



A MULTI-COUNTRY CAPACITY ASSESSMENT ON SDG INDICATOR 1.4.2

**GLOBAL STATUS ON LAND TENURE SECURITY DATA
COLLECTION, ANALYSIS AND REPORTING**



CONTENTS

List of tables and Figures	3
Acronyms	4
Acknowledgements	6
Citation	6
Disclaimer	6
Executive Summary	7
1. Introduction & background	11
1.1 Land and Sustainable Development Goals	11
1.2 Background on multi-country assessment	14
1.3 Methods & Analysis framework	16
1.3.1 Assessment Methods and Process	16
1.3.2 Country Samples	17
1.3.3 Analysis frame	18
2. Status of data availability and quality	20
2.1 Data Availability	20
2.1.1 Administrative data sources reported in the survey	21
2.1.2 Significant on-going movements to improve data on SDG 1.4.2	22
2.2 Data quality	24
3. NSO capacities and structure of collaboration	27
3.1 Findings ON NATIONAL statistical organisations' capacities	27
3.2 FINDINGS on NSO Status on collaboration and co-ordination	29
4. Conclusion	31
5. Recommendations	34
Annexes	36
A.1 Online Survey tool	36
A.2 Demonstrative examples of questions on land in existing country surveys	44
6.o The Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII)	49

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Figure 1. Schema of process of conducting multi-country assessment on SDG indicator 1.4.2.....	17
Figure 2. Sample of countries covered in the multi-country assessment on SDG 1.4.2.....	17
Figure 3. Analysis Framework for multi-country capacity assessment /country preparedness to report on SDG indicator 1.4.2	19
Table 1. Status of data availability (and gaps therein) on SDG 1.4.2.....	21
Table 2. Overview analysis of World Bank Household Micro data	23
Table 3. Status (& gaps therein) of Quality of Data on SDG 1.4.2	26
Table 4. Status (& gaps therein) on NSO capacities and structure of collaboration	28

ACRONYMS

AU	African Union
CAPI	Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing
CFS	United Nations Committee on World Food Security
CSO	Central Statistical Organisation
DANE	National Administrative Department of Statistics, Colombia
DHS	Demographic and Health Survey
EGM	Expert Group Meeting
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GLII	Global Land Indicators Initiative
GLTN	Global Land Tool Network
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IFAD	International Fund for Agriculture Development
ILC	International Land Coalition
ILO	International Labour Organisation
LDC	Least Developed Country
LGAF	Land Governance Assessment Framework (World Bank)
LPI	Land Policy Initiative (African Union, African Development Bank and UNECA)
LSMS	Living Standard Measurement Survey (World Bank initiative)
LSMS-ISA	Living Standard Measurement Survey – Integrated Survey on Agriculture
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MICS	Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (UNICEF initiative)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NRI	Natural Resources Institute (University of Greenwich)
NSO	National Statistical Organisation
ODK	Open Data Kit
PRIndex	Property Rights Index (Land Alliance initiative to measure perceptions of tenure security)
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
UEMOA	Union Economique et Monetaire Ouest-Africaine (West African Economic and Monetary Union)
UIS	Urban Inequities Survey (UN-Habitat initiative)
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNICEF	United Nations Children Fund

UN Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
VGGT	Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests
WCA	World Census on Agriculture (FAO data initiative)
WHH	Women headed household

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful for research and technical advice from Mr. Oumar Sylla, Unit Leader – Land and Global Land Tool Network, Everlyne Nairesiae, Coordinator Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII); Robert Ndugwa, Head-Global Urban Observatory Unit, and Donatien Beguy, Human Settlement Officer in Research and Capacity Development Branch in UN Habitat; and Leandre Ngogang Statistician with Africa Centre for Statistics (UN Economic Commission for Africa). We also express appreciation for the valued time and perspectives provided by senior leadership of national statistical offices in the 17 countries. This multi-country assessment has also benefitted from the deliberations of the Expert Group Meeting (EGM) held in Washington DC (May 2017) by custodian agencies for indicator 1.4.2 – UH-Habitat and World Bank, in collaboration with the GLII. We acknowledge the six National Statistical Offices - NSOs (Colombia, India, Tanzania, Uganda, Jamaica, Cameroon) who participated in the EGM, provided valuable perspective on existing (and) data availability, data quality, NSO capacities, and on the gaps therein, and data agencies coordination issues. Despite unevenness, and lack of coordination efforts so far in NSO's coverage of data on tenure security, the authors were impressed by the extent to which the NSOs surveyed are already seeking to capture relevant data and the significant efforts already underway. Contrary to the perception that NSO's are methodologically unprepared for data collection on security of land and property rights, this finding is extremely encouraging from the point of view of efforts to upgrade the level of prioritization of land indicators within the SDG framework, although many NSOs are not yet to collect the necessary data for measuring the indicator. The NSOs' perspective are useful in understanding how readiness can be improved for countries to report data on this indicator, and their contributions to this assessment is sincerely acknowledged.

CITATION

R. Kumar, J. Quan, G. Mboup (2017) 'A Multi-Country Capacity assessment on SDG 1.4.2: Global status on land tenure security data collection, analysis and reporting'. Commissioned by UN Habitat /GLTN's Global Land Indicators Initiative, study conducted by Natural Resources Institute, University of Greenwich report, Chatham: UK.

DISCLAIMER

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries, or regarding its economic system or degree of development. The analysis, conclusions and recommendations of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme or its Governing Council.

Background to the Study

Land is of cross cutting significance for the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. Under SDG Goal 1, Ending Poverty, SDG Target 1.4, articulates a high priority global objective:

*"By 2030, ensure that **all men and women, in particular 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.**"*

Secure rights to land and property for women and men are a critical element of rights to economic resources, and security of land tenure is also essential in both urban and rural areas to ensure shelter and enable people to access basic and financial services, establish a livelihood and ensure wellbeing. Directly linked to SDG Target 1.4, SDG 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**, is a key indicator that provides a globally comparable basis for the measurement of tenure security.

The Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDGs of the UN Statistical Commission has classified indicator 1.4.2 as Tier III indicator, signifying that so far this indicator has had no established methodology and data is not regularly collected at country level. UN Habitat and the World Bank are the custodian agencies for this indicator, tasked to provide technical support in the development of methodology for monitoring this indicator and capacity strengthening for Land and National Statistical Agencies in data collection, analysis and reporting.

For better understanding of countries' existing readiness to report against Indicator 1.4.2, UN-Habitat in collaboration with the Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII) commissioned a rapid multi-country assessment of the existing status of data availability, data quality and data related institutional capacities at country level amongst National Statistical Organisations (NSOs) to collect, analyse the relevant data, on documentation and perceptions of security of land and property rights in both urban and rural areas.

UN Habitat commissioned the Natural Resources Institute (NRI) to conduct the assessment which was designed in collaboration with UN Habitat and GLII, with inputs from Africa Centre for Statistics (UNECA). This report presents the results of the assessment. It is intended to inform the work of the co-custodian agencies on Indicator 1.4.2 be used in developing a coherent strategy to further develop country level NSO capacities and strengthen their collaboration with land agencies.

In order to upgrade the Tier Status of the indicator it will be necessary to expand the capacity for data collection using consistent, harmonized and globally comparable methodologies to meet the reporting requirements of Indicator 1.4.2. In context of the need to upgrade the status of the indicator within the SDG monitoring framework, immediate priorities on which this report is intended to shed light, are to develop authoritative guidelines to orient the efforts of NSOs and initiate capacity building to enable them, together with national land agencies holding relevant administrative data, to fast track systematic data collection and reporting for the indicator. The report also informs GLII platform members and other stakeholders of the types of needs and opportunities for capacity strengthening that presently exist.

The research team used the following methods:

- Online survey with NSO representatives – 15 countries responses received (out of 73 countries to whom the survey questionnaire was sent; a response rate of over 20%).
- Face to Face interview of country level NSO and land ministry officials through country visits – 2 countries (Niger and Senegal).

Data availability and quality on SDG indicator 1.4.2

This assessment shows that international household survey programs like LSMS, DHS, MICS, WCA exist in 14 of the 17 countries that responded. At present, 11 of these 14 countries are collecting data related to documentation of land rights. However, only 3 of those countries are also collecting data related to perceptions of tenure security. At present, 5 of the 17 responding countries reported that their national censuses collect data related to documentation of land rights, however no country reported collection of perception data. About half of respondent countries have reported existence of other data initiatives, which can potentially supply data related to this indicator.

Several efforts across the countries give clear indication of a strong on-going movement to improve data related to measuring land tenure security over the years. Cameroon is ready to report on this indicator by 2019. Senegal DHS 2005 included the UN-Habitat's module on secure tenure. In Niger, land is part of household living conditions and agriculture survey. India undertakes separate and independent household surveys on land and farmers' working and living conditions, which include data related to documentation of land rights. The last such survey was undertaken in 2013 by India's National Sample Survey Office (NSSO). LSMS-ISA captures (e.g. for Uganda, 2013) ownership status of agriculture land and source of acquisition and also on land rights documentation and threat perception. The DHS-7 round (2013-2018) includes a limited set of questions on self-reported ownership of land and housing and available documentation, in order to measure intra-household asset ownership and its impact on indicators of women's empowerment. Recent surveys that include land questions are available for over 75 countries.

The findings of the online survey and interviews with NSOs show that gender-disaggregated data is fully or partially available in 8 of the 17 countries surveyed. Data disaggregated by income groups was reported by 12 of the 17 NSOs. Disaggregation by 'type of tenure' is currently being captured by 15 of the 17 countries surveyed, although the extent to which household survey data can be disaggregated to capture customary tenure types in countries where this applies is not clear. The data quality on 'extent of coverage' dimension shows a mixed picture. While both agriculture and residential land data is available for 15 of the 17 countries, data for community or group land holding and for slum /informal settlements is available only for 7 and 5 of those countries respectively. Most of the NSOs responding concurred on the need for refinement and additional questions to capture information which will respond to the requirement of reporting on SDG indicator 1.4.2. The Niger and Senegal NSOs pointed out that the cost of data collection, processing and analysis will depend on the length of the module.

The online survey and interviews with the NSO representatives in 17 countries gives a clear indication that medium to good availability and quality of data on the SDG indicator 1.4.2. The assessment have shown that a good range of survey opportunities currently exist in all countries, which if leveraged, can ensure robust data collection and reporting on SDG indicator 1.4.2. International survey programs in 14 of the 17 countries surveyed is a strong indicator of higher probability of success of efforts at integrating land modules (key questions within existing survey programs) and harmonizing data standards and protocols across countries.

All the NSOs in this survey have shown their willingness to include a land module into existing household surveys and other data initiatives.

NSO capacities and collaboration with land agencies and international organisations

The NSOs (surveyed) are well-equipped in terms of human resources and technology and have many years of experience of conducting households' surveys and censuses, although resource constraints for regular conduct of surveys and censuses were identified as one of the main issues by some NSOs, especially in LDCs which depend heavily on donor funding to conduct surveys and censuses. While, NSOs have upgraded their information technology infrastructure and ICT related skills in recent years, many of those responding in this assessment identified a range of needs for capacity augmentation related to use of mobile technology, GPS, exploitation of big data, computer-assisted data collection, development of strong and secure integrated data management systems, and on-line data capture application etc.

Approximately half of the NSOs have formal or informal coordination and information sharing arrangements with land agencies, such as national, provincial and local land boards, customary authorities. All NSOs (surveyed) understand that data held by land agencies and other institutions (NGOs, civil society, international organizations, etc.) will complement their survey datasets and can also be used for triangulation. There are many interesting examples of strong collaboration (for instance Colombia, India, and Sweden) between NSOs and land agencies. Other NSOs reported that their working arrangements with land agencies 'partially' exist at present. However all the NSOs responding showed willingness to develop productive engagement with the country's land

agencies. Very few NSOs (3 of 17 surveyed) currently have a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) or structured collaboration (for the SDG data reporting) with international organisations.

This multi-country assessment shows that institutionally, the responding NSOs are on a strong footing to address the requirements of data collection and reporting on the SDG indicator 1.4.2 as they have the required willingness, infrastructure and skills, even though some augmentation will be required in these areas to make reporting on this indicator more robust and effective. While this is a very positive finding, the caveat is that unknown numbers of the NSOs that did not respond, and those that were not surveyed may be in a weaker position to address indicator 1.4.2. The Responding NSOs called for strengthening their links with country's land agencies and with international organisations. To maximize the potential of these collaborations, NSOs expressed the need for increased/higher level of involvement and representation in international discussions related to this indicator (and to other SDG indicators). They also would like the role of NSOs to be clearly defined when working with UN-Habitat, the World Bank and other partners. They stressed that they should be involved in the roll out of new survey methodologies by international organizations, and especially in design and analysis of results).

Conclusion:

The study results show that in their efforts directed towards reclassification of SDG indicator 1.4.2 from Tier III to Tier II and eventually to Tier I, the co-custodian agencies can build on opportunities that presently exist while also addressing prevailing challenges. This assessment illustrates the opportunities that co-custodian agencies can leverage. At the same time, the findings identify some early challenges that can be tackled immediately or relatively quickly as well as bigger challenges that require longer term efforts. These are key points for reflection for co-custodian agencies and for GLII platform members which can inform their future planning and actions.

Recommendations:

This assessment provides a status on strengths, challenges and opportunities for land data collection, analysis and reporting on the SDG indicator 1.4.2. This report inform the work of the co-custodian agencies on Indicator 1.4.2 particularly in prioritizing the capacity needs for NSOs and land data institutions to fast track reporting on the indicator. The key recommendations below are distilled from the findings of this multi-country assessment and provide a number of pointers to the co-custodian agencies to steer their work in the next one to two years:

- 1. Leverage existing data initiatives for transitioning SDG indicator 1.4.2 from Tier III to Tier II and eventually to Tier I:** The widespread implementation of household surveys offers the possibility of adding security of land tenure modules to the household questionnaire. The international survey programs such as LSMS, DHS, MICS, and NSOs should tap these opportunities by adjustment of the newly agreed questions on land to bring these in line with the requirements of global-scale reporting on the SDG indicator 1.4.2.
- 2. Strengthen the indicator 1.4.2 Custodian Agencies' Meta data document, methodology report to the IAEG-SDG EGM in November 2017 and forward plans for capacity building utilizing the key findings of this report:** This assessment shows a significant on-going trends across all countries surveyed to improve data related to measuring land tenure security. The assessment also points out how and where this movement can be strengthened to ensure that globally comparable reporting on the SDG indicator 1.4.2 take place in the near future. It also provides the arguments for upgrading the tier status of the indicator. The key findings of this multi-country assessment can feed into the Meta data document, methodology report to the IAEG-SDG and work-plan documents due to be submitted to the IAEG-SDGs in autumn of 2017.
- 3. Country level actions to improve availability and quality of data at country level:** The assessment shows that few countries are well advanced in their preparedness to report on the SDG 1.4.2 indicator. These quick-wins needs to be realized. The assessment also highlight gaps and a clear need for strengthening

existing data initiatives at country level to transition to improve data availability and data quality (on the SDG indicator 1.4.2) in the next few years. Three-pronged actions are needed in such cases:

- i. Integrating land modules / key questions within existing survey programs - both national and international survey programs.
 - ii. Working with NSOs to upgrade their information technology infrastructure and ICT related skills, and capacity augmentation related to use of mobile technology, GPS, exploitation of big data, computer-assisted data collection, development of strong and secure integrated data management systems, on-line data capture application etc..
 - iii. harmonizing data standards and protocols across countries through active national, regional and international collaborations with existing data initiatives, including other SDG indicators (e.g. 5.a.1). This will require user manuals, authoritative guidelines for harmonization.
4. **Strategic investments for ensuring disaggregated data:** Disaggregation by gender, income and tenure type etc. are crucial to gain a fuller picture. The co-custodian should deploy a team of researchers for gaining detailed understanding of methodologies used by national and international survey programs so that approaches for obtaining disaggregated data can be harmonised across countries.
5. **Catalysing formal /informal engagement of NSOs with land agencies in the country:** The co-custodian agencies should build on NSO's willingness to link with land agencies and lessons from countries where these links are well-established (for example Colombia, India, Jamaica, Tanzania etc.), and support the NSOs in strengthening their formal /informal engagement with land agencies. In this context, establishing regional steering committees could be helpful where NSOs and land departments play a central role in land data collection and analysis.
6. **Maximising active participation /involvement of NSOs:** The co-custodian agencies should develop an engagement plan that defines NSO needs and capacities and specify their roles and responsibilities for maximizing active participation and involvement of NSOs in survey design and analysis processes related to the indicator. As a first step, this report should be shared with the NSOs for their feedback. The roll out of new survey methodologies by international organization should necessarily involve NSOs in design and analysis.
7. **Specific capacity and Resource support to NSOs:** Some of the NSOs (especially those in LDCs) need support to address their bigger /longer term challenge of mobilizing financial resources for effective conduct of their national surveys. The co-custodian agencies should consider how best to work with and develop existing donor collaborative platforms to mobilize resources to support NSOs and Land agencies. The co-custodian agencies should constitute regional /country level technical task teams that can conduct research and facilitate technical and management support to NSOs and land agencies on their granular capacity building needs.

1. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

1.1 LAND AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Relevance of land to the SDGs, SDG targets and associated indicators

United Nations Member States have committed to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) within a time frame of 15 years, endorsing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 70/1.

Land is the primary source of food production and natural resources, the foundation for human shelter and settlement, and a source of livelihoods for people throughout the world. Opportunities and rights to access or own and utilise land are of fundamental significance for economic development: security of rights to land unlocks economic opportunities by enabling individuals and households to utilize it by producing food or running businesses, to access basic and financial services, establish a livelihood and ensure wellbeing. In these ways land tenure security is of central importance for ending poverty, in both urban and rural areas.

Equal rights to land and property for women and men is a critical ingredient of women's empowerment and necessary to eliminate gender discrimination. Clarity and certainty of land rights are also necessary to enable all land users, whether individuals, households, communities, companies, corporations and other organisations to plan and utilise land resources sustainably, in both urban and rural contexts. Land is thus of cross cutting significance for the achievement of the SDGs. According to Professor Jeffrey Sachs in a recent blog (<https://landportal.info/blog-post/2017/09/land-and-sdgs>), *Land rights determine social status, women's empowerment, and the survival or destruction of cultures, especially of indigenous peoples... [And]..... Land use is at the heart of poverty eradication, food security, gender equality, water management, and decent work, sustainable cities, ending climate change, and protecting biodiversity.*

Under SDG Goal 1, Ending Poverty, SDG Target 1.4, articulates a high priority global objective:

*"By 2030, ensure that **all men and women, in particular 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.**"*

Secure rights to land and property for women and men are a critical element of rights economic resources, and land tenure security is essential to ensure shelter and enable people to access services. In promoting and charting progress in extending people's access to economic and livelihood resources and towards ending poverty, SDG 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**, provides a globally comparable basis for the measurement of tenure security.

Secure land rights, sustainable land use and good land governance more broadly are also of direct relevance to other SDGs and associated targets and indicators:

- Under Goal 2, Zero hunger, Target 2.3 which includes *the doubling of agricultural productivity and the incomes of small scale food producers in all sectors through secure and equal access*

to land and other productive resources, can also be supported by using information collected to meet indicator 1.4.2 in addition to indicator 2.4.2 Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture.

- Target 5a, under **Goal 5. Gender equality**, is to *Undertake reforms to give women equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, financial services, inheritance and natural resources, in accordance with national laws.* Associated Indicator 5.a.i is intended to track: *a) Proportion of total agricultural population with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land, by sex; (b) share of women among owners or rights-bearers of agricultural land, by type of tenure*
- Target 11.1, under **Goal 11. Sustainable cities** is: *By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums.* Associated indicator 11.1.1 seeks to track the *Proportion of urban population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing*, and in practice will in part rely on data collected under indicator 1.4.2, disaggregated specifically to capture levels of security for different categories of tenure on which urban people rely to access land in informal settlements and for slum improvement. Goal 11 also requires improved urban land use and settlement planning and provision of public spaces in cities, targets that also rely on having good land information for decision making and monitoring of progress.
- Target 15.2 under Goal 15, Life on Land is to: *By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation-neutral world, and indicator 15.3.1 aims to track the proportion of land that is degraded, over total land area, on a country-by-country basis.* Although this indicator can be addressed by utilising various in-country and remote or aerial photographic digital data sources, secure land rights and clarification of land user and institutional responsibilities for different publically and privately owned land areas provide a key basis for decision making on sustainable land use and the reversal of land degradation.

Given its central importance for ending poverty and tracking country progress in putting secure land and property rights in place as a central enabling condition for poverty reduction, and the relevance of data collected for 1.4.2 to other SDG targets, notably Target 5.a. i. and Goal 11 Sustainable Cities, 1.4.2 is a key indicator that countries need to report on in seeking to achieve the SDGs.

Tier classification of SDG land indicators, the roles of custodian agencies, statistical organisations and other organisations

The UN's IAEG-SDGs in collaboration with UNSC, the UN statistical commission has classified all of the accepted SDG indicators into 3 tiers according to availability of suitable data sources and methodologies for data collection and analysis and the extend of reporting by countries in tracking progress against each specific indicator.

In March 2016, The Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDGs of the UN Statistical Commission classified indicator 1.4.2 as a Tier III indicator since this indicator currently has no established methodology and data is not regularly collected at country level.

UN Habitat and World Bank are the custodian agencies for this indicator, and are tasked to provide technical support in the development of methodology for monitoring this indicator and capacity strengthening for National Statistical Organisations and Land Agencies in data collection, analysis and reporting. This process entails:

- i. development and revision of a meta-data document describing the data sources, methodologies and survey instruments presently available for countries to report against the indicator;
- ii. methodological work to develop and strengthen existing survey instruments and data sets to enable countries to collect and report on the necessary data, including utilization of available administrative data on tenure security for reporting in the short term where appropriate survey data is not so far available;
- iii. intensified engagement with and interaction and debate amongst NSOs and land agencies to assess their readiness to expand data collection using appropriate and consistent survey tools, capacity to reporting against the indicator drawing on the range of available and emerging sources;
- iv. production of evidence on Expert Group Meetings (EGMs), member states consultations, methodology improvements and data collection to meet the criteria for reclassification of indicator 1.4.2 into Tier II and subsequently Tier III (classification criteria are described below); and
- v. Assessment of capacity building needs and mobilization of the necessary resources to initiate and subsequently expand the necessary capacity.

The World Bank, UN Habitat along with national statistical systems, bilateral and multilateral aid donors including the Global Donor Working Group on Land, and with the support of the Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII) are fast tracking efforts for reclassification of this indicator to Tier II

At present relatively few countries produce relevant land tenure data sets, and those that do collect and report relevant data do not do so using consistent and comparable methodologies. Reclassification of Indicator 1.4.2 to Tier II requires that the indicator be conceptually clear, and have an established methodology, and clearly available data standards that NSOs and other organisations involved in reporting can follow, but does not require that a critical mass of countries be already equipped for regular reporting.

Preparation of the methodology report to be submitted to the Inter-Agency Expert Group (IAEG) on SDG Indicators on 11-14 November 2017 is now, at the time of writing, the immediate priority for the Indicator 1.4.2 Custodian Agencies. The IAEG-SDG's decision on the tier status of the indicator will determine how quickly countries as a whole will embark on national level data collection and reporting on the indicator. This report is intended to shed light on the readiness of NSOs to adopt common methodologies and on complementary activities to assist development the methodology report and in promoting reclassification of the indicator.

Other key objectives of the custodian agencies and supporting organisations are to initiate systematic capacity building for NSOs to enable them to report more regularly on Indicator 1.4.2 and other SDG related land indicators, and, after a period in which methodologically consistent and regular data collection and progress reporting expands across countries in all regions, to embark on reclassification of Indicator 1.4.2 to Tier 1. This requires not only that the indicator is conceptually clear, with

established methodology and standards available, but that data is regularly produced by a growing number of countries). This assessment is therefore also intended to shed light on the type of assistance and capacity building that NSOs are likely to need to roll out data collection and reporting broadly across all global regions, the priority needs for capacity building in the short term, and how NSO status and capacity for reporting on this indicator could be assessed more systematically as a basis for sustained global capacity (which will also be needed to meet the reporting requirements of other priority indicators presently classified as Tier II or Tier III).

In most countries NSOs are the central infrastructure for data collection analysis of statistical data and production and management of official statistics and creation of accurate data sets for decision-making. Land Registries and other land agencies play a similar role in compiling administrative data on land holding, land use including the incorporation of descriptive information on land parcels and land rights holders into official cadastral and land information systems. Data gaps, however, exist in a number of sectors, including land, as land registry information is generally incomplete, certain categories of socially legitimate land rights, such as customary tenure systems may lack official recognition. Moreover data on tenure security of land rentals is generally not available from land agencies, and there is little interaction between statistical and land agencies for purposes of development of more complete and more useful data sets to support policy and decision making on land.

The requirement for reporting on SDG 1.4.2 provides a clear opportunity to strengthen country-level data generation systems, and in turn to take action to help deliver greater security of land and property rights in both urban and rural areas. Land governance can further be strengthened by an information- and monitoring-driven approach for change, within which national land institutions can develop ways of making reliable and regularly updated land and property information publically available on a routine basis. This would also improve the availability of administrative data; alongside greater availability of relevant spatial data sets and household survey data, including data on perceptions of tenure security. This can help ensure that no-one is left behind in the drive to improve security of land and property rights for all.

1.2 BACKGROUND ON MULTI-COUNTRY ASSESSMENT

An understanding of countries' readiness to report against Indicator 1.4.2 requires assessment of the existing status of data availability, data quality and data related capacities and co-ordinations at country level to collect, analyse the relevant data, on documentation and perceptions of security of land and property rights. This assessment is important to enable adoption of a coherent strategy to build on existing NSO capacities and collaborations with land agencies at country level to expand their capacities and overall coverage.

In some countries, the World Bank and FAO have supported national censuses, agricultural censuses and national household surveys through which availability of land tenure related information can plausibly be expected to have improved in the last survey round during 2010-15 where some countries took the initiative to include land tenure documentation in their national censuses. Voluntarily or in response to UN-Habitat request, some countries and a number of major cities have also included questions on tenure documentation and perceived eviction on their household surveys such as DHS and MICS. Other countries have also conducted full Urban Inequities Surveys with an entire survey module on secure tenure. This multi-country study reported here is therefore timely and important in

providing an assessment of the extent to which land tenure security data is available through national and internationally supported data sources in each country.

Against this backdrop, and for better understanding of countries' existing readiness to report against Indicator 1.4.2, UN-Habitat in collaboration with the Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII) commissioned a rapid multi-country assessment of the existing status of data availability, data quality and data related institutional capacities at country level amongst NSOs to collect, analyse the necessary data on documentation and perceptions of security of land and property rights. UN Habitat commissioned Natural Resources Institute of the University of Greenwich., to conduct the assessment, assisted by contributions from Gora Corp. The assessment was designed in collaboration with UN Habitat and GLII, with inputs from Africa Centre for Statistics (UNECA). This report presents the results of the assessment.

The main objective of this assessment is to examine National Statistical and Data System preparedness to report on land indicator 1.4.2 for a sample of countries. The assessment has the following objectives:

1. Establish the level of data availability by type and quality at national/country level
2. Examine the data production capacities including institutional and systemic
3. Assess structural issues including coordination mechanisms and collaboration arrangement in the data production/use infrastructure for this indicator
4. Provide key recommendations on the capacity of NSOs for action by the custodian agencies for indicator 1.4.2 and other partners linked to land monitoring in the SDGs, regional and other land governance global frameworks.

This report provides a multi-country capacity status report on strengths, challenges and opportunities for land data collection, analysis and reporting on indicator 1.4.2. It is intended to inform the work of the co-custodian agencies on Indicator 1.4.2 in adopting a coherent strategy for further development of country level NSO capacities and strengthen their collaboration with land agencies.

Given the need to upgrade the Tier Status of the indicator it will be necessary to expand the capacity for data collection using consistent, harmonized and globally comparable methodologies to meet the reporting requirements of Indicator 1.4.2. This report is also to shed light on the readiness of NSOs to adopt and implement appropriate survey tools and methodologies and initiate active country reporting on the indicator.

The report also GLII platform members and the GDWGL as "Friends of the Custodian agencies" (name of an informal committee established by GDWGL in April 2017) and other stakeholders of the types of needs and opportunities for capacity strengthening that presently exist and to which they can contribute. In addition to reporting on overall progress towards SDG 1, *Eliminating Poverty*, Global efforts to gather data to report on indicator 1.4.2 and other land related SDG indicators can also lead to better reporting and tracking of countries efforts to adopt and implement the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGTs).

A fundamental principle of the VGGTs is for countries with support of development partners in public and private sectors and in civil society to pursue the development and implementation of sound legal and institutional frameworks, and fit-for-purpose land administration, information and spatial data systems that recognise, incorporate and offer security to all socially legitimate forms of tenure are

fundamental. Existing land administration data and survey data on tenure security where available can be utilized to refine, advocate and measure progress of land policy reforms and associated development assistance programmes.

1.3 METHODS & ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

1.3.1 ASSESSMENT METHODS AND PROCESS

This multi-country assessment was designed in collaboration with UN Habitat and GLII, with inputs from Africa Centre for Statistics (UNECA). The research have used the following methods:

- Online survey with NSO representatives – 15 countries’ responses were received, out of 73 countries to whom the survey questionnaire was sent). In addition, research team conducted one to one discussions with NSO representatives during EGM in Washington DC – 6 countries (whose online survey responses were also received)
- Face-to Face interview of country level NSO and land ministry officials through two country visits (Niger and Senegal¹).


The 73 countries, targeted for the survey, were selected to ensure representation across different regions in the world. As the survey was initiated in only one language (English), consideration was given to select ‘English’ speaking countries, even though some French /Spanish speaking countries were also targeted where it was assumed that response was possible in English. At over 20% this was a relatively high response rate for this online survey, although a higher level of responses would have been desirable. The online survey was available for response by targeted NSO respondents during one month (15 May to 15 June 2017). To encourage responses three follow up reminder notes were sent to the potential respondents during this period.

The multi-country assessment was carried out using 8-steps, described in figure 1 below. The starting point was to develop a concept note detailing the objective of the assessment and its utility in understanding country level preparedness to report on the SDG indicator 1.4.2. The assessment framework was developed consultatively with UN Habitat, GLII, Gora Corp. and UNECA’s Africa Centre for Statistics (ACS). The online survey was designed and administered through University of Greenwich (UoG)² subscription service of an online survey portal (BOS online surveys). The online survey tool and stakeholder interview checklists are annexed. The online survey was conducted during 15 May to 15 June 2017.

¹ Niger and Senegal were selected opportunistically and the interviews conducted by team member Dr Gora Mboup of Gora Corp. as he was able to schedule the interviews during a visit to those countries in May 2017.

² We have signed up to and followed UoG code of practice for collecting and processing personal data. Confidentiality is maintained throughout and respondent identifies are protected in this research.

Figure 1. Schema of process of conducting multi-country assessment on SDG indicator 1.4.2




Upon receiving the responses from the survey and report of country missions, we carried out analysis and synthesis of data and perspective to prepare this assessment report.

1.3.2 COUNTRY SAMPLES

Overall the research data comes from 17 countries (15 online surveys + 2 country missions) representing different regions across the world. Overall, Africa was most strongly represented (7 countries), followed by Asia (4 countries):

Figure 2. Sample of countries covered in the multi-country assessment on SDG 1.4.2



The report presents summary and comparative analysis of country level situation across 17 countries. This although providing an indicative overview of NSO readiness for SDG indicator 1.4.2, is not

representative of the global level situation as country samples are based on self-selected voluntary participation of 17 countries in an online survey broadcasted to a total of 73 countries.

The full set of 73 countries were selected jointly with UN Habitat based on criteria of regional representation, and familiarity with the English language, given inadequate resources to conduct the survey and analysis in other languages. Niger and Senegal were chosen for face to face interviews through country visits due to proximity of one of the French speaking consultant; who lives in Senegal.

1.3.3 ANALYSIS FRAME

The multi-country assessment is structured around three components: DATA, CAPACITY and STRUCTURE. This structure of assessment is used as an analysis framework for understanding the global status on data collection, analysis and reporting on SDG indicator 1.4.2.


1. **DATA:** Assessment related to data availability and data quality.
2. **CAPACITY:** Assessment related to data collection and management capacity at NSOs
3. **STRUCTURE:** Assessment related to coordination and collaborative arrangement at the country level for collecting, analysing and reporting data.

The analysis framework is described in Figure 3. In addition, assessment of data availability and quality on SDG 1.4.2 was done through micro data³ available at World Bank and DHS websites.

³ [http://dhsprogram.com/What-We-Do/survey](http://dhsprogram.com/What-We-Do/survey;) ;

<http://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/1sms>

Figure 3. Analysis Framework for multi-country capacity assessment /country preparedness to report on SDG indicator 1.4.2



2. STATUS OF DATA AVAILABILITY AND QUALITY

The main sources of data for SDG 1.4.2 (besides administrative records) are:

1. Household surveys supported by International Survey programs like Demographic and Health Survey (DHS, ~5 years frequency), Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS, ~5 years frequency), Living Standard Measurement Survey (LSMS, ~3 to 5 years), LSMS-Integrated Survey on Agriculture (LSMS-ISA, ~2 to 3 years), FAO World Census on Agriculture (WCA, ~10 years)
2. National Household Surveys (NHS, ~3 to 5 years) conducted by NSOs, with eventual support from line /sectoral ministries
3. National population and housing and censuses (~10 years) and other country-level data /survey initiatives

In this section, we present an assessment of the extent to which the above quoted national and international survey programs exist in 17 countries (countries in this survey are self-selections as an online survey was sent out to 70+ countries) and to what extent these surveys currently capture relevant data for SDG 1.4.2 and what are the key gaps therein. Data quality is assessed through three dimensions, a) extent of disaggregation available, b) level of coverage achieved (rural /urban, community/groups, slums /informal settlements), c) public access to micro data of these survey programs.

2.1 DATA AVAILABILITY

Land tenure security can be effectively measured by the population-based data using household surveys and censuses, which are statistically rigorous means of collecting globally comparable data that is representative of national populations. Monitoring the land tenure security within a given population enables policy makers to trace the impact of land policies and market and social dynamics by gathering data directly from the people themselves.

International survey programs such as LSMS, DHS, MICS, WCA exist in 14 of the 17 countries (see table 1) surveyed. Wherever one of these international survey program exists, they collect data related to documentation of land rights, except Bangladesh, Mauritius and Slovenia. However, the household questionnaires would need to be improved and standardized so as to collect data specifically related to 'legally recognized documentation'. However, most of these survey programs do not collect information related to perception ("whether people feel or perceive that land, housing or property rights are secure, or at risks in any way") of land tenure security or risks therein. Three out of the fourteen countries that operated international household surveys reported that they are currently collecting perception related land tenure data.

National household surveys (country's own initiatives as opposed to internationally assisted survey programs mentioned above) exist in all countries surveyed. At present, 12 of the 17 countries surveyed (see table 1) are collecting data related to documentation of land rights, and as with above, only 3 of 17 countries are collecting data related to perception.

Population and Housing Census is also universal across the countries. About two-thirds of countries have conducted their census surveys in the last five years. In general, censuses are conducted every 10 years (last round conducted around 2010, next round being planned around 2020). At present, 5

of 17 countries reported that census collect data related to documentation of land rights, and no country has reported collection of perception data.

Other relevant data initiatives within countries: Approximately half of respondent countries have reported existence of other relevant data collection initiatives. These initiatives in Bangladesh, Cameroon, Colombia, India, Mauritius and other countries are currently collecting data related to documentation of land rights through their other survey initiatives, some of the examples of which are - Effective Enjoyment of Rights Survey (EGED) in Colombia, Land survey in India, Household living condition survey in Niger and Senegal, Household Expenditure Surveys and annual Labour Force Surveys in Singapore, Agricultural Census in Mauritius, etc.

Table 1. Status of data availability (and gaps therein) on SDG 1.4.2

Country	Intl. Survey Program (LSMS, DHS, MICS, Agriculture Census etc.)			National household surveys			Census and other initiatives		
	Whether exist	Contain data on docu'n	Contain data on perception	Whether exist	Contain data on docu'n	Contain data on perception	Census contain data on docu'n	Census contain data on perception	Other initiatives - data on docu'n
Bangladesh	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓
Bhutan	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗
Cameroon	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Colombia	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓
India	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓
Jamaica	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Japan	✗			✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Madagascar	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Mauritius	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
Niger	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Senegal	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Singapore	✗			✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓
Slovenia	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Sweden	✗			✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
Tanzania	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓
Tunisia	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗
Uganda	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
Proportion (Yes)- No. of countries	14 / 17 countries	11 / 14 countries	3 / 14 countries	17 / 17 countries	12 / 17 countries	3 / 17 countries	5 / 17 countries	0 / 17 countries	8 / 17 countries
Proportion (Yes) - % of countries	82%	79%	21%	100%	71%	18%	29%	0%	47%

2.1.1 ADMINISTRATIVE DATA SOURCES REPORTED IN THE SURVEY

Sweden reported that Swedish real estate registers include ownership, and personal id number of the registered owner for each real estate. Mauritius reported that administrative data at the Registrar General and Ministry of Housing and Lands comprise detailed information on ownership of land and dwellings. Tanzania reported that their Ministry of Lands, Housing and Human Settlements, along with National Housing Cooperation is running a Property and Business Formalization Programme, which seeks to monitor and improve the status of documented land rights.

2.1.2 SIGNIFICANT ON-GOING MOVEMENTS TO IMPROVE DATA ON SDG 1.4.2

Several efforts across the countries give clear indication of a significant on-going movement to improve data related to measuring land tenure security over the years, some instances of which are:

- **Cameroon is ready to report on this indicator** (both documentation and perception) in 2017-2019 through: DHS (2017-2018), Fourth General Population and Housing Census (2017), Fifth Cameroon Household Survey (LSMS): (2018-2019). A detailed country level assessment in Cameroon can guide the process of refinement and standardization of the methodology to ensure that all aspects of the indicator is answered well.
- **Extensive experience exists with administrating questions and modules on tenure security** and perceptions within many NSOs including Colombia, India, Uganda and Tanzania.
- **Several NSOs have administered the land module** and data is available (e.g. Malawi, Mali, Uganda, Tanzania). Other NSOs included key questions in new surveys that also address documentation and perception (e.g. Zimbabwe, UEMOA countries in West Africa).
- LSMS-ISA captures (e.g. for Uganda, 2013) ownership status of agriculture land and source of acquisition and also on land rights documentation and perception of threat to tenure security.
- The DHS-7 round (2013-2018) **includes a limited set of questions on land and houses on self-reported ownership of land and housing and available documentation**, in order to measure intra asset ownership and its impact on indicators of women's empowerment. Recent surveys with land questions are available for over 75 countries.
- Senegal DHS 2005 included the **UN-Habitat's module on secure tenure**. The Senegal 'Household Living Conditions Surveys' included questions on ownership and documentation. UN-Habitat added a 1 page module on tenure security, which included perception data, although this was limited to urban areas. It was analysed and included in the 2012 MDG report. Senegal is one of the few countries that conduct Continuous DHS (i.e. every year but restricted to a few key questions). This offers a good opportunity for such a country to get regular data on land. In addition to the DHS, land questions have been included in Senegal's household living conditions survey.
- In Niger, **land is part of household living conditions and agriculture survey**. The 'Household Living Conditions Surveys' include two main questions on housing: 1) ownership and 2) possession of title deed. But it does not refer to land tenure documents. Questions on agriculture land were much more developed with 7 questions on ownership, documentations, right to sale, etc. than the housing/residential land with only one question combining ownership and documentation. Niger NSO usually collects information on housing and land in its Household Living conditions and Agriculture land as they were collected in the 2005, 2007, 2011 and 2014 Niger Household Living Conditions Surveys. Only the 2007, 2011 and 2014 rounds include questions on documentation.
- India undertakes **separate and independent household surveys on land and farmers conditions**, which collect data related to documentation of land rights. The last such survey was undertaken in 2013 by the National Sample Survey Office (NSSO). Presently India does not conduct DHS but instead undertakes national family health survey which is conducted by the Ministry of Family and Health Welfare (NFHS), which currently have questions on ownership.
- DHS program offers the possibility of including **optional questionnaires on various additional topics**, for any specific country. Furthermore interim DHS Surveys (focuses on the collection of information on key performance monitoring indicators) can be used to get updates on land tenure

security (documentation and perception) indicator. Household survey questionnaire can incorporate land ownership question (security of tenure) along with a question on documentation evidence. This can explore both housing /dwelling unit and agriculture land. Women’s and men’s questionnaires can tackle the tenure security and land conflict questions within the introduction /profile section. **The Wealth Index** was introduced in the DHS surveys and is based on data collected in the Household Questionnaire on household assets. The standardized asset scores are used to create the break points that define wealth quintiles as: Lowest, Second, Middle, Fourth, and Highest. This methodology can be replicated across various surveys to provide disaggregation by income groups.

Household micro data available with the World Bank

An overview analysis of micro data (113 surveys of LSMS during 1985 and 2014), available from the World Bank micro data website, shows:

Table 2. Overview analysis of World Bank Household Micro data

Survey Aspect covered	Number of surveys	Country coverage
Housing (dwelling type, occupancy status, ownership and property rights etc.)	18 surveys	Albania (2002, 2005), Bosnia (2001), Ecuador (1994, 95, 98), Ghana (87, 88,91), Jamaica (98,99, 2000), Nicaragua (1993), Panama (97, 2003), Tajikistan (99), Vietnam (1992, 97)
Agriculture land ownership, acquisition, tenure, area owned	46 surveys	Bosnia (2001), Burkina Faso (2014), China (1995), Cote d’Ivoire (85,86,87,88), Ghana (87,88,91,98, 2009), Guatemala (2000), Malawi (2004, 2010, 2013), Mali (2014), Nicaragua (1998, 2001, 2005), Niger (2011, 2014), Nigeria (2010, 2012), Panama (1997, 2003, 2008), Peru (1985, 91), Tajikistan (1999, 2003, 2007), Tanzania (2010), Timor Leste (2001), Uganda (2009, 2011, 2013), Vietnam (92, 97)
Asset - land ownership information	92 out of 113 surveys	Forms of acquisition is available in 63 surveys, decision making on use is available in 16 surveys, value of land is available in 72 surveys
Plot level information of quantity and size	59 surveys	

In terms of areas of improvement of data availability, NSO respondents pointed out following suggestions:

- **Bangladesh:** The specific questions /land module can be accommodated in the Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES) or any other survey.
- **Cameroon:** Regular periodic data collection on tenure security is essential to track the progress made on this issue and appropriate computation method of calculating this indicator will be needed.
- **Colombia:** It is important to obtain information from cadastral offices and property registration to perform a check of information between the survey data and the reality of tenure status.

- **Tanzania:** Land tenure security (as per SDG 1.4.2 requirements) is partially reflected in the data collection instruments. Only some adjustments and additional questions will be needed to capture information which will respond to the SDG 1.4.2 more precisely.
- **Uganda:** The questions are normally answered by the head of the Household and there is need to improve respondent selection to be able to measure security of tenure for all adults. There is need for improvement in the phrasing of some of the questions related to security of tenure especially the perception questions and ensure a full response rate amongst all individuals surveyed.
- **Uganda:** Documentation can include for both formal and informal land rights documents held by people and the relevant types of document need to be identified and classified for the purpose of data collection and analysis.

2.2 DATA QUALITY

The existing data quality related to SDG indicator 1.4.2 is assessed (in a limited way) on three dimensions:

- **Disaggregation:** Whether the existing surveys specify data by gender (male headed, female headed, joint spousal), income groups, and by type of tenure (lease, ownership, renting etc.)
- **Extent of coverage:** Whether the existing surveys capture data for agricultural, non-agricultural and residential land, land parcels owned or held by communities or other type of groups, and by slum /informal settlements
- **Open access:** Whether the general public have access to micro-data from the surveys

The findings of online survey and interviews with NSOs shows that gender-disaggregated data is available (fully or partially) in 8 out 17 countries (see table 3). However these countries (Bhutan, Colombia, Jamaica, Madagascar, Tanzania and Uganda) also expressed the need for some adjustment and some additional questions to capture data to respond to the SDG indicator 1.4.2 more precisely. Based on the information provided by the Senegal and Niger NSOs, can only be disaggregated directly by the gender of the household head. Nevertheless additional questions can be added to capture the gender of other household members. Data on land tenure collected in the Niger and Senegal household living conditions also includes only one question that refers to title deeds. Thus the disaggregated data on land tenure collected in Niger and Senegal household living conditions requires improvement and supplementation by additional questions that capture other forms of tenure, gender, and perceptions of tenure security in order to be used fully for the SDG indicator 1.4.2.

The situation on disaggregation by income groups is relatively much better as 12 out 17 countries are capturing this level of disaggregation. The status is even better by 'type of tenure' as this level of disaggregation is currently being captured by 15 out of 17 countries surveyed. The survey analysis in Niger can be disaggregated by wealth quintile and region including the capitals (Dakar and Niamey). The data can be disaggregated by slum/non-slum by using UN-Habitat's definition of slum at the household level. It can also be disaggregated by type of tenure.

The data quality on 'extent of coverage' dimension shows a mixed picture. While both agriculture and residential land data is available across 15 out 17 countries surveyed, data for community /groups and slum /informal settlements is available only across 7 and 5 countries respectively (see table 3).

Open data access (micro data) is reportedly available in 11 out of 17 countries surveyed e.g. the data in Senegal and Niger is accessible to the public upon request. Among international survey programs, DHS is more widely available than some of the other surveys.

In terms of areas of improvement of data quality, NSO respondents made the following suggestions:

- **Bangladesh:** The national household surveys should be accommodated with the disaggregation along with the questions related to SDG 1.4.2. Technical help will be required on metadata and other guidelines.
- **Cameroon:** To ensure data quality to produce indicator 1.4.2, concepts and definitions need to be harmonized, and data collection questions and methodologies standardized.
- **Jamaica:** Existing data is limited in scope in terms of disaggregation. We will also need access to software for anonymizing data needed. This will allow for easier access by users.
- **Tanzania:** Necessary disaggregation is partially reflected in existing data collection instruments, but there is need for refinement and additional questions to capture information that responds to the requirement of reporting on SDG 1.4.2.



KEY MESSAGES

The online survey and interviews with the NSO representatives in 17 countries gives a clear indication of medium to good availability and quality of data on the SDG indicator 1.4.2. The assessment has shown that a good range of survey opportunities currently exist in all countries which if leveraged can ensure robust data collection and reporting on SDG indicator 1.4.2. International survey programs in 14 of the 17 countries surveyed is a strong indicator of higher probability of success of efforts at integrating land modules (key questions within existing survey programs) and harmonizing data standards and protocols across countries. All the NSOs in this survey have shown their willingness to include a land module into existing household surveys and other data initiatives.

Table 3. Status (& gaps therein) of Quality of Data on SDG 1.4.2

Country	Disaggregation			Extent of Coverage			Open data access to Public
	Gender	Income groups	Type of tenure	Agriculture /residential	Community /other type of groups	Slum /informal settlement	Micro data access
Bangladesh	☆	☆	☆	★	☆	☆	☆
Bhutan	★	★	★	★	☆	☆	★
Cameroon	☆	★	★	★	☆	★	★
Colombia	★	★	★	★	★	☆	★
India	☆	★	★	★	★	☆	★
Jamaica	★	☆	★	★	☆	☆	★
Japan	☆	★	★	★	☆		★
Madagascar	★	★	★	☆	☆	☆	☆
Mauritius	☆	☆	★	★	★	★	★
Niger	☆	★	★	★	☆	★	☆
Senegal	☆	★	★	★	☆	★	☆
Singapore	★	★	★	☆	☆		★
Slovenia	☆	★	★	★	☆	☆	☆
Sweden	★	★	★	★	★		☆
Tanzania	★	★	★	★	★	★	★
Tunisia	☆	☆	☆	★	★	☆	★
Uganda	★	☆	★	★	★	☆	★
Proportion - No. of countries <i>(Yes or Partially Yes)</i>	8 /17 countries	12 /17 countries	15 /17 countries	15 /17 countries	7 /17 countries	5 /17 countries	11 /17 countries
Proportion - % of countries <i>(Yes or Partially Yes)</i>	47%	71%	88%	88%	41%	36%	65%
☆	No						
★	Yes but partially						
★	Yes						

3. NSO CAPACITIES AND STRUCTURE OF COLLABORATION

This section deals with operational /institutional issues which play a large part in efficient and effective reporting by countries on the SDG indicators. These issues relate to:

- **Capacities** (individual and institutional) at the NSOs for data collection, analysis, processing, storage, data security and management of databases
- **Structure** of co-ordination and collaboration within the country (between NSOs and land related ministries) and amongst NSOs and international organisations (such as World Bank, USAID, FAO, UN Habitat, UNICEF etc.). The efficacy of this structure of co-ordination and collaboration gives an indication of how effectively harmonization of data standards and protocols can be achieved, which can then lead to standardized (with appropriate customization at country level) and comparable reporting on the SDG indicator 1.4.2 at global scale.

It was well-beyond the purview of this multi-country assessment to delve more deeply into these relevant issues, despite their relevance, as the online survey and interviews conducted with NSOs were only able to address them in a limited way.

3.1 FINDINGS ON NATIONAL STATISTICAL ORGANISATIONS' CAPACITIES

The NSOs surveyed believe that they are generally well-equipped in terms of human resources and technology and have many years of experiences of conducting household surveys and censuses. This is clearly reflected in the findings where 11 of the 17 NSOs' respondents stated that individual and institutional capacities for data collection, analysis and processing are available and sufficient for conducting, analyzing and reporting on household surveys and censuses. Some countries (Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cameroon, Colombia, Madagascar and Tanzania) expressed having 'partial' capacity, meaning that there are areas where some augmentation is needed. These areas mostly concern resource availability for regular conduct of household surveys and censuses e.g. Senegal and Niger NSOs stated that while they are well equipped in terms of technology and human resources and have more than 30 years of experiences in conducting household surveys and censuses including DHS, MICS, LSMS etc., as LDCs, they remain heavily dependent on donor funding to conduct the necessary surveys and censuses. Thus they would also rely on donor support to introduce the necessary changes and improvements to land related questionnaire modules to meet requirements of Indicator 1.4.2.

In recent years, the NSOs have upgraded their information technology infrastructure and ICT related skills. Most of the NSOs have reported their ICT skills as 'adequate'. Some of the NSOs in countries like Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cameroon, Madagascar and Tanzania have reported that ICT skills are 'partially' available and /or 'partially' leveraged to enable data collection for household surveys or national census. These NSOs clearly need upgrading on ICT skills. Furthermore, 9 of 17 NSOs (who responded to the online survey) have expressed that their data storage, data security and data management systems are adequate to address their needs. Some NSOs have perceived the need for upgrading on ICT skills, data storage and data security related infrastructure, indicative examples of which are given below:

- The **use of mobile technology (CAPI, ODK etc.)** can improve data collection and reduce the time required to produce results. Computer-assisted data collection in household surveys with

validation checks directly integrated into the collection application will improve data quality. This approach permits considerable reduction in errors and efficiency in data management

- The **use of GPS** to associate data with images can illuminate the results. This requires development of **integrated data dissemination platforms** within NSOs, or development of collaborative arrangements with external partners to facilitate this.
- The exploitation of **big data** that can reduce the collection costs and respondents' fatigue/burden
- Development of **strong and secure integrated data management system** within the NSO, ensuring data security and data storage infrastructure for the SDG data
- Capacity building on **development of online data capture applications** and improved compilation of routine data collection systems.
- Singapore has an **open data policy**. The Statistics organization in Singapore is aware of the range of administrative data sources and provided us with links to the relevant cadastral and land use planning maps.

Table 4. Status (& gaps therein) on NSO capacities and structure of collaboration

Country	Capacity			Harmonisation	
	Data collection, analysis and process	ICT skills	Data storage, security and DBM	Co-ordination among Land agencies and NSOs	MoU - NSOs and Intl. organisations
Bangladesh	★	★	★	★	★
Bhutan	★	★	★	★	★
Cameroon	★	★	★	★	★
Colombia	★	★	★	★	★
India	★	★	★	★	★
Jamaica	★	★	★	★	★
Japan	★	★	★	★	★
Madagascar	★	★	★	★	★
Mauritius	★	★	★	★	★
Niger	★	★	★	★	★
Senegal	★	★	★	★	★
Singapore	★	★	★	★	★
Slovenia	★	★	★	★	★
Sweden	★	★	★	★	★
Tanzania	★	★	★	★	★
Tunisia	★	★	★	★	★
Uganda	★	★	★	★	★
Proportion (Yes)- No. of countries	11 /17 countries	12 /17 countries	9 /17 countries	9 /17 countries	3 /17 countries
Proportion (Yes) -% of countries	65%	71%	47%	47%	18%
★	No				
★	Yes but partially				
★	Yes				

The assessment found that relatively few countries have existing MoUs with international organisations, and that developing countries are likely to need international support to significantly expand data collection for the indicator.

3.2 FINDINGS ON NSO STATUS ON COLLABORATION AND CO-ORDINATION

Successful reporting on the SDG indicator 1.4.2 (and other SDGs indicators) requires effective collaboration and co-ordination within the country and among country institution and international organisations. In addition, effective data collection and globally comparable reporting on the indicator will require harmonisation with other SDG indicator (like 5.a.1) to ensure common data standards and protocols and to avoid duplicity of efforts and resources. In this section, we look at the status of NSO practices in relation to these pertinent issues.

In the online survey, 9 of 17 NSOs surveyed expressed that formal or informal coordination and information sharing arrangements exist among country's land agencies (national, provincial and local land boards, customary authorities) and themselves. A clear example here comes from National Administrative Department of Statistics (DANE), Colombia. DANE is the governing body of the National Statistical System, and is currently consolidating the National Statistical Plan. In this plan, coordination has been defined with different entities at the national, regional and local level for the consolidation and provision of information through administrative records. DANE have recently developed the Third National Agricultural Census. One of the sources of information was the national cadaster (by the Agustín Codazzi Geographic Institute) and the decentralized cadastral agencies (Bogotá DC, Antioquia, Medellín and Cali) to allow the possibility of georeferencing the Units of Agricultural Production and to make triangulation with property information. Singapore operates an open, coordinated data policy and the Singapore statistical organization, SINGSTAT, pointed out available cadastral and land use planning and other relevant data sets accessible on the world wide web⁴ Another example here comes from Sweden. Statistics Sweden has an agreement with the National Mapping and Cadastral Agency which gives access to all kinds of geospatial information including real estate registers.

Some of the NSOs like Bhutan, Cameroon, Madagascar, Niger, Senegal, Tunisia and Uganda suggested that these co-ordination and collaborative working arrangements are 'partially' in existence. The Senegal NSO has the tradition to collaborate with land agencies. Similarly Niger NSO collaborated in the past with the land agencies (Cadaster and Ministry of Urbanism).

Very few NSOs (3 of 17 surveyed) currently have a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) or structured collaboration (for the SDG data and reporting) with international organisations. A need for the same is expressed by the NSOs to carry forward their work on improving resources and technical capacities for maintaining SDG data momentum, for example, Niger and Senegal NSOs are willing to work closely with UN-Habitat, the World Bank and other partners to improve the data collection and analysis for SDG indicator 1.4.2. Senegal NSO is willing to cooperate and include land monitoring

⁴ In Singapore, the land parcel data are available from www.data.gov.sg; information on land uses and planned supply is available on our Ministry of National Development's (MND) website (www.mnd.gov.sg/landuseplan), while more information on the land use for 2010 and 2030 are available in MND's report on "A High Quality Living Environment for All Singaporeans – Land Use Plan to Support Singapore's Future Population" (www.mnd.gov.sg/landuseplan/e-book/index.html). Indicative polygon of land use zoning boundary for the Master Plan 2014 Land Use (<https://data.gov.sg/dataset/master-plan-2014-land-use>) and Master Plan 2008 Land Use (<https://data.gov.sg/dataset/mp08-land-use>) are also available on Data.gov.sg.

within its data collection mechanism. The main constraints are financial. The Niger NSO has shown enthusiasm for collaboration with the World Bank, UN-Habitat and partners as well as with land agencies and other institutions. The Mauritius NSO actively welcomed examples and guidance on how to include data on documented land rights in household surveys and in absence of this has developed a working proxy indicator for security of secure housing tenure, based on available survey and census information. The Mauritius Census of Agriculture collects data on farmland tenure broken down by type of tenure. Some of the NSOs (like India, Tunisia, and Colombia) have stated the need for larger representation of NSOs in international discussions on the SDG indicator 1.4.2 as this can cement useful collaboration among NSOs and the international organisations.

In the EGM at Washington DC (May 2017), the importance of coordination and options for harmonizing the work for indicators 1.4.2 and 5.a.1 was emphasised. In consultation with custodian agencies for 1.4.2 and 5.a.1, a technical team from GLII reviewed and provided recommendations for harmonization of indicators 5.a.1 and 1.4.2 in April 2017 based on the proposed methodology for 5.a.1 and the draft metadata for 1.4.2. The review showed that both indicators have much in common. The major difference is the scope with 1.4.2 being universal, while the focus of 5.a.1 is on agricultural land

and populations. If these indicators are well harmonized, it will enhance feasibility of data collection by the NSOs and facilitate policy dialogue.

4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study results show that in their efforts directed towards reclassification of SDG indicator 1.4.2 from Tier III to Tier II and eventually to Tier I, the co-custodian agencies can build on opportunities that presently exist while also addressing prevailing challenges. This assessment illustrates the opportunities that co-custodian agencies can leverage. At the same time, the findings



KEY MESSAGES

The online survey responses and interviews with the NSO representatives from the 17 countries responding to the assessment survey gives a clear indication of medium to good availability and quality of data on the SDG indicator 1.4.2. The assessment has shown that a good range of survey opportunities currently exist in all countries which could quite easily be leveraged to enable robust data collection and reporting on SDG indicator 1.4.2. International survey programs in 14 of the 17 countries surveyed is a strong indicator of good probability of success of efforts at integrating land modules (key questions within existing survey programs) and harmonizing data standards and protocols across countries.

While in recent years, the NSOs have upgraded their information technology infrastructure and ICT related skills, most of the NSOs responding to this assessment identified a range of needs for capacity augmentation related to use of mobile technology, GPS, exploitation of big data, computer-assisted data collection, development of strong and secure integrated data management systems, on-line data capture application etc.

All the NSOs that responded to this assessment have shown willingness to develop productive engagement with the country's land agencies. NSOs have the required willingness, infrastructure and skills, even though some augmentation will be required in these areas to make reporting on the SDG 1.4.2 more robust and effective. NSOs called for strengthening their links with country's land agencies and with international organisations. To maximize the potential of these collaborations, the NSOs surveyed expressed unanimously the need for their increased/higher level of involvement and representation in international discussions related to this indicator (and other SDG indicators)

identify some early challenges that can be tackled immediately or relatively quickly as well as bigger challenges that require longer term efforts). These are key points for reflection for co-custodian agencies and for GLII platform members which can inform their future planning and actions.

Opportunities:

- **International survey programs:** The presence of international survey programs in most of the responding countries indicates a positive opportunity to improve data collection for measurement of land tenure security in coming years. International survey programs such as DHS offers the possibility of including optional questionnaires on various additional topics, for any specific country. Building on and leveraging this opportunity can ensure robust data collection and reporting on SDG indicator 1.4.2. Given willingness of the NSOs this should be possible in most countries where international survey programmes are active, not only in those that responded to this assessment.
- **Country preparedness:** Few countries (who responded to the survey) such as Cameroon, Columbia, Uganda, Tanzania, India etc. are well advanced in their preparedness to report on the SDG 1.4.2 indicator. Quick wins can be achieved in these and many other similarly placed countries through dialogue and engagement by the custodian agencies with these countries' NSOs.
- **Land module integration:** In most household surveys - mentioned in this assessment- the thematic scope (demographic, economic well-being, social status and physical infrastructure) is more or less the same. Land tenure security is frequently missing however. Inclusion of key questions about land holding or tenure security within large scale surveys (and also in periodic national censuses and agricultural censuses), is therefore a priority in order to create comparable data sources and enable harmonized global reporting on indicator 1.4.2 and other land indicators. All the NSOs in this survey have shown their willingness to include a land module into existing household surveys and other data initiatives. The NSOs are on a strong footing to address the requirements of data collection and reporting on the SDG indicator 1.4.2. This shows harmonizing data standards and protocols across countries is an achievable aim.
- **Collaboration of NSOs with land agencies:** The NSOs surveyed realise that they need to strengthen links with their country's land agencies. They understand that data held by land agencies and other institutions (NGOs, civil society, international organizations, etc.) will complement their survey datasets which can also be used for triangulation. Approximately half of the NSOs have formal or informal coordination and information sharing arrangements with land agencies, such as national, provincial and local land boards, customary authorities. The NSOs are willing to part of the team in finding expressed the need for increased/higher level of involvement and representation in international discussions related to this indicator (and to other SDG indicators).

Early Challenges:

- **Disaggregation:** The current status on data availability and quality by sex, income groups, rural /urban, slums /informal settlement shows a mixed picture. Most of the NSOs responding concurred on the need for refinement and additional questions to capture information on other forms of tenure, gender, and perceptions of tenure security in order to respond to the requirement of reporting on SDG indicator 1.4.2. This will have implications in terms of cost of data collection, processing and analysis. The Wealth Index in the DHS surveys defines define

wealth quintiles as: Lowest, Second, Middle, Fourth, and Highest. This methodology can be harmonised across with the approaches used by other international survey programs.

- **Collaboration of NSOs with international agencies:** The NSOs have expressed the need for their increased/higher level of involvement and representation in international discussions related to this indicator (and other SDG indicators). They also want the role of NSOs to be clearly defined when working with UN-Habitat, the World Bank and other partners. The assessment found that relatively few countries have existing MoUs with international organisations, and that developing countries are likely to need international support to significantly expand data collection for the indicator.

Bigger /Longer term Challenges:

- **NSO capacities:** identified a range of needs for capacity augmentation related to use of mobile technology, GPS, exploitation of big data, computer-assisted data collection, development of strong and secure integrated data management systems, and on-line data capture application etc.
- **NSO resources:** Resource constraints for regular conduct of surveys and censuses) were identified as one of the main issues by some NSOs, especially in LDCs which depends heavily on donor funding to conduct surveys and censuses. Thus they would need assistance in mobilising necessary resources.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

This assessment provide a status on strengths, challenges and opportunities for land data collection, analysis and reporting on the SDG indicator 1.4.2. This report inform the work of the co-custodian agencies on Indicator 1.4.2 particularly in prioritizing the capacity needs for NSOs and land data institutions to fast track reporting on the indicator. The key recommendations below are distilled from the findings of this multi-country assessment and provide a number of pointers to the co-custodian agencies to steer their work in the next one to two years. The key recommendations are:

- 1. Leverage existing data initiatives for transitioning SDG 1.4.2 from Tier III to Tier II and eventually to Tier I:** The widespread implementation of household surveys offers the possibility of adding security of land tenure modules to the household questionnaire. The international survey programs such as LSMS, DHS, MICS, and NSOs should tap these opportunities by adjustment of the newly agreed questions on land to bring these in line with the requirements of global-scale reporting on the SDG indicator 1.4.2.
- 2. Strengthen the 1.4.2 Custodian Agencies' Meta data document, methodology report to the IAEG-SDG EGM in November 2017 and forward plans for capacity building utilizing the key findings of this report:** This assessment shows a significant on-going trends across all countries surveyed to improve data related to measuring land tenure security. The assessment also points out how and where this movement can be strengthened to ensure that globally comparable reporting on the SDG indicator 1.4.2 take place in the near future. It also provides the arguments for upgrading the tier status of the indicator. The key findings of this multi-country assessment can feed into the Meta data document, methodology report to the IAEG-SDG and work-plan documents due to be submitted to the IAEG-SDGs in autumn of 2017.
- 3. Country level actions to improve availability and quality of data at country level:** The assessment shows that few countries are well advanced in their preparedness to report on the SDG 1.4.2 indicator. These quick-wins needs to be realized. The assessment also highlight gaps and a clear need for strengthening existing data initiatives at country level to transition to improve data availability and data quality (on the SDG indicator 1.4.2) in the next few years. Three-pronged actions are needed in such cases:
 - i. Integrating land modules / key questions within existing survey programs - both national and international survey programs.
 - ii. Working with NSOs to upgrade their information technology infrastructure and ICT related skills, and capacity augmentation related to use of mobile technology, GPS, exploitation of big data, computer-assisted data collection, development of strong and secure integrated data management systems, on-line data capture application etc..
 - iii. harmonizing data standards and protocols across countries through active national, regional and international collaborations with existing data initiatives, including other SDG indicator (e.g. 5.a.1). This will require user manuals, authoritative guidelines for harmonization.

- 4. Strategic investments for ensuring disaggregated data:** Disaggregation by gender, income and tenure type etc. are crucial to gain a fuller picture. The co-custodian should deploy a team of researchers for gaining detailed understanding of methodologies used by national and international survey programs so that approaches for obtaining disaggregated data can be harmonised across countries.
- 5. Catalysing formal /informal engagement of NSOs with land agencies in the country:** The co-custodian agencies should build on NSO's willingness to link with land agencies and lessons from countries where these links are well-established (for example Colombia, India, Jamaica, Tanzania etc.), and support the NSOs in strengthening their formal /informal engagement with land agencies. In this context, establishing regional steering committees could be helpful where NSOs and land departments play a central role in land data collection and analysis.
- 6. Maximising active participation /involvement of NSOs:** The co-custodian agencies should develop an engagement plan that defines NSO needs and capacities and specify their roles and responsibilities for maximizing active participation and involvement of NSOs in survey design and analysis processes related to the indicator. As a first step, this report should be shared with the NSOs for their feedback. The roll out of new survey methodologies by international organization should necessarily involve NSOs in design and analysis.
- 7. Specific capacity and Resource support to NSOs:** Some of the NSOs (especially those in LDCs) need support to address their bigger /longer term challenge of mobilizing financial resources for effective conduct of their national surveys. The co-custodian agencies should consider how best to work with and develop existing donor collaborative platforms to mobilize resources to support NSOs and Land agencies. The co-custodian agencies should constitute regional /country level technical task teams that can conduct research and facilitate technical and management support to NSOs and land agencies on their granular capacity building needs.

SDG 1.4.2 Country Preparedness Survey

Page 1: Cover

Your assessment of country preparedness on reporting on SDG 1.4.2 Indicator is very IMPORTANT and is highly VALUED, as this is crucial for preparing the country action plans leading to actions and investments in data and statistical capacity development.

SDG 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.

*The 1.4.2 is part of **SDG Target 1.4**, which says that, "By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular 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."*

This assessment is structured around three components: **DATA**, **CAPACITY** and **STRUCTURE**. DATA sheet include assessment related to **data availability** and **data quality**. CAPACITY sheet includes assessment related to data collection and management capacity based on your knowledge and experience of working with the different types of data. STRUCTURE sheet includes assessment related to coordination and collaborative arrangement at the country level for collecting, analysing and reporting data. Overall, the assessment is designed for quick and spontaneous responses and are expected to take 15 to 20 minutes of your valued time.

REQUEST YOU TO PLEASE PARTICIPATE IN THIS ONLINE SURVEY and provide directions to the country level analysis and reporting on the SDG indicators.

1. Name of Respondent**a. Organisation of the Respondent****b. Country of the Respondent (write global, if representing multi-country institution or international agencies)****c. Position of the Respondent**

Page 2: DATA AVAILABILITY

2. Have at least one of the following household surveys have been implemented in last ten to fifteen years in your country? - Living Standard Measurement Survey (LSMS, poverty surveys) - LSMS-Integrated Survey on Agriculture (LSMS-ISA) - Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) - Multi-Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) - FAO World Census on Agriculture - Urban Inequities surveys *SKIP TO QUESTION 3, IF ANSWER IS "NO" OR "DO NOT KNOW"*

a. If yes, please specify which ones of the household survey has been implemented in last five years?

b. If yes, whether these surveys include information on documentation of land and /or housing rights held by respondents?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

c. If yes, whether these surveys include information on whether or not people feel or perceive that land, housing or property rights are secure, or at risk in any way?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

3. Whether your country conduct national household survey system on a regular basis - at least once in every 5-6 years?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

a. Whether the NATIONAL household surveys (country's own initiative as opposed to LSMS, DHS, MICS etc.) include information on documentation of land and /or housing rights held by respondents?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

b. Whether the national household's surveys include information on whether or not people feel or perceive that land or property rights are secure, or at risk in any way?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

4. When did your country conducted national population and housing census?

- Recently in last two years (2015-17)
- During 2012-15
- During 2010-12
- Prior to 2010

a. Whether the national population and housing census include information on documentation of land and /or housing rights held by respondents?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

b. Whether the national population and housing census include information on whether or not people feel or perceive that land or property rights are secure, or at risk in any way?

- Yes

No

Do not know

5. Is there any other land and housing related data initiatives which include information on documentation of land and /or housing rights held by respondents and /or perception on tenure security?

Yes

No

Do not know

a. If YES, provide **more details on other land and housing related data initiative** in the box below:

6. Please share your views on **areas of improvement on DATA AVAILABILITY** on SDG 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*) related data in various country level instruments - household surveys, population and housing census and other data initiatives

Page 3: DATA QUALITY

7. Whether the national household surveys specify data by gender of the land holders: male household head; female household head; joint spousal land holding?

Yes

No

Yes, but partially

Do not know

8. Whether the national household surveys include information on land parcels owned or held collectively by community or other types of groups?

Yes

No

Yes, but partially

Do not know

9. Whether the national household surveys captures disaggregated data by income groups?

Yes

No

Yes, but partially

Do not know

10. Whether the national household surveys captures disaggregated data by type of tenure (lease, ownership, renting etc.)?

Yes

No

Yes, but partially

Do not know

11. Whether the national household surveys captures disaggregated data by slum /informal settlements?

Yes

No

Yes, but partially

Do not know

12. Whether the national household surveys captures disaggregated data by uses of land - agriculture, non-agriculture, residential etc.?

Yes

No

Yes, but partially

Do not know

13. Whether the general public have access to micro-data from household surveys /national population and housing census?

Yes

No

Yes, but partially

Do not know

14. Please share your views on **areas of improvement of DATA QUALITY** on SDG 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*) related data in various country level instruments - household surveys, population and housing census, expert assessment, and other land related data initiatives



Page 4: CAPACITY

15. Are capacities (individual and institution) for data collection, analysis and processing available and sufficient for conducting, analysing and reporting household surveys and population and housing census?

Yes

No

Yes, but partially

Do not know

16. Are information and communication technologies skills available and sufficiently leveraged in household or census data analysis and reporting?

- Yes
- No
- Yes, but partially
- Do not know

17. Are capacities for data storage, data security and management of databases (household surveys and population and housing census) available and sufficient?

- Yes
- No
- Yes, but partially
- Do not know

18. Please share your views related to **areas of improvement** on **COUNTRY LEVEL CAPACITIES** related to data collection, analysis, processing, storage, and use of ICT etc. in conducting Household Surveys and population and housing Census that can also be beneficial for reporting on SDG 1.4.2



Page 5: STRUCTURE - COLLABORATION AND CO-ORDINATION

19. Formal or informal coordination and information sharing arrangement exist among land agencies (national, provincial and local land boards, customary authorities) and national statistical offices (NSOs)

- Yes
- No
- Yes, but not sure
- Do not know

20. Memorandum of Understanding (MoUs) exist between NSOs and international organisations

Yes

No

Yes, but not sure

Do not know

a. If yes, please explain which agencies and what does this MoU cover

21. Please share your views related to **areas of improvement** on **CO-ORDINATION, COLLABORATION AND INFORMATION SHARING ARRANGEMENTS** between land and data agencies in the country for SDG land and housing related data collection and reporting

Page 6: Thank you for your time and participation. We greatly value your response.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

A.2 DEMONSTRATIVE EXAMPLES OF QUESTIONS ON LAND IN EXISTING COUNTRY SURVEYS

Uganda:

Uganda National Panel Survey 2013/14 Agriculture Questionnaire is exemplary in understanding how different countries are already collecting pieces of information on the SDG indicator 1.4.2. Uganda survey captures all three aspects of SDG 1.4.2: a) land ownership and acquisition, including use and sell rights b) tenure system and documentation, c) perception. With some standardization and improvement of questions, these can precisely answer the SDG indicator 1.4.2.

OWNERSHIP STATUS				USAGE			
Tenure system	How did you acquire this parcel?	In which year did you first acquire this parcel?	Do you currently have access to the parcel?	What was or is the primary use of the parcel during the two cropping seasons?		What was the most recent year/ agricultural season in which the parcel was left fallow?	How many consecutive years was the parcel left fallow this last time and what type of fallow was used?
1= Freehold 2= Leasehold 3= Mailo 4= Customary 6= Other (specify)	1= Purchased 2= Inherited or Received as gift 3= Leased-in 4= Just walked in (cleared) 5= Do not know 6= Other (specify)	Record 999 if household has always had the land	“Access” refers to ownership rights to the parcel. 1=Yes 2=No	1= Own Cultivated (annual crops) 2= Own Cultivated (perennial crops) 3= Rented-out>>14 4=Cultivated by mailo tenant>>14 5=Fallow 6=Pasture 7=Woodlot/Forest 96=Other (specify)		Record Year [yyyy] IF NEVER LEFT FALLOW, RECORD 9999 AND SKIP TO COL. 15	IF LESS THAN 1 YEAR WRITE '00
				1 st cropping season 2013	2 nd cropping season 2013		Years Type

RIGHTS				
Does this parcel have a formal certificate of title or customary certificate of ownership or certificate of occupancy issued by and registered with government authorities? 1=Certificate of title 2= Certificate of customary ownership 3=Certificate of occupancy 4=No document >>24a/24b	Which household member's name is on the title/certificate? Record IDs of up to 2 persons >> q27a	Who has the Ownership rights to this parcel? Record IDs of up to 2 persons	Who can decide whether to sell this parcel or use it as collateral? Record IDs of up to 2 persons	Have you ever been concerned that somebody might dispute your ownership/ use rights on this parcel? 1=Yes 2=No

Colombia:

DANE carried out in the year 2014 the Third National Agricultural Census, the largest national statistical exercise. This Census provided georeferenced and updated statistical information on the country's agricultural sector. The three main themes of the Census encompass social, environmental and economic contexts. In this last one, as a basic element of the agrarian structure, the variable land tenure of the units of agricultural production is highlighted, materialized in the information collection under question 39 of Section V of the census form: What is the form of land tenure of this property ?, with ten options of answer: 01. Own; 02. Lease; 03. Sharecropping; 04. Usufruct; 05. Commodity; 06. Occupation in fact; 07. Collective ownership; 08. Awardee or community; 09. Another form of tenure; 99. Does not know. The initial results showed that 72.7% of the producers declared that their production unit is their own, followed by leasing with 9.6% and other forms with 6.6%.

National Quality of Life: This survey emerges as a response to the need to characterize the population in the different aspects involved in household welfare. From 1997, the postulated methodology of Living Standards Measurement Study (LSMS), promoted by the World Bank, was incorporated into its design and execution. As of 2010, due to the increasing importance of the topics addressed, it is carried out with an annual periodicity. One of the variables contained in the survey is the tenure and financing of housing, which includes the following aspects: type of housing tenure; Possession of deed or property; Subsidies received for the purchase, construction, improvement, titling or deed of

housing. This is materialized in Chapter L of the collection form, in question 1, where it is inquired whether the housing occupied by the household is: own - fully paid; Own - is being paid; Leasing or subleasing; With permission of the owner without payment (usufruct); Possession without title (occupant of fact) or collective property. In addition, question 3 asks if any household member has registered housing deeds, with Yes and No response options. The results obtained in the 2016 Survey show that 42.8% of the households own fully paid housing, and 36.8% are in lease or sublease condition.

In 2018, the Population and Housing Census is planned, which, in the preliminary design of the form, has in the section concerning the Home to ask for the tenure of the dwelling under the same standard of the question formulated in The Quality of Life Survey.

NIGER:

In the Household Living conditions questionnaire (see file ECVMA2_Quest_Men) of the 2014 survey, at the Section 6 (Housing Characteristics) the following question was asked on housing and land tenure:

Enquêtes conditions de vie des ménages

Household living conditions Survey

Questions in French (Original)	Translation in English
<p>(6, 03) Quel est actuellement votre statut d'occupation ?</p> <p>1. Propriétaire avec titre foncier/acte de propriété (6,08)</p> <p>2. Propriétaire sans titre foncier ni acte de propriété</p> <p>3. Copropriétaire/familiale avec titre foncier</p> <p>4. Copropriétaire/familiale sans titre foncier</p> <p>5. Locataire</p> <p>6. Location-vente</p> <p>7. Logé gratuitement (parents, amis)</p> <p>8. Logement de fonction</p> <p>9. Autre</p>	<p>What is your current occupation Status in the dwelling?</p> <p>1. Owner with title deed/property act</p> <p>2. Owner without title deed/property act</p> <p>3. Co-owner with title deed/property act</p> <p>4. Co-owner without title deed/property act</p> <p>5. Tenant</p> <p>6. Tenant with possibility to buy</p> <p>7. Free (with parents/friends)</p> <p>8. Official housing</p> <p>9. Others</p>

For the Agriculture land the following questions were asked:

Enquêtes conditions de vie des ménages

Household living conditions Survey

Agriculture land

Agriculture land

Questions in French (original)	Translation in English
<p>Quel est le mode d'occupation de la parcelle ?</p> <p>1=Propriété 2= Copropriété 3=Location 4=Hypothèque (mise en gage) 5=Prêt (gratuit) 6= Autres (à préciser)</p>	<p>What is your occupation status of this parcel?</p> <p>1. Owner 2. Co-owner 3. Lease 4. Mortgage 5. Free 6. Others</p>
<p>Quel type de titre de propriété avez-vous pour cette parcelle?</p> <p>1=Titre foncier 2= Certificat coutumier 3=Attestation de vente 4=Autre document 5=Aucun document</p>	<p>What type of ownership document do you have for this parcel?</p> <p>1. Title deed 2. Custom certificate 3- Sale certificate 4- Other document 5- None</p>
<p>Est-ce que la parcelle appartient à un membre ou à plusieurs membres du ménage?</p> <p>1. Un membre du ménage 2. Plusieurs membres du ménage 3. Propriété partagée avec d'autres parents non membres du ménage</p>	<p>Is the parcel owned by one member or several members of the household?</p> <p>1. One Household member 2. Several household members 3. Parcel co-owned with other people who are not members of this household</p>
<p>Les propriétaires de la parcelle ont- ils le droit de la vendre?</p> <p>1=Oui 2=Non</p>	<p>Do the owners of this parcel have the right to sell it?</p> <p>1=Yes 2=No</p>

Si les propriétaires devraient vendre cette parcelle, quel en serait le prix actuel?	If the parcel was to be sold, what would be the price?
quel montant accepteriez- vous d'hypothéquer ou de louer cette parcelle?	If the parcel was to be used for a loan at Bank, at what amount it would be?
Cette parcelle est-elle exploitée actuellement par le ménage ou par un de ses membres ?	Are your household or a member of the household is currently using this parcel?

6.0 THE GLOBAL LAND INDICATORS INITIATIVE (GLII)

The need to step up monitoring of land governance issues led to the establishment of GLII in 2012 by Millennium Challenge Corporation, the World Bank and UN-Habitat. The platform is hosted and facilitated by Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) at UN-Habitat. GLII is as a collaborative and inclusive process for development of Global Land Indicators that aims to making global scale monitoring of land governance and progress towards secure tenure for all a reality. In addition to developing land indicators, the GLII platform provides accompanying tools and guidelines for monitoring, reporting and capacity building, and a means of coordinating and convening land and data communities. The initiative has now grown to over 50 platform members, including non-governmental organizations, multi-lateral agencies, academia, research institutions and training institutions, farmers' organizations, UN agencies working on land governance, land data and statistical agencies.

Through a series of consultations in 2012-16 amongst land professionals and development practitioners from civil society, UN and donor agencies, research institutions and independent experts, GLII has developed a set of harmonised land indicators intended to measure progress towards tenure security and better land governance at country level and globally. As a result, GLII has become established and continues to develop as a stakeholder platform for knowledge generation and learning on land monitoring.

GLII platform members alongside the Global Donor Working Group on Land (GDWGL) and other agencies contributed strongly to securing inclusion of land indicators in the framework for monitoring progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals. The GLII set of 15 nationally applicable and global comparable land indicators goes beyond the provisions for tracking the SDG land indicators to cover four key areas of land governance: land tenure security; land disputes and conflicts; land administration services; and sustainable land use management. In collaboration with platform members, GLII has developed a series of working papers on land monitoring; facilitated the development and piloting of methodology and tools for data collection on tenure security in several countries in Africa; and developed a Training Curriculum on Methodology for Data Collection and Reporting on Land Indicators fostering global learning and knowledge sharing on land monitoring. Find more information at www.gltn.net

Members of the GLII platform continue to explore innovative means of land data collecting, monitoring and reporting, including steering land and data community consultations on harmonized indicators and methodologies for data collection, in-country monitoring and analysis and regional and global discussions on land governance monitoring at scale. GLII now continues to work towards realising its' mission of making global scale monitoring of land governance a reality focused on common global indicators, globally comparable data sources and harmonised monitoring and reporting processes, aligned with the globally agreed Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure and regional frameworks such as the Framework & Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa, the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda.