, the lack of emphasis on a certain group of society is deliberate when considering the monitoring system and it will become clearer why later in this paper.

Two examples of programmes with similar outputs and outcomes are the Land Tenure Regularisation Programme in Rwanda and the Land Investment for Transformation Programme in Ethiopia which the author has worked on as a full-time member of staff for a number of years.

The case study for both are presented below from secondary sources.

The case study for the Rwanda programme comes from the recently published "Fit for Purpose Guide for Land Administration":

> *"Land Tenure Regularisation in Rwanda"*
>
> *Rwanda implemented a well-functioning Land Information System through a program called Land Tenure Regularisation. Nationwide systematic land registration started after piloting in 2009. The goal was to provide legally valid land documents to all rightful landholders and the program was completed in 2013.*
>
> *… The information from the registers was entered into the Land Tenure Regularisation Support System, from which titles were processed and printed for first issuance. A Land Administration Information System is used for processing transactions and for updating the register. In May 2013 about 10.4 million parcels were registered and 8.8 million of printed land lease certificates had been issued. The unit costs were about 6 USD per parcel (that is of course subject to specific country conditions).*
>
> *The expected achievements for Rwanda are social harmony arising from reduced land conflicts and secure tenure, increased investment in land, greater land productivity and an increased contribution of land as an economic resource towards national development. There were not many qualified surveyors in the country. However, a land surveying programme to train Geomatics engineers is underway. (Enemark et al 2015)*

The second case study is that of the Land Investment for Transformation Programme (LIFT) in Ethiopia, summarised through the 2015 DFID Annual Review which is available online from the institutions "Development Tracker"

> *"Land tenure insecurity contributes to poverty by reducing farmers' incentives to invest, impeding efficient allocation of resources and contributing to environmental degradation. Land governance is critical in Ethiopia since 85% of workers are farmers. The Ethiopian Government has been undertaking a programme of land certification, but this has been basic, lacking mapped detail of boundaries,*

missing spouses and children (even parcels) making it incomplete. In addition, there are weaknesses in the supporting land administration including land registries not being maintained making around 10% of the issued land certificates obsolete every year. Consequently, Ethiopia suffers from land tenure insecurity, inefficiently managed allocation of land to investors, land degradation and low soil fertility. The resulting problems particularly affect women.

To address these problems, LIFT will:

enable provision of map-based land certificates to farmers in four Regions through support for: production of aerial photographs; development of a digital cadastre; engaging farmers to identify their land parcels on the resulting photographic map and resolve any disputes; and issuance of certificates of ownership;

strengthen capacity in the rural land administration system to register, update and enforce rights through: developing land administration systems backed by IT; training land administrators; refining and documenting administrative processes;

facilitate increased investment and productivity through support to the development of the land market, based on detailed analysis and research; and

strengthen the existing land policies and procedures, with the aim of enhancing security of tenure for communal land holdings, pastoralists and customary land use and improving the transparency of land allocation.

Both programmes are characterised as large endeavours, set to provide land rights to millions and to provide a semi-autonomous land administration service. There are also broader characteristics which both programmes possess-:

- They are complex initiatives set in an uncertain environment,
- They not only rely upon the buy in of the customers (land holders) in to the new system but also rely upon the improved motivation and capacity of the institutions to deliver better services on a consistent basis,
- They involve the employment of thousands of staff and worker across a large area,
- They both require the upscaling of activities.

The challenges of these types of programmes can be broadly summarised under two headlines; technical and managerial. The technical is the expertise to provide the quality in the service delivery and to suggest a solution to challenges faced including; surveying, registration, administration, GIS/ IT development, business models for further services for land administration. The technical expertise is well researched and remains equally challenging.

However, the ability to manage or deliver such programmes, and other public service programmes, is only starting to get the same exposure and critique. The fact remains that without the strong managerial ability to actually deliver services which are required in order to meet the programmes objectives, the programmes could not succeed. In a recent World Bank publication, Edwards (2014) stated that land registration programme designs often overlook the menial tasks of programme control through monitoring, even though it is one of the four most important components for a successful registration programme.

The managerial challenges are numerous and varied. But the importance of them are exceptionally high. One managerial challenge is that of the establishment of a robust monitoring system which not only tracks achievement of set tasks, but also considers, throughout the programme life cycle, how to achieve the desired result of public service delivery, in this case, land administration. If implementation of the programme can be influenced by the results of both considerations, then the programme has a better chance of meeting its desired goal.

The Monitoring System

The UNDP handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results (2009) defines monitoring as:

"… the ongoing process by which stakeholders obtain regular feedback on the progress being made towards achieving their goals and objectives".

The handbook is quick to make the distinction between two different questions for monitoring to respond too:

"Are we taking the actions we said we would take?" and,

"Are we making progress on achieving the results that we said we wanted to achieve?"

These two questions are essential for any monitoring system. The first is a tally of achievement or otherwise which is important for management and control of the programme. The second question asserts that monitoring needs to consider if the endeavour is going to achieve what it set out to achieve; if the programme states that the goal is to deliver a million land leases or establish an irreversible delivery of land administration services, or both, does it appear like the programme will achieve that. And if not why not?

The why not question should be posed as a basic test of the assumptions which the programme hypothesis is based upon, we assumed that people wanted an improved land administration system, we assumed that we knew what "improved" is. The assumptions need to be tested through actual implementation of the product (land administration for example) to see if the assumptions are true. This focuses implementation, as the programme progresses, to deliver what is actually wanted and needed, rather than constantly providing a set product. What is delivered does not change, but implementation mutates as the complexities of the environment and society the programme is operating in become clearer. Testing the assumptions and allowing for changes in our approach as required by the results, gives the programme a greater chance of successfully achieving the desired result.

Many monitoring systems consider the first question posed by UNDP and partially consider the second, often reneging on considering the assumptions which the programme is based upon. Regarding the first question in terms of a land registration and administration programme, this means that process mapping needs to be designed and clearly set out through a manual, but that this manual also needs to state what is being monitored and how for each activity. This is the case in both Rwanda and Ethiopia, all manuals had the processes mapped out, but each process node had a related monitoring consideration- what are we monitoring? How are we monitoring and how will the results be communicated and to who?

If we take an example of land transactions, the manual will state how the inheritance or sale or any other transaction of land will be presented to the land institution, how it is filed, considered for approval or otherwise and how a new land lease or deed is returned to the land holder. But what equally needs to be documented in the same manual is how this flow will be monitored ensuring that it is occurring and by how much. The results of this monitoring should influence implementation in order to improve or to change the process of delivery. This answers the first question of monitoring set out in this section.

However, the second question also needs to be answered. A certain number of land transactions may be a desired result which can be obtained from the first question. But if another result is to secure the irreversible delivery of land administration services, then further monitoring needs to be carried out. This requires more in depth and robust analysis compared to the above basic, but necessary, monitoring of activities.

In Pursuit of Irreversible Delivery

The term "Irreversible delivery" of public services has been coined by Sir Michael Barber in a number of his publications. In "The Good News from Pakistan" he states that:

> *"Irreversibility means not being satisfied merely with an improvement in outcomes but asking whether the structures and culture are in place that will guarantee the right trajectory of results for the foreseeable future. How can the changes be made to stick?"*

Thus, irreversible delivery is the mentality and the ability to not only continue to deliver but to improve the service delivery. A land administration system should be aiming for such a status.

It is my view that irreversible delivery- or sustainability as the old adage goes- for public service provision can only be achieved through the basic concepts of supply and demand.

Supply is the capacity and motivation of the institution, in this case a land office, to provide public services, in this case, land administration. In development, we are often aware of the need for capacity and provide activities for capacity building such as provision of resources for offices, training staff and improved systems. But rarely is there a consideration for the effect of these interventions and, even more importantly, whether they are the right interventions. For example: a computer land cadastre system, considered the greatest in the world, will be useless if the ICT of the land offices cannot operate it or if the staff are not motivated to use it or there is a high turnover of trained staff to use it. In this instance, if the cadastre system is delivered, the first question from the UNDP monitoring statement would be satisfied. However, the second question, if queried, would not be satisfied- it is not suitable for the needs of the office and thus will not achieve the result of irreversible delivery of land administration services.

To satisfy the second question, the type of cadastre that is provided needs to be continuously monitored in conjunction with other considerations such as an improved ICT or improved employment packages for staff. These other considerations may be or may not be within the programmes remit to carry out these complimentary activities but if it is not, then the programme needs to consider what it is delivering and change the component to suit the needs and environment of the office. What are the needs of the institution and how well is the intervention being delivered can only be answered through a rigorous monitoring system, if a programme objective of securing irreversible delivery is to be realised.

At the same time demand needs to be stimulated to ensure that the system is being used. The only way that public services become irreversible is if the populous are using the system and they are demanding better and improved services, the best land administration system in the world is only useful if land holders use it. Advocacy for a consistent and improved delivery of land administration can only be achieved through demand from the customers, in this case, land holders and other interested parties. Land programmes will often commence by proposing what is for the best based upon best practice and research from other initiatives. But what if land holders do not wish to pay fees, or the district land office is too far for them to walk to or if it takes too long to register a land transaction and this was not considered in the design of the programme (all of these issues arose in the Rwanda example- the original proposed system assumed these would not be issues). Customer demand and satisfaction needs to be monitored and understood to ensure that the demand is stimulated enough to ensure the system is held to account once the programme is concluded, again achieving irreversible delivery.

Supply (how effective land institutions deliver land administration) and demand (the land holders use and accountability of the land administration system) must be successfully monitored in order to achieve the desired sustainable outcome. How the monitoring system is related to the successful outcome depends upon implementations ability to change for the dynamic needs of the institution and customers for which the monitoring system is providing information on. A connection needs to be made between the results of the monitoring and the ability to change implementation to meet these needs of supply and demand.

This demonstrates the importance of a monitoring system, it goes beyond the conventional monitoring of activities or processes and becomes an informant for how the programme is being delivered and how it should be delivered.

The knock-on effect of monitoring in this manner is that it also allows for the programme to deal with complexity in delivering such programmes. If the challenges of the institutions are well understood, and the customer architypes are set out clearly, then the programme has a better chance of creating an enabling environment and increased mitigation for complexity. This is vital for upscaling of the land initiatives and will be covered further in this paper.

Setting out the Monitoring System

The monitoring system for a land registration and administration programme needs to be able to measure:

- Progress, or lack of, against the set trajectory of programme activities and reasons why. A query which needs to be resolved may be “Have we achieved one million land parcels demarcated by March? If so how and if not, why not? Do we need to make a change in how we implement this programme?
- Land holders (or customers) satisfaction and buy in to the new services. A question which may be raised here is what form of communications are most useful for women and male land holders? Is the location of the land administration office too far away? Are they happy to pay fees? Do land holders raise complaints with the institutions or are they afraid too? Do characteristics differ between different types of land holders?
- Institutions assessment of change in how the institution delivers land administration- questions here will include, what are the constraints to an institution to become fully operational? Are staff motivated? Has the new land administration system we have applied change things? Does the institution listen to land holders? Does the institution interact with other institutions?

The parts of the monitoring system which answers these three broad considerations can be summarised as:

- Programme monitoring,
- Household Surveys,
- Institutional Assessments,
- Studies.

Programme Monitoring

Programme monitoring is essential for the management of the programme to understand how the programme is progressing against a set trajectory and, if required, to change the way the programme is implemented to get back on trajectory. In Rwanda, the land registration programme was vast, both in number of land parcels which were surveyed (10.3 million) and in terms of the geographical space (the entire country) which the programme operated in. At any one time, millions of land parcels could be at different stages of registration, with the entire land registration process being managed by thousands of staff. Only through the use of quantitative and qualitative monitoring data of that process can control of the programme be sustained.

Much of how the programme monitoring was designed was taken from lessons learned from Barber's work at the Prime Minister Delivery Unit (Barber 2008). Set against the land registration process manual (as discussed earlier) the programme monitoring in Rwanda accounted for the completion of activities and the basic progress made in quantitative terms of each activity. At the start of the programme, a trajectory was set across the programme life span with the aim being the final goal of all rightful land claimants receiving legal tenure. Along the trajectory were key milestones which needed to be reached so that the programme knew it was on track. For example, monthly milestones for the demarcation of land parcels were set and progress made from the monitoring system was compared against these milestones so that it could be judged whether the programme was on trajectory for the demarcation activity or not.

If the programme is off the trajectory, key questions need to be resolved with action orientated answers, why are we off milestone, how do we get back on to milestone and who is responsible for getting on to the milestone. In Rwanda, monthly stock take meetings were held with managerial and technical staff with the problem being set out and the action-oriented solutions were considered. Sometimes it could be as small a solution as providing a different type of pencil to draw the boundaries of the land parcels. In Ethiopia, the lead of the pencils being used was too brittle and kept breaking resulting in field teams not having a means to draw boundaries. When the monthly milestone is close to 40,000 demarcated parcels, a broken pencil can really damage the ability of the programme to meet its milestone.

Thus programme monitoring needs to not only set out what the trajectory is and how we are performing against set milestones, it also needs to have the ability to ask why the programme is off trajectory and, most crucially of all, have an influence over implementation so that it can change to allow the programme to get back on track. This last point directly relates the monitoring system, to programme control. In Ethiopia, programme monitoring is represented by the following circular graph:

The table below provides a description for each stage of the cycle:

Stage of the cycle	Description
Programme Activities	"Activities" incorporates all of LIFT's programme elements such as Second Level Land Certification (SLLC) and Regional Land Administration System (RLAS) development.
Reporting	Reporting will occur against all appropriate activates in the LIFT work plans. Reporting processes and formats will be designed by LIFT's national level programme staff and populated by Regional and Woreda Level programme staff who will be trained on how to provide reliable data in the reports, as well as LIFT's other systems including the FMIS and NRLAIS. This information will then be aggregated through the MIS for analysis.
Analysis	Data provided through the reports will be appropriately accumulated for analysis by the LIFT Management Team, DFID, Regional Land Administration and Use Directorate (RLAUD) and any other identified stakeholders. Analysis will be presented in various reports, detailed in the next section of this paper)
Change Management	Based upon the approved analysis, the need for change in programme activities will be assessed and if required changes in programme delivery will be proposed, approved, implemented and documented through the MIS Change Management System.

Speed is also vital, so that data gets to the management of the programme as soon as possible. In Rwanda, data was collected on a monthly basis. This was considered not to be fast enough so in Ethiopia, data is collected from all over the country on a weekly basis and is fed into a computerised Management Information System for automatic generation of reports. This means that by Tuesday of every week, the management of LIFT know the results from over the entire programme area from last week, a powerful tool for implementation.

A final important point is that auditing, or triangulation of the data, is essential to ensure the data is correct. In Ethiopia, this is achieved through a biannual audit by the monitoring team who visit the programme sites and review the data which has been collected and test the robustness of the data. The programme monitoring data can also be tested by comparing it to the results of the household survey.

Household Survey

A household survey, quantitative in nature, should be carried out on an annual basis. This is the survey which captures the voices of land holders en masse. The survey should be backed with a rigorously tested survey tool and be representative of the entire population. For example, in Ethiopia, 7200 households were interviewed, with a 50% split between control and treatment samples.

The objective of the survey is to:

- Provide data at outcome and impact level from land holders,
- Provide information for programme implementation on land holders opinions of the land services which the programme is providing,
- Verify that the programme monitoring data is correct.

As discussed, it is important to understand land holder's needs (the demand) for land administration in order to meet the goal of irreversible delivery of land administration. So, the household survey tool needs to understand the complexities of the society which the programme is operating in and to understand what they want or need from a land administration system. Skilled designers of household surveys would be able to gage to some degree of accuracy what land holders want even if they don't know what a land administration system looks like through well craft questions. These queries assist in understanding what the outcome and impact of the programme may be.

Additionally, the survey needs to provide queries which will offer recommendations for the improved delivery of the programme. Queries need to be made on the most effective means to communicate government messages on land rights or how satisfied land holders are in the way that the services are being delivered. This provides a means to ensure that recommendations can be made to improve the delivery of the programme from the end users, the households.

Finally, the survey needs to act as confirmation that the programme monitoring data is accurate and correct. If the programme monitoring data suggests that disputes are low but the household survey states that disputes are higher, then there is a need to investigate why there is a discrepancy between the two data sets. Conversely, if the survey data suggests a similar result to the programme monitoring data then greater confidence can be placed on the programme monitoring data.

Household survey data needs to be collected on an annual basis. The procedure is expensive and time consuming so to carry it out more than once a year is unrealistic, and in any case, change in society is not so

quick. It is important to ensure that, as the programme progresses, both types of treatment areas (those that have been treated and those that will) are surveyed in order to learn lessons from those who have received the services so that they can be applied elsewhere.

Institutional Assessment

An institutional assessment is carried out to understand the supply aspect of irreversible delivery. As detailed in the Ethiopian programme, the purpose of the institutional assessment will be:

- To understand the current status of how land administration offices are performing to meet their roles and responsibilities.
- To monitor the implementation of land administration, and how it changes, over time and to provide recommendations on how it can be improved.
- To assess the effectiveness and attribution of programme capacity building activities and to recommend changes to future activities.
- To recommend capacity milestones to Government of Ethiopia to improve the effectiveness of land administration and the enabling environment. Thereafter, to monitor if the recommendations have occurred and their impact upon the improved services of land administration.

The assessment tools are a mixture of checklists, scales and key informant interviews. The tools assess both the resources (staff, equipment and office space) and the management (linkages with other institutions, financial management) of the institution and how these work together, or not, in order to meet the mandate of the organisation, the provision of land administration services for example.

Essentially, the institutional assessment describes how an institution is before the intervention of the programme and how it reacts once the programme has intervened. Land administration, like most government services, is continuous. And it is surrounded by a complex environment which is in a constant flux. Most development programmes provide capacity and then move on without really assessing to see how the interventions have changed the institution and to understand if improvements can be made both for that institution and others within the programme remit.

The institutional assessment thus needs to be carried out on a sample large enough to represent the number of institutions in the programme area. In Ethiopia, out of the 140 land administration offices receiving programme support, 60 will be assessed through the survey tool. Once lessons are learned from this, implementation can be influenced to improve what is being provided by the programme to the institution, improving the supply of public services and thus increasing the chances of irreversible delivery. If the ICT cannot support the type of cadastre that is being proposed, or staff turnover is high, the institutional assessment will be able to tell the management of the programme this.

Studies

Due to the large sample size of the household survey and the institutional assessment, the survey tools need to be broad in the questions they ask in order to consider the multi facets that characterise a land programme. More in-depth queries can be pursued through a literature review or qualitative means such as specific studies.

For example; the household survey tool may suggest that women do not feel as though they have as much tenure security as men, but why they feel this may not be considered because there are a multitude of different responses. Being identified as an issue which needs further analysis, a study is an affordable way to understanding a more specific issue further.

A hypothesis will be set which needs to be tested, such “There is a correlation between Gender Based Violence and an increase in land rights for women”. The hypothesis needs to be founded and supported, either from the household survey or from the institutional assessment which requires further analysis. This can then be analysed and provide recommendations for implementation if required.

Studies are sporadic and cannot be planned out, but they do provide an opportunity to understand an important issue more carefully and are important for overall implementation.

Outcomes of the Monitoring System

As with most systems, the importance is not what is collected but what is presented from the system and how it is used. Numerous reports should be developed which meet the needs of the management or technical

experts. Although specific reports (such as a household baseline survey report) will be written as well, the overall programme reports need to include:

- Results based management,
- Archetype reporting,
- Progress reports.

Results Based Management

Programme control is secured through management based upon results from programme monitoring. The information from the programme monitoring needs to be clearly presented to decision makers. This should be done through clear, concise delivery reports with only key performance indicators highlighted which have been set out to demonstrate if the programme is on trajectory or not (Barber 2008). The delivery reports should be produced on a weekly basis as stated in the previous section.

Such key indicators in the delivery report for land registration may be the number of parcels demarcated or the number of land leases collected. The key performance indicators need to be simple and easy to digest. In Rwanda, 8 indicators were reported on for the land registration process, 13 in Ethiopia. It is essential to ensure that the definition of each indicator is known to all stakeholders. In Rwanda “leases collected” and “leases issued” were often mistaken for one and the same because the definitions of each were not clearly set out at the beginning of the programme.

Of equal importance to the results-based management system is to ensure that a change management system is in existence, which is alluded to in the programme monitoring cycle, set out in the previous section. In the event that change is required due to the data being presented, a system needs to be in place to ensure that the change is defined precisely, is supported by evidence from the data and that the change is communicated appropriately to the entire programme team. This completes the formal process of ensuring monitoring informs implementation.

It is vital that all decision makers are involved in the entire results-based management process. If a donor is funding the programme, then their reporting needs and their ability to agree to change needs to be considered as well as those of the programme management team and the Government. All decision makers must agree on the results based management procedure before they embark on the process, if the donor of the Government is not flexible enough to allow for informed changes in implementation from the beginning of the programme cycle, this could cause issues during implementation.

Archetype Reports

Monitoring institutions and land holders to review supply and demand are crucial. But the analysis of the results from the household survey tool and the institutional assessment should not be presented as a whole. Different groups of society, and different institutions can face differing challenges and as such have differing needs and requirements. Both society and government institutions are examples of complex systems, hence the great challenge of complexity in most development work. This means that the results for the institutions and the customers need to be carefully represented by breaking down the broad groups and presenting them in differing categories. Archetypal reporting is required.

In Ethiopia, respondents may be separated into the different regional states (which vary massively) or into male and female, or both. The data from the household survey can be easily manipulated to demonstrate different responses between the different categories of customers. As a fictional example; women in rural Tigray may consider their rights to be well represented whereas those of Oromia may not consider this to be the case at all. The information from the different respondents can either change or focus implementation in order to meet the differing needs of society and categories within society. In the fictional example management of the programme may change the land right public awareness tools which are being used by the progamme in Oromia compared to Tigray, or technical experts can suggest a better way to approach the specific issues of Oromia.

Archetypes also need to be built for institutions much in the same way as customers above. For example, an institution may have specific issues in their area which are not faced by others such as large-scale land acquisitions or have capacity or motivational issues. In Rwanda, some districts are poorer than others so income from land related services may be less in one district when compared to other districts, creating different challenges for the institution in the poorer region. The institutions could be categorised in relation to the income status of each district to see if similar issues are occurring in each district office or if they differ.

The objective of having specific architype reporting is to provide both technical and managerial positions with knowledge of the differing complexities within the programme area. This knowledge can improve the service delivery as these complexities are better understood and improve the supply and demand which are the basis of institutional change programmes.

Progress Reports

These reports need to clearly state how progress is being made and to assess broad considerations such as risk management. Progress reports are an opportunity for stocktake of the programme as a whole, to provide analysis to understand what is working well and what is not working well and what can be done to improve that.

Progress reports are an opportunity to aggregate data from all four sources to provide the total picture and should be written as a collaboration of the entire team, not just an individual. In both Ethiopia and Rwanda, the progress reports are complimented with stock take meetings with all staff and presentations of final results.

Importance to Continuously Monitor and for Up Scaling

The importance of the monitoring system lies in its ability to answer the two key questions set out by the UNDP. But its importance also lies in its ability to influence delivery to ensure that the lessons learned manipulate implementation so that the goal of irreversible delivery of land administration is met.

Due to the second part, the monitoring system needs to be utilised throughout the programme cycle, from design to decommission. An example of this is the question of sustainability often the goal of land administration services. Habitually, this is queried at the end of the programme coupled with questions which can provide answers for future misadventures elsewhere. This is inappropriate because it will not affect the implementation of the current programme if the question is only asked at the end, and it is rarely enough to inform future endeavours as these are set in completely different contexts, in differing complexities of societies and institutions.

The question, the second one set out in this paper, should be asked throughout the programme cycle so that delivery can be influenced to ensure that sustainability is achieved, rather than evaluating if it has or has not occurred at the end of the programme.

The same monitoring procedures should be implemented during the design phase as well. Land holders and institutions needs must be considered during design through the tools suggested in this paper, not just during implementation. The design of a programme, and thus the initial stages will better inform implementation if households have been surveyed and if institutions have been assessed. This will result in the design of the programme being context specific and providing a better understanding of the complexities which the programme will operate in. If this is fed into the design of the programme, early implementation has a better chance of being suited to the needs of customers and institutions.

Both Rwanda and Ethiopia used a scaling up approach to providing land administration services. They both started with a smaller treatment size and then expanded that size once lessons could be learnt and implemented. A monitoring system is vital for firstly to understand if the upscale should occur and if so, to control the programme as its treatment area expands. Upscale is not always a solution, complexities and challenges outside the control of the programme may mean that a lesser approach is better. The monitoring system can assist in making this decision before it has to be made as it sets out the demand and supply constraints and opportunities of the land administration services in the specific context. If a programme up scales when it shouldn't, programme failure is likely. Thus, a rigorous monitoring system is vital for this consideration.

Conclusion

The importance of the monitoring system in the irreversible delivery of land administration is high when it is designed correctly. The design of the system needs to provide for:

- Measures of progress and achievement against a set trajectory,
- Consideration for the demand (land holders) and supply (institutions) for land administration services in order to achieve irreversible delivery,
- Change management system allowing for changes in implementation based upon the results and analysis of the monitoring system,
- The use of the monitoring system throughout the programme lifecycle, including the design phase.

This conference possesses the question of how to scale up responsible land governance. It is my firm belief that this is not just a technical question but also a managerial one, how can the design of systems and processes allow for successful upscaling of a responsible land governance system. A robust monitoring system is important to achieve this through the rigorous monitoring of progress and the achievement of the desired results through the monitoring systems influence on implementation.

The final conclusion is this. I believe the approaches set out here are not simply for land registration and administration programmes but for the successful delivery of all public service programmes which are in the pursuit of irreversible delivery. The tools may change, but the four points above will always hold, and they are vital in ensuring success.

Bibliography

Barber, M. 2008," Instruction to Deliver: Fighting to Transform Britain's Public Services" Methuen Publishing Ltd

Barber, M. 2013, "The good news from Pakistan" Reform

Cotula L., Toulmin C. and Quan J. 2006. "Better Land Access for The Poor" FAO

Department for International Development, 2015 "Land Investment for Transformation Annual Review", DFID UK.

Edwards, O., 2014 "Delivering large scale land certification programmes; lessons learned from the Rwanda Land Tenure Regularisation Programme" World Bank

English, C. and Edwards, O. 2011 "Innovative Approaches to Land Governance and Programme Management, a Contractors Perspective" World Bank

Emebark, S., McLaren R., and Lemmen, C. 2015 "Fit for Purpose for Administration" UNHABITAT

Gignoux J., Macours K., and Wren- Lewis, L. 2013 "Evaluating the impact of Land Administration Programs on agricultural productivity and rural development" Inter-American Development Bank

UNDP, "HANDBOOK ON PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATING FOR DEVELOPMENT RESULTS" 2009, UN Publications.