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PART II: LESSONS LEARNED
RESULTS FROM MAST

• Project Processes /Timeline
• Results are presented by village and thematic categories:
  – Ilalasimba
  – Itagutwa
  – Kitayawa
• Key Benefits
## Project Timing, Key Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Project Phases</th>
<th>Ilalasimba</th>
<th>Itagutwa</th>
<th>Kitayawa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and Training</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Adjudication and Data Processing</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Verification and Validation</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Presentation of Land Rights Documents</td>
<td>7 months</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>7 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADJUDICATION: FIELD DATA CAPTURE, ILALASIMBA
### NUMBER OF PARCELS, BY VILLAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th># of parcels</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Average size of Parcel (ha)</th>
<th>Total Area Mapped (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ilalasimba</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1205.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itagutwa</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1786.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitayawa</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2793.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3927</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>5784.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# NUMBER OF LAND RIGHTS DOCUMENTS ISSUED, BY TENURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Type</th>
<th>Ilalasimba</th>
<th>Itagutwa</th>
<th>Kitayawa</th>
<th>#, by Tenure Type</th>
<th>% by Tenure Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Occupancy/ male</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Occupancy/ female</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Tenancy/ Male &amp; Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Tenancy/ Male &amp; Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Tenancy/ Female &amp; Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenancy in Common</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenancy in Common (Probate)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian (Minor)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>910</strong></td>
<td><strong>1126</strong></td>
<td><strong>1878</strong></td>
<td><strong>3927</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ILALASIMBA
EARLY OBSERVED BENEFITS [1]

• Women felt more empowered as a result of trainings on women’s land rights and as a result of acquiring formal rights to land;

• Women felt that the land rights of their children would be more secure as a result of having the children’s names listed on CCROs;

• Some villagers noted that they would now invest in cash crops, such as tomatoes, for sale in markets;

• Youth felt as though they made a positive contribution to their community by serving as Trusted Intermediaries;

• Youth felt encouraged and empowered by the capacity building experience using the mobile technology;
EARLY OBSERVED BENEFITS [2]

• Villagers felt that some conflicts would be avoided in the future given that land rights were clarified and secured;

• Villagers felt that they were less likely to be expropriated or wrongfully lose land rights;

• Villagers felt that by having CCROs the value of their land would rise; and

• Villagers felt that they would be able to use their CCROs as collateral for loans; and

• Villagers felt that they would be able to use their CCROs as bonds to release family members who were in jail.
LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE MAST PILOT PROJECT

Observations are grouped into six thematic categories:

- National Level
- District Level
- Village Level
- Mapping/Technology
- Land Use
- General Issues and Sustainability Concerns
A HIGH-LEVEL LOOK: NATIONAL, DISTRICT, AND VILLAGE
NATIONAL LEVEL

• Consistent outreach to, and engagement with, national land offices helped strengthen the design of the MAST pilot project
  – MOL and NLUPC were involved from earliest stages of project
• Engagement of MOL & NLUPC validated the project and was important for integrating MAST into rural adjudication processes
• Partnering with government at the operational level was a big help with implementation at the district and local levels
  – EX: Land Officers built support among village leaders & villagers; supported training and identified ways to improve technology
HOWEVER

• Competing demands on staff time and a lack of funding inhibits a stronger partnership with the MOL
  – MOL/NLUPC generously allowed staff to participate but staff had to balance project requests with other work
  – Looking ahead, dedicated and dependable funding streams will be important to scale land adjudication/titling
DISTRICT LEVEL [1]

• District staff have sufficient levels of expertise in surveying and mapping
  – The MAST pilot benefited from the DLO’s experience and expertise in this regard

• Implementation activities benefited from active supervision by our implementing partners
  – CARE/Tanzania and partner, TAGRODE, provided active supervision of and support to DLO to keep project moving forward
DISTRICT LEVEL [2]

• Cumbersome procedures defined in the VLA place pressure on limited resources at the DLO
  – Complex procedures involving multiple steps and fixed costs strained project resources
• Clearly defined roles and responsibilities helped to expedite key project activities
• Competing commitments, lack of funding and technical resources limits the DLO’s land administration capacity
  – DLO has limited funding and limited capacity to address project demands while also addressing other regular office demands
VILLAGE LEVEL [1]

- Engaging community leaders helped improve project planning and establish realistic timelines
- Training was critical to build support for adjudication
  - Hamlet-level training and awareness raising proved to be an important mechanism for engaging villagers in the project
- Villagers can use technology & document land rights
- Putting youth engagement at the center of technology training yielded benefits
  - Active learning was easily adopted by young people at the village level and using youth may have helped limit conflict around project
VILLAGE LEVEL [2]

• Trusted Intermediaries from one village were effective trainers of other TIs.
  – TIs shared their experiences and knowledge with their peers and this proved beneficial during field implementation.

• Targeting of women and other vulnerable groups was key to increasing security and promoting gender equality
  – Focused on incorporating gender specific materials and the importance of having women attend trainings, workshops and community activities

• The implementation process supported local disputes resolution
  – Participatory training and adjudication processes helped to identify and resolve conflicts

• Careful messaging was needed to emphasize the benefits of securing tenure
  – Messaging focused on tenure security rather than collateralization
**MAPPING/TECHNOLOGY**

- High costs of internet access is a major barrier for the implementation of land adjudication/information projects.
  - DLO does not have dedicated funding for ICT
- Geospatial resources can effectively support public outreach activities
  - Maps helped orient TIs during planning and villagers during adjudication
- Through better tasking and orientation, trusted intermediaries improved accuracy, reducing validation/verification time and costs
- However, lack of reliable baseline spatial data is a problem
  - Lack of accurate, up-to-date information (especially land use planning information) led to uncertainties during demarcation, and can potentially be a source of land disputes
LAND USE

• Poor land use planning framework may exclude farmers in marginalized zones and increasing disputes
  – The village land use planning process is supposed to be participatory, the pilot found that village-level participation in the VLUP process is often limited

• Villagers and village leaders may benefit from coupling MAST technology with other land use management technology such as LandPKS
  – In informal interviews, villagers noted that they would benefit from having access to land information such as soil conditions and land cover.
GENERAL ISSUES AND SUSTAINABILITY CONCERNS [1]

• Financial Sustainability
  – Systematic land registration of land requires political and financial commitments; financial commitment needs to be clarified
  – To ensure sustainability the right price point for service delivery needs to be set

• Subsequent registration
  – The MAST pilot project was designed to test a citizen-centric approach to capturing land rights; it was extended to support the issuance of formal land rights documents.

• Staffing Issues
  – The DLO is currently not staffed at a sufficient level to support the systematic adjudication of land rights while also conducting normal office business.
GENERAL ISSUES AND SUSTAINABILITY CONCERNS [2]

- Fixed costs associated with official “crested papers,” forms and supplies are high
- Using a cloud based land information system presents opportunities and challenges
  - These technologies may offer a way to reduce adjudication costs
- Clarifying benefits of technology.
  - MAST seems to fit well with government development priorities for inventorying lands and attracting agricultural investment, but it remains to be seen whether it will be widely adopted by the GOT
- Per-diems and Participation
  - Government and community engagement has come at a cost. Almost all activities, including the participation of the DLO and of villagers in the project, was tied to the provision of per-diems