



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# MID-TERM PERFORMANCE EVALUATION LAND AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (Mid-term PE-LRDP)

Work Plan and Evaluation Design Report

MARCH 2017

This document was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by The Cloudburst Group for the Mid-term PE-LRDP Task Order under the Strengthening Tenure and Resource Rights (STARR) IQC.

Prepared for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Contract Number AID-514-TO-17-00003, Mid-term PE-LRDP Task Order under the Strengthening Tenure and Resource Rights (STARR) IQC No. AID-OAA-I-12-00030.

Report prepared by Dr. Heather Huntington, Nicole Walter, David Varela, Ana Montoya and Juan Tellez with support from Aidan Schneider.

Implemented by:

The Cloudburst Group  
8400 Corporate Drive, Suite 550  
Landover, MD 20785-2238

# Mid-Term Performance Evaluation of the Land and Rural Development Program (Mid- term PE-LRDP)

Work Plan and Evaluation Design Report

MARCH 2017

## **DISCLAIMER**

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

# CONTENTS

- ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS ..... V**
- 1.0 INTRODUCTION ..... 1**
- 2.0 BACKGROUND ..... 3**
  - DEVELOPMENT PROBLEM AND MOTIVATION FOR LRDP ..... 4
- 3.0 LRDP INTERVENTIONS & THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK ..... 10**
  - OVERVIEW OF LRDP ..... 10
  - THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK ..... 12
  - LRDP COMPONENTS ..... 12
- 4.0 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES, QUESTIONS, & INDICATORS ..... 15**
  - LRDP-PE EVALUATION QUESTIONS ..... 15
  - LRDP-PE EVALUATION HYPOTHESES ..... 16
  - PRIMARY DATA SOURCES ..... 17
  - SECONDARY DATA SOURCES ..... 18
  - KEY OUTCOME INDICATORS ..... 19
  - KEY CONTEXT INDICATORS ..... 19
- 5.0 COMPONENT 1: DESK STUDY AND SECONDARY DATA ..... 24**
- 6.0 COMPONENT 2: QUALITATIVE METHODS ..... 26**
  - RESEARCH AND SURVEY METHODS ..... 26
- 7.0 COMPONENT 3: QUANTITATIVE METHODS ..... 33**
  - MATCHING ..... 33
  - RESEARCH AND SURVEY METHODS ..... 34
- 8.0 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN ..... 40**
  - TEAM COMPOSITION ..... 40
  - EVALUATION ACTIVITIES ..... 41
  - REPORTING AND COMMUNICATION ..... 44
- APPENDIX A: SAMPLING MATRIX ..... 45**
- APPENDIX B: LRDP PROGRAMMING MATRIX ..... 48**
- REFERENCES ..... 67**

# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADR	Rural Development Agency
ANT	National Land Agency
ART	Territory Renewal Agency
DDL	Development Data Library
FARC	Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia)
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GoC	Government of Colombia
INCODER	Colombian Rural Development Institute
IQC	Indefinite Quantity Contract
IRB	Institutional Review Board
KII	Key Informant Interview
LRDP	Land and Rural Development Program
LRU	Land Restitution Unit (Unidad de Restitución de Tierras)
MARD	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
MDES	Minimum Desired Effect Size
Mid-term PE-LRDP	Mid-Term Performance Evaluation of the Land and Rural Development Program
PE	Performance Evaluation
PND	National Development Plan
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
SNGT	National Land Management System
STARR	Strengthening Tenure and Resource Rights
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government

# I.0 INTRODUCTION

This report describes a performance evaluation (PE) design for work being conducted under the Strengthening Tenure and Resource Rights (STARR) IQC No. AID-OAA-I-12-00030 for USAID/Colombia's Land and Rural Development Program (LRDP, 2013–2018), which is being implemented by Tetra Tech. LRDP works in five regions, encompassing 57 municipalities. The regions include Cesar, Montes de Maria, Tolima, Meta and Cauca. The LRDP selected these areas in consultation with USAID and the GoC based on the need to strengthen the GoC's institutional capability to title and register lands held informally (formalization), return land to their rightful owners (restitution), and to improve the livelihoods of rural communities through increasing public investment in conflict-affected regions.

Gross inequality (manifest in the insecure land tenure and property rights of vulnerable groups), weak state presence in rural areas (coupled with low-level of public investment) are root causes of the vicious circle of the armed conflict that has devastated the country of Colombia for over 50 years. While Colombia's legal and institutional framework provides for various forms of private land tenure all face significant recognition and enforcement barriers, exacerbated in the case of vulnerable populations. The GoC also lacks a uniform and secure information and knowledge management system for land, which has led to inconsistencies and potential manipulation in land parcel information, making restitution and formalization slow and inefficient. These institutional deficiencies and lack of formal land ownership have exacerbated poverty and social conflict between communities, ethnic populations, businesses, and rural citizens and has contributed to rural stagnation or decline in several rural areas. Despite the progress made in recent years in reducing poverty and inequality, informality remains high in Colombia, especially in the rural sector. Colombia faces major challenges stemming from these issues in addition to weak institutional capacity, lack of coordination to integrate the GoC's systems and policies, and limited civil society participation.

As an institutional strengthening initiative, USAID/Colombia's LRDP is designed to help the GoC improve its ability to resolve these complex land and rural development issues. LRDP is a five-year task order, initiated at the end of July 2013, under the Strengthening Tenure and Resource Rights (STARR) Indefinite Quantity Contract. LRDP is currently in its fourth year. LRDP assists the GoC to strengthen its capacity to develop systems and skills that will enable it to fulfill its mandate to resolve the land and rural development issues that have fueled Colombia's decades-long internal conflict. LRDP works closely with Colombian institutions to ensure that the needs of vulnerable populations such as women and ethnic minorities have access to legal representation, land and property, reliable markets for agriculture, and public goods and services in rural areas.

LRDP has four objectives, which are also the project's structural components:

1. **Restitution Component:** Increase capacity of the GoC Land Restitution Unit (LRU) and relevant agencies to restitute lands to victims of conflict;
2. **Formalization Component:** Strengthen the capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) and relevant GoC agencies to formalize rural property;

3. **Rural Development Component:** Increase the opportunities for sustainable licit rural livelihoods in conflict-affected areas; and
4. **Information and Knowledge Management Component:** \_Improve availability and efficient use of information to deliver land rights services.

In December 2016, The Cloudburst Group was awarded a five-month contract to conduct a PE of LRDP in Colombia (Mid-term PE-LRDP). The overall purpose of the Mid-term PE-LRDP is to assess if the program’s institutional strengthening initiative is likely to be effective and sustainable. In accomplishing this purpose, the evaluation will assess if the support provided by LRDP has contributed to structural changes in GoC institutions as well as to the design, implementation, and GoC scale up of land titling, formalization, rural development, and restitution policies, tools and strategies, as well as strategies for sustainable livelihoods. The Mid-term PE-LRDP will assess and compare and contrast the achievement of program objectives across each of the program’s structural components<sup>1</sup> and mechanisms<sup>2</sup>.

The Mid-term PE-LRDP methodology is comprised of three complementary components, including a desk study, review and analysis of secondary data, and primary data collection. The primary data collection will be driven by both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Quantitative data collection will include a large N household study with 1,500 households in 50 municipalities, and structured interviews with 100 stakeholders. The qualitative data collection will focus on focus group discussions (FGDs) of target populations and key informant interviews (KIIs) with local stakeholders.

Through this comprehensive data collection and analysis effort, the PE will provide a rich evidence base and sophisticated analysis for improved LRDP policy making and programming. The evaluation findings will enable LRDP’s program theory to be validated, and adjusted if required, before the project reaches its completion.

What follows in this design report and work plan is a summary of the context and theoretical underpinnings of the LRDP’s interventions, a detailed description of the evaluation objectives, questions, key indicators and methodology, as well as the evaluation implementation plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> LRDP’s efforts are organized under four structural components—restitution, formalization, rural development, and information sharing and management—the unique realities of each region call for a tailored package of activities.

<sup>2</sup> As a part of the objective to formalize rural property rights, LRDP is implementing four mechanisms of pilot formalization including: Massive titling, notification, and registration of public lands; Municipal formalization plans; MARD private land formalization program and; Property ownership clarification, and the recovery of illegally or inappropriately acquired baldíos.

## 2.0 BACKGROUND

This section outlines two key issues that motivate USAID's investment in programming to improve land tenure in Colombia. The first is the armed conflict between the Government of Colombia (GoC) and various guerilla/paramilitary groups which led to the displacement of millions of Colombians, particularly in rural areas throughout the country. The second is the high level of poverty and economic inequality. Informal and insecure land tenure are root causes behind both of these development problems.

Gross inequality (manifest in the insecure land tenure and property rights of vulnerable groups), weak state presence in rural areas (coupled with low-level of public investment) are root causes of the vicious cycle of armed conflict that has devastated the country of Colombia for over 50 years. Land conflicts reaching back to the start of the 20th century have produced a long legacy of insecurity and squatting that have implications for landholding patterns today (LeGrande 1986, Roldan 2002). Migration of landless peasants to frontier regions throughout that century resulted in high levels of land ownership informality throughout the country (LeGrande 1989, Ibanez and Querubin 2004). Informality creates opportunity for legal disputes over ownership, and potential for abuse by more powerful economic actors. Combined with high levels of inequality of ownership, these dynamics have produced fertile ground for unrest and insurgency exacerbated by the growth of illicit crops. This extremely profitable venture was originally fostered by organized crime but ended up associated with the financing of insurgent groups. Drug trafficking fueled a vicious circle of impunity and violence in large portions of the countryside that featured illicit enrichment, capture of local authorities and massive land grabs, with criminal organizations and insurgent groups taking advantage of weak state presence. As state authorities were less able to provide law-enforcement services in large tracts of rural areas, such groups took control over more land and co-opted more smallholders into growing illicit crops.

Armed conflict and land tenure issues are closely related in Colombia. Land inequality, insecurity, and failed reform efforts in the 1960s (among other factors) were behind the formation of insurgent armed groups in the country's periphery (Marulanda 1973, Albertus and Kaplan 2012). Land issues have in turn been exacerbated by the armed conflict. Conflict has pushed millions of people out of their homes and produced one of the largest internally displaced populations in the world (IMDC 2016). The implications for land tenure issues are enormous: an estimated 6.6 million hectares of land were forcibly abandoned between 1980 and 2010 (Garay et al., 2010). These dynamics resulted in traditional land policies, laws and regulation being unable to face the challenges of restitution of land to millions of displaced civilians as well as greater formalization of land ownership more broadly (including State-owned lands, GoC being supposedly one of the major landholders in the country but equally affected by the lack of clean and marketable titles). Special procedures had to be developed to deal with land restitution claims and land claims from secondary occupants who may have settled on or bought forcibly abandoned land (wittingly or not), as well as the restitution claims of vulnerable ethnic communities. The varying historical, social and economic issues across Colombia led to varying levels of crime and violence and consequently the number of victims and those seeking restitution vary significantly across the rural areas.

After decades of failed negotiations and attempts to militarily defeat the guerrilla groups active in the country, since the beginning of his first term in 2010 President Santos adopted a new strategy to end the Colombian internal armed conflict through a political solution. In 2012, he formally began negotiations with the guerrillas of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC). By May 2013, the Government of Colombia (GoC) reached consensus on the first agreement with FARC precisely on comprehensive rural development dealing with issues of access and use of land, unproductive lands, property formalization, agricultural productivity and protected areas. Subsequent negotiations during 2014 and 2015 reached additional consensus on other complex issues such as illegal drugs, political participation and transitional justice. The agreement to end the conflict, including a cease-fire, handover of weapons and guerrilla members' reintegration into civilian life was signed on November 24, 2016.

Despite the progress made in recent years in reducing poverty, inequality and informality in Colombia remain high, especially in the rural sector. The country continues to feature large income inequalities: the richest 10% of the population receives more than 17 times the income of the poorest 10%. Poverty incidence is not homogeneous throughout the Colombian territory. It is higher among rural populations (around 43%) than in urban populations (around 27%). Extreme poverty in rural areas still affects 19% of the population while on the urban side is only 6%. Other indicators of social development show that gaps in income and living conditions between rural and urban areas have continued to widen, for example due to the aging of the rural population, the migration of young people and the increase of female heads of households.

## **DEVELOPMENT PROBLEM AND MOTIVATION FOR LRDP**

In Colombia, democratic institutions and conflict have coexisted for decades (Nasi 2007). On one hand, Colombian democracy (though still flawed) <sup>3</sup> is one of Latin America's most stable political systems (not necessarily the most open), with almost uninterrupted, regularly held, largely free and fair elections (according to international observer missions from the OAS) for the past several decades (Peeler 1985). On the other hand, Colombia has one of the longest ongoing armed conflicts in the hemisphere. This paradox may be the outcome of power vacuums of the national state in many areas where not only violence but also corruption is pervasive. At the same time, Colombia is considered by some experts a success story of both judicial autonomy and activism in Latin America (Uprimmy, 2004; Couso, 2004). The following sections summarize how the executive and judicial institutions interact in the process of recognition and enforcement of land rights and identifies the main development issues the LRDP attempts to address.

## **KEY EXECUTIVE INSTITUTIONS DEALING WITH RESTITUTION OR FORMALIZATION ISSUES**

In the last 15 years, many land restitution or formalization programs (other than LRDP) have been financed with the GoC's own resources or by other donors. Implementation has been the responsibility of three key land agencies.

**Land Restitution Unit**—The programs under the Victims and Land Restitution Law are designed to support judicial, administrative, social and economic measures for the benefit of individuals and groups that have been victims of the conflict, including land restitution for displaced peoples. The LRU, under the MARD, is responsible for implementation of various donor-supported programs for victims. The

---

3 <http://www.eiu.com/Handlers/WhitepaperHandler.ashx?fi=EIU-Democracy-Index-2015.pdf&mode=wp&campaignid=DemocracyIndex2015>

LRU also: (i) administers a Registry of Abandoned Lands (separate from SNR) in which victims eligible for restitution and their family households can record claims on the legal status of a land parcel; and (ii) submits, on behalf of the victims, claims before specialized land courts for land restitution or, where restitution is not possible, for compensation to the victims.

**ANT**—Originally led by Colombian Rural Development Institute (INCODER), and transferred in 2016 to the National Land Agency (ANT), land reform and formalization programs are focused on reforming the structure of land ownership through small land awards to poor peasants, smallholders, peasant women heads of household and members of vulnerable groups.<sup>4</sup> Such programs include actions to formalize private property rights, provide clear titles and assist the beneficiaries in complying with the relevant notarial and registration procedures. To that end, ANT: (i) manages the land of the National Agrarian Fund, monitors property transfers to individuals or communities, and enforces the devolution of State property in the cases provided by law; and (ii) facilitates access to land for small and mid-sized rural producers, and promotes alternatives for efficient, rational and sustainable land use. The regulations of INCODER/ANT on selection of beneficiaries, land transfers and regularization must take into account the different levels of complexity of factual and legal issues in various rural areas.

**MARD**—This Ministry's main mandate is to develop, coordinate and evaluate policies that promote a competitive, equitable and sustainable development of agricultural, forestry, fishery resources, or improve the quality of life of the Colombian rural population. MARD supervises the activities of LRU and ANT.<sup>5</sup>

## **KEY JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS DEALING WITH LAND ISSUES <sup>6</sup>**

The judicial branch is also involved in the solution to land conflicts in Colombia. Citizen access to the Colombian court system is also a central feature of the judicial phase in the land restitution process envisioned under Law 1448. Any individual victim or community can make a direct informal petition to the LRU in the administrative phase. As a result, the LRU lawyers prepare a case file for restitution that will be presented to the restitution judges for review and ruling. There are 39 first instance restitution judges in the country. If there is no third party claiming ownership over the same piece of land, the restitution judge may issue a fast-track ruling granting legal ownership over that land. Land restitution cases in which interested parties challenge the claim will move to the appeals' courts (15 in the country). First instance and appeals' land restitution judges have a deadline of four months to rule on individual cases, which is not always complied with. One important aspect of LRDP has been to improve the institutional capacity of the LRU to process the administrative phase of these cases.

## **KEY EXECUTIVE INSTITUTIONS DEALING WITH RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

As noted above, Colombia remains one of the most unequal countries in the world and the gap between urban and rural areas remains wide, inequality affecting even more indigenous peoples and afro-Colombians. While the agricultural sector currently represents only 6 per cent of Colombia's GDP and 16 per cent of employment, the country's agricultural potential is significantly larger. Over the last 25 years, the growth rate of this sector has been only half the rate of the overall economy. Lack of

<sup>4</sup> INCODER's programs for rural development have transferred to the ADR.

<sup>5</sup> The land formalization programs of MADR have been transferred to ANT.

<sup>6</sup> While LRDP support is focused on the administrative phase led by the LRU it has some spillover effects and provides indirect support to the judiciary. LRDP is also holding close coordination with the USAID-financed Access to Justice Program that does deal directly with the land restitution judges.

adequate GoC's support policies, and poor land use practices have been identified as the main causes of stagnation.

The National Development Plan 2014-2018 acknowledged that for the benefits of the peace accords to be shared equally, the reduction of territorial disparities in living conditions, and a more educated rural population are essential. The 2014 Havana agreement on Comprehensive Rural Reform set out an ambitious agenda for rural development aimed at reinforcing social and economic changes. The same year, GoC convened a Mission for Rural Transformation (*Misión Rural*) which delivered a comprehensive set of policy recommendations around six strategies: social inclusion, productive inclusion and family farming, competitive agricultural sector, environmentally sustainable development, territorial planning, and institutional reforms. In 2015, GoC endorsed the *Misión Rural* report and initiated critical institutional reforms in the agricultural sector. Three new agencies—ANT, the Rural Development Agency (ADR) and the Territory Renewal Agency (ART) – were established to implement the ambitious reform agenda proposed by *Misión Rural*. Not all institutional transitions have been smooth: for instance, the dismantling of INCODER and the setting up of ANT posed some coordination challenges that slowed the implementation of programs such as LRDP.

While these institutional changes were already underway, issues related to rural development remained high on the peace talks agenda, were included in the Final Agreement of November 2016, and are expected to stay a priority during the post-conflict period. The Agreement is also expected to increase public and private investment in the rural sector through projects geared to increasing small farmers' productivity, and improving infrastructure and services. The GoC's vision for the post-conflict presently emphasizes an integrated approach to rural development, including efficient land use, improved infrastructure, and the support to family farming.

Major challenges remain for these policy objectives to be achieved. The ability of the new national agencies to work at the regional and local levels is still being developed, and under the decentralized/deconcentrate administrative model of the country they will have to coordinate effectively with the mostly weak departmental and municipal secretariats of agriculture. These institutional arrangements are not always suitable to address the serious bottlenecks for rural productivity the country faces, particularly in terms of infrastructure and services to connect farmers and markets, and technical support for farmers to improve productive practices.

## **EFFECTIVENESS OF THE LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK**

### **OVERVIEW OF THE LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK**

Colombia's legal and institutional framework provides for various forms of private land tenure. In general, individual rights (ownership, possession, squatting and others) are clearly determined and enforced in urban areas, while in rural areas recognition and enforcement is uneven at best. Women's rights are also weak because many women involved in 'common-law' marriages lack of documents to prove ownership of their land.

Although collective rights (for indigenous, Afro-Colombian and other communities) are also recognized, major barriers remain for effective enforcement, particularly due to the strong opposition of politically or economically influential actors or constraints in the organization and representation of these vulnerable groups

Recent studies by the World Bank have shown that only 75% of the urban land and 40% of rural lands in Colombia have been properly demarcated and recorded in an official cadaster . Registration of land

rights (by the Superintendency of Notaries and Registry-SNR) is separate from the cadaster surveys (mainly the responsibility of the Geographic Institute Agustín Codazzi, with the exception of some large municipalities). The information of the registry refers only to the legal status of the property (in alphanumeric format) while that of the cadaster includes only the parcel's physical and economic data (in alphanumeric and graphic formats). The database interfaces between the registry and the cadaster have only operated occasionally as part of special-purpose programs to match cadastral maps/plans with registry records. The out-of-pocket expenses of registering a property transfer (including lawyers and notaries) may reach up to 2–5% of the commercial value of the land making this process too cumbersome and expensive for most rural citizens. The overall transaction costs including time and number of steps of property registration may be significantly higher, and the quality and efficiency of the land registration in Colombia are average for Latin American standards and low for OECD standards.<sup>7</sup>

GoC is one of the main holders of rural and urban lands. The administration of these lands remains under the responsibility of several agencies. Since 2016, ANT is responsible for the public lands (*baldíos*); the Special Administrative Unit of the National Parks System of the protected areas; the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and the Regional Autonomous Corporations are responsible for the forest reserves; and the Ministry of Mines and Energy, the Mining-Energy Planning Unit, the National Mining Agency and the National Hydrocarbons Agency have the responsibility for the subsoil and related resources.

However, most of these agencies have not been able to prevent the illegal squatting and appropriation of the State lands under their jurisdiction. It is estimated that more than 60% of land now considered private has not been legally transferred and, in theory, has never left the domain of the State. According to SNR, up to 65 fraudulent schemes have taken advantage of an equal number of legal loopholes to facilitate the illegal transfer of State lands.

## **MAIN BOTTLENECKS**

In addition to the GoC-sponsored “Misión Rural,” several studies supported by international donors (including USAID, through LRDP)<sup>8</sup> and local think tanks have identified the main bottlenecks to the effective implementation of the legal and institutional framework for land in Colombia.

### **Limited Coordination Among GoC Agencies**

- The current land management system is not effective partly because the institutional mandates are not well defined, leading to duplications, overlapping and even contradictory functions and responsibilities among central and decentralized agencies, particularly regarding State-owned lands. It is expected that some recent reforms will improve the levels of coordination (see below).
- Plans, programs and projects of different sectors (i.e. agriculture, mining and energy, transport, environment) are not fully coordinated thereby generating disincentives for land allocation/use in accordance with technical criteria, or disputes among stakeholders.
- The instruments of urban and rural planning used by the different levels of government are not properly articulated, especially in the rural sector where local authorities with responsibilities for land planning are not fully prepared to face the challenges of a modern land management system.

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.doingbusiness.org/data/exploreeconomies/colombia#registering-property>

<sup>8</sup> LRDP produced a policy document on institutional reforms for rural development which highlighted bottlenecks on resource mobilization, and proposed the creation of ADR.

- The costs and benefits of implementing land policies have not been properly measured. The figures available are only general estimates, and the institutional capacities to conduct more detailed exercises are limited. There is no country system for monitoring and evaluating the achievement of the social/economic objectives of land policies; the institutions report the progress in policy implementation in their own formats so no permanent/systematic monitoring of results on the ground has been put in place.

### **Weak Recognition and Enforcement of Land Rights**

- In rural areas, more than half of individual and collective titles are not properly recorded as a result of: (i) access barriers to registry services (particularly in terms of out-of-pocket expenses and other transaction costs), insufficient awareness by legal owners of the importance of formalizing land rights with a title recorded in the registry, and lack of up-to-date information in the cadaster databases; and (ii) non-compliance with legal requirements, such as: (A) succession procedures (notarial or judicial) to transfer lands in case of death; (B) registration by the beneficiaries of *baldíos* awards; (C) registration of improvements and possessions; and (D) signing public deeds instead of informal documents to effect the transfer of property rights over land. Most cases of non-compliance with legal requirements are associated with the high costs of notaries, registry/cadaster and lawyers for vulnerable individuals and communities who do not have enough resources, especially if the travel/time costs of compliance are added.
- In the formalization processes, consistency between the physical and legal description has not always been ensured in recording the transaction, either in the registry or the cadaster.
- Despite the legal ban, some areas within forest reserves have been encroached by agricultural and mining uses.
- As opposed to urban areas, in rural areas no effective compensation mechanisms have been established for changes in land use.

### **Inconsistencies Between Registry and Cadaster Information**

- The description of the land area and boundaries in the registry does not match that of the cadaster, an issue that affects land formalization, restitution and titling programs.
- Database interfaces between the cadaster and the registry have only been operational for short-term programs, not as a permanent feature of the IT systems used by both agencies.
- In general, the legal or geo-referenced information about lands is not fully reliable and has not allowed effective enforcement of owners' rights in rural areas. There is no full-fledged inventory of State lands that includes information on disputes related to illegal squatting or appropriation. The cadastral and registry records usually do not match variables such as area, boundaries and cartography. Such information has not been compiled into a single standardized repository but remains scattered in various agencies so it is not fully accessible to the public or to other agencies. Information on certain non-marketable lands, such as national parks and protected areas, is more reliable but uncertainties remain on some boundaries or cases of illegal squatting.
- The cadastral valuations to establish the tax base for the unified property tax in rural areas may not be consistent with the physical and/or market reality of the property due to: (i) limited cadastral surveys; (ii) outdated cadastral information; (iii) limited or no information on land markets, especially in rural areas; (iv) appraisers' discretion on valuation methodologies; (v) land use decisions that favor particular interests, or facilitate speculation; (vi) land distribution issues, mainly in rural areas; and (vii) political or economic influences to keep large landholdings undervalued.

## **RECENT REFORMS: NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (PND) AND MULTI-PURPOSE CADASTER**

The 2014–2018 National Development Plan (PND) establishes a land management and rural transformation policy that attempts to increase access to land for agricultural workers, increase efficient land use and establish legal certainty over property rights. The PND expects that the new land use/planning processes will provide the conditions for vulnerable populations to use land to improve their quality of life and socio-economic stability. The PND Law granted the president with special law-making authority to establish the ANT and the ADR as new entities responsible for leading land management and rural development, respectively. The PND also called for a new multipurpose national cadaster, which should unify land information, contribute to the legal security of real property, strengthen local taxation, land use and planning, and overall social and economic development. This multipurpose cadaster will be the basis of a new National Land Management System (SNGT).

The implementation of PND policies and the establishment of the SNGT provide an unprecedented opportunity for Colombia to enforce its legal and institutional land tenure framework.

Under the new multipurpose cadaster, the interface between the registry and the cadaster databases should become fully operational to track the dynamics of the land markets in Colombia. Whenever a change in land rights takes place, the databases of both the cadaster and the registry should be automatically updated. To facilitate the search of land information, a single property number could be established for the registry, the cadaster and the new inventory of GoC lands that would include a full dataset on illegal squatting, good faith occupation and appropriation cases. It is expected that the issues related to outdated registration and cadaster databases and inter-institutional coordination will be solved through the development of modern information management tools and systems.

As noted in this chapter, land tenure and rural development issues in Colombia are complex and no single donor-financed operation has attempted to address them all at the same time. The existence of a number of GoC land-related institutions and the incremental development of assistance programs by various donors has posed additional issues in establishing a coordinated and consistent land sector reform. To resolve Colombia's multifaceted land sector issues, LRDP developed its own innovative and comprehensive theoretical framework with ambitious policy objectives at the national level while focusing on targeted regional implementation of pilot initiatives to help Colombia's move to a post-conflict scenario.

# 3.0 LRDP INTERVENTIONS & THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

## OVERVIEW OF LRDP

Taking into account the ongoing transition to a post-conflict society, LRDP was designed as an institutional strengthening initiative to help the GoC improve its ability to resolve the complex land and rural development issues described above in Section 2. While the GoC has made some recent reforms to address the bottlenecks described in Section 2, LRDP is working alongside the government to further build their capacity to continue to overcome these inefficiencies.

LRDP is a five-year task order, initiated at the end of July 2013, under the Strengthening Tenure and Resource Rights (STARR) Indefinite Quantity Contract. The program is currently in Year 4 of its five-year duration. LRDP works in five regions, encompassing six departments and 57 municipalities. The six departments include Cesar, Sucre, Bolivar, Tolima, Meta and Cauca. Figure 1 (below) is a map of these departments and municipalities. LRDP assists the GoC to strengthen its capacity to develop systems and skills that will enable it to fulfill its mandate to resolve the land issues that have fueled Colombia's decades-long internal conflict.

LRDP has four objectives, which are also the project's structural components:

1. **Restitution Component:** Increase capacity of the GoC LRU and relevant agencies to restitute lands to victims of conflict;
2. **Formalization Component:** Strengthen the capacity of the MARD and relevant GoC agencies to formalize rural property;
3. **Rural Development Component:** Increase the opportunities for sustainable licit rural livelihoods in conflict-affected areas; and
4. **Information and Knowledge Management Component:** Improve availability and efficient use of information to deliver land rights services.

LRDP's capacity building and institutional strengthening project components establish a new methodology for the way that USAID provides assistance to the land sector.



**FIGURE I. THE DEPARTMENTS AND MUNICIPALITIES INCLUDED IN THE MID-TERM PE LRDP**

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

LRDP and USAID worked closely to develop the “LRDP approach.” Rather than USAID implementing a project to fill a “service delivery gap,” LRDP launched the program with the intent of providing tools and support to strengthen the GoC agencies and remove internal bottlenecks. Through supporting the GoC’s own initiatives, LRDP focused on developing an innovative package of assistance instruments that would enable the GoC entities to be fully responsible for accomplishing their institutional mandates.

LRDP employs a demand-driven process of activity design and implementation to reflect the diverse contexts and needs at the national and regional levels. Given the unique realities of each region, LRDP tailors its local, regional and national activities to best respond to specific development challenges.

Per LRDP’s approach elaborated in the USAID LRDP Year 3 Work Plan<sup>9</sup>, the program focuses on a two-pronged strategy to achieve the program objectives:

- Create enabling environments for the institutional uptake of LRDP pilot activities by working with national-level decision makers within the GoC to support institutional uptake of pilot interventions. This involves working at both the senior management level and technical level to foster sustainable in improved processes across restitution, formalization and rural development.
- Include “institutional adoption strategy” with relevant program activities to ensure that the institutional conditions are in place necessary for success and sustainability. This involves close collaboration with GoC counterparts at all levels during intervention design and implementation, as well as the provision of significant support to promote the uptake of results.

More recently, LRDP has been redesigned to emphasize an ‘integrated’ focus across the four components. In particular, as part of rural development, LRDP is supporting the GoC to assist their departments in mobilizing resources to improve the quality of life in rural areas. At the time of this mid-term evaluation, LRDP’s private-public sector strategy is the main cross-cutting activity, which integrates land and rural development interventions at the regional level. LRDP is currently working with the GoC at the national and regional levels to work towards achieving this integrated approach.

## LRDP COMPONENTS

LRDP has four structural components including restitution, formalization, rural development and information and knowledge management. Throughout all program components, LRDP works closely with Colombian institutions to promote access to legal representation, land and property, market opportunities for agricultural products, and public goods and services for conflict-affected rural communities. Despite a broad approach to improving livelihoods for rural communities, LRDP also applies an inclusive and differentiated approach to women and ethnic populations. These components take place at the municipal, departmental and national levels. For more detailed information on LRDP’s activities, refer to LRDP’s Year 4 Work Plan or Annual report.

---

<sup>9</sup> LRDP’s approach evolved from Year 1 to Year 3. The theoretical framework outlined in the Year 1 and 2 Annual Reports does not reflect the project approach at the time of this midline.

## **RESTITUTION COMPONENT**

According to LRDP's Year 4 Work Plan, LRU has received 91,537 restitution requests. With almost half ready to move to the next step in the restitution process. Of these requests, more than 60% have completed the administrative phase and 45% of these have been included in the Registry of Dispossessed and Forcibly Abandoned Lands. Of the included requests, more than 75% have been presented to judges and 30% have received a ruling (3,670). It's also important to note that not all of the regions that LRDP currently works in were microfocalized at the start of the program. While LRDP is continuing to facilitate the process of restitution requests, the number of requests are about half of the expected amount of requests. One of the greatest challenges for the GoC moving into the next phases of the process the judicial phase is preparing cases for judicial review and ensuring they the local governments are compliant with restitution rulings. Additionally, three new agencies were created following the liquidation of INCODER, thus creating a strong need for more capacity building in land restitution related processes within these agencies. These three new agencies have different mandates that will overlap with land restitution in some regions. The challenges facing the new agencies are the capacity to respond to restitution sentences mandating: 1) restituted land be formalized (ANT) and 2) the provision of livelihood opportunities and rural infrastructure (ADR).

## **FORMALIZATION COMPONENT**

The GoC's top priority as Colombia enters the post-conflict phase will be compliance with the Havana peace agreement. The Comprehensive Rural Reform section of the agreement includes land formalization, access to land and equal distribution of land, all of which are imperative in achieving rural development and improving the livelihood of rural populations. Formalization has traditionally taken the form of landholders having to seek formal titles for themselves to their land, which can easily exclude poor or vulnerable populations who do not have time or access to resources to be able to initiate and follow through with such a lengthy and expensive process. As part of the peace agreements, the GoC agreed to adopt a new model of formalization that will be government-driven rather than a demand-driven model. This model led to the establishment of a new land agency in Colombia with the intent of operating under this new vision and allowing thousands of rural citizens who lack legal rights to their land to obtain titles for the land where they live and work.

## **RURAL DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT**

Another LRDP focus is supporting the GoC to assist their departments in mobilizing resources to improve the quality of life in rural areas, with the end goal of giving priority attention to restituted and land titling beneficiaries. This includes supporting the three new land and rural development related agencies including the National Land Agency, the Rural Development Agency, and the Agency for Territorial Renovation. Supporting these agencies' in the development of their management models and strategic plans is critical to the sustainability of the regionally focused interventions and to the accomplishment of the comprehensive implementation of land and rural development policies in the country. Local governments, grower associations, and community leaders are key players in driving these efforts in partnership with departmental secretaries of agriculture.

## **INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT COMPONENT**

The 2016 SNR assessment recently identified 66 ways in which victims of Colombia's armed conflict suffered property rights violations including document forgery, identity theft, alteration of the legal data chain at public registry offices, and inadequate information management by government entities. These

violations are largely related to lack of technological infrastructure and largely paper-based registry information across the land agencies, which leaves this information prone to falsification and alteration. In order to achieve land restitution, formalization, and recover lands that were illegally appropriated, it is crucial that the GoC's land information systems be digitized while also putting proper security and data protocols into place. LRDP has been providing the needed assistance to ensure that the GoC is able to achieve this across all land-related entities. The information and knowledge management component, therefore, supports the objectives of the other three components by building efficiency, transparency and integrity into other land and rural development service delivery. This component also serves information needs and systems for project banks and other applications involved in territorial management of rural development. LRDP's three key activities in this area include converting paper files to digital formats, building electronic information systems, and launching a network called the Land Node, which will make data accessible across all key land sector entities.

### **WOMEN AND ETHNIC MINORITIES**

Prioritizing the needs of vulnerable groups such as women and ethnic minorities is a key priority of LRDP and all Colombian institutions. In order for the government to build trust amongst these populations, it is imperative that their historic marginalization be recognized and addressed. This includes removing barriers and increasing access to legal representation, land and property, and public goods and services in rural areas. LRDP's approach to supporting women and ethnic minorities also includes training GoC officials to ensure they understand the community's relationship to land, as well as, the violence they experienced and the grievances they have as a result of this violence. This training also included developing methods to have constructive dialogue in order to address their specific needs. LRDP also hired a social inclusion specialist for each regional office and a Gender and Minorities Component Leader in Bogotá with the intent of cultivating strong relationships with local entities responsible for the programs components and ensuring that authorities are giving special attention to these groups. LRDP also supported the LRU to use an existing legal framework to improve the situation of indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities and provided inputs to MARD on the barriers that women face to access land and productive opportunities in rural areas.

# 4.0 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES, QUESTIONS, & INDICATORS

The overall purpose of the Mid-term PE-LRDP is to examine whether LRDP's institutional strengthening hypothesis is likely to be effective and sustainable. In accomplishing this purpose, the evaluation will assess if the support provided by LRDP has contributed to structural changes in GoC institutions, as well as, to the design, implementation, and GoC scale up of land titling, formalization and restitution policies and strategies. The evaluation will assess the achievement of LRDP program objectives across each of the program's structural components—restitution, formalization, rural development, and information-sharing at the national, departmental, regional and municipal level.

This midterm evaluation will provide insights into project performance and recommendations for improving the effectiveness of LRDP through the remaining period of performance for the program.

## LRDP-PE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The Mid-term PE-LRDP will answer the following key research and evaluation questions:

1. What effect has LRDP had on beneficiaries, especially on women, youth and ethnic minorities in conflict-affected areas receiving technical support from LRDP?
2. Is LRDP using a coordinated and integrated approach among its four components in responding to multi-faceted problems and diverse regional and institutional requirements?
3. What were the LRDP start-up challenges, and what are the accomplishments and progress to date, in establishing the necessary relationships with, and operational mechanisms within, GoC partner institutions at the national and local levels to achieve the full set of LRDP activities and objectives by July 2018?
4. What are the achievements and challenges of the institutional strengthening activity/objective given the political and institutional dynamics of GoC entities technically supported by LRDP?
5. To what extent has the institutional strengthening activity/objective of the program been able to address structural land and rural development constraints for effective implementation of land and rural development policy?
6. Does the progress to date prepare GoC partner institutions well to address upcoming institutional changes?

Each evaluation question will be assessed for each of LRDP's four structural components. Moreover, with the exception of Q1, which focuses on outcomes at the household and municipal levels, each evaluation question will be analyzed across LRDP's four implementation levels—national, departmental, regional, and municipal.

Although the evaluation is not an impact evaluation, it aims to explore programming effects on key outcomes of interest through a rigorous data collection and analysis at the municipal and household levels. While all six research questions above will be addressed through the PE's qualitative analysis, several questions also lend themselves to evaluation through more quantitative methods of analysis. In particular, these include Mid-term PE-LRDP questions 1, 4, 5, and 6 from the list above.

Furthermore, it is important to note that as not all LRDP interventions have been applied or applied in equal proportions to all target municipalities, outcomes will only be assessed in the geographic area where the interventions have been implemented.

## **LRDP-PE EVALUATION HYPOTHESES**

The Mid-term PE-LRDP tests a number of research hypotheses that follow from the evaluation questions and program theory guiding LRDP. Depending on the scope and level of intervention, the evaluation will examine the program performance across a range of hypotheses and, when data allows, will assess improvements relative to comparison areas. Below, are the core hypotheses for analysis.

### **Municipalities, regions, or departments receiving LRDP interventions will:**

#### *Restitution*

- H-1. Display greater rates of resolved land restitution cases
- H-2. Have faster processing times for administrative portion of land restitution cases
- H-3. Have increased number of women and ethnic minority groups involved in the restitution process
- H-4. Have improved perception of the quality of LRU restitution cases

#### *Formalization*

- H-5. Display stronger administrative capacity and understanding of property formalization processes for rural populations
- H-6. Have improved accounting and recovery of public lands
- H-7. Display stronger access rates of women and key ethnic minority groups to property formalization services

#### *Rural Development*

- H-8. Have increased mobilization of funds for rural development
- H-9. Have increased number of Departmental and Municipal Development Plans that include reference to rural development
- H-10. Have increased rates of submissions of rural projects to be funded by departmental and municipal governments
- H-11. Have increased rates of new LRDP-supported public-private partnerships (PPPs)
- H-12. Display stronger access rates of women and ethnic minorities in PPPs
- H-13. Display improved livelihood and welfare outcomes in target regions

#### *Information*

- H-14. Have reduction in processing time for restitution ruling monitoring system
- H-15. Have improved perception among administrators of information-sharing capacity and efficacy

## **Beneficiaries in regions receiving LRDP's interventions will:**

### *Restitution*

- H-1. Have improved access to legal representation in restitution-related disputes
- H-2. Have improved perception of efficiency and fairness in the restitution legal process
- H-3. Have improved perception of efficiency and fairness related to the specific Colombian institutions governing land restitution cases
- H-4. Have increased sense of security that land will not be subject to future legal dispute
- H-5. Have increased knowledge of LRU related services

### *Formalization*

- H-6. Perceive greater tenure security and protection of household land
- H-7. Perceive greater efficacy and capacity of departmental land-related institutions
- H-8. Have improved awareness of the value of being a land title holder

### *Rural Development*

- H-9. Have improved livelihood and welfare outcomes
- H-10. Have improved opinion of the government's efforts to promote rural development
- H-11. Have increased awareness of Private-Public-Partnerships

## **PRIMARY DATA SOURCES**

To answer the evaluation questions and test the key hypotheses described above, the evaluation will use a mix of secondary and primary data sources at the national, departmental, municipal, and household level to investigate and track the progress to date in the achievement of LRDP's goals and activities throughout various geographical areas and target groups. The instruments and respondents are deliberately selected to provide an assessment of the range of LRDP interventions, which are not applied evenly across regions or municipalities. Indeed, due to the context-specific nature of programming, qualitative protocols and survey instruments are designed with a variety of modules that can be adapted to the specific respondent depending on the information sought.

## **QUALITATIVE**

**Key Informant Interviews**—In-depth, semi-structured interviews will be conducted with LRDP implementing partners, GoC representatives at the national and regional level, and other key stakeholders of interest to the evaluation, each identified based on their specialized knowledge of LRDP implementation and program activities and specific topics of relevance to the evaluation questions. Interviews will be conducted across each of the five programming regions asking about implementation and program activities and specific topics of relevance to the evaluation questions.

**Focus Group Discussion**—The evaluation will conduct 10 small FGDs with project beneficiaries in 8 programming municipalities across the regions. The FGDs will be 90-120 minutes in length. The sub groups of interest include women, youth, producer association members, and ethnic minority communities.

Please refer to Section 6 Qualitative Methods for the specific lists of national and regional KII, as well as list of FGD locations and target respondents.

## QUANTITATIVE

**Beneficiary Household Survey**—A large N beneficiary survey is planned for implementation in 50 municipalities across the five LRDP programmed regions; this includes 25 LRDP programmed municipalities that have been matched to 25 comparison municipalities. The beneficiary survey will involve a 45–60 minute household survey with up to 1500 respondents.

The household survey has been designed by the evaluation team to the highest standards. The survey contains modules on restitution, tenure security, formalization, knowledge/awareness of restitution, and formalization processes and rural development. The survey will assess citizens' attitudes toward land, land conflict, land restitution, land formalization, and the land and legal institutions upon which LRDP has been programming. Outcomes can be tracked and analyzed according to the types of LRDP interventions implemented across the programmed municipalities. In addition, the instrument includes traditional context and demographic questions, as well as those bearing on attitudes toward Colombia's conflict, land insecurity, and the Colombian institutions that govern land. To address concerns inherent in the sensitivity of these issues, the survey will make extensive use of survey experiments to retrieve the true incidence of attitudes even while shielding respondent anonymity.

The evaluation team is working closely with LRDP, USAID and LRU Regional Directors to collect sufficiently detailed beneficiary data to target communities and households that have directly partaken of restitution, titling, and rural development programming in programming municipalities. Depending on the availability of beneficiary lists, a sampling frame that emphasizes direct beneficiaries will be devised, otherwise, in municipalities where the lists cannot be generated, the sampling frame will target communities with a significant number of direct LRDP beneficiaries.

Please refer to Section 7 Quantitative Methods for more details on the matching procedure and sampling plan.

**GoC Stakeholder Surveys**—Structured surveys will be administered to approximately 100 GoC stakeholders across all five regions LRDP programming areas in addition to comparison municipalities. The location of the surveys will be based on where their particular offices are located. The survey will be a 45-60 minute close-ended survey interview. The stakeholder groups include mayors (25), land-restitution judges (30) and key administrators within the land restitution offices (45).

## SECONDARY DATA SOURCES

Various secondary data sources were referred to in order to identify LRDP beneficiaries and to ultimately also inform the sampling frame.

- LRDP-collected baseline data, shared with the evaluation team prior to evaluation start-up
- Data on process of determining site selection for programming, shared with the evaluation team by USAID and LRDP
- Matrix of programming by municipality, component, and activity provided by USAID and LRDP
- Producer association lists with community names where members are located provided by Producer Association Leaders
- LRU Data indicating communities with a high prevalence of restitution cases or applications provided by the LRU Regional Directors

## KEY OUTCOME INDICATORS

- A. Number of resolved land restitution cases\*\*
- B. Average length of time of the administrative processes for restitution case
- C. Number of restitution cases where plaintiff is woman or key ethnic group\*\*
- D. Household assets and income
- E. Access to public infrastructure (roads and irrigation)
- F. Perceptions of improved access and quality of legal representation for restitution beneficiaries
- G. Perceptions of efficiency, effectiveness, fairness of local and regional land-related government entities
- H. Perceptions of land tenure security
- I. Perceptions of personal efficacy with respect to awareness about land-related resources
- J. Perception of increased administrative capacity with respect to formalization efforts.
- K. Awareness of presence and work of PPPs
- L. Time to process restitution cases through monitoring system\*\*
- M. Perceptions of information system speed and efficiency
- N. Municipal, regional and departmental rural development plans
- O. Number of Rural Project submissions
- P. Number of public-private partnerships\*\*
- Q. Number of activities targeted to women and key ethnic minority groups
- R. Perceptions of the regional and national government
- S. Funds mobilized to support rural development in the regions.\*\*
- T. Perceptions of quality of restitution cases coming from LRU
- U. Number of cases of recovered public lands inventoried to potentially feed into the Land Fund\*\*
- V. Decreased time to register issued titles (M&E Yr 2)\*\*
- W. Awareness of land-related resources related to formalization processes

*\*\*Outcome indicator will be using the M&E data as a data source*

## KEY CONTEXT INDICATORS

These context indicators will be analyzed as part of the study to understand the contextual issues taking places in the various regions that might relate to the various outcome indicators.

- A. Perceptions of the likelihood of land conflict resurgence
- B. Perception of the peace process as increasing tenure security
- C. Trust in land-related governmental institutions
- D. Self-reported eviction rate
- E. Self-reported rate of legal title holding
- F. Perception of likelihood of future land conflict
- G. Self-reported ease of access to credit
- H. Satisfaction with local irrigation infrastructure
- I. Rate of citizen involvement in local decision-making
- J. Perception of personal safety in post-conflict context
- K. Rate of civilian engagement with government agencies
- L. Rate of displacement or forced abandonment of land
- M. Rate of registration with the National Registry of Victims among restitution victims
- N. Perceptions of the Law of Victims
- O. Awareness of the LRU

## MUNICIPALITIES, REGIONS OR DEPARTMENTS

### RESTITUTION

<b>H-1. Display greater rates of resolved land restitution cases</b>	
Indicators	A. Number of resolved land restitution cases
Data Sources	Household Survey Stakeholder Survey Key Informant Interviews M&D Data
<b>H-2. Display faster processing times for administrative portion of land restitution cases</b>	
Indicators	B. Average length of time for the administrative processes of restitution case
Data Sources	Household Survey Stakeholder Survey Key Informant Interviews M&E Data
<b>H-3. Have increased number of women and ethnic minority groups involved in the restitution process</b>	
Indicators	C. Number of restitution cases where plaintiff is woman or key ethnic group Q. Number of activities targeted to women and key ethnic minority groups
Data Sources	Stakeholder Survey Key Informant Interviews M&E Data Annual Reports
<b>H-4. Have improved perception of the quality of LRU restitution cases</b>	
Indicators	S. Perceptions of quality of restitution cases coming from LRU
Data Sources	Household Survey Stakeholder Survey Key Informant Interviews

### FORMALIZATION

<b>H-5. Display stronger administrative capacity and understanding of property formalization processes for rural populations</b>	
Indicators	J. Perception of increased administrative capacity with respect to formalization efforts. R. Funds mobilized to support rural development, restitution and formalization in the regions. V. Decreased time to register issued titles
Data Sources	Stakeholder Survey Key Informant Interviews M&E Data
<b>H-6. Have improved accounting and recovery of public lands</b>	
Indicators	U. Number of cases of recovered public lands inventoried to feed into the Land Fund
Data Sources	M&E Data Stakeholder Survey Key Informant Interviews
<b>H-7. Display stronger access rates of women and key ethnic minority groups to property formalization services</b>	
Indicators	N. Municipal, regional and departmental rural development plans targeting women and ethnic minorities Q. Number of activities targeted to women and key ethnic minority groups
Data Sources	M&E Data Key Informant Interviews Stakeholder Survey Success Stories

## RURAL DEVELOPMENT

<b>H-8. Have increased mobilization of funds for rural development</b>	
Indicators	O. Number of Rural Project submissions S. Funds mobilized to support rural development in the regions.
Data Sources	Annual Reports M&E Data Departmental and Municipal Rural Development Plans Stakeholder Survey Key Informant Interviews
<b>H-9. Have increased number of Departmental and Municipal Development Plans that include reference to rural development</b>	
Indicators	N. Municipal, regional and departmental rural development plans
Data Sources	Annual Reports Departmental and Municipal Rural Development Plans Stakeholder Survey
<b>H-10. Have increased rates of submissions of rural projects to be funded by departmental and municipal governments</b>	
Indicators	O. Number of Rural Project submissions
Data Sources	Annual Reports Stakeholder Survey M&E Data Key Informant Interviews
<b>H-11. Have increased rates of new LRDP-supported public-private partnerships (PPPs)</b>	
Indicators	P. Number of public-private partnerships
Data Sources	Stakeholder Survey M&E Data
<b>H-12. Display stronger access rates of women and ethnic minorities in PPPs</b>	
Indicators	Q. Number of activities targeted to women and key ethnic minority groups
Data Sources	Stakeholder Survey Key Informant Interviews M&E Data
<b>H-13. Improved livelihood and welfare outcomes in target regions</b>	
Indicators	D. Household assets and income E. Access to public infrastructure (roads and irrigation)
Data Sources	Stakeholder Survey Household Survey (aggregated)

## INFORMATION

<b>H-14. Have reduction in processing time for restitution ruling monitoring system</b>	
Indicators	M. Perceptions of information system speed and efficiency L. Time to process restitution cases through monitoring system
Data Sources	M&E data Key Informant Interviews Stakeholder Survey
<b>H-15. Have improved perception among administrators of information-sharing capacity and efficacy</b>	
Indicators	M. Perceptions of information system speed and efficiency
Data Sources	Key Informant Interviews Stakeholder Survey

## HOUSEHOLD RESTITUTION

<b>H-1. Have improved access to legal representation in restitution-related disputes</b>	
Indicators	F. Perceptions of improved access and quality of legal representation for restitution beneficiaries
Data Sources	Household Survey Stakeholder Survey FGDs
<b>H-2. Have improved perception of efficiency and fairness in the restitution legal process</b>	
Indicators	F. Perceptions of improved access and quality of legal representation for restitution beneficiaries G. Perceptions of efficiency, effectiveness and fairness of local and regional land-related government entities
Data Sources	Household survey FGDs
<b>H-3. Have improved perception of efficiency and fairness related to the specific Colombian institutions governing land restitution cases</b>	
Indicators	G. Perceptions of efficiency, effectiveness and fairness of local and regional land-related government entities R. Perceptions of the regional and national government
Data Sources	Household survey FGDs
<b>H-4. Have increased sense of security that land will not be subject to future legal dispute</b>	
Indicators	H. Perceptions of land tenure security I. Perceptions of personal efficacy with respect to awareness about land-related resources R. Perceptions of the regional and national government
Data Sources	Household survey FGDs
<b>H-5. Have increased knowledge of LRU related services</b>	
Indicators	I. Perceptions of personal efficacy with respect to awareness about land-related resources
Data Sources	Household Survey FGDs

## FORMALIZATION

<b>H-6. Perceive greater tenure security and protection of household land</b>	
Indicators	H. Perceptions of land tenure security I. Perceptions of personal efficacy with respect to awareness about land-related resources G. Perceptions of efficiency, effectiveness and fairness of local and regional land-related government entities
Data Sources	Household survey FGDs
<b>H-7. Perceive greater efficacy and capacity of departmental land-related institutions</b>	
Indicators	G. Perceptions of efficiency, effectiveness and fairness of local and regional land-related government entities W. Awareness of land-related resources related to formalization processes
Data Sources	Household survey FGDs
<b>H-8. Have improved awareness of the value of being a land title holder</b>	
Indicators	H. Perceptions of land tenure security I. Perceptions of personal efficacy with respect to awareness about land-related resources W. Awareness of land-related resources related to formalization processes

Data Sources	Household survey FGDs
--------------	--------------------------

## **RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **H-9. Have improved livelihood and welfare outcomes**

Indicators	D. Household assets and income F. Access to public infrastructure (roads and irrigation)
Data Sources	Household survey FGDs

### **H-10. Have improved opinion of the government's efforts to promote rural development**

Indicators	R. Perceptions of the regional and national government G. Perceptions of efficiency, effectiveness and fairness of local and regional land-related government entities
Data Sources	Household survey FGDs

### **H-11. Have increased awareness of presence Private-Public-Partnerships**

Indicators	K. Awareness of presence and work of PPPs
Data Sources	Household Survey FGDs

# 5.0 COMPONENT I: DESK STUDY AND SECONDARY DATA

This section describes the documents and secondary data that will be reviewed by the evaluation team during the evaluation's desk study, which is currently ongoing.

The evaluation design and instruments draw from a wealth of documents and data provided by LRDP and USAID. These include quarterly and annual reports produced by USAID that detail the objectives and progress made during each time period. They also include work plans that detailed the programming plan for the upcoming year (including the most recent one). Attention will be paid to identifying variation in implementation across regions as well as across components. Moreover, progress on objectives will be identified using this class of documents. Monitoring reports and data offered by USAID and the LRDP will also be used to evaluate the rate of progress across different components and particular interventions. Finally, data on the site selection process for LRDP programming was requested and received from USAID, and this includes maps and internal communication detailing how programming municipalities were ultimately chosen. This has important implications for site selection for the evaluation.

In addition, a significant amount of secondary data was collected and analyzed as part of the research preparation phase, including data on municipal characteristics of programming and non-programming regions. This data will be used to better understand the historical and developmental characteristics of the programming municipalities, and in particular how similar or different they are to other parts of the country. The data can also be aggregated up to take account of regional trends and differences. In addition, this data plays a significant role in informing site selection for the household survey.

Finally, a substantial amount of additional data was requested from LRDP, in the form of an "LRDP Programming Matrix". This matrix (Appendix B) includes some data on sub-municipal location of program activities in addition to key contacts on where to get data for programming beneficiaries as well as information on where certain women and ethnic group focused programming took place. This information helped defined where FGDs would take place. This programming matrix was also important for understanding the dispersed and heterogenous nature of LRDP programming and for determining the sampling frame and where enumerators will seek out respondents. As not all LRDP interventions have been applied or applied in equal proportions to all target municipalities, outcomes will only be assessed in the geographic area where the interventions have been implemented. The programming matrix, therefore, will inform the final analysis plan. Moreover, as described in more detail below in Section X Quantitative Methods, the programming matrix has served as the key resource for compiling the sampling frame to guide respondent selection for the beneficiary survey.

Data Category	Desk Study Materials
Implementer Perspectives	Q&A Human rights_Tolima, Q&A LRU_National, Q&A Mayor Fuentedeoro_Meta (Spanish), Q&A Secretary Agriculture_Cesar, Q&A Secretary Agriculture_Meta
Progress Reports	e.g.; Biweekly Reports, Monthly Highlights,, USAID LRDP Quarterly Reports, USAID LRDP Annual Reports
Work Plans	USAID LRDP Year 1 Work Plan, USAID LRDP Year 2 Work Plan, USAID LRDP Year 3 Work Plan, USAID LRDP Year 4 Work Plan
Site Selection Documents	Internal USAID LRDP emails, Restitution and Conflict Maps and Location Data
Municipal Characteristics	CEDE Panel of Municipal Characteristics, Regional and Municipal Profiles
Monitoring Data	Synthesis of indicator progress, indicator progress disaggregated by component, programming matrix

# 6.0 COMPONENT 2: QUALITATIVE METHODS

## RESEARCH AND SURVEY METHODS

The proposed qualitative methods for the PE include focus groups and national and regional KIIs. National and regional KIIs will examine LRDP's performance in promoting the institutional capacity of GoC partners to achieve development objectives related to restitution, formalization and rural development. The evaluation team will conduct semi-structured interviews with regional KIIs across five LRDP programming regions. For these one-on-one interviews, questions pertaining to the perceived progress of LRDP effort along the structural component(s) relevant to the participant will be discussed, with a particular emphasis on *why* the participant perceives that the component programming has progressed as much (or as little) as it has. In the process, participants will be asked to identify potential bottlenecks and challenges in the implementation of the LRDP intervention under discussion. Moreover, these methods will also help to identify regional or context-specific mechanisms that facilitate or hinder LRDP's program objectives. For example, as mayoral interest and willingness to work with LRDP was identified in secondary data as a key variable to implementation success, interviews will collect information on perceptions of the programming municipality's quality of governance. Finally, participants will be asked to discuss their impressions on the challenges faced by key groups of interest with respect to implementation (i.e., women and ethnic communities) in order to gain insight on administrators' perception of these challenges.

FGDs will be implemented to understand the experiences, attitudes and perceptions of different stakeholders regarding land conflicts, land restitution, the responsiveness of key government institutions, and government efforts to promote rural development. These findings will promote our understanding of how beliefs, perspectives, social status and experiences impact citizen, NGO and government interactions with the LRDP project, particularly those bearing on women and indigenous Colombians. For example, the FGDs will be used to explore why certain groups benefit more or less from the expected improvements in rural development or land administration as a result of LRDP. These qualitative methods will help us to understand "why" the program is working (or not working) and "why" we see discrepant outcomes between various population groups.

These will include discussion of perceptions of the role of land in past conflict, and of institutions, such as the LRDP and the relevant GoC institutions, such as the Land Restitution Unit, in resolving those conflicts. In particular, there will be an emphasis on discussion centering around civilians' sense of personal efficacy with respect to pursuing government support in a land-related dispute. Relevant to this discussion are civilian's own knowledge of how to pursue and process a land-related issue as well as whether civilians perceive the relevant institutions as capable and invested in resolving their issue, both of which will be discussed. Finally, FGDs will emphasize understanding behavior such as land use and access to land markets, beliefs about land use and decision-making, and opinions about land titling and restitution.

## **RESPONDENT SELECTION**

Focus group participants and interview respondents represent purposive samples that have been selected in close collaboration with LRDP and USAID/Colombia. LRDP supplied lists of national and regional partners with associated contact information. Subsequently, the evaluation team has been working closely with LRDP and USAID during the evaluation design process to identify priority KIIs across the four structural components and GoC partner institutions. Given the large and diverse number of institutions involved in LRDP, respondent selection has sought to balance the selection of a representative number of respondents within the allowable budget and timeframe for the evaluation.

National KIIs are focused in Bogota and regional KIIs are planned across five LRDP programming regions, including Montes de Maria, Tolima, Cauca, Cesar and Meta. The specific KIIs respondent lists are provided below. Regional KIIs were selected to coincide with municipalities and institutions that have had the most intensive programming and therefore offer opportunity for exploring progress along the relevant programming components.

Focus groups will take place with direct project beneficiaries in municipalities that have experienced more intensive programming. Similar to the KIIs respondent selection, the identification of FGD sites and beneficiaries has occurred in close collaboration with LRDP and USAID, during the design phase. Ten FGDs will be conducted across four LRDP programming regions including, Tolima, Montes de Maria, Cauca and Cesar. The FGDs have been designed to capture information on the LRDP's four structural components across the following key beneficiary sub groups: women; youth, producer association members, Afro-Colombian and Indigenous. Among the FGD groups, women, youth and Afro-Colombian and Indigenous respondents are likely to face specific challenges in relation to restitution, formalization, and rural development. For example, rural women have historically struggled to gain access to land titling services, have lower developmental outcomes than their male counterparts, and have high victimization rates with respect to the armed conflict. Determining the effect of LRDP programming on these vulnerable groups is important to the PE given that this is one of the key objectives of the program.

The specific FGD participants and locations are listed below. To the extent possible, the evaluation team has selected FGD sites in the same municipalities where the KIIs will be held. As previously mentioned, these areas have experienced a larger amount of LRDP programming, which affords us the opportunity to analyze how civilians perceive various aspects of the programming. In addition, by holding focus groups in the same areas as KIIs we are able to collect qualitative data on both the “demand” and “supply” side of land restitution and formalization.

### **KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS—BOGOTÁ**

The proposed key informant respondents in Bogota are listed below. Please note that the component column refers to the following: R—Restitution, IM—Information Management, F-Formalization, RD—Rural Development, and PPP—Public Private Partnership: Private Sector.

According to the evaluation schedule, these interviews will take place throughout March 6–April 20, 2017.

## PROPOSED KEY INFORMANT RESPONDENTS IN BOGOTÁ

Entity	Position	Name	Component
LRU	Director	Ricardo Sabogal	R, IM
LRU	Advisor to the Director	Lukas Urdaneta	R, IM
LRU	Legal Director	Rubén Revelo	R, IM
LRU	Social Director	Raquel Victorino	R, IM
LRU	Cadastral Director	Jorge Bonil	R, IM
LRU	Ethnic Affairs Director	Derly Aldana	R, IM
SNR	Land Advisor	Clara Maria Sanin	R, F
SNR	Deputy Coordinator: Land Protection, Restitution & Formalization	Jhon Fredy Gonzáles	R, F
IGAC	Coordinator of the Office for Full Compensation to the Victims-Deputy Directorate of Cadaster	Oscar Zarama	R, F, IM
IGAC	Director	Juan Antonio Nieto	R, F, IM
ANT	Director	Miguel Samper	R, F, IM
ANT	Deputy Director of Land Information Systems	William Sandoval	R, F, IM
ANT	Director for Managing the Social Order of Property	Juliana Cortés	R, F, IM
DNP	Deputy Director Land and Public Investment	Manuel Castro	RD, F, IM
DNP	Rural Development Subdirector	Diego Mora	RD, F, IM
ART	Director	Mariana Escobar	RD, F, IM
UPRA	Director	Felipe Fonseca	RD, IM
OACP	Advisor, Peace and Land	Diego Bautista	R, F, RD, IM
CSJ	Engineer of the IT Unit	Luis Eduardo Yepes	R, IM
DP	Director	Carlos Hernán Rodriguez	R, F, IM
DP	Group Head of Victims Judicial representation	Nadia Beatriz Yarala	R
LRDP	Chief of Party	Anna Knox	LRDP
LRDP	Component Manager—Information and Knowledge Sharing	Beatriz Salazar	LRDP
LRDP	Component Manager—Rural Development	Adriana Velez	LRDP
LRDP	Component Manager—Formalization	Ana Carolina Alzate	LRDP
LRDP	Component Manager—Restitution	Alba Zuluaga	LRDP
AJP	Chief of Party	Stephen McFarland	R, IM
NRDA	President	Carlos Gechem	RD
NRDA	Vice President	Juan Londono	RD
MARD	Viceministro de Desarrollo	Juan Pablo Diazgranados	RD, F
MARD	Asesor Viceministro	Fabian Acosta	RD, F
INCODER	Former Staff	Pilar Solorzano	R, F, IM
INCODER	Former Manager	Rey Ariel Borbon	R, F, IM
Casa Luker SA	Purchases Manager	Juan Carlos Arroyabe	PPP
Alqueira SA	General Manager	Carlos Enrique Cavelier	PPP

## KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS—TARGET MUNICIPALITIES

The proposed key informant respondents for five LRDP programming regions are listed below. As above, the component column refers to the following: R—Restitution, IM—Information Management, F—Formalization, RD—Rural Development, and PPP—Public Private Partnership: Private Sector.

According to the evaluation schedule, these interviews will take place between March 27–April 20, 2017.

- Week 1: Meta and Montes de Maria—Sat March 25–Sat April 1
- Week 2: Cauca—Sat April 1–Sat April 8
- Week 3: Cesar—Sun April 9–Sat April 15
- Week 4: Tolima—Sat April 15–Thurs April 20

### REGIONAL KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

Region	City	Position	Name	Component
Montes de Maria	Cartagena	Secretary of Agriculture (Bolívar)	Herney Olaya Santamaria	RD
Montes de Maria	Cartagena	LRU Regional Director	Elisa Cecilia Del Castillo	R, RD, IM
Montes de Maria	Cartagena	Registrador Orip	Oscar Hernandez Hernandez	IM, F, RD
Montes de Maria	Cartagena	IGAC Regional Director	Lucía Isabel Cordero Salgado	IM, F, RD
Montes de Maria	Carmen de Bolívar	Mayor	Rafael Gallo	R, RD, F
Montes de Maria	Carmen de Bolívar	LRU Director	Alvaro Tapia Castelli	R, IM
Montes de Maria	Ovejas	Mayor	Mauricio Garcia Cohen	R, RD, IM
Montes de Maria	Sincedejo	Secretary of Agriculture (Sucre)	Jaime Acosta	RD
Montes de Maria	Sincedejo	LRDP Regional Manager	Elvira Utria	LRDP
Montes de Maria	Sincedejo	Registrador Orip	Rodolfo Machado Otalora	F, IM, RD
Meta	Villavicencio	Secretary of Rural Development	Alberto Castro Sandoval	RD
Meta	Villavicencio	LRU Regional Director	Diana Esmeralda Herrera Patiño	R, IM
Meta	Villavicencio	LRDP Rural Development Specialist	Dora Tibaquirá	LRDP
Meta	Villavicencio	IGAC Regional Director	Jairo Alexis Frias	IM, F, RD
Meta	Villavicencio	Registrador Orip	George Zabaleta Tique	IM, F, RD
Cauca	Popayan	Regional Director of LRU	Maria del Mar Chavez	R, IM
Cauca	Popayan	LRDP Regional Manager	Cielo Ordonez	LRDP
Cauca	Popayan	IGAC Regional Director	Laura Inés Restrepo Varela	IM, F, RD
Cauca	Popayan	Registrador Orip	Doris Amparo Aviles Fiesco	IM, F, RD
Cauca	Corinto	Municipal Unit of Rural Technical Assistance	Marden Castaño Trochez	RD
Cauca	Corinto	Mayor	Edward Fernando García	R, RD
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	Secretary of Government	Diego Fernando López	RD, R, F
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	Mayor	Alvaro Hernando Mendoza.	RD, R, F
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	IGAC Regional Director	Clara Inés Astudillo	F, IM, RD
Cauca	Cali	Comfandi Fruver Supermercados	Eliana Sandoval	PPP

## REGIONAL KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

Region	City	Position	Name	Component
Cesar	Valledupar	Secretary of Agriculture	Carlos Eduardo Campo	RD
Cesar	Valledupar	LRU Regional Director	Jorge Chavez Perdomo	R, IM
Cesar	Valledupar	LRDP Regional Manager	Fabio Canchila	LRDP
Cesar	Valledupar	IGAC Regional Director	Nolin Humberto González	F, IM, RD
Cesar	Valledupar	Registrador Orip	Fernando Callesteros Gomez	IM, F, RD
Tolima	Ibague	LRU Regional Director	Luis Afonso Ruiz Alegria	R, IM
Tolima	Ibague	IGAC Regional Director	Mauricio Fernando Mora Bonilla	F, IM, RD
Tolima	Ibague	LRDP Regional Manager	Albeiro Trujillo	LRDP
Tolima	Chaparral	Secretary of Agriculture	José Nelson Garzón Florez	RD
Tolima	Chaparral	Cafisar Cooperative Manager	Luis Ernesto Vaquiro Olaya	PPP
Tolima	Chaparral	Mayor	Humberto Buenaentura Lasso	R, F, RD

## FOCUS GROUPS

The ten proposed FGDs for five LRDP programming regions are listed below. The topical areas covered by the FGDs include: Restitution (R), Land Tilting and Documentation (L), Rural Development (RD), Tenure Security and Conflict (TS), Government Support and Relationships (G), and Producer Association (PA). All topics will not be asked across all groups. Each group has questions that are specifically relevant to that group.

According to the evaluation schedule, these interviews will take place between March 14–April 9, 2017.

- Tolima (March 14-15): 1 FGD
- Cauca (March 16-23): 3 FGDs
- Cesar (March 24-28): 2 FGDs
- Montes de María (March 29- Apr 9): 4 FGDs

## PROPOSED KEY INFORMANT RESPONDENTS IN BOGOTÁ

FGD Location	Group	LRDP Intervention/ Topics	Topic
Santander (Cauca)	Youth	Community hip hop performance to raise awareness of collective land rights of Afro Communities	L, TS, G
Santander (Cauca)	Afro Colombian	Creation of private public partnerships in cacao	R, L, RD, TS, G
Corinto (Cauca)	Young Women	Itinerant school for rural women	R, L, RD, TS, G
Carmen de Bolivar (Montes de Maria)	Producer Association	Producer associations support including Name, Yuca and Cacao	PA, R, L
Carmen de Bolivar (Montes de Maria)	Women	Women's group including Name producers	R, L, RD, TS, G, PA

## PROPOSED KEY INFORMANT RESPONDENTS IN BOGOTÁ

FGD Location	Group	LRDP Intervention/ Topics	Topic
San Jacinto (Montes de Maria)	Afro Colombian (Consejo Comunitario Eladio Ariza)	Characterization studies to support restitution of collective Afro Colombian territory	R, RD, TS, G
Pueblo Bello (Cesar)	Producer Associations, Campesinos, Indigenous (Arhuacos)	Mobilization of integrated rural development resources from national and regional level to local level	RD, TS, G, PA
La Paz (Cesar)	Yukpas (Indigenous)	Characterizations of effects of armed conflict in ethnic territories	R, D, TS, G
Chaparral (Tolima)	Women	Strategy for diffusion of information on women's restitution and property rights	L, RD, TS, G
Maria la Baja (Montes de Maria)	Afro Colombian Women	Technical assistance to women members of producers associations	R, L, RD, TS, G

### ANALYSIS PLAN

The qualitative instruments serve three primary purposes: 1) to assess outcomes related to institutional capacity development, 2) to add a social context to ground the econometric results, and 3) to add depth and nuance to the overall research effort. The evaluation team will record audio of focus groups, and keep detailed notes of the KII conversation, both of major topics and issues that are discussed as well as the evaluation team member's own impressions of what the key topics of discussion are, where appropriate to do so. In some cases, this may involve taking note of nonverbal, contextual information that could inform how people perceive LRDP programming. Analysis of the FGDs and in-depth interviews will involve the evaluation team synthesizing and summarizing the content of each discussion, making note of key issues pertinent to LRDP programming.

The PE team will employ a deductive approach to the qualitative analysis. This means that the hypotheses and indicators will be used to guide and focus the analysis of the data obtained from KIIs and FGDs. Analysis will involve listening to audio recordings and rereading notes from throughout the KIIs and FGDs, carefully grouping the data according to similar or related pieces of information presented. This process will allow the team to organize and compare similar and related pieces of information in the qualitative data and to identify key themes and trends across the project area. The analysis will therefore add depth and social context to inform the interpretation of the results of the empirical analysis and shed light on the multiplicity of perspectives and potential mechanisms surrounding outcomes of interest to the evaluation.

### CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATION

There are a number of concerns in asking individuals to participate in FGDs and in-depth interviews. First, due to the sensitive nature of questions concerning conflict-related experiences such as

displacement, civilians may be hesitant about discussing these experiences in either a group setting or one-on-one with an interviewer. Those who do choose to participate may be substantively different from those who refuse, biasing our pool of interview data. Second, participants in focus groups and KIIs are always subject to social desirability bias. It may be, for instance, that individuals in a social setting will have a hard time honestly answering questions that might imply unpopular or socially unacceptable answers. For example, GoC stakeholders who work closely with LRDP may not be as forthcoming in their responses to the evaluation team. Additionally, the evaluation team worked through LRDP in order to organize the FGDs. While the evaluation team chose the initial selection based on LRDP project documents and knowledge of the interventions across the programming regions, the participants were not necessarily picked at random. Finally, with respect to land restitution cases and other land-related legal disputes, participants may fear discussing these matters will have implications for their existing or prospective legal cases. The ability to successfully engage respondents will depend on the training and capacity of the interviewing team to assuage these concerns, by making clear the implications of participating and creating an environment both in group and one-on-one interviews that maximizes comfort for participants in discussing sensitive issues.

# 7.0 COMPONENT 3: QUANTITATIVE METHODS

The evaluation will rely on three quantitative methods to address the key evaluation hypotheses described in Section 3. These include: 1) a household survey; 2) a stakeholder survey; and (3) secondary data analysis.

For primary data collection, the evaluation's quantitative efforts will be two-fold: 1) a household beneficiary survey; and 2) a GoC stakeholder survey. The household survey will assess beneficiaries attitudes towards rural development, land restitution, land formalization, and the land and legal institutions upon which LRDP has been programming. The GoC stakeholder survey will assess the outcomes related to institutional development and capacity related to restitution, formalization, information management and rural development among LRU officials, mayors and land restitution judges.

## **MATCHING**

The municipalities chosen for LRDP programming were chosen based on how well they overlapped with regions with recent histories of armed conflict and regions proposed by a number of governmental and non-governmental development organizations in the country. The absence of randomization precludes an impact evaluation, however, to produce a rigorous evaluation report, the evaluation team will generate a comparison set of municipalities to which one can compare the LRDP municipalities for the quantitative data collection effort. As such, the evaluation team has pursued a matching strategy. Matching is a statistical approach to generate pairs of observations that are as similar as possible; it outperforms the most common methods used in smaller samples for achieving balance on covariates, such as stratification or re-randomization (Barrett and Carter 2010; Bruhn and McKenzie 2010).

The evaluation team collected an enormous quantity of municipal-level data for approximately 1,100 of municipalities across Colombia. These data characterize each municipality's history of conflict experiences, economic development attributes, degree of rurality and land-tenure characteristics, as well as presence of ethnic minority group land holdings. In addition, standard municipal characteristics that are pertinent to the Colombian context such as population size, homicide rate, altitude, and distance to the capital were collected. Finally, vote shares for the president's party in the 2010 election were also incorporated into the matching framework.

In order to ensure the municipalities are as comparable as possible, the evaluation team created pairwise matches of municipalities that are as similar as possible. In conducting the matches, the goal was to produce sets of municipalities that are as similar as possible on key characteristics but differ in whether or not they have received LRDP programming. Doing so required that the team identify key characteristics that seemed likely to impact land conflicts, land tenure insecurity, demands for land restitution, and rural development across municipalities (i.e., the outcomes that LRDP aims to improve). The team selected 34 background characteristics for the matching procedure that we expected to be strongly correlated with the outcomes of interest.

The matching algorithm generated 50 high quality matched pairs (i.e., 100 municipalities). Given budget constraints, the evaluation can only do data collection in a total of 50 municipalities. In order to get down to 25 matched pairs, the team eliminated pairs on the following basis. First, where the non-LRDP municipality is a place where similar (but non-LRDP) programming is taking place. Second, since we were able to achieve least balance on the presence of coca cultivation, we dropped matched pairs where the non-LRDP municipalities had unusually high levels of coca cultivation. Finally, the evaluation team dropped matched pairs that are separated by large geographic distances.

The resulting 50 municipalities (25 matched pairs) were shared with USAID and LRDP. LRDP provided feedback that approximately half of the matched LRDP programmed municipalities had not received a large amount of programming—and therefore suggested 12 replacement municipalities where a larger number of activities have been implemented. The evaluation team accepted these 12 replacements—while noting that this reflects the selection of 25 non-representative LRDP programmed municipalities—and subsequently generated 12 new matched comparison municipalities.

## **RESEARCH AND SURVEY METHODS**

### **HOUSEHOLD SURVEY**

The household survey will cover a representative sample of citizens in LRDP and matched non-LRDP municipalities for a total sample size of 1500 households in 50 municipalities. Consistent with the matching survey described above, 25 municipalities will be LRDP programmed areas and 25 will be their matched comparison pairs.

### **SAMPLING FRAME**

After determining an optimal matched set of programming and comparison municipalities, the sampling frame for the household survey was structured using sub-municipal data from three sources: programming interventions from the LRDP, producer association community lists, and names of communities from LRU Regional Directors where restitution beneficiaries live. These lists were then compiled and compared to see what community-level overlap existed between the various program components. This sampling matrix is in Appendix A. This sub-municipal data was collected and organized by the evaluation team while in-country. For the comparison municipalities, the names of communities were also collected in order to have a comparison group of communities with a high number of restitution requests or where there is demand. In comparison municipalities with no restitution data, communities will be selected that have similar qualities to other rural communities in the region.

Given the location of these beneficiaries, the evaluation team's selection criteria ensures that civilians with characteristics relevant to the program, including being direct beneficiaries, are surveyed at sufficient rates so as to draw meaningful conclusions about such populations. With such a sampling frame, we can speak more confidently about the attitudes and experiences of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries (such as displaced people who have not brought cases) who might be impacted by the program.

### **COMMUNITY SELECTION METHOD**

- I. Select restitution communities that overlap with producer associations or formalization (very few). Survey firm will then coordinate with the LRU Regional Directors to directly access these beneficiaries.

2. If no producer associations or formalization beneficiaries exist in given municipality, select community with a high number of restitution beneficiaries and requesting coordination assistance from the LRU.
3. To balance out the sample, evaluation team is also selecting communities that have a high number of producer association members or formalization beneficiaries. The survey firm is then given the contact of the producer association leader to coordinate a group of these beneficiaries.

## **GENDER**

According to the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre website, 52.3% of those displaced between 1985 and 2014 were women. Women face specific challenges in relation to restitution, formalization, and rural development. Rural women have historically struggled to gain access to land titling services, have lower developmental outcomes than their male counterparts, and have high victimization rates with respect to the armed conflict. LRDP has maintained a special focus on women in many of its programming efforts, such as in the issuance of new land titles or in legally represented cases. LRDP has also undertaken some programming focused on rural women, such as in aiding women in the parcelization process and creating awareness around the land formalization processes, including those who face challenges related to common-law marriage. The current regulatory framework makes it difficult for women to prove that they were or are in a common-law marriage.

Determining the effect of LRDP programming on women is important to the PE given that this is one of the key objectives of the program. To this end, the household beneficiary survey will deploy a sampling frame that attempts to include a significant percentage of women within the sample at the community level and ultimately at the municipal level.

## **POWER ANALYSIS**

The following power analysis pertains only to beneficiary-level outcomes. Here, power refers to the probability of detecting an effect if one does exist; the associated power calculations indicate the sample size required for an evaluation to detect a given minimum desired effect size (MDES). This is the smallest effect size the proposed study could detect, where effect size is measured in standard deviations from the mean in the outcome of interest. The evaluation team will measure trends and associations at the beneficiary level.

In this exercise, the evaluation team calculated MDES for a two-level cluster random assignment design. We assume a power level of 0.80, alpha level of 0.05 and a two-tailed test of difference in means. Given the proposed N of 1500 respondents spread out over 50 municipalities, we assume approximately 30 respondents per municipality. An educated guess of the outcome variance is necessary to make these calculations; we estimate variance based on a range of survey response items from Colombia LAPOP survey from 2014, typically Likert-scale type questions. The average standard deviation for these outcomes is about 1.7. We use that metric in our calculations; note that lower (higher) outcome variance decreases (increases) the MDES.

The following table describes MDES at varying assumed levels of intraclass correlation—i.e., the proportion of total variance in a given outcome that is attributable to between-cluster variation. In these calculations, the MDES ranges roughly between .21 and .32 standard deviations from the mean for a given outcome. These effect sizes are typically categorized as small to medium effect sizes which gives us confidence the study will have sufficient power to capture meaningful programming effects.

Municipalities	Power	Alpha	Respondents (per mun.)	ICC	MDES
50	0.8	0.05	30	0.1	0.194
50	0.8	0.05	30	0.2	0.256
50	0.8	0.05	30	0.3	0.306

## ANALYSIS PLAN

The effect of LRDP on household-level outcomes collected through the survey instruments will be assessed using random effects modeling, which has some advantages over traditional fixed effects approaches to multilevel data (Bell and Jones 2012). We will also report results with fixed effects. The main quantities of interest will bear on the comparison of LRDP municipalities with very similar municipalities that have not received programming.

The effect of LRDP on stakeholder outcomes collected through the survey instruments will be assessed with conventional econometric techniques for the exploration of cross-sectional data. Stakeholder responses will be compared across programming and non-programming regions to determine potential differences in areas where LRDP is active. In addition, descriptive and exploratory analysis of responses will aid in characterizing the attitudes and perceptions of stakeholders with respect to their work, the LRDP, and their respective institutions.

## STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

Given the relatively limited size of the stakeholder survey, the evaluation team recommends a focused and narrow approach to selecting the 100 stakeholders to collect responses from. Key to achieving this is identifying a few key types of stakeholder actors that are most relevant to LRDP programming. A survey that samples widely across the many different actors involved in LRDP programming risks capturing responses that are unrepresentative of any one group.

The evaluation team recommends focusing on LRU officials, land restitution judges, and mayors as key actors for the stakeholder survey. LRU officials are key actors for understanding LRDP impact on, and the more general context of, the administrative component of land restitution and other land-related challenges in the country. Specifically, we have chosen to focus on the Social, Cadastral, and Judicial Directors of the LRUs. This variety of LRU officials grants us a varied perspective on LRDP programming, particularly where it comes to inter-institutional cooperation. Land restitution judges comprise the second crucial piece of these processes, namely the judicial component. While LRDP does not directly support the judiciary, land restitution judges are key stakeholders in assessing the quality of cases coming from the LRU. They also have access to important land related information systems and they have a vast understanding of the challenges throughout the restitution process. LRDP will not be assessed directly on judiciary processing times. Finally, mayors can speak most clearly to the multi-faceted LRDP rural development programming.

## SAMPLING FRAME

Each municipality in LRDP programming regions has an active mayor. The evaluation team will interview 25 mayors, split across LRDP programming areas and their respective comparison areas. In terms of LRU officials, we will focus on the Social Director, Cadaster Director, and Judicial Director across both

programming and comparison regions. The LRU offices for the areas receiving LRDP programming are located in the municipalities' respective department capitals (Valledupar, Sincelejo, Popayan, Villavicencio, Ibague), with the exception of the Montes de Maria region which has an office in Carmen del Bolivar. Participants for stakeholder interviews will be selected from these regional offices, with the addition of the Bogota office. There will be roughly 45 interviews. Land restitution judges will similarly be pulled across LRDP programmed regions and comparison regions, for a total of 30.

## **SURVEY EXPERIMENTS**

Some of the issues that LRDP programs might be considered sensitive--whether minorities feel excluded from Colombian land institutions, whether the displaced are afraid to bring cases, citizen perceptions of corruption in Colombian institutions, etc. Getting truthful answers to such questions is difficult, because they are subject to "social desirability". Thus, above and beyond standard questions, the survey will also include several survey experiments, including list, conjoint and priming experiments. These survey experiments are particularly useful at uncovering the incidence of sensitive or unpopular behaviors or beliefs in a sample—behaviors and beliefs that traditional survey questions are poor at uncovering--even as they shield respondents from directly admitting to any "inappropriate" or socially undesirable attitude or behavior. List and conjoint experiments are excellent means of shielding responding respondent anonymity even as they permit for the collection of information on the incidence of sensitive behaviors and attitudes.

## **SECONDARY DATA ANALYSIS**

The secondary data analysis will include two data sources: LRDP's monitoring and evaluation (M&E data and panel data from the research center CEDE, at the University of Los Andes.

LRDP's M&E data will be used to supplement primary data sources as well as to create several outcome indicators covered in the Hypotheses and Indicators section of this report. As part of LRDP's M&E methodology, a selection of performance indicators was chosen to be included in the baseline study. While these indicators vary by municipality, program component, and uniformity overtime, there are several indicators that can be used as a proxy for outcomes in order to examine institutional strengthening activities and explore challenges across the municipalities or at the national level. While there are many factors that can influence these indicators, a descriptive analysis of the indicators will provide context for primary data analysis and for the overall evaluation. This secondary M&E data in addition to qualitative information (covered in a later section of this report) will specifically be used to address evaluation questions 1, 2, 3 and 4.

The following M&E indicators have been identified in line with these evaluation questions. Additional M&E indicators may be added or removed depending on findings from primary data sources.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Component</b>
PO1	Percentage of restitution and formalization beneficiaries that are women	Crosscutting
PO2	Number of cases of restitution that benefit families that belonging to ethnic groups	Crosscutting
PO3	Percentage increase in resources mobilized as a result of LRDP support in the targeted regions	Crosscutting
PO4	Number of government officials, traditional authorities, or individuals trained in restitution, formalization, public project	Crosscutting

No.	Indicator	Component
	planning, information sharing and management as a result of LRDP assistance	
O1.1	Number of restitution cases processed by the LRU	Restitution
O1.2	Percentage increase in the average number of restitution cases processed monthly by the LRU	Restitution
O2.3	Reduced time to register issued titles	Formalization
O3.1	Percentage of projects funded with LRDP support that are in implementation	Rural Development
O3.2	Number of rural households in conflict affected regions that gain access to public goods through expanded funding as a result of LRDP assistance	Rural Development
O3.1.1	Number of public-private partnerships (PPPs) formed with LRDP support	Rural Development
O3.1.2	Number of resources submissions from municipal governments supported by LRDP that obtained funds from National, Regional or Local GoC entities—Projects with resources allocated	Rural Development
O4.1	Number of GoC land entity action plans developed, systematized and reporting to the National System for the Evaluation of Public Sector Performance	Information
O4.2	Reduced time to access inputs to restitution processes	Information
O4.2.1	Number of land related files digitalized	Information

The evaluation team will also incorporate CEDE’s panel data into the study through providing a descriptive characterization of LRDP and matched LRDP municipalities on key characteristics bearing on programming. Such evidence bears on the historic incidence of conflict, the nature of local agricultural production, the distribution of land, the incidence of land displacement, recent agricultural production, etc. Their municipal-level secondary data is very rich in this regard. Most of this data is reported at the municipal level and does not speak to household-level hypotheses.

## CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATION

While matching is the best available technique for generating a comparison group given the number of municipalities that LRDP has programmed in, it does depend on assumptions that are not testable. Most importantly, the quality of matches depends on whether or not the variables that were matched upon include the key factors that might otherwise impact LRDP outcomes of interest. While we have relied on a very rich municipal data set and produced high quality matches on a large number of variables, we cannot know for sure that the LRDP and non-LRDP municipalities are the same in every relevant way. There are also non-trivial limits in our capacity to detect LRDP program effects given the number of LRDP municipalities and the budget to conduct the evaluation, which limits our data collection to 50 municipalities.

Regarding the beneficiary survey, the sampling frame relied heavily on the quality of sub-municipal data for restitution, producer associations and formalization. The availability of data was defined by if the individual in charge of the data or information was responsive to the request or not. The evaluation team used LRDP’s “Programming Matrix” (Appendix B) to identify who needed to be contacted, but responsiveness was not always consistent. The quality of data also varied by individual. Producer association lists consisted of photos of documents or a combination of handwritten names of individuals and communities. Additionally, several producer associations did not have lists or the lists did not have

complete information. Given the challenges of collecting such data from rural communities and individuals, all producer association totals by vereda <sup>10</sup>(Appendix A) may not always be accurate. For formalization related contacts, most individuals did not have a list of beneficiaries. To overcome this challenge, the data collection firm has been given the contact information of individual leaders in order to request that they support the firm in gathering the group of beneficiaries.

---

<sup>10</sup> Vereda is a subdivisional administrative part of a municipality in Colombia. For the purpose of this report, it's referred to as a "community."

# 8.0 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

## TEAM COMPOSITION

The Cloudburst Group proposes an evaluation team composed of five core personnel: Evaluation Manager (Dr. Heather Huntington), Evaluation Team Leader (Mr. David Varela), Senior Land Analyst (Ms. Ana Montoya), Evaluation Specialist (Ms. Nicole Walter), and Senior Research Analyst (Mr. Juan Tellez). The overall evaluation effort will be managed and coordinated by the Evaluation Manager. With the exception of the Evaluation Manager, the core team will collaborate on the KIIs and meetings with primary stakeholders in Bogotá. Three members of the team will serve as the key field team personnel—Evaluation Team Leader, Senior Land Analyst, and Evaluation Specialist—for the municipal-level data collection and will be responsible for conducting KIIs across the five programming regions. In addition, the team includes two local subject matter experts (SME) (Anthropologists) who will focus on the organization, implementation and analysis of FGDs. Cloudburst will also partner with a local Colombian data collection firm to collect the required *quantitative* data for the study, including the large N beneficiary survey and structured interviews with GoC stakeholders. With support from Cloudburst home staff and the Evaluation Specialist, the Senior Research Analyst will be primarily responsible for training and managing the local data collection firm and survey analysis. All team members will collaborate on data analysis and drafting of the final report.

## MID-TERM PE-LRDP TASK ORDER KEY PERSONNEL

**Evaluation Team Leader**—David Varela will lead the team during the field based data collection. He will serve as the team’s subject matter expert on context and land related issues for the evaluation. Mr. Varela will also assist with conducting qualitative interviews with regional and Bogota-based key informants. He will also assist with quality assurance for all efforts including analysis and report generation.

**Senior Land Analyst**—Ana Maria Montoya will support the development of the research design, as well as quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments. Ms. Montoya will help coordinate and conduct the qualitative interviews and data collection in Bogotá and at the regional level. She will assist Mr. Tellez in the research preparations related to the training of the data collection firm.

**Evaluation Specialist**—Nicole Walter will coordinate field based data collection including qualitative and quantitative data collection. Ms. Walter will also support the development of the research design, the quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments and will interpret and analyze data. Ms. Walter will also provide the team with mapping or geo spatial support, as needed.

## OTHER MID-TERM PE-LRDP TEAM MEMBERS

**Evaluation Manager**—Heather Huntington will manage the evaluation and provide technical direction for instrument development and data analysis. She will serve as the principal point of contact with the USAID technical office and the implementing partners. In collaboration from the team, she will

coordinate the development of work plans, scopes for assignments, prepare all major deliverables and ensure that deliverables are high quality and timely.

**Senior Research Analyst**—Juan Tellez will support the development of research design and drafting of quantitative and qualitative data collection tools. He will focus on in-country survey firm training and management, and will lead the quantitative survey data analysis. Mr. Tellez will also conduct interviews in Bogotá, as well as support the collection and analysis of any secondary data as needed.

**Local SME**—Paula Guerrero will help coordinate the KIIs in Bogota and will lead the FGD effort across the regions. She will work closely with LRDP and community leaders to organize, conduct and analyze the findings from each FGD with program beneficiaries.

**Local SME**—Tania Bonilla will support Paula Guerrero in organizing, conducting and reporting on each of the planned FGDs.

**Research Analysts**—Aleta Haflett and Aidan Schneider will provide as-needed support by conducting: survey programming, survey firm management, data cleaning and analysis; field work travel and logistics; deliverable formatting and branding; and Mid-Term PE-LRDP communications.

**Senior Land Tenure SME**—Karol Boudreaux will provide quality assurance of technical deliverables and STARR IQC reporting.

## MANAGEMENT

The Evaluation Manager will be responsible for coordinating the entire Mid-term PE-LRDP team by overseeing resource allocation and supervising the team's work on all aspects of the evaluation. The Evaluation Manager will provide quality assurance of all deliverables and data collection protocols, in addition to the Senior Land Tenure SME. The Evaluation Manager will work closely with key personnel and Cloudburst's corporate support team to ensure the proper monitoring of tasks, quality of deliverables, and reporting. The Evaluation Manager will also manage communications between the Mid-term PE-LRDP team and USAID/Colombia.

The Cloudburst corporate staff will provide oversight support and quality assurance on all final reporting deliverables. Furthermore, they will provide assistance in coordinating travel logistics and ensuring the safety procedures and protocols are all met as the evaluation team travels to and through Colombia. Lastly, the Cloudburst corporate staff will ensure that the Mid-term PE-LRDP is progressing as expected with respect to compliance with the contract and accepted budget for the evaluation.

## EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Activities and deliverables have been organized into two sequential phases which cover the inception of the evaluation design, then the data collection, data analysis, and reporting.

### PHASE I

Since award of the contract, the evaluation team has been working on research preparations for the performance evaluation. These tasks have included: a desk review of LRDP documentation, analysis of secondary data; designing the survey methodology, developing drafts of the data collection instruments and protocols; and arranging travel and logistics for the primary data collection planned for Phase 2 of

the performance evaluation. The team also produced and released an RFP for a local Colombian firm to conduct the quantitative data collection.

To facilitate the desk review, meetings were held with USAID/Colombia and with the LRDP implementation team to gather all available relevant LRDP documentation. The evaluation team also requested and began analysis of the secondary data, including LRDP monitoring and evaluation (M&E) data.

The desk review and secondary data analysis was used to inform this Performance Evaluation Design and Work Plan, which includes refined quantitative and qualitative methodologies, the municipalities selected as key field sites of interest, a list of stakeholders to interview, and a timeline for evaluation implementation.

The evaluation team also used the desk review period to inform the development of the quantitative data collection instruments and qualitative interview protocols. As the evaluation team conducts the desk review and develops the draft Evaluation Design and Work Plan, the support team will be planning and coordinating logistics for the evaluation team's travel during Phase 2.

## **PHASE 2**

After submission of the draft Evaluation Design and Work Plan, USAID/Colombia and LRDP reviewed the draft over a two-week period in early February and provided the evaluation team with a set of revisions and edits to the design and work plan. During the review time, the evaluation team held a technical panel to select a data collection partner, complete drafts of the quantitative data collection instruments and finalize travel logistics. Due to the holidays throughout December and into the beginning of January, data collection firms needed additional time for the RFP submittals, which delayed the data collection firm selection process. In addition, the evaluation team submitted the proposed evaluation and the corresponding survey instruments to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Duke University. The IRB is an ethics body in charge of overseeing and monitoring research activities involving human subjects. Its main role is to ensure that research procedures do not pose more than negligible risk to the participant subjects and to assess the adequacy of safeguards to protect subjects' rights, welfare and dignity. Researchers are typically required by the IRB to: (1) inform the subjects about the purpose, risks and benefits of the study so that they can make an informed decision about whether to participate in the research and (2) protect the anonymity of subjects and the confidentiality of the data.

The research team will provide training to all enumerators to ensure they understand these principles. Upon completion of research activities in the field, the data will be maintained in a way that adheres to IRB principles. All analyses and publications will respect the anonymity of respondents; no identifying information will be used in reports or presentations. The mode of analysis will follow econometric standards for survey research, the aim of which is to make general claims about the participant and non-participant populations, not specific claims about identifiable individuals.

The evaluation team arrived in Bogotá, Colombia to begin Phase 2 on March 5, 2017. The entrance briefing was held on March 6<sup>th</sup>. During the Entrance Briefing, the evaluation team met with Mission staff, experts, and any other key actors to present the objectives and methodology of the evaluation and to receive additional feedback on the draft Evaluation Design and Work Plan. Following the Entrance Briefing, the evaluation team continued working with LRDP and USAID/Colombia on the sampling plan for project beneficiaries, as well as updating and editing the qualitative protocols and quantitative instruments. Due to additional sampling coordination and data collection to inform the sampling frame,

the launch of the household and stakeholder survey was delayed to ensure that project beneficiaries could be identified in coordination with the LRU. This final Work Plan and Evaluation Design Report, Deliverable 3, is being submitted on March 24<sup>th</sup> with the final survey instruments to be submitted on March 27<sup>th</sup> to allow for additional edits after the survey pilot.

Data collection activities began shortly after the team’s arrival in Bogotá. During the week of March 6<sup>th</sup>, the Mr. Varela, Ms. Montoya, and Ms. Walter will begin conducting KIIs with national level LRDP partners and relevant stakeholders in Bogotá. FGDs began in the regions the week of March 13<sup>th</sup>. The week of March 20<sup>th</sup>, the core team trained the local data collection partner on the quantitative instruments and data collection methods in preparation for the beneficiary survey pilot and launch.

After submission of the Final Evaluation Design and Work Plan on March 24<sup>th</sup>, the Ms. Montoya and Ms. Walter will travel to the selected municipalities to collect regional KIIs, while Mr. Tellez will launch the quantitative data collection with the partner firm. Mr. Varela will remain in Bogotá to conduct any remaining interviews from stakeholders in Bogotá. During the data collection in the field, the evaluation team will submit weekly reports on progress of both the qualitative and quantitative data collection progress (Deliverable 4).

Ms. Walter will return to the US on March 31<sup>st</sup>, and Mr. Tellez will return to the US April 9<sup>th</sup>. Meanwhile, the Evaluation Team Leader and Senior Land Analyst will complete the qualitative data collection effort. Qualitative data collection is expected to take about 6 weeks and quantitative data collection is expected to take about 5 weeks to complete. The additional coordination with the LRU as well as the week long holiday of Semana Santa is expected to delay the data collection timeframe by 1 week. The data collection timeframe will begin the week of March 27<sup>th</sup> and continue through the week of May 1, 2017.

Ms. Montoya will return to Bogotá after completing the KIIs in the regions while Mr. Varela continues any Bogotá- based KIIs. Ms. Montoya and Mr. Varela will attend an outbrief (Deliverable 5) to discuss preliminary thoughts and findings on April 21<sup>st</sup>. Ms. Montoya will then return to the US. Throughout the data collection process, the evaluation team will be analyzing and synthesizing the data into comprehensive findings. The evaluation team will begin developing Deliverable 6, the draft Performance Evaluation Findings Report for submission to USAID/Colombia on May 26, 2017.

USAID/Colombia will have approximately a two-week period to review and provide feedback on the draft Performance Evaluation Report. The evaluation team will then finalize the report based on this feedback and include any additional findings from the final data analysis. During the final weeks of the contract, all of the data will be cleaned and prepared for public dissemination. Deliverables 7 & 8 will consist of the clean dataset, all evaluation documentation, and the final Performance Evaluation Findings Report; they will be submitted to USAID/Colombia on July 10, 2017 before closing out the evaluation contract.

<b>Deliverable</b>		<b>Estimated Deadline</b>
1	Draft Performance Evaluation Work Plan and Design	January 24 <sup>th</sup>
2	Entrance Briefing	March 6 <sup>th</sup>
3	Final Performance Evaluation Work Plan and Design	March 24 <sup>th</sup>
4	Weekly Reports	March 31 <sup>st</sup> , April 7 <sup>th</sup> , 14 <sup>th</sup>
5	Exit briefing	April 21 <sup>st</sup>
6	Submit Draft Performance Evaluation Findings Report	May 26 <sup>th</sup>
7	USAID Draft Report Review Period	May 26 <sup>th</sup> – June 9 <sup>th</sup>

8	Final Performance Evaluation Findings Report	July 10 <sup>th</sup>
9	Performance evaluation documentation and datasets	July 10 <sup>th</sup>

## REPORTING AND COMMUNICATION

Due to the fast pace and frequency of deliverables for the Mid-term PE-LRDP, there will be frequent communication between the Mid-term PE-LRDP evaluation team and USAID/Colombia throughout the life of the evaluation. This correspondence will include brief email updates detailing progress from the evaluation field team for the approximately four-week data collection period. While these weekly updates will be contingent on the field team having reliable internet connection, they will be sent to USAID/Colombia every Friday, or as soon thereafter as an internet connection can be made, during the data collection. The Mid-term PE-LRDP evaluation team will also provide several contract deliverable evaluation reports. These deliverables include the evaluation design report and work plan, data collection instruments, and final evaluation report, as well as datasets.

# Appendix A: Sampling Matrix

This sampling matrix was created by reviewing LRDP's Programming Matrix (Appendix B) as well as the names of veredas<sup>11</sup> from the LRU for restitution and the names of veredas from producer association leaders. For formalization, there were very few names of veredas for comparison. Due to the consistency and quality of data available for producer association members, some numbers may vary from what is listed below. For the restitution data, sometimes only names of veredas were present and not total restitution beneficiaries.

- R = Restitution Beneficiaries
- F = Formalization Area/Beneficiaries
- RD = Roads or Irrigation Area/Beneficiaries
- PA = Producer Association Members

Department	LRDP	Municipality	Vereda	Type of Beneficiary				Number of Beneficiaries					
				F	R	RD	PA	F	R	RD	PA		
Bolivar	I	El Carmen De Bolivar	MACAYEPOS	F	R								
Bolivar	I	El Carmen De Bolivar	Caracoli		R		PA						50
Bolivar	I	Maria La Baja	Mampujan		R		PA						13
Bolivar	I	Maria La Baja	Matuya		R		PA						25
Bolivar	I	San Jacinto	Las Palmas		R								
Bolivar	I	San Jacinto	Cataluna		R								
Cauca	I	Buenos Aires	Producer Association Leader Picks		X	RD	PA						
Cauca	I	Buenos Aires	Producer Association Leader Picks		X	RD	PA						
Cauca	I	Caldono	Los Quingos		X		PA						
Cauca	I	Caldono	Potreillo		X		PA						
Cauca	I	Corinto	Quebratitas/La Alita	F		RD	PA						40
Cauca	I	Corinto	Urban Head/Main Town		R				14				
Cauca	I	Jambalo	CHIMICUETO	F	X		PA						6
Cauca	I	Jambalo	La laguna	F	X		PA						10
Cauca	I	Santander De Quilichao	Random				PA						
Cauca	I	Santander De Quilichao	Lomitas	F	R	RD			23				
Cesar	I	Augustin Codazzi	7 de Agosto	F		RD	PA						116
Cesar	I	Augustin Codazzi	Begoña (casacara), Santa Rita, El Paraiso		R				6				
Cesar	I	La Paz	Yukpas										
Cesar	I	La Paz	San Jose de Oriente.			RD							
Cesar	I	El Copey	La Ley de Dios		R				6				
Cesar	I	El Copey	Alejandria (6), Buenos Aires (4)		R				6				

<sup>11</sup> Vereda is a subdivisional administrative part of a municipality in Colombia. For the purpose of this report, it's referred to as a "community."

Department	LRDP	Municipality	Vereda	Type of Beneficiary				Number of Beneficiaries			
				F	R	RD	PA	F	R	RD	PA
Cesar	I	Pueblo Bello	Jewrwa		X	RD	PA				153T
Meta	I	El Castillo	Casco Urbano		R			8			
Meta	I	El Castillo	Cano Claro (El Porvenir finca)	F			PA				21
Meta	I	El Dorado	Llano	F		RD	PA				
Meta	I	Fuente De Oro	Puerto Alijire	F	R	RD		0			17
Meta	I	Fuente De Oro	Las Delicias			RD	PA				65
Meta	I	Puerto Gaitan	Tilliva, Puerto Mosco		R			39			
Meta	I	Granada (Boca De Monte)	URT Picks	F	R	RD		7			
Meta	I	Granada (Boca De Monte)	Random								
Sucre	I	Ovejas	Chengue	F	R		PA				
Sucre	I	Ovejas	Villa Nueva		F						
Sucre	I	Chalan	EL LIMON				PA				10
Sucre	I	Chalan	Casco Urbano		R						
Sucre	I	Morroa	Cambimba		R						
Sucre	I	Morroa	Pertinencia		R						
Tolima	I	Chaparral	Icarco	R			PA	7			15
Tolima	I	Chaparral	Alto Redondo + Maito (Calarma)	F			PA				
Tolima	I	Ataco	Balsillas		R						
Tolima	I	Ataco	El Aceituno		R		PA				17
Tolima	I	Ortega	Llovedero		R		PA	1			35
Tolima	I	Ortega	San Miguel		R		PA	13			4
Tolima	I	Planadas	El Jordan		R		PA	1			18
Tolima	I	Planadas	Primavera		R		PA	1			8
Tolima	I	Rioblanco	Rio Verde		R		PA	2			15
Tolima	I	Rioblanco	La Union		X		PA				6
Antioquia	0	Salgar	Los Andes	X	R	X	X	8			
Antioquia	0	Salgar	La Amagaceña	X	R	X	X	6			
Antioquia	0	Giraldo	El Balso	X	R	X	X	9			
Antioquia	0	Giraldo	Kilometro 16 Vieja Vía Al Mar	X	R	X	X	8			
Antioquia	0	Caucasia	El Tigre I	X	R	X	X				
Antioquia	0	Caucasia	Random	X		X	X				
Antioquia	0	Canasgordas	La Aguadita	X	R	X	X	9			
Antioquia	0	Canasgordas	Ribicon/Rubicon	X	R	X	X	10			
Bolivar	0	Clemencia	Random	X		X	X				
Bolivar	0	Clemencia	Random	X		X	X				
Bolivar	0	San Estanislao	Random	X		X	X				
Bolivar	0	San Estanislao	Random	X		X	X				
Boyaca	0	Pauna	Random	X		X	X				
Boyaca	0	Pauna	Random	X		X	X				
Caldas	0	Marmato	San Juan or Manzanilla	X	R	X	X				
Caldas	0	Marmato	Boquerón or Guadualejo	X	R	X	X				
Caqueta	0	San Vicente Del Caguan	La Tolda	X	R	X	X	36			
Caqueta	0	San Vicente Del Caguan	La Tunia	X	R	X	X	32			
Cauca	0	Rosas	Random	X		X	X				
Cauca	0	Rosas	Random	X		X	X				

Department	LRDP	Municipality	Vereda	Type of Beneficiary				Number of Beneficiaries			
				F	R	RD	PA	F	R	RD	PA
Cauca	0	Paez (Belalcazar)	Río Chiquito, Araujo	X	R	X	X		?		
Cauca	0	Paez (Belalcazar)	Itaibe y resguardos de Choetando, Avirama, Belalcázar	X	R	X	X		?		
Cauca	0	Morales	Random	X		X	X				
Cauca	0	Morales	Random								
Cauca	0	Popayan	Random	X		X	X				
Cauca	0	Popayan	Random	X		X	X				
Cordoba	0	Los Cordobas	Random	X		X	X				
Cordoba	0	Los Cordobas	Random	X		X	X				
Cordoba	0	Valencia	Jaraguay	X		X	X				
Cordoba	0	Valencia	Villa Nueva	X		X	X				
Huila	0	Colombia	Random	X		X	X				
Huila	0	Colombia	Random	X		X	X				
La Guajira	0	San Juan Del Cesar	Caracoli	X	R	X	X		5		
La Guajira	0	San Juan Del Cesar	Corralejas	X	R	X	X		4		
La Guajira	0	Villanueva	La Culebrera	X	R	X	X		7		
La Guajira	0	Villanueva	Urbano	X	R	X	X		13		
Meta	0	Cumaral	Random	X	R	X	X				
Meta	0	Cumaral	Random	X	R	X	X				
Norte De Santander	0	TIBU	Random	X		X	X				
Norte De Santander	0	TIBU	Random	X		X	X				
Quindio	0	Genova	Random	X		X	X				
Quindio	0	Genova	Random	X		X	X				
Norte De Santander	0	EL CARMEN	Random	X		X	X				
Norte De Santander	0	EL CARMEN	Random	X		X	X				
Sucre	0	El Roble	Random	X		X	X				
Sucre	0	El Roble	Random	X		X	X				
Sucre	0	San Juan De Betulia	Random	X		X	X				
Sucre	0	San Juan De Betulia	Random	X		X	X				
Tolima	0	Anzoategui	La Pitata	X	R	X	X		9		
Tolima	0	Anzoategui	Palomar	X	R	X	X		9		

# Appendix B: LRDP Programming Matrix

This matrix was created by LRDP for the evaluation's LRDP programming regions. The original matrix also included contact information for the actors which we have removed for this report.

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C1-RESOURCE MOBILIZATION TO SUPPORT COMPLIANCE WITH RESTITUTION RULING	Programmed	Municipality	Municipal government and SNARIV
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C1-INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF SECONDARY OCCUPANTS	Programmed	Municipality	Departmental ombudsman. Lawyers working with Ombudsman's office who attend secondary occupants in municipality
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C1-INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF PROCESSED RESTITUTION CASES	Programmed	Municipal	Regional Land Restitution Unit. Not yet initiated. Eventually, restitution claimants
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C1- FORMULATION OF TERRITORIAL ACTION PLANS (PATs)	Finalized	Municipal	GOC institutions involved in SNARIV. Communities would not likely be aware of these.
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipality	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipality	Community leaders and mayors who participated in planning process.
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C3-SUPPORT TO CACAO PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	In process	Regional	Cacao producer association members.
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C3-STUDIES AND DESIGNS FOR RURAL PUBLIC PROPERTY: IRRIGATION DISTRICTS	Programmed	Municipality	
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C3-PROMOTION OF YUCCA AND ÑAME PPPS	Programmed	Regional	Members of producer associations. Name PPP has been signed, but new activity, so material benefits not yet evident. Name association not yet formed.
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C4-RAISING AWARENESS OF POLICY AND GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS ON LAND AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT	Finalized	Municipality with departmental participation.	Community leaders and mayors attending meetings would be the most likely to be able to attest to outcomes.

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C4- RAISING COMMUNITY AWARENESS OF OMBUDSMAN'S ROLE IN REPRESENTING SECONDARY OCCUPANTS	Finalized	Municipality	Community leaders and mayors attending meetings.
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C4-STRENGTHENING MAYORAL APPRECIATION OF LAND AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	Finalized	Municipality with departmental participation.	Community leaders and mayors attending meetings would be the most likely to be able to attest to outcomes.
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C4-INFORMATION SYSTEM: RESTITUTION SENTENCES	Programmed	Municipality	Not yet initiated. Effects would only be recognizable by the LRU and other local GOC institutions
Bolivar	Carmen de Bolivar	C4- INFORMATION SYSTEM: PRODUCTIVE PROJECTS	Programmed	Departmental and municipal	Not yet initiated. Effects would only be recognizable by local GOC.
Bolivar	Maria la Baja	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipality	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Bolivar	Maria la Baja	C3= TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO WOMEN MEMBERS OF PRODUCERS ASSOCIATIONS	In process	Members of women's producer association - ASPOAGROMAR	Members of women's producer association - ASPOAGROMAR
Bolivar	Maria la Baja	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipality	Community leaders and mayors participating would be the most likely to be able to attest to planning process and outcomes.
Bolivar	Maria la Baja	C3-SUPPORT TO CACAO PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	In process (associations to enter PPP not yet finalized)	Municipal	Cacao producer association members, including women's association
Bolivar	Maria la Baja	C3-PROMOTION OF YUCA AND NAME PPPS	Programmed	Regional	Members of producer associations. Yuca PPP has been signed, but new activity, so material benefits not yet evident. Name association not yet formed.
Bolivar	Maria la Baja	C4- INFORMATION SYSTEM: PRODUCTIVE PROJECTS	Programmed	Departmental and municipal	Not yet initiated. Effects would only be recognizable by local GOC.
Bolivar	San Jacinto	C1-CHARACTERIZATION STUDIES TO SUPPORT RESTITUTION OF COLLECTIVE AFROCOLOMBIAN TERRITORY	In process	Eladio Ariza collective territory	Indigenous community leaders. Difficult to access (rough terrain, landslides, etc); also only permitted to speak with leaders, not community members.
Bolivar	San Jacinto	C1-INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF SECONDARY OCCUPANTS	Programmed	Ombudsman's Office and secondary occupants in the municipality	Lawyers working with Ombudsman's office who attend secondary occupants

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Bolivar	San Jacinto	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Bolivar	San Jacinto	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	Community leaders and mayors who participated in planning process.
Bolivar	San Jacinto	C3-SUPPORT TO CACAO PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	In process	Regional	Cacao producer association members.
Bolivar	San Jacinto	C4-STRENGTHENING MAYORAL APPRECIATION OF LAND AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	Finalized	Municipality with departmental participation.	Community leaders and mayors attending meetings would be the most likely to be able to attest to outcomes.
Bolivar	San Jacinto	C4- INFORMATION SYSTEM: PRODUCTIVE PROJECTS	Programmed	Departmental and municipal	Not yet initiated. Effects would only be recognizable by local GOC.
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C1-RESOURCES MOBILIZATION TO SUPPORT COMPLIANCE WITH RESTITUTION RULING	Programmed	Municipal	Municipal government and SNARIV
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C1-FORMULATION OF TERRITORIAL ACTION PLANS (PATs)	Finalized	Municipal	Municipal government, SNARIV
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C1-INTER-INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION FOR RESTITUTION OF TERRITORIAL RIGHTS	In process	Municipal	Land Restitution Unit, Mayor's Office, SNARIV
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C2-DESIGN OF SYSTEMATIC PROPERTY FORMALIZATION PLAN	Finalized	Municipal	Municipal administration; indirectly, the community in general
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C2-SUPPORT FOR INITIATION OF MUNICIPAL LAND OFFICE	In Process	Municipal	Municipal administration; community members
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C2-TRAINING OF MEDIATORS IN APPLYING "DIFFERENTIAL APPROACH"	Finalized	Municipal	Conciliators in equity
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	Municipal government
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C3-CREATION OF PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS IN CACAO	In process	Subregional: Three municipalities involved in the cacao value chain: Suárez, Miranda, Santander de Quilichao.	Members of cacao producer associations

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C3-ITINERANT SCHOOL FOR RURAL WOMEN	In process	Municipal	Women who participated in the training program. Program was carried out in collaboration with USAID's Human Rights program
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C3-CONSTRUCTION OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR NORTHERN CAUCA	Finalized	Subregional	Mayors and other participsnyd In planning and implementation process from Northern Cauca (Toribío, Santander de Quilichao, Caloto, Corinto, Miranda, Jambaló, Guachené, Caldono, Puerto Tejada, Padilla, Villa Rica, Buenos Aires, Suárez)
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C3-STRENGTHENING OF THE MUNICIPAL AGRICULTURE AND UMATAS SECRETARIES	In process (Fase II)	Municipal	Municipal government
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C1 - CREATION OF COMMUNITY HIP HOP PERFORMANCE TO RAISE AWARENESS OF COLLECTIVE LAND RIGHTS OF AFRO COMMUNITIES	Finalized	Municipal	Children, youth, adolescents who participated in performance
Cauca	Santander de Quilichao	C4-STRATEGY FOR DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION ON WOMEN'S RESITUTION AND PROPERTY RIGHTS	Finalized	Regional	Two levels of beneficiaries: 1) Women who were trained in communications and radio theater, and 2) those who listened to the broadcasts and learned about their rights to claim land.
Cauca	Buenos Aires	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Cauca	Buenos Aires	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCILS	In process (fase II)	Municipal	community leaders and municipal government
Cauca	Buenos Aires	C3-CREATION OF PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS FOR PLANTAIN	In process	Municipal	members of small-scale producer asspcoatpoms
Cauca	Buenos Aires	C3-CONSTRUCTION OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR NORTHERN CAUCA	Finalized	Subregional	Mayors and other participsnyd In planning and implementation process from Northern Cauca (Toribío, Santander de Quilichao, Caloto, Corinto, Miranda, Jambaló, Guachené, Caldono, Puerto Tejada, Padilla, Villa Rica, Buenos Aires, Suárez)
Cauca	Buenos Aires	C3 -MOBILIZATION OF PRODUCER SUBSIDIES FROM NATIONAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL TO LOCAL LEVEL	Finalized	Municipal	small-scale producers and municipal government

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Cauca	Buenos Aires	C3-STRENGTHENING OF THE MUNICIPAL AGRICULTURE AND UMATAS SECRETARIES	In process (Fase II)	Municipal	municipal government
Cauca	Buenos Aires	C4-STRATEGY FOR DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION ON WOMEN'S RESITUTION AND PROPERTY RIGHTS	Finalized	Regional	Two levels of beneficiaries: 1) Women who were trained in communications and radio theater, and 2) those who listened to the broadcasts and learned about their rights to claim land.
Cauca	Corinto	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Cauca	Corinto	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	municipal government
Cauca	Corinto	C3-CREATION OF PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS FOR COLD CLIMATE FRUIT AND PLANTAIN	In process	Municipal	small-scale producers
Cauca	Corinto	C3-ITINERANT SCHOOL FOR RURAL WOMEN	In process	Municipal	Women who participated in the training program. Program was carried out in collaboration with USAID's Human Rights program
Cauca	Corinto	C3-CONSTRUCTION OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR NORTHERN CAUCA	Finalized	Subregional	Mayors and other participants in planning and implementation process from Northern Cauca (Toribío, Santander de Quilichao, Caloto, Corinto, Miranda, Jambaló, Guachené, Caldono, Puerto Tejada, Padilla, Villa Rica, Buenos Aires, Suárez)
Cauca	Corinto	C3 -MOBILIZATION OF PRODUCER SUBSIDIES FROM NATIONAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL TO LOCAL LEVEL	Finalized	Municipal	small-scale producers and municipal government
Cauca	Corinto	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCILS	In process (Fase II)	Municipal	community leaders and municipal government
Cauca	Corinto	C3-STRENGTHENING OF THE MUNICIPAL AGRICULTURE AND UMATAS SECRETARIES	In process (Fase II)	Municipal	municipal government
Cauca	Corinto	C4-STRATEGY FOR DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION ON WOMEN'S RESITUTION AND PROPERTY RIGHTS	Finalized	Regional	Two levels of beneficiaries: 1) Women who were trained in communications and radio theater, and 2) those who listened to the broadcasts and learned about their rights to claim land.

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Cauca	Caldono	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	municipal government
Cauca	Caldono	C3-CREATION OF PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS FOR COLD CLIMATE FRUIT	In process	Municipal	Members of small-scale producer associations
Cauca	Caldono	C3-CONSTRUCTION OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR NORTHERN CAUCA	Finalized	Subregional	Mayors and other participants In planning and implementation process from Northern Cauca (Toribío, Santander de Quilichao, Caloto, Corinto, Miranda, Jambaló, Guachené, Caldono, Puerto Tejada, Padilla, Villa Rica, Buenos Aires, Suárez)
Cauca	Caldono	C3-SUPPORT FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT MUNICIPAL COUNCILS	In process (Fase II)	Municipal	community leaders and municipal government
Cauca	Caldono	C3 -MOBILIZATION OF PRODUCER SUBSIDIES FROM NATIONAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL TO LOCAL LEVEL	Finalized	Municipal	small-scale producers and municipal government
Cauca	Caldono	C3-STRENGTHENING OF THE MUNICIPAL AGRICULTURE AND UMATAS SECRETARIES	In process (Fase II)	Municipal	municipal government
Cauca	Caldono	C4-STRATEGY FOR DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION ON WOMEN'S RESITUATION AND PROPERTY RIGHTS	Finalized	Regional	Two levels of beneficiaries: 1) Women who were trained in communications and radio theater, and 2) those who listened to the broadcasts and learned about their rights to claim land.
Cauca	Jambaló	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	municipal government
Cauca	Jambaló	C3-CREATION OF PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS FOR COLD CLIMATE FRUIT LULO	In process	Municipal	Members of small-scale producer associations
Cauca	Jambaló	C3-CONSTRUCTION OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR NORTHERN CAUCA	Finalized	Subregional	Mayors and other participants In planning and implementation process from Northern Cauca (Toribío, Santander de Quilichao, Caloto, Corinto, Miranda, Jambaló, Guachené, Caldono, Puerto Tejada, Padilla, Villa Rica, Buenos Aires, Suárez)

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Cauca	Jambaló	C3-SUPPORT FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT MUNICIPAL COUNCILS	In process (Fase II)	Municipal	community leaders and municipal government
Cauca	Jambaló	C3-STRENGTHENING OF THE MUNICIPAL AGRICULTURE AND UMATAS SECRETARIES	In process (Fase II)	Municipal	municipal government
Cauca	Jambaló	C3-ITINERANT SCHOOL FOR RURAL WOMEN	In process	Municipal	Women who participated in the training program. Program was carried out in collaboration with USAID's Human Rights program
Cesar	Augustin Codazzi	C1-RESOURCE MOBILIZATION TO SUPPORT COMPLIANCE WITH RESTITUTION RULING	Programmed	municipal	Municipal government and SNARIV
Cesar	Augustin Codazzi	C1-INCREASE IN NUMBER OF REPRESENTED SECONDARY OCCUPANTS	In process	municipal and departmental	Departmental ombudsman; Lawyers working with Ombudsman's office who attend secondary occupants in municipality
Cesar	Augustin Codazzi	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	municipal and departmental	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Cesar	Augustin Codazzi	C2-FORMALIZATION OF PRODUCTIVE PRIVATE PARCELS	In process	Municipal,, specifically Vereda 7 de Agosto	Producers in Vereda 7
Cesar	Augustin Codazzi	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	municipal	Mayor and team aware
Cesar	Augustin Codazzi	C3-STUDIES AND DESIGNS FOR RURAL PUBLIC GOODS: IRRIGATION DISTRICTS	In process	District of La Iberia	community, mayor and department government
Cesar	Augustin Codazzi	C3-MOBILIZATION OF INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES FROM NATIONAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL TO LOCAL LEVEL	Finalized	Ave María district	small-scale producers who are beneficiaries of the irrigation district
Cesar	Augustin Codazzi	C3-PROMOTION OF PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR COFFEE	Programmed	municipal	Just initiated. Eventually, Indigenous associations (3)
Cesar	Augustin Codazzi	C4-STRENGTHEN INTER-INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION TO IMPROVE EXCHANGE OF LAND INFORMATION	Finalized	departamental-municipal	Regional directors of entities involved in restitution

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Cesar	Augustin Codazzi	C4-CREATION OF CARTOGRAPHIC LAND USE INFORMATION TO FACILITATE DECISION MAKING	In process	municipal	Mayor and department government
Cesar	Augustin Codazzi	C4-MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION	Programmed	municipal and departmental	Departmental and municipal government
Cesar	Pueblo Bello	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	municipal	Mayor and planning secretary
Cesar	Pueblo Bello	C3-STUDIES AND DESIGNS FOR RURAL PUBLIC PROPERTY: IRRIGATION DISTRICTS	In process	1 district	Citrus producers residing in district
Cesar	Pueblo Bello	C3-MOBILIZATION OF INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES FROM NATIONAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL TO LOCAL LEVEL	Finalized	municipal	PPP actors; departmental and municipal government
Cesar	Pueblo Bello	C3-PROMOTION OF PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS FOR HONEY	In process	municipal and departmental	Members of honey associations
Cesar	Pueblo Bello	C3-PROMOTION OF PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS FOR COFFEE AND PANELA (CAÑA PANELERA)	Programmed	municipal and departmental	Members of coffee and panela associations
Cesar	Pueblo Bello	C4-CREATION OF CARTOGRAPHIC LAND USE INFORMATION TO FACILITATE DECISION MAKING	In process	municipal and departmental	Mayor and departmental government
Cesar	Pueblo Bello	C4-MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION	Programmed	municipal and departmental	Mayor and departmental government
Cesar	El Copey	C1-RESOURCES MOBILIZATION TO SUPPORT COMPLIANCE WITH RESTITUTION RULING	Finalized	municipal	Municipal government and SNARIV
Cesar	El Copey	C1-INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF REPRESENTED SECONDARY OCCUPANTS	Programmed	municipal and departmental	Departmental ombudsman; Lawyers working with Ombudsman's office who attend secondary occupants in municipality
Cesar	El Copey	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	municipal	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Cesar	El Copey	C2-FORMALIZATION OF PRODUCTIVE PRIVATE PARCELS	In process	municipal	Activity being initiated; private parcels just in process of being identified

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Cesar	El Copey	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	municipal	Mayor; Regional Planning Council
Cesar	El Copey	C3 - CREATION OF THE SECRETARY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT FOR EL COPEY	In process	municipal	Municipal government
Cesar	El Copey	C4-STRENGTHEN INTER-INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION TO IMPROVE EXCHANGE OF LAND INFORMATION	Finalized	municipal and departmental	Municipal and departmental government
Cesar	El Copey	C4-CREATION OF CARTOGRAPHIC LAND USE INFORMATION TO FACILITATE DECISION MAKING	In process	municipal and departmental	Mayor and departmental government
Cesar	El Copey	C4-MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION	Programmed	municipal and departmental	Mayor and departmental government
Cesar	La Paz	C1-RESOURCES MOBILIZATION TO SUPPORT COMPLIANCE WITH RESTITUTION RULING	Finalized	municipal	Municipal government and SNARIV
Cesar	La Paz	C1-INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF SECONDARY OCCUPANTS	In process	municipal and departmental	Departmental ombudsman; Lawyers working with Ombudsman's office who attend secondary occupants in municipality
Cesar	La Paz	C1-CHARACTERIZATIONS OF EFFECTS OF ARMED CONFLICT IN ETHNIC TERRITORIES	Finalized	municipal / ethnic community - resguardo Yukpas	Community aware but no direct access to enquire
Cesar	La Paz	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	municipal	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Cesar	La Paz	C2-FORMALIZATION OF PRODUCTIVE PRIVATE PARCELS	In process	municipal	Activity still in contracting process; only a few parcels prioritized so far
Cesar	La Paz	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	municipal	Municipal Council; Regional Planning Council
Cesar	La Paz	C3-STUDIES AND DESIGNS FOR RURAL PUBLIC PROPERTY: IRRIGATION DISTRICTS	In process	District of Betnia	Mayor.Secretary of Agriculture. Producers residing in irrigation districts
Cesar	La Paz	C4-STRENGTHEN INTER-INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION TO IMPROVE EXCHANGE OF LAND INFORMATION	Finalized	municipal and departmental	Municipal and departmental government

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Cesar	La Paz	C4-CREATION OF CARTOGRAPHIC LAND USE INFORMATION TO FACILITATE DECISION MAKING	In process	municipal and departmental	Mayor and departmental government
Cesar	La Paz	C4-MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION	Programmed	municipal and departmental	Departmental government
Meta	El Castillo	C1-INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF SECONDARY OCCUPANTS	Programmed	All LRDP municipalities in Meta	Departmental ombudsman; Lawyers working with Ombudsman's office who attend secondary occupants in municipality
Meta	El Castillo	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal 26 parcels (rural schools)	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Meta	El Castillo	C2- PARCELIZATION OF FARM COLLECTIVELY TITLED TO WOMEN	Programmed	El Porvenir vereda	Not yet initiated; eventually, 21 families that make up the women's association AGROEMPO
Meta	El Castillo	C2-FIELD RESEARCH ON PROPERTY RIGHTS OF WOMEN IN CONSENSUAL UNIONS	Programmed	El Porvenir vereda	This activity was to collect data to inform a study on property rights of women in consensual unions, and provide policy recommendations. Recipients of program efforts to socialize findings and recommendations with local authorities most likely to perceive impacts.
Meta	El Castillo	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	Mayor's Office; Municipal Council; Regional Planning Council; Municipal Rural Development Council
Meta	El Castillo	C3-SUPPORT TO CACAO PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	Programmed	Municipal	ASOCCUBA EL CASTILLO: 66 producers for the improvement of benefits and marketing of cacao beans
Meta	El Castillo	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCILS	Finalized	Municipal	Mayor's Office; leaders from the municipal rural sector
Meta	El Castillo	C3-SUPPORT FOR PLANTAIN PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	Programmed	Municipal (Fuente de Oro, Pto Lleras, El Castillo)	Just initiated; eventually 5 associations that bring together at least 200 plantain producers; technical secretary of the plantain chain; Mayor's Office of Fuentedeoro
Meta	El Castillo	C3-SUPPORT FOR MILK PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	Finalized	Municipal (El Castillo, Fuentedeoro)	Producer association ASOGANCAS, with 30 producers in the PPP
Meta	El Castillo	C3- EVALUATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY OF DAIRY PRODUCER ASSOCIATIONS	Finalized	Veredas: Cumaral Bajo, Playa Rica, El Jardín, El Encanto, Malabares	ASOGANCAS: 40 men and 20 women

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Meta	El Castillo	C3- FORMULATION AND COMMUNICATION OF TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE ARIARI REGION AND MOBILIZATION OF IMPLEMENTATION RESOURCES	Finalized	Subregional (Ariari region)	Municipal Rural Development Councils
Meta	El Castillo	C3-STUDIES AND DESIGNS FOR RURAL PUBLIC GOODS: TERTIARY ROADS	In process	Subregion of Alto Ariari; municipalities of El Castillo (9 veredas) and Lejanias (4 veredas)	Tertiary road network in foothills that connects to Marginal de la Selva
Meta	El Castillo	C3- DECLARATION OF ARIARI REGION AS PRIORITY ZONE FOR PRODUCTION OF FOOD AND WATER	Programmed	Departmental and subregional: 7 municipalities of Ariari; Castillo, Lejanias, Granada, Fuente de oro, El Dorado, San Martin, Puerto Lleras	Not yet initiated; eventually Municipal Rural Development Councils; Regional Planning Councils.
Meta	El Castillo	C4- INFORMATION SYSTEM: PRODUCTIVE PROJECTS	Programmed	Municipal	Not yet initiated. Effects would only be recognizable by local GOC (mayor, Municipal Rural Development Council)
Meta	El Castillo	C4-INFORMATION SYSTEM: FOLLOW-UP OF RESTITUTION SENTENCES	Programmed	Municipal	Not yet initiated. Effects would only be recognizable by the LRU and other local GOC institutions
Meta	El Castillo	C4-STRATEGY FOR DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION ON WOMEN'S RESITUTION AND PROPERTY RIGHTS	Finalized	Dissemination via communiy radio stations in Llano, Emisora Brisas del Tonoa, with municipal coverage in Cubarral and El Castillo	Two levels of beneficiaries: 1) Women who were trained in communications and radio theater, and 2) those who listened to the broadcasts and learned about their rights to claim land.
Meta	El Dorado	C1-REOSURCES MOBILIZATION TO SUPPORT COMPLIANCE WITH RESTITUTION RULING	Programmed	Municipalities of Puerto Gaitan, El Dorado; government of Meta	Municipal government and SNARIV
Meta	El Dorado	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal 11 parcels (rural schools)	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Meta	El Dorado	C3-SUPPORT TO CACAO PRIVATE PUBLIC ALLIANCES	Programmed	Municipal	ASOFRUD: 86 producers. They are part of MARD's productive alliances
Meta	El Dorado	C4- INFORMATION SYSTEM: PRODUCTIVE PROJECTS	Programmed	Municipal	Not yet initiated. Effects would only be recognizable by local GOC.

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Meta	El Dorado	C4-STRATEGY FOR DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION ON WOMEN'S RESITUTION AND PROPERTY RIGHTS	Finalized	Dissemination via community radio stations in Llano, Emisora Brisas del Tonoa, with municipal coverage in Cubarral and El Castillo	Two levels of beneficiaries: 1) Women who were trained in communications and radio theater, and 2) those who listened to the broadcasts and learned about their rights to claim land.
Meta	Fuente de Oro	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal 20 parcels (rural schools)	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Meta	Fuente de Oro	C1-INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF SECONDARY OCCUPANTS	Programmed	All LRDP municipalities in Meta	Departmental ombudsman; Lawyers working with Ombudsman's office who attend secondary occupants in municipality
Meta	Fuente de Oro	C2-FIELD RESEARCH ON PROPERTY RIGHTS OF WOMEN IN CONSENSUAL UNIONS	Finalized	Puerto Aljure vereda	This activity was to collect data to inform a study on property rights of women in consensual unions, and provide policy recommendations. Recipients of program efforts to socialize findings and recommendations with local authorities most likely to perceive impacts.
Meta	Fuente de Oro	C2-PARCELIZATION OF COLLECTIVELY TITLED FARMS	In process	Municipal	Mayor. Activity just started. Eventually, 120 families that will obtain individual property titles
Meta	Fuente de Oro	C3-SUPPORT FOR PLANTAIN PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	Programmed	Municipal	4 associations that contain at least 100 plantain producers; technical secretary of the plantain value chain; Mayor's Office of Fuentedeoro
Meta	Fuente de Oro	C3-SUPPORT FOR MILK PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	Finalized	Municipal. Parcelación Maracaibo	ASOPROARI producer association, with 30 producers in the PPP
Meta	Fuente de Oro	C4- INFORMATION SYSTEM: PRODUCTIVE PROJECTS	Programmed	Municipal	Not yet initiated. Effects would only be recognizable by local GOC (mayor, Municipal Rural Development Council)
Meta	Fuente de Oro	C4-STRATEGY FOR DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION ON WOMEN'S RESITUTION AND PROPERTY RIGHTS	Finalized	Dissemination via community radio station network in Llano, Emisora Marfil Sterreo de Puerto Lleras with municipal coverage in Fuentedeoro and Puerto Lleras	Two levels of beneficiaries: 1) Women who were trained in communications and radio theater, and 2) those who listened to the broadcasts and learned about their rights to claim land.
Meta	Granada	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal 12 parcels (rural schools)	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Meta	Granada	C1-INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF SECONDARY OCCUPANTS	Programmed	All LRDP municipalities in Meta	Departmental ombudsman; Lawyers working with Ombudsman's office who attend secondary occupants in municipality
Meta	Granada	C4-STRATEGY FOR DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION ON WOMEN'S RESITUTION AND PROPERTY RIGHTS	Finalized	Dissemination via community radio station network in Llano, Emisora Ondas del Tonoa in Cubarral, with municipal coverage in Granada and Cubarral	Two levels of beneficiaries: 1) Women who were trained in communications and radio theater, and 2) those who listened to the broadcasts and learned about their rights to claim land.
Meta	Puerto Gaitan	C1-RESOURCES MOBILIZATION TO SUPPORT COMPLIANCE WITH RESTITUTION RULING	Programmed	Municipalities of Puerto Gaitan, El Dorado; government of Meta	Municipal government and SNARIV
Meta	Puerto Gaitan	C1-INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF SECONDARY OCCUPANTS	Finalized	Rural area of Cristalinas	Departmental ombudsman; Lawyers working with Ombudsman's office who attend secondary occupants in municipality
Meta	Puerto Gaitan	C1-FORMULATION OF TERRITORIAL ACTION PLANS (PATs)	Finalized	Municipality of Puerto Gaitán	Municipal government, SNARIV
Meta	Puerto Gaitan	C1- CHARACTERIZATION OF EFFECTS OF ARMED CONFLICT ON ETHNIC TERRITORIES	In process	2 indigenous reserves (Domo Planas and Walianai) of the Sikuni people, located in Puerto Gaitán	Regional LRU office; Community leaders; indigenous families
Meta	Puerto Gaitan	C1-PRELIMINARY STUDIES OF EFFECTS OF ARMED CONFLICT ON ETHNIC TERRITORIES	Finalized	7 indigenous reserves (Corozal-Tapaojo, Domo Planas, El Tigre, Iwiwi, Vencedor-Piriri, Wacoyo, Walianai) of the Sikuni people, located in Puerto Gaitán	Regional Land Restitution Unit
Meta	Puerto Gaitan	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal 5 parcels (rural schools)	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Meta	Puerto Gaitan	C4- INFORMATION SYSTEM: PRODUCTIVE PROJECTS	Programmed	Municipal	Not yet initiated. Effects would only be recognizable by local GOC (mayor, Municipal Rural Development Council)
Meta	Puerto Gaitan	C4-INFORMATION SYSTEM: FOLLOW-UP OF RESTITUTION SENTENCES	Programmed	Municipal (Puerto Gaitán)	Not yet initiated. The activity's impacts will initially be seen by officials from the Mayor's Office and the Land Restitution Unit and restitution judges.

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Meta	Puerto Gaitan	C4-STRATEGY FOR DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION ON WOMEN'S RESITUTION AND PROPERTY RIGHTS	Finalized	Dissemination via network of community radio stations of the Llano, Emisora Ondas del Manacacias with coverage in entire municipality	Two levels of beneficiaries: 1) Women who were trained in communications and radio theater, and 2) those who listened to the broadcasts and learned about their rights to claim land.
Sucre	Chalan	C1-INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF SECONDARY OCCUPANTS	Programmed	Municipal	Departmental ombudsman; Lawyers working with Ombudsman's office who attend secondary occupants in municipality
Sucre	Chalan	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	23 parcels will be formalized, including 12 schools	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Sucre	Chalan	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	Mayors and community leaders who participated in the process
Sucre	Chalan	C3-SUPPORT TO CACAO PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	In process	Producer association - ASOJUVENTUD	Producer association - ASOJUVENTUD
Sucre	Chalan	C3-STUDIES AND DESIGNS OF RURAL PUBLIC PROPERTY: IRRIGATION DISTRICTS	Programmed	Regional	Eventually producers residing in irrigation districts
Sucre	Chalan	C3-PROMOTION OF YUCA AND ÑAME PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	Programmed	Regional	Members of producer associations. Name PPP has been signed, but new activity, so material benefits not yet evident. Name association not yet formed.
Sucre	Chalan	C4- RAISING COMMUNITY AWARENESS OF OMBUDSMAN'S ROLE IN REPRESENTING SECONDARY OCCUPANTS	Finalized	Municipal and national	Land Restitution Unit at national level; secondary occupants in the municipality. The activity involved development of "Secondary occupant information system" managed by the Land Restitution Unit and a system for following up restitution cases managed by the Land Restitution Unit
Sucre	Ovejas	C1-RESOURCES MOBILIZATION TO SUPPORT COMPLIANCE WITH RESTITUTION RULING	Programmed	Village of Chengue	37 beneficiary families in Chengue
Sucre	Ovejas	C2-DESIGN OF MUNICIPAL FORMALIZATION PLAN	Finalized	Municipal	Community members; municipal government
Sucre	Ovejas	C2-ESTABLISHMENT OF MUNICIPAL LAND OFFICE	Finalized	Municipal	105 families initially benefitting from property titles; municipal government
Sucre	Ovejas	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal: 20 parcels on which public entities operate,	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
				whose formalization will be supported	
Sucre	Ovejas	C2-EXECUTION MUNICIPAL FORMALIZATION PLAN	In process	Municipal	Community members; municipal government
Sucre	Ovejas	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	Mayor and community leaders who participated in the planning process (Municipal Council, Regional Planning Council, Municipal Rural Development Council)
Sucre	Ovejas	C3-SUPPORT TO CACAO PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	In process	Municipal	Members of ASOVICHENGUE, including restitution beneficiaries.
Sucre	Ovejas	C3-STUDIES AND DESIGNS OF RURAL PUBLIC PROPERTY: IRRIGATION DISTRICTS	Programmed	Regional (Ovejas, Chalan, Coloso)	100 beneficiary families of irrigation district
Sucre	Ovejas	C3-PROMOTION OF YUCA AND ÑAME PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	Programmed	Municipal	Members of producer associations. Yucca PPP has been signed, but new activity, so material benefits not yet evident. Name association not yet formed.
Sucre	Ovejas	C4-RAISING AWARENESS OF POLICY AND GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS ON LAND AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT	Finalized	Municipal and national	Land Restitution Unit at national level; secondary occupants in the municipality. The activity involved developmet of "Secondary occupant information system" managed by the Land Restitution Unit and a system for following up restitution cases managed by the Land Restitution Unit
Sucre	Ovejas	C4- RAISING COMMUNITY AWARENSS OF OMBUDSMAN'S ROLE IN REPRESENTING SECONDARY OCCUPANTS	Finalized	Municipal	Community members participating in awareness raising forums
Sucre	Ovejas	C4- INFORMATION SYSTEM: PRODUCTIVE PROJECTS	Programmed	Municipal	Not yet initiated. Effects would only be recognizable by local GOC (mayor, Secretary of Agriculture).
Sucre	Ovejas	C4-DEVELOPMENT OF LAND INFORMATION CONSULTATION SYSTEM	Programmed	Municipal	Mayor's Office; Land Office; local communities
Sucre	Morroa	C1-RESOURCE MOBILIZATION TO SUPPORT COMPLIANCE WITH RESTITUTION RULING	Programmed	Village of Cambimba	Municipal government and SNARIV

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Sucre	Morroa	C1-FORMULATION OF TERRITORIAL ACTION PLANS (PATs)	Finalized	Municipal	GOC institutions involved in SNARIV. Communities would not likely be aware of these.
Sucre	Morroa	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal: 23 properties housing public service entities	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Sucre	Morroa	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	Mayor and community leaders who participated in planning process (Municipal Council, Regional Planning Council, Municipal Rural Development Council)
Sucre	Morroa	C3-SUPPORT TO CACAO PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	In process	Municipal	Mayor; members of cacao producer associations
Sucre	Morroa	C3-PROMOTION OF YUCA AND NAME PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS F	Programmed	Municipal	Members of producer associations. Yucca PPP has been signed, but new activity, so material benefits not yet evident. Name association not yet formed.
Sucre	Morroa	C4-STRENGTHENING MAYORAL APPRECIATION OF LAND AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	Finalized	Municipality with departmental participation	Community leaders and mayors attending meetings would be the most likely to be able to attest to outcomes.
Sucre	Morroa	C4- INFORMATION SYSTEM: PRODUCTIVE PROJECTS	Programmed	Departmental and municipal	Not yet initiated. Effects would only be recognizable by local GOC (mayor, Secretary of Agriculture).
Tolima	Chaparral	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal (rural and dispersed)	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Tolima	Chaparral	C2-FIELD RESEARCH ON PROPERTY RIGHTS OF WOMEN IN CONSENSUAL UNIONS	Finalized	Municipal	This activity was to collect data to inform a study on property rights of women in consensual unions, and provide policy recommendations. Recipients of program efforts to socialize findings and recommendations with local authorities most likely to perceive impacts.
Tolima	Chaparral	C2-SUPPORT FOR ALTERNATIVE CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN LAND FORMALIZATION	Finalized	Ibague, Chaparral, Planadas, Ortega	Conciliators in equity in Ortega and Chaparral; director of regional "Casa de Justicia"; representative of MARD's Formalization Program
Tolima	Chaparral	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	Municipal Council; Regional Planning Council; Municipal Rural Development Council; local government

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Tolima	Chaparral	C3-SUPPORT TO CACAO PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	In process	Planadas, Ataco, Rioblanco, Ortega, Chaparral, San Antonio	Amocal; Asopromuco; Aprocasurt; Asocatol; Aprocamaito; Asaprogaro; Asopracop; Asoprocas; Asociaminec; Aitedem; Ecoaproacim; Asoparaiso Altamira
Tolima	Chaparral	C3-INVENTORY TO PRIORITIZE REHABILITATION OF TERCARY ROADS	Programmed	Municipal	Departmental and municipal government. Activity just initiated; eventually, community members.
Tolima	Chaparral	C2-SUPPORT FOR FORMALIZATION OF RURAL PRIVATE PROPERTY	In process	Village of Calarma	300 rural families
Tolima	Chaparral	C3-PROMOTION OF COFFEE PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	In process	Ataco, Planadas, Ortega, Riboanco, Chaparral, San Antonio	Cafisur; Aprovocal; Asocalarama
Tolima	Chaparral	C4-STRATEGY FOR DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION ON WOMEN'S RESITUTION AND PROPERTY RIGHTS	Finalized	Municipal	Two levels of beneficiaries: 1) Women who were trained in communications and radio theater, and 2) those who listened to the broadcasts and learned about their rights to claim land.
Tolima	Ataco	C1-RESOURCES MOBILIZATION TO SUPPORT COMPLIANCE WITH RESTITUTION RULING	Programmed	Municipal and Departamental	Departmental and municipal government. Activity just initiated; eventually, restituted population; departmental and municipal governments
Tolima	Ataco	C1- FORMULATION OF TERRITORIAL ACTION PLANS (PATs)	Programmed	7 veredas of the municipality of Ataco: Canoas La Vaga, Canoas Copete, Basillas, Santa Rita, San Roque, Potrerito, Beltrán	Departmental and municipal government. Activity just initiated; eventually, restituted population; departmental and municipal governments
Tolima	Ataco	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal (rural and dispersed)	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Tolima	Ataco	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	Municipal Council; Regional Planning Council; Municipal Rural Development Council; local government
Tolima	Ataco	C3-SUPPORT TO CACAO PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	In process	Municipal	ASOCAT; ATACONDOR; ASOESTRELLA; RENACER LAS BLANCAS
Tolima	Ataco	C3-INVENTORY TO PRIORITIZE REHABILITATION OF TERCARY ROADS	Programmed	Municipal	departmental and municipal governments Activity just initiated; eventually, community members in the municipality.
Tolima	Ataco	C3-PROMOTION OF COFFEE PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	Programmed	Municipal	Asocasaverde, Asocanoas; Asociacion de Retorno Iniciando de Nuevo

Department	Municipality	Intervention	Implementation Stage	Intervention Coverage	Key Actors
Tolima	Ataco	C4-INFORMATION SYSTEM: RESTITUTION SENTENCES	Programmed	Municipal and Departamental	Not yet initiated. Effects would only be recognizable by the LRU and other local GOC institutions
Tolima	Ataco	C4-STRATEGY FOR DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION ON WOMEN'S RESITUTION AND PROPERTY RIGHTS	Finalized	Vereda	Two levels of beneficiaries: 1) Women who were trained in communications and radio theater, and 2) those who listened to the broadcasts and learned about their rights to claim land.
Tolima	Ortega	C2-SUPPORT FOR ALTERNATIVE CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN LAND FORMALIZATION	Finalized	Municipal	Conciliators in equity
Tolima	Ortega	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	Municipal Council; Regional Planning Council; Municipal Rural Development Council; local government
Tolima	Ortega	C3-SUPPORT TO CACAO PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	In process	Municipal	Agroemp Ortega; Asagrol Loany Toy; Asoacas; Asoperotol; Asopromecol
Tolima	Ortega	C3-INVENTORY TO PRIORITIZE REHABILITATION OF TERCARY ROADS	Programmed	Municipal	Community members in the municipality; departmental and municipal governments
Tolima	Planadas	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	Municipal Council; Regional Planning Council; Municipal Rural Development Council; local government
Tolima	Planadas	C3-SUPPORT TO CACAO PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	In process	Municipal	Cafisur; Acedga; Asoprobil
Tolima	Planadas	C3-INVENTORY TO PRIORITIZE REHABILITATION OF TERCARY ROADS	Programmed	Municipal	Community members in the municipality; departmental and municipal governments
Tolima	Planadas	C3-PROMOTION OF COFFEE PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	Programmed	Municipal	Cafisur; Acedga; Asoprobil
Tolima	Planadas	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Vereda	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.
Tolima	Rioblanco	C3-SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS	Finalized	Municipal	Municipal Council; Regional Planning Council; Municipal Rural Development Council; local government
Tolima	Rioblanco	C3-SUPPORT TO CACAO PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	In process	Municipal	Agroorio; Asochocorio; Asprocario
Tolima	Rioblanco	C3-PROMOTION OF COFFEE PRIVATE PUBLIC PARTNERSHIPS	Programmed	Municipal	Cafisur; Asoquebradón; Asoceas

<b>Department</b>	<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Implementation Stage</b>	<b>Intervention Coverage</b>	<b>Key Actors</b>
Tolima	Rioblanco	C2- FORMALIZATION OF PUBLIC USE PROPERTIES	In process	Municipal (rural and dispersed)	Mayors; communities will not yet see investment benefits before titles are issued.

# REFERENCES

- Albertus, M., Kaplan, O. (2012). Land reform as a counterinsurgency policy: Evidence from Colombia. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 57(2). (198–231)
- Barrett, C., Carter, M. (2010) The Power and Pitfalls of Experiments in Development Economics: Some Non-random Reflections. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 32(4). 515-548.
- Bell, A., & Jones, K. (2012). Explaining fixed effects: Random effects modelling of time-series cross-sectional and panel data. School of Geographical Sciences, Centre for Multilevel Modelling. University of Bristol.
- Bruhn, M., McKenzie, D. (2010). In pursuit of balance: Randomization in practice in development field experiments. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 1(4). 200-232.
- Cepeda, M. J. (2007). *Polémicas constitucionales*. Bogotá: Legis.
- Couso, J. (2004). "The politics of judicial review in Chile in the era of domestic transition, 1990- 2002." In *Democratization and the judiciary: The accountability function of courts in new democracies*, ed. S. Gloppen, R. Gargarella and E. Skaar. London: Frank Cass Publishers.
- Garay, L., Barberi, F., Ramirez, C., & Vargas, F. (2010). Tercer informe de verificación sobre el cumplimiento de derechos de la población en situación de desplazamiento. Report for: Comisión de Seguimiento a la Política Pública Sobre el Desplazamiento Forzado. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Jacob, H., Blankenburg, E., Kritzer, H. M., Provine, D. M., Sanders, J. (1996). Courts, law, and politics in comparative perspective. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Ibáñez, A. M., Querubin, P. (2004). Acceso a tierras y desplazamiento forzado en Colombia. Universidad de los Andes.
- Ibáñez, A. M. & Vélez, C. E. (2008). Civil conflict and forced migration: The micro determinants and welfare losses of displacement in Colombia. *World Development*, 36(4):659-676
- LeGrand, C. (1986). *Frontier expansion and peasant protest in Colombia*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- LeGrand, C. (1989). Colonization and violence in Colombia: Perspectives and Debates. *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 14(28), 5-29. doi:10.1080/08263663.1989.10816623
- Nasi, C. (2007). *Cuando callan los fusiles. Impacto de la paz negociada en Colombia y en Centro América*. Bogotá: Grupo Editorial Norma -Universidad de los Andes.
- Peeler, J. (1985). *Latin American democracies: Colombia, Costa Rica, Venezuela*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC.
- Roldán, M. (2002). *La violencia in Antioquia, Colombia*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.

Uprimmy, R. (2004). The Constitutional court and the control of presidential extraordinary powers in Colombia. In S. Gloppen, R. Gargarella & E. Skaar (Eds.), *Democratization and Judiciary: The Accountability Function of Courts in New Democracies* (pp. 33-50). London: CHR Michelsen Institute

U.S. Agency for International Development  
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20523  
Tel: (202) 712-0000  
Fax: (202) 216-3524  
[www.usaid.gov](http://www.usaid.gov)