

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF MOBILE APPLICATION TO SECURE TENURE (MAST) PILOT IN ILALASIMBA VILLAGE

Report prepared by Gwynne Zodrow (MSI), Dr. Martin Kijazi (consultant), Dr. Benjamin Linkow (NORC at the University of Chicago)

June 3, 2016

This presentation was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Management Systems International for the E3 Analytics and Evaluation Project.

MAST Performance Evaluation – First Pilot Site

 First MAST pilot implemented by Cloudburst Group in Ilalasimba, January-July 2015

 Independent evaluation through E3 Analytics and Evaluation Project implemented by MSI / NORC / dTS

Evaluation purpose: to assess
 MAST model and draw lessons
 for future implementation



Evaluation Questions

- How did beneficiaries and other stakeholders in the first pilot site perceive MAST?
- a) Was the mapping and verification process seen as transparent and participatory?
- b) What disputes arose in the course of mapping and verification, and were these disputes resolved fairly?
- c) Were the data collected by MAST sufficient to allow for the issuance of CCROs?
- d) Did MAST outreach and communications activities inform and educate users of land in the MAST village on the appropriate land laws and related processes?

Methodology

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with 6-12 participants per group

- Cross section of land users with and without CCROs
- Female land users
- Youth
- Pastoralists
- Trusted intermediaries
- Members of village land council
- Residents of neighboring villages

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

- Village Chairperson, Village Executive Officer and Hamlet Chairpersons
- District Land Officer & Natural Resource Management Officer
- Community members involved in disputes

Limitations of the Evaluation

Limited generalizability of findings

 Cannot compare MAST to alternative approaches to formalizing land rights

Key Findings

The pilot was successful overall and MAST is a promising approach

- Successful development and implementation of "crowd sourced" approach using mobile technology
- Ease of use: no significant difficulties with technology reported by trusted intermediaries, DLO
- Residents perceived mapping and verification process to be inclusive and transparent
- MAST relied on existing institutions and processes to resolve disputes,
 which were sufficient in this case despite substantial numbers of disputes

Key Findings

Challenges

- Confusion over joint application forms (who can be listed?)
- Attendance at village outreach seminars was limited, especially for women
- Delays in issuing CCROs
- Youth concerns that MAST would increase purchase price for land

Additional Lessons Learned

- Importance of Village Land Use Planning (VLUP) process
 - Pastoralists felt excluded by VLUP and felt that their interests were not considered
 - Other criticisms and inconsistent understanding among residents

Key Recommendations

 Future CCRO projects should devote considerable attention to ensuring that a careful and inclusive VLUP process is successfully completed before implementation

2. The process of filing joint CCRO application forms, including rules for who may be included on a coregistered CCRO, should be clarified

Key Recommendations

3. Future CCRO projects should review and adjust project education and outreach curricula based on lessons learned from the pilot in Ilalasimba

4. Future education and outreach activities should work with communities to find ways to maximize attendance and participation, particularly for women

Key Recommendations

5. Women's land rights are an important topic that should continue to be included in future outreach and education activities

6. The MAST technology is a promising approach that should be considered in future land mapping and registration projects

7. Future CCRO activities should be closely coordinated with the DLO and MLHHSD

Additional Ongoing Evaluation Activities

- MAST Cost Effectiveness Study
 - Compares MAST to alternative approaches in terms of cost, other dimensions
- Rigorous impact evaluation of Land Tenure Assistance (LTA) activity