



# Project Completion Report

---

## PCR

***Project Name:*** Land Administration II

***Country:*** Belize

***Sector/Subsector:*** Agriculture and Rural Development

***Original Project Team:*** Michele Lemay, (RE2/EN2), Project Team Leader; Kevin Barthel (consultant); Evan Cayetano and Rory Solis (COF/CBL); Laura Profeta (LEG/OPR2); George Alexandrou (RE2/EN2); Fernando Villamizar (IDB/RUTA); and Silvia Echeverria (RE2/EN2).

***Project Number:*** BL0017

***Loan Number (s), TC(s):*** 1322/OC-BL

***CRG Date:*** May 31, 2011

***Final Approval Date of PCR:*** 10 de junio de 2011

***PCR Team: Principal Author and Members:*** Marion Le Pommellec (RND/CHA), Rory Solis (ITI/CBL), Michele Lemay (INE/RND) and the LMP II former Project Director

## **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

DLS	Department of Lands & Surveys
EA	Executing Agency
GPS	Global Positioning System
IT	Information Technology
LIS	Land Information System
LMP	Land Management Program
LR	Land Registry
LTU	Land Titles Unit
MNR	Ministry of Natural Resources
MRDC	Ministry of Rural Development and Culture
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NLAC	National Land Advisory Committee
PCC	Project Coordinating Committee
PMU	Project Management Unit
RIM	Registry Index Map
TC	Technical Cooperation

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Acronyms and Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Table of Contents .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. Basic Information .....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
<b>II. The Project .....</b>	<b>5</b>
a. Project Context .....	5
b. Project Description .....	6
<b>III. Results .....</b>	<b>8</b>
a. Outcomes .....	8
b. Externalities .....	8
c. Outputs .....	9
d. Project Costs .....	17
<b>IV. Project Implementation .....</b>	<b>18</b>
a. Analysis of Critical Factors .....	18
b. Borrower/Executing Agency Performance .....	20
c. Bank Performance .....	20
<b>V. Sustainability .....</b>	<b>21</b>
a. Analysis of Critical Factors .....	21
b. Potential Risks .....	22
c. Institutional Capacity .....	23
<b>VI. Monitoring and Evaluation .....</b>	<b>23</b>
a. Information on Results .....	23
b. Future Monitoring and Ex-Post Evaluation .....	24
<b>VII. Lessons Learned .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>VIII. Annexes .....</b>	<b>27</b>

## I. Basic Information

BASIC DATA (AMOUNTS IN US\$)	
PROJECT NO: BL0017	TITLE: Land Administration II (Known as "Land Management Program – LMP")
Borrower: Government of Belize Executing Agency (EA): Ministry of Natural Resources	Date of Board Approval: June 6, 2001 Date of Loan Contract Effectiveness: February 18, 2002
Loan(s): 1322/OC-BL Sector: Agriculture and Rural Development	Date of Eligibility for First Disbursement: July 23, 2002
Lending Instrument: Investment	<u>Months in Execution</u> * from Approval: 89 * from Contract Effectiveness: 80
	<u>Disbursement Periods</u> Original Date of Final Disbursement: February 18, 2006 Current Date of Final Disbursement: June 30, 2010 Cumulative Extension (Months): 52 Special Extension (months): 29 (to allow payment of contracted commitments, realization of the final audit, reimbursement of unused revolving funds, and cancellation of undisbursed resources).
	<u>Loan Amount(s)</u> * Original Amount: 7,000,000 (IDB) + 1,860,000 (GoB) * Current Amount: 7,000,000 (IDB) + 1,860,000 (GoB) * Pari Passu (if applicable): YES
Poverty Targeted Investment (PTI): No	<u>Disbursements</u>
Social Equity (SEQ): Yes	Disbursement: 6,690,205 (96%) Cancellation: 309,795 (4%)
Environmental Classification: B	<u>Total Project Cost</u> (Original Estimate): 8,860,000
	<u>Redirectioning</u> : NO
	*
	<u>On Alert Status</u>
	Is project currently designated "on alert" by PAIS: No
	Comments on relevance of "on alert" status for this project (if applicable):

Summary Performance Classifications				
DO	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Probable (HP)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Probable (P)	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Probability (LP)	<input type="checkbox"/> Improbable (I)
IP	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory (HS)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory (S)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory (US)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unsatisfactory (VU)
SU	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Probable (HP)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Probable (P)	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Probability (LP)	<input type="checkbox"/> Improbable (I)

## **II. The Project**

### **a. Project Context**

Belize encompasses a total land area of 22,960 km<sup>2</sup> of which 5% is distributed over more than 1,060 islands. Public lands account for 46% (approximately 1 million ha) of the total land surface of Belize. These public lands are further divided into: (i) Protected areas and forest reserves which represent over 30% of the total national territory, and (ii) Other 'national lands' (16% of the total national territory) which are either already allocated under a government lease or un-leased public land. Privately held lands represent 54% (approximately 1.2 million ha) of the total national territory which consists of over 1 million ha in rural parcels greater than 40 ha. Small private urban parcels account for less than 0.1% of the total national territory. It is estimated that there exists between 90,000 and 105,000 land parcels that can eventually form part of the national cadastre. To the extent that land rights are secure and fully registered, these parcels could contribute to a dynamic real estate market that is responsive to sustainable development and private sector investment.

Building on the gains made with an earlier Bank-financed project (1017/OC-BL), the Land Administration Program II, commonly named Land Management Program (LMP), was designed to address the main problem of tenuous land security associated with the use of two separate ownership registration systems with only one of them (pursuant to the Land Registry Act) providing for effective management of land records and more secure property title associated with a unique identifier for all registered parcels. The proposed strategy was to promote the conversion of a significant portion of the country towards a single Land Registry in both rural and urban areas, with pilot activities in the latter. This was to be accompanied by the development of a capacity to resolve more complex land management functions such as land valuation, land use and national land policy in a more integrated manner. A key concept of the strategy was to sequence investments and activities in step with an institutional strengthening process that would ensure that the changes brought about by the LMP were well absorbed by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), the executing agency for the Program.

Major changes in the Ministry's policy affected the project early on. First was the issue to pursue an LIS that included not only the registry but also the Land Titles Unit, which was transferred to the Ministry just around the time of approval of the project. This delayed implementation of the Land Information System. The Ministry also decided that rather than contracting a firm to complete a business process review for the Department of Lands and Surveys, they would do it themselves. This took a long time to get off the ground and as a result the Ministry could not provide the baseline data required. Without the input of the Ministry the central government also decided that it would change the land tax law and this affected the land valuation work, and the collection of land taxes. During the period of project execution elections were held for village councils and this resulted in a change of all village councils, which greatly impeded the work on village boundaries. The work of the National Land Advisory Council was impeded by the chairman's illness, general elections in the country and a change of Minister. These events all contributed to a lack of continuity on the work of land policy reform.

## **b. Project Description**

### **i. Development Objective(s)**

The overall objective of the project is to secure more efficient and sustainable use of land resources through enhanced land security, effective land markets and the promotion of a coherent land policy framework.

The objectives stated in the Logical framework remained unchanged over the life of the LMP. The verifiable indicators remained essentially the same, though the language was improved over time to become more precise. Documentation of the improvements can be found in successive Project Performance and Monitoring Reports (PPMRs) produced by the IDB. Based on discussion with representatives of the IDB and the Program Management Unit, the log frame was not updated as the language of the verifiable indicators was improved. Nevertheless, at the time to prepare this PCR, it clearly appears that it would have been beneficial to update the log frame, for the following reasons: (i) it is actually not logical: there is a lack of causal relations between “outputs” and “outcomes”; and several targets/results presented as “outputs” are actually outcomes or milestones (ii) several baselines and targets are missing, making, in those cases, difficult to conclude about the Program performance.

### **ii. Components**

The project consisted of the following components:

**National Cadastre and Property Rights Registration.** Under this component land security in rural and urban areas was to be enhanced through the declaration of Compulsory Registration Sections and the preparation of Registry Index Maps (RIM) for each section. There would be land tenure clarification and property rights registration of an estimated 15,000 rural parcels (approximately 50% of all rural parcels to be registered) in a total of three districts. The same would happen for 500 urban parcels (approximately 2% of all urban parcels) in two registration sections in Belize City, using a streamlined approach to urban surveying and mapping based on aerial photography, survey compilations and ground verification. The holders of these parcels would be assisted with the first registration of their property rights in accordance with the Land Registered Act. In addition, approximately 5,000 rural parcels were to be surveyed and mapped, and declared as registration sections; but First Registration was not to be completed by the program. Similarly, 21,300 urban parcels in four urban areas (Orange Walk Town, Belize City, San Ignacio/Santa Elena and Dangriga) were to be mapped, and compulsory registration sections would be declared for them. However, it was expected that in both instances (rural and urban), the landholders would use their own initiative to complete the first registration.

**Expansion of Land Administration Services.** This component sought to improve the efficiency, reliability and accountability of land administration services provided by MNR. At the time that the LMP was being formulated the Ministry was managing two sets of land records. Operating two centers for land records, each with a different set of rules was increasing the complexity of service delivery and of internal activities such as land valuation, taxation and management of the parcel information system. One of the expected outcomes of this component of the LMP was a computerized and searchable database of the records of the Land

**Titles Unit (LTU) and the consolidation of at least 3000 land parcel records into the Land Registry (LR).** This consolidation was to enhance reliable and timely access to property records at the Land Registry thereby reducing the costs associated with land transactions. In the process, other land administration services would be improved. Another expected output of this component was a national parcel-based land information system. This database would be used to manage national land and land held under leasehold and freehold titles. This component also included the reconciliation of valuation records, updating of assessments and training in land valuation methodologies.

**Land Use Planning and Development Review.** This component of the LMP was to improve public sector capacity to plan for, review, and monitor land use changes; including development proposals. It was to develop and propose a decentralized national land use planning framework, prepare local land use plans and delineate village boundaries. The latter was to be undertaken in partnership with the Ministry of Rural Development and Culture (MRDC).

**Land Policy Reform and MNR Institutional Strengthening:** Under this component the LMP was to provide support to the National Land Advisory Committee (NLAC) in the formulation of policy reform recommendations. Through this component, investment would also be made for complementary institutional strengthening of MNR to implement the reforms and monitor their impact. The latter included, among various strategic improvements, the development of a performance-oriented Information Technology (IT) strategy and a Ministry-wide plan for the phased introduction of fees for services.

### **iii. Execution**

To execute the project the Executing Agency set up a Project Management Unit to take on the project's activities. Overall management of the project was the responsibility of the Project Coordinating Committee (PCC), which served as an advisory body to the EA and the PMU. The PCC comprised of representatives from the different departments and units of the Ministry of Natural Resources, and other stakeholders such as the Ministries of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF), and Rural Development, NGOs, and the City and Town Councils. It was expected that some if not all of these agencies would collaborate on some of the project's activities, e.g., adjudication process, land valuation process review, community development plans, and land policy reform. Being part of the PCC meant the agencies would have intimate knowledge about the project and its activities.

### III. Results

*All the “outcomes” and “outputs” are presented as they appeared in the original logical framework and as they were measured in the final evaluation report.*

#### a. Outcomes

ACHIEVEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES (DO)					
<b>Development Objective(s) (Purpose):</b> Secure more efficient and sustainable use of land resources through enhanced land security, effective land markets and the promotion of a coherent land policy framework.					
Key Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Planned outcomes (target at the end of project)	Achieved outcomes (date: 2008)	Comments	Classification
Ratio of total lease approvals, lease certificates and property titles (annual basis by district).	Not available	Increased by 20%	Not available	One of the agreements of the mid-term review of September 2004 is that the Ministry of Natural Resources was to provide the data after completing their “business process review” but they could never provide it.	Probable
Savings (based on average rural and urban parcel size) in the provision of land administration services compared to LAP (surveying, mapping, adjudication and registration).	Not available	Reduced by 20%.	Not available	However, even with data as of 2008, assessment of the degree to which the Development Objective was achieved would have been impeded by: (a) the absence of indicators more directly related to land tenure security; (b) the absence of a baseline together with %-based targets; (c) the nature of the indicators themselves which, in some instances, went beyond the project’s scope particularly with regard to the improvement of land markets. Available data from fiscal year 2002-2003 to fiscal year 2007-2008 on land revenues collected, new mortgages and land transfers do not indicate a consistent trend and it is likely that several external factors affected these indicators.	
Increase in the number and reductions in the average time for processing land-related transactions (private parcels and national estates).	Not available	Reduced by 30%.	Not available	We estimate that the classification was “improbable” in 2008 at the end of the execution, but is “probable” in 2011, it is because (i) the improvement of land transactions (described by the current outcome indicators) would have mainly resulted from the implementation of a performing Land Information System (LIS), (ii) the design and implantation of the LIS was critically delayed during the Program and its implementation started only at the end of the execution period and (iii) the LIS operates very well in 2011 in the 3 sections of the Department of Land and Survey where it has been deployed.	

#### b. Externalities

More local surveyors are now experienced in the use of Global Positioning System (GPS) technology for conducting land surveys. They received both theoretical and practical training in the use of this technology and as a result they are capable of conducting surveys more rapidly. For the future, this is expected to reduce the cost of surveys and contribute to a more dynamic land market that should benefit both investors and landowners.



The adjudication of parcels in rural areas done by local surveyors and the issuance of some 12, 568 certificates to land owners were not project activities but could be considered as positive project externalities. These would have otherwise had to be done by the MNRE with consequent delays and inconveniences to the land owners in receiving their certificates.

### c. Outputs

*Main sources: loan proposal and final evaluation report of the Program (October 2, 2008).*

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 1: National Cadastre and Property Rights Registration					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
Sub-component 1: Cadastre, tenure clarification and registration of rural parcels (budget – US\$2,825,000)					
Land tenure clarification and registration of definitive property rights for rural parcels	N/A	15,000 parcels in 3 districts	16,445 parcels in Corozal, Orange Walk and Belize districts	Under the loan contract, those with land interest would have needed to travel to Belmopan to process their first registration. The PCC made the decision that more progress would be made and more people would benefit if the process also included first registration. Consequently, first registration became part of the services provided under this sub component, and many of those with interest were facilitated with their first registration. Target is exceeded not only from the quantitative, but also from the qualitative point of view. However, the implementation of the sub-component suffered important delays.	Highly Satisfactory
Surveying, mapping, and declaration as registration areas for additional rural parcels	N/A	5,000 parcels	7,673 parcels		Satisfactory
Sub-component 2: Cadastre, tenure clarification and registration of urban parcels (budget – US\$78,000)					
Adjudication and registration of property rights for urban parcels	N/A	500 parcels in Belize City	1,493 parcels surveyed and declared But only 380 claims for conversion collected.	Initially, the related activities were to be undertaken by the same firm which performs the activities in the rural areas (Swede Survey) but their contract was terminated at the completion of their delivery for Orange Walk and Corozal, because of huge time overruns. So those activities were undertaken directly by the Project Management Unit. Work could not be completed due to consulting firm's failure to deliver RIMs.	Unsatisfactory
Surveying, mapping, and declaration as registration areas for additional urban parcels	N/A	20,800 parcels in Belize City, Dangriga, Orange Walk, San Ignacio/Santa Elena	20,379 parcels in the 4 cities	Although the quantitative target is met, the survey and mapping was not satisfactorily done by Finnmap (poor quality). The LMP III has to finance the parcel remediation to improve the mapping integrity of the parcels in the 4 areas.	Unsatisfactory
Sub-component 1.3: Public awareness and participation in land tenure clarification (budget – US\$200,000)					
National, district-level and local media campaigns	N/A	Campaigns completed in 3 districts	Campaigns launched in 3 districts		Satisfactory
CBOs participating in monitoring and education activities in at least 3 districts	N/A	Not available	Several Community Cased Organizations participated		Satisfactory

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 1: National Cadastre and Property Rights Registration					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
Global qualification of the component				<p>The two international consulting firms working on adjudication, survey, and mapping activities did not perform well. They were consistently behind schedule and the targets could not be met in a timely manner. Consequently, the project had to be extended to ensure completion of activities in the rural areas, and to give the firm working in urban areas time to complete its work. Activities were completed in rural areas and targets were surpassed. In addition, the project issued 12,658 certificates (lease and freehold title), which was not part of the project original design. However, in urban areas, the activities could not be completed as the consulting firm never finished the surveying &amp; mapping of the urban parcels, which prevented declaration of registration areas. Only one area was declared, the area where the pilot urban adjudication took place.</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory (because of the preponderant weight of the highly satisfactory sub-component 1, which is reflected by the budget allocation (&gt; 90% of the budget for component 1))</b></p>

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 2: Expansion of land administration services					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
<b>Sub-component 2.1: Consolidation of the Land Registry (budget – US\$148,000)</b>					
Consolidation of land documents from the General Register into the Land Registry	N/A	3,000 land records consolidated in 3 districts	3,153 records consolidated + 3,571 new land records developed and added to the Land Registry, for Corozal, Orange Walk and Belize districts		Highly Satisfactory
Volume of land transactions handled yearly	Information not available	Increased by 30%	Information not available	The land registry provided statistics for the entire country for the calendar years from 2002-2004. total approvals increased from 2,550 to 3,102 to 5,086 for the three years. However, as the project started in 2002 and LIS started been implemented in 2008, this result cannot be attributed to the Program.	Classification impossible because of absence of data
Online access to Land Registry data	No access	Access achieved for all 7 sections of the DLS + 6 district offices	No access	This was included in the contract related to the Land Information System, but the Ministry eventually decided to suspend indefinitely the implementation of online access to the Land Registry database.	Very unsatisfactory
<b>Sub-component 2.2: Improving land valuation and taxation processes (budget – US\$210,000)</b>					
Valuation staff trained	N/A	No target	9 training days provided to public and private sector valuers		Satisfactory
Reconciliation of valuation records	N/A	Reconciliation completed in 6 districts	Reconciliation and updating of the valuation rolls and data entry of this information and others contained in the Valuation Rolls achieved	The Government changed the land tax laws in 2004. Consequently, although the target was already met, a new tax assessment was required and the Ministry had to divert resources in order to update all land valuation records. The new assessments (including new up-date of the valuation rolls) were ongoing at the time of the final evaluation. However, the initial output achieved was not useless as the law was not retroactive.	Satisfactory
Efficiency gain in land revenue collection.	Information not available	Increased by 35%	Information not available	As the Revenue Section was (and is still) not fully integrated into the Land Information System, they had / have limited ability to be current on land transactions that are underway.	Classification impossible because of absence of information, but probably unsatisfactory
Increase in the collection of arrears	Information not available	No target	Information not available		Classification impossible because of absence of information
Valuation methodology	Not standardiz	Standardized	No change in the valuation methodology	The Ministry decided that they would not pursue this as the municipal authorities were not in favor of changing their	Very Unsatisfactory

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 2: Expansion of land administration services					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
	ed			methodology.	
<b>Sub-component 2.3: National parcel-based information system (budget – US\$742,000)</b>					
<b>Cadastral data, orthophoto maps and LIC GIS integrated into a parcel-based information system</b>	Parcel-based information system does not exist, data not integrated	Data integrated in the Land Information System	<b>Cadastral data, orthophoto maps and LIC data integrated</b>	Output achieved with delays, as the Ministry took time to explore the possibility of funding a LIS that would include both the Land Registry and the Land Titles Unit, which was not part of the project scope.	Satisfactory
<b>1:4:000 aerial photographs acquired and processed</b>	N/A	175 km2	Partially completed	The consulting firm hired to capture and process the photos performed very poorly and at the end of the project still had not delivered some very important products, namely, Registry Index Maps (RIM) and the Digital Terrain Models (DTM).	Unsatisfactory
<b>Delivery of land information product to towns, villages and private sector</b>	<i>Information not available</i>	<i>"Increased" but no target</i>	No products	No activity performed. This was ignored, emphasis was placed on online access (access via the world wide web) and ensuring that the MNREI service centers had access to the LIS.	Very Unsatisfactory
<b>Sub-component 2.4: Institutional strengthening for land management (budget – US\$152,000)</b>					
<b>MNREI service centers</b>	One DLS office in each district but they work on National Estate only	Centers fully operating in all districts	Land information system (LIS) developed and implemented only in 3 sections of the Department of Land and Surveys in Belmopan.	Access to the Land Folio system would have enabled the district offices to provide other services than National Estate to the public. But bandwidth had been identified as a limiting factor in the provision of access to the Land Folio system in the district centers. The Ministry was never able to propose a solution for this problem.	Very unsatisfactory
<b>Department of Land and Survey staff trained</b>	N/A	50% of staff trained	<i>Information not available</i>		<i>Classification impossible because of absence of information</i>
<b>Global qualification of the component</b>				The most significant output in this component is the development and implementation of the Land Information System, which resulted in a very performing tool, but with many delays.	<b>Satisfactory</b>

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 3: Land use planning and development review					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
Sub-component 3.1: Establishment of a decentralized national land use planning framework (budget – US\$100,000)					
Public forums completed on decentralized framework	N/A	No target	6 district and 2 regional workshops held		Satisfactory
Agreement with City and town councils on indicators and streamlined regulations	No agreement	Agreement reached	No agreement	Consultancy conducted to identify mechanisms for effective coordination and communication among various government departments, local government agencies and the general public who carry out land transactions. Role of local authorities and mechanisms for them to be effective in land use planning identified and documented. But no specific actions taken to implement the recommendations. At the time of the evaluation, no agreement was reached between the parties on the sharing of land management responsibilities. It is always difficult to get coordination and agreement at government departments in Belize. Consequently, it seems that the Ministry did not give to that inter-governmental coordination issue the priority specified in the Program, beyond the hiring of a consultant to look at the issue.	Very unsatisfactory
Number of incomplete and/or non-compliant development and subdivision applications received	Information not available	Reduced by 30%	Information not available	The project did not address those issues.	Very unsatisfactory
Compliance with development regulations	Information not available	"Increased" but no qualitative/quantitative target	Information not available		
Sub-component 3.2: Local land use planning activities (budget – US\$380,000)					
Community development plans approved	0	5 (according to logframe) 3 (according to the loan proposal narrative)	3	There is general knowledge and awareness of the existence of a community development and land use plan in the respective communities, but those plans are not used for land use and land allocation decisions. Their use is the responsibility of the Rural Development Department in the case of rural communities, and of the Housing and Planning Department and the City Council in the case of communities in Belize City. Neither of these parties were significant players in the formulation of the community plans and they did not participate in a review of the process or the products.	Unsatisfactory (initial output achieved but not used)
Boundaries for villages delineated, official village maps published and incorporated to parcel-based information system	0	80 villages (initial logframe)  Delineation of 15 village boundaries only (after midterm review)	4 village boundaries proposal prepared, of which 2 were approved, of which 1 statutory instrument prepared for signature.	Disagreement about the definition of village boundaries: for MNRE, village boundaries encompass the residential areas of villages, whereas for the Ministry of Rural Development and Culture, boundaries should include residential & agricultural land and provision for village expansion. as a result the activity commenced very late. In addition, village council elections interrupted the process by the end of the project.	Very unsatisfactory
Sub-component 3.3: Capacity building in land use planning and development review (budget – US\$20,000)					
Land use planning and	Information	"Strengthened" in	No change in	A small budget was annexed to the logframe but no activities were	Very

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 3: Land use planning and development review					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
monitoring skills	<i>n not available</i>	MNREI, Belize City and 7 town administration	comparison with the situation before the project	provisioned in the loan proposal narrative. No activity was implemented. The Ministry did not see this as a priority.	unsatisfactory
Use of the parcel-based information system by City and town planners	No parcel-based information system	"Increased", but no target	No change in comparison with the situation before the project	A small budget was annexed to the logframe but no activities were provisioned in the loan proposal narrative. No activity was implemented.	Very unsatisfactory
Global qualification of the component					<b>Very Unsatisfactory</b>

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 4: Land policy reform and Ministry-wide institutional strengthening					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
<b>Sub-component 4.1: support for the National Land Advisory Committee (budget – US\$100,000)</b>					
<b>National Land Advisory Committee sets priorities for its agenda on an annual basis in consultation with Stakeholders</b>	No participative & annual plan	Participative & annual plan	Participative plan prepared for the 1 <sup>st</sup> year only	The NLAC was essentially a single-person committee; the NLAC's chairman's illness shortly after commencing, along with the lack of a coordinator, negatively affected the work of the NLAC. After the change in chairman, the NLAC was never able to embark on a sustained period of activity.	Unsatisfactory
<b>Expert studies on land reform options</b>	No studies	Studies commissioned and results disseminated (but no quantitative target, for instance, minimum number of studies)	No expert studies commissioned	The NLAC carried out some studies themselves. Recommendations were made to the Minister but not supported by expert studies. No evidence that anything was done with the recommendations.	Very Unsatisfactory
<b>Open forums (on the NLAC reform agenda)</b>	N/A	Held in all districts	Held in all districts		Satisfactory
<b>Sub-component 4.2: complementary institutional strengthening of MNREI (budget – US\$200,000)</b>					
<b>MNREI unit performance indicators</b>	<i>Information not available</i>	Established and linked to service and product delivery	A business process review report prepared for DLS, but indicators not used by the MNRE	The business process review took a long time, over a period where there were changes (in personnel) in various sections within DLS as well as within the Ministry as a whole. Consequently, while the review was completed (with target rates for the various processes), the strategic plan was not. In addition, the MNR decided that it would use the system of performance indicators put in place for all ministries and departments of the government. A procedures manual to promote best practice and standardization in service provision in the various sections of the Department of Lands and Survey was also developed and the final document has been accepted as reflecting the current processes, procedures and workflow. At the time of the final evaluation, what was outstanding was a process for keeping the manual current and to ensure that it would be used.	Unsatisfactory
<b>IT plan completed and put into effect</b>	0 plan	1 plan	No plan.	The work was on-going at the time of the final evaluation. The key question was to ensure that the IT plan would be completed and that it would be implemented.	Unsatisfactory
<b>Submission of quarterly financial statements and annual financial analysis report</b>	<i>Information not available</i>	<i>No target</i>	<i>Information not available</i>		<i>Classification impossible because of absence of information</i>
<b>Fees for land administration services</b>	N/A	"Revised" (according to logframe) "Introduction" (according to loan proposal narrative)	Not revised / introduced	An extensive user fee study was conducted . Based on the analysis of all cost factors for the range of services provided by the DLS and a cost recovery objective, fee revision alternatives were recommended but were never adopted, as the MNR was not in agreement with the propositions.	Unsatisfactory

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 4: Land policy reform and Ministry-wide institutional strengthening					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
Global qualification of the component					Unsatisfactory



## d. Project Costs


Total Project Cost – Planned (US\$000)			Total Project Cost – Actual (US\$000)			% Difference	
	IDB	GOB	Total		IDB	GOB	Total
<b>Project</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>1,196</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>1,079.70</b>	<b>663.4</b>	<b>1,766.00</b>
<b>Admin.</b>				<b>Admin.</b>			
PMU	800	-	800	PMU	1,057.40	292.1	1,354.70
Seconded Personnel	-	356	356	Seconded Personnel		371.3	371.3
Final Eval.	40	-	40	Final Eval.	22.3	-	40
<b>Direct Costs</b>	<b>4,655</b>	<b>1,265</b>	<b>5,920</b>	<b>Direct Costs</b>	<b>4,506.10</b>	<b>884.4</b>	<b>5,698.20</b>
<b>Cadastre &amp; Property</b>	<b>2,603</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>3,103</b>	<b>Cadastre &amp; Property</b>	<b>2,330.30</b>	<b>178.1</b>	<b>2,569.40</b>
Rural Adjud.	2,325	-	2,325	Rural Adjud.	2,191.40	-	2,222.20
Rural Surveys	-	500	500	Rural Surveys		178.1	178.1
Urban Adjud.	78	-	78	Urban Adjud.	9.8	-	24
Public Awaren.	200	-	200	Public Awaren.	129.1	-	145.1
<b>Land Admin. Services</b>	<b>1,252</b>	<b>765</b>	<b>2,023</b>	<b>Land Admin. Services</b>	<b>1,613.70</b>	<b>673.4</b>	<b>2,421.20</b>
Consolidation of Registry	148	-	148	Consolidation of Registry	22.8	-	29.7
Valuation & Taxation	210	-	210	Valuation & Taxation	154.2	32	186.2
Land Info. Management	742	-	742	Land Info. Management	1,036.30	50	1,188.40
Instit. Strengthening	152	765	923	Instit. Strengthening	400.4	591.4	1,006.90
<b>Land Use Planning &amp; Dev. Review</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>Land Use Planning &amp; Dev. Review</b>	<b>264.4</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>300.3</b>
National Framework	100	-	100	National Framework	59.9	-	62.3
Local Land Use Planning	380	-	380	Local Land Use Planning	204.6	-	216
Capacity Building	20	-	20	Capacity Building		-	22
<b>Land Policy Reform &amp; MNR Streng.</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>Land Policy Reform &amp; MNR Streng.</b>	<b>297.6</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>407.3</b>
NLAC	100	-	100	NLAC	55.2	-	68
MNR Strength.	200	-	200	MNR Strength.	242.4	32.9	339.3
<b>Auditing</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>Auditing</b>	<b>67.6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Unallocated</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>Unallocated</b>		<b>9.3</b>	<b>10.9</b>
<b>Capitalization Charges</b>	<b>1,076</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>1,150</b>	<b>Capitalization Charges</b>	<b>1,011.00</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>1,085.00</b>
F.I.V.	70	-	70	F.I.V.	5	-	5
Interest	1,006	-	1,006	Interest	1,006.00	-	1,006.00
Credit Comm.	-	Credit Comm.	74	Credit Comm.			
Rotating fund				Rotating fund	25.80	-	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,000</b>	<b>1,860</b>	<b>8,860</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,690.20</b>	<b>1,633.10</b>	<b>8,323.30</b>
				<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>-2.6</b>

Component 1 showed a reduction in costs due to the lower than expected cost of rural surveys, the inability to complete the urban adjudication activities, and lower cost of consulting services. The LMP was very smart in its selection of registration sections for this subcomponent Surveying, and Declaration of Other Rural Registration Sections. It opted to assign registration sections with large agricultural parcels to Swede Survey and contracted local surveyors to survey and map parcels within and near to villages. As a result of its decisions on how to allocate the registration sections, savings of more than half million Belize dollars accrued.

The cost of Component 2 increased as a result of the increased cost of the LIS. The reduction of costs in component 3 was a result of the reduced cost of consulting services.

Component 4 showed an increase as a result of the cost of contracting the IT specialist for the MNR over the extension period. There was a significant increase in project administration expenses due to the extension of the project.

The overall project cost was reduced slightly due to decreased expenditure by the MNR for rural surveys and for building expansion.

#### IV. Project Implementation

##### a. Analysis of Critical Factors

POSITIVE FACTORS	
Description	Effect on output(s) / outcome(s)
Mr. Lindsay Belisle, who has served at the highest administrative and technical levels of the Ministry of Natural Resources and was understanding land management and the operations of Government, was appointed Program Manager of the LMP and remained in that position for the duration of the project.	Both knowledge sets were essential to the implementation of the LMP in a way that keeps the government engaged. This also provided much needed continuity, especially since there was significant turnover in senior personnel over the life of the LMP. The overall result is a satisfactory implementation of the project.

NEGATIVE FACTORS	
Description	Effect on output(s) / outcome(s)
<b><i>Project Design / Component 1 (National Cadastre and Property Rights Registration)</i></b>	
<b><i>Project design / Component 2 (Expansion of Land Administration Services)</i></b>	
The budget set aside for the parcel-based information system did not allow for an all inclusive system. The intention was for a system to be implemented at the Department of Lands & Surveys (DLS). However, at the start of the project the MNR decided that such a system would not meet its needs. The MNR made this decision based on the fact that the LTU was recently transferred from the General Registry, which was under the Judiciary, to the MNR. It quickly became apparent that the LTU needed to be automated and this was brought to the attention of the Bank.	The Bank agreed and provided assistance in the form of a TC to develop a proposal for a complete system, but this delayed implementation of the parcel-based information system under the LMP.
<b><i>Contract Management / Component 2 (Expansion of Land Administration Services)</i></b>	
The international consulting firm contracted to carry out the aerial photo acquisition and production of the ensuing cadastral maps performed very poorly. Though there were major delays the Executing Agency (EA) decided not to terminate the contract as there were concerns about the transferability of the work being done, that is, the EA was	As a result, the urban adjudication and registration activities could not be completed as originally planned.

NEGATIVE FACTORS	
Description	Effect on output(s) / outcome(s)
of the opinion that the required work did not lend itself to a smooth and simple transfer to another firm. It was felt that transferring the work to a new entity would have resulted in considerable delays, and may have even required a complete restart of the activity. The consulting firm continued to work but by the deadline did not produce the cadastral maps required for the urban adjudication activity.	
<b><i>MNR Change of Priority / Component 2 (Expansion of Land Administration Services)</i></b>	
Two years after the start of project execution, the Government changed the land tax laws.	This affected the valuation reconciliation activity by requiring new valuation assessments. This not only delayed the completion of the reconciliation, which in turn impacted the collection of land taxes, but it also complicated the entire tax collection system. Firstly, the DLS had to deploy already scarce human resources to complete the required assessments. Secondly, the DLS now had to collect taxes at different rates for a given land parcel. This led to a reduced rate of tax collection.
<b><i>MNR Change of Priority / Component 4 (Land Policy Reform and Ministry-wide Institutional Strengthening)</i></b>	
To improve the delivery of services the Ministry was to expand its office space within two years of the start of the project. However, this office expansion was never realized. Instead the Ministry refurbished some offices but this was insufficient to meet the new demands.	Additional staff could not be accommodated nor was there sufficient storage space for the products of the adjudication activities.
<b><i>Internal Management of Land Policy / Component 3 (Land Use Planning and Development Review)</i></b>	
Before the activity of delineation of village boundaries could be undertaken, the MRDC and the MNR had to agree on what constituted a village's boundary.	An agreement could not be reached and as a result the Ministry and the Bank agreed that efforts would be directed at defining the boundaries for a smaller subset of 15 villages, down from the original target of 80 villages. These villages were selected based on the perception that there was a general consensus about what should be the village's boundaries. Work proceeded slowly on this activity as several meetings had to be held with each village council.
The activity was also interrupted by the village council elections, which resulted in a change in all village councils.	This change required additional meetings to inform the new village councils about the work to establish village boundaries. By the end of the project only two of the 15 villages received approval of their boundaries and one was passed into law.
<b><i>Internal Management of Land Policy / Component 4 (Land Policy Reform and Ministry-wide Institutional Strengthening)</i></b>	
The land policy reform activities were to be carried out by the NLAC, a body consisting of 14 members appointed by the Minister of Natural Resources, with the support of the LMP. NLAC members work on a voluntary basis and are chosen from across all sectors including, public and private sectors, non-governmental organizations (NGO) and the political party in opposition. Given that it's the Minister that appoints the members, the perception is that the NLAC remains only as long as the Minister remains.	This perception can affect the work and may have affected the work as it related to the project as at times it appeared that the committee was non functional due to general elections and a change in the Minister responsible for the MNR.
The work of the NLAC depended a great deal on the efforts of the chairman of the NLAC. Consequently, when the chairman became ill and eventually left, the NLAC did not function. Second, support from the LMP, in the administrative area, was not consistent as the LMP was unable to keep the services of a part-time consultant to act as coordinator of the NLAC.	Besides the public consultations, little other activity was undertaken by the NLAC; especially, the critical land policy reform issues were not addressed as envisioned. The NLAC never developed the terms of reference for hiring experts in charge of studies on land policy reform options. The NLAC did submit policy recommendations on land allocation and land acquisition to the Minister but these were developed by the committee members using the information gathered at the forums conducted throughout the country. These recommendations did not result in any meaningful change in land policy.

## **b. Borrower/Executing Agency Performance**

The EA set up a PMU to assist with the execution of the project. Overall management of the project was the responsibility of the Project Coordinating Committee (PCC), which served as an advisory body to the EA and the PMU. The PCC comprised of representatives from the different departments and units of the Ministry of Natural Resources, and other stakeholders such as the Ministries of Agriculture and Fisheries, and Rural Development, NGOs, and the City and Town Councils.

### **PMU Performance:**

The PMU moved quickly to contract the needed consulting firms and individual consultants to carry out the project's activities. As a result most of the project's activities started on time. The activities that did not start were outside the PMU's control and included the LIS development, land valuation process improvement, land policy review and the MNR institutional strengthening activities.

In managing the contracts the PMU maintained constant contact with all consultants. Nevertheless, there were delays in a number of areas even though PMU repeatedly requested that contractors improve their performance.

The PMU moved quickly to process deliverables from all consultants with the bulk of the workload coming from component 1 activities.

### **MNR Performance:**

Besides the delays due to consultants' performance there were delays in executing activities as a result of an inability to take required decisions, for example, village boundaries. Also, the MNR proceeded rather slowly with the activities it was responsible for, which included most of the activities in components 2, 3 & 4. As a result those that were completed took until the end of the project though they could have been done before.

**Performance: Satisfactory**

## **c. Bank Performance**

The Bank supported the EA as best as it could with the available human resources for the duration of the LMP. The relationship between the Bank and the EA was always cordial and mutually respectful. From early in the LMP it was obvious that the project was not fully conceptualized as modifications in the project design had to be made for the wider benefit to the public and for greater efficiency and economy of operations and which caused some delays in project implementation. Examples are amendment of the loan contract to support quality and cost vs least cost for the survey contract; the selection of districts for adjudication; the delineation of village boundaries, and others. Also, the Bank's cumbersome process and procedures for the selection and hiring of consultants and the need to get the Bank's approval for everything in advance affected the project performance. For example, to purchase a cheap computer monitor to allow a data entry clerk work to continue had to be delayed for many days because three

quotations had to be obtained and subsequent approval had to be first received from the Bank.

On the other hand, the Bank supported the EA in obtaining TC funds to get a consultancy to explore the possibility of co-financing for a wider LIS but this did not materialize and delayed the implementation of the LIS in accordance with the loan contract. The Bank also met with the survey and adjudication contractor to discuss the delays in deliverables, however, the Bank was not amenable to the inclusion of a financial penalty clause in any contract as an incentive for contractor's to deliver on time.

Two key areas where the EA could have benefitted more are from direct support from a Natural Resources Management Specialist and a Financial Specialist. None of these specialists were resident in Belize for the full duration of the LMP and resident Bank staff was assigned to monitor the project. This affected timely decision making resulting in project delays as information had to be forwarded to Bank specialist outside Belize for decisions to be made and then forwarded back to the EA. With respect to the finance and accounts activities, the LMP faced some challenges that created a few delays in the payment of invoices and salaries and the preparation of the audited financial statements in a timely manner. It appeared that there was no set policy nor procedures to follow as every Financial Specialist that visited changed the way submissions are to be done. Future projects could benefit from the development of an integrated manual of accounting procedures and standards at the start of the project to include topics such as finance, accounting, stores and standards of accounting entry, among others. Despite above challenges, the EA, PMU and Bank worked very closely together to minimize potential delays and which resulted in a successful project that is benefitting Belizeans and others with their land transactions.

Performance: Satisfactory.

## V. Sustainability

### a. Analysis of Critical Factors

Description	Consequences on Sustainability	Next steps
<b><i>Institutional Strengthening and Technology Transfer</i></b>		
Significant efforts were made by the MNR and the PCU to integrate the implementation of the LMP into the work and operations of the Department of Lands and Surveys (DLS). In fact, many of the employees within the program were seconded from the Ministry and/or shared office space with two sections of DLS.	As a result, the Program was not seen as being distinct from the Ministry. Rather, it was seen as a program that was contributing to capacity building within the MNR, and specifically, the DLS. This emphasis on integration made it easier for knowledge transfer to occur.	The institutional design of futures projects should consider that lesson learnt to ensure sustainability ( <i>the current LMP III director is actually a MNR civil servant</i> ).
Operation of the Land Registry has now become an important activity within the DLS, with significant gains in record management through the use of digital technology. This technology introduced by the LMP is robust and it has increased efficiency in the sections of DLS where it is currently deployed.	In order to be fully sustainable, the Ministry needs to complete the deployment of the LIS in all sections of the DLS and the district offices. This will further expand the utility of the parcel based information system. It is also important that decisions be made about how to extend the compulsory registration areas to cover	Future projects (current LMP III and future phases) must take those recommendations into account ( <i>the main output expected from LMP III is actually the finalization of the deployment of the LIS</i> ).

	the entire country that is not managed under the National Parks Systems Act or the Forest Act. The expansion in land administration services should be sustainable since it can be accompanied with increased revenues collected by the MNR as long as the issue of cost recovery is addressed.	
Continuous training of staff to use the technology, and training of specialists to manage and maintain the software is a long term challenge that will need to be grappled with.	If the training issues are addressed, the investment in the expansion of the number of registration sections and the land administration services will be sustainable. The Land Registry will also be in a position to expand the number of registration sections and land parcels managed.	Continuous training is key to avoiding the erosion of knowledge and competences due to too many routine work and staff turnover, and to ensuring the sustainability of new technologies. MNRE should budget resources to ensure recurrent training for the staff that uses the newly deployed LIS ( <i>this is actually budgeted in LMP II</i> ).
The LMP facilitated the preparation of an operations manual that captures the improved processes used by the DLS for land administration activities. All heads of sections participated in the compilation of processes and in the review of the documentation.	The operations manual is now deployed, but over time, as the LIS is deployed in other sections of DLS and in the district offices and for other reasons, processes and procedures will change and new processes and procedures will be added.	It is important that there is a clearly articulated process for updating the manual and disseminating updates. This will help prevent the manual from becoming obsolete, thereby further adding to sustainability of the technology transfer.
<b>Cost Recovery</b>		
An extensive user fee study was conducted within the context of the LMP. Options for fee revisions were recommended based on an analysis of cost factors for the range of services provided by the DLS.	Those recommendations have not been adopted, and no alternative fee structure was considered. This activity seems to have ended with completion of the study.	The subject of fees for services, particularly with a view of ensuring the sustainability of reliable land administrative services, should be revisited in the future ( <i>it is actually considered in LMP II</i> ).
<b>Land Use Planning</b>		
Nothing has been done with the community development plans, and the draft legislation for a decentralized land use framework developed under the LMP has not reached Cabinet for their consideration	Sustainable gains in land use planning and delineation of village boundaries have not been achieved	The shift towards a more integrated approach to land use planning is more likely once the Physical Planning Section of the Ministry is brought into the LIS thereby facilitating linkages with DLS.
This activity did not gain momentum within DLS or the MNR	It is not likely that the MNR will continue to invest in village boundaries after the LMP	In hindsight, there would have been more value in mapping the land parcels and the assets of villages. Such data could serve useful to disaster mitigation and response organizations and to the village councils. Such an activity should probably be pursued through the Ministry of Rural Development.

The Bank has had a continued presence in the country in this sector. Since 1997, three loans have been approved. The LMP III now in execution was important to provide continuity to the work started under the LMP II. In the longer term, any future support of this sector should look into strengthening national capacity for planning, implementing and maintaining the work being carried out.

## **b. Potential Risks**

The main risk to sustainability would have been the potential failure to continue implementation of the LIS at the three DLS sections where it had been deployed. However, as of 2011, it clearly appears that the LIS has been fully and continuously

used in those sections, with a high level of satisfaction from the staff. Additionally, the four remaining sections of DLS (National Estates, Valuation, Physical Planning and Land Titles) show impatience and excitement to have the same very useful and performing tool deployed at their level by 2012.

### **c. Institutional Capacity**

As mentioned in section V.a., the integration of the Program into the work and operations of the Department of Lands and Surveys contributed significantly in enhancing the capacity of the MNR to sustain the gains achieved, particularly in three key units of the DSL (Land registry, Survey and Mapping, and the Land Information Center). Overall institutional capacity was also enhanced through training of the Valuation Section, a business process review and the preparation of the Operations Manual for DLS. The sustainability of the Program achievements will be monitored during the implementation of the "Land Management Program III" (project BL-L1008, loan 2208/OC-BL), which started at the beginning of 2010 and is the continuity of the LMP.

## **VI. Monitoring and Evaluation**

### **a. Information on Results**

A mid-term review was conducted in September 2004 and concluded that execution overall had been satisfactory. One of the main issues, resulting from a key weakness of the Program design, was the need to compile a baseline for quantitative indicators agreed upon for monitoring and evaluation. Indeed, the Loan Proposal had underscored that the measurement of the program's impact would require the collection of statistical data during the 4-year period of execution to establish the baseline situation and to determine the changes occurring as a result of the LMP. The Ministry and the PMU agreed to include the 2002 baseline in the next progress report prepared by the PMU. The submission of this baseline data by the MNR was, however, delayed, by lack of capacity to collect the necessary information. Consequently, it was agreed in 2006 that the Bank would fund a consultancy for the collection of baseline and monitoring data for 2002-2008. This consultancy, which resulted in the design of software for the generation of statistical reports, was completed in April 2008 just a few months prior to the completion of the LMP. However, those indicators went beyond the project's scope (the indicators: stamp duty collected, land tax payable, land tax paid, land rent payable, land rent paid, new mortgages, and land transfers, were more related to the long term impact of the improvement of land management in Belize, and were not usable to evaluate the achievement of the project outcomes), and available data from fiscal year 2002-2003 to fiscal year 2007-2008 on land revenues collected, new mortgages and land transfers do not indicate a consistent trend and it is likely that several external factors affected these indicators. Consequently, the routine monitoring of the program was focused only on the achievement of activities and outputs, while the measurement of the progress of outcomes remained impossible.

Both a final report prepared by the PMU, and an independent final evaluation, have also been conducted and provide detailed information on results.



The mid-term review report, the final report and the final evaluation report are presented in Annexes.

## **b. Future Monitoring and Ex-Post Evaluation**

The project outcomes and potential future impacts of LMP will be monitored during the implementation of the "Land Management Program III". The high level indicators (impact and outcome levels) will be obtained through the operation of the Land Information System itself, which was designed and partially deployed during LMP and will be expanded to the 7 sections of the DLS and the 6 district offices by the end of 2012.

## **VII. Lessons Learned**

<b>Situations</b>	<b>Lessons learnt</b>
<p><b>Evaluability and clarity of the objectives of the Program.</b> It is not always possible / easy to precisely assess the achievement of the Program, by lack of vertical logic of the intervention (what can be attributed to the intervention?) and absence of systematic and clear baseline and target for all the indicators.</p> <p>The components (1 and 2) that had the best results were those that had the clearest objectives and most clearly articulated benchmarks. On the contrary, in component 3, nothing was articulated in the benchmark so its accomplishment could not be used to measure the success of achievement of the component or of the Program;. What would be done with its results was not clear.</p> <p>Consequently, though the community development plans were prepared, nothing was done with them. Similarly, the benchmark for component 4 did not measure achievement of the range of activities that were to be completed.</p>	<p>The results matrix needs to be perfectly logical, with outcomes, outputs and milestones clearly stated and articulated, and baseline and targets need to be clearly defined.</p> <p>Not doing so</p> <p>(i) can result in bad implementation, because what needs to be done and by which organizations / agencies / stakeholders will also not be clear, and/or less emphasis may be given to the objective and benchmarks that are confused or appear not to be relevant;</p> <p>(ii) impedes the evaluation of the project achievements.</p>
<p><b>Integration.</b> The implementation of the program was integrated into the work and operations of the DLS. Many of the employees within the program were employees of the Ministry. The Program also shared office space with two sections of DLS. The LMP was not seen as being distinct from the Ministry. Rather, it was seen as a program that was contributing to capacity building (skills development, process improvement and institutional strengthening) within the MNR, and specifically, the DLS. The result of this integration within the DLS was that components 1 and 2 of the LMP, that had the most direct benefit and beneficial change to the work of the DLS, were the most successful in their implementation. The same level of integration did not occur with other stakeholders / beneficiaries. As a result, component 3, which had the potential to impact the work of the Ministry of Local Government, the Ministry of Housing, the Rural Development Department and the municipal and village governments, did not performed well. Component 4 could have impacted the work of the MNR with respect to its land and natural resource policies and processes, but as the Program was not integrated into the general work and processes of the Ministry, it did not give the expected results.</p>	<p>The concept of being "a part of" rather than "apart from", makes it easier for ownership and knowledge transfer to occur.</p> <p>The less integrated the key stakeholders and beneficiaries were, the less successful was the program in delivering the expected outputs.</p>
<p><b>Government Commitment.</b> The Government in general and the Ministry of Natural Resources in particular is committed to implementing the Registered Land Act, and there is a commitment to improvement in land</p>	<p>In any project, the commitment of the stakeholders is critical to success and to the achievement of the project objectives.</p>



administration. The result is that there was significant progress in Component One and Component Two of the LMP. The situation is exactly opposite for components 3 and 4, with very few commitment from stakeholders and very few achievements (or studies and pilots were achieved, but not followed by actions).	
<b>Continuity in Program Administration.</b> The Director of the Program served from the inception to completion of the LMP. His experience and knowledge of the sector and the Ministry helped to prioritize work that would most advance the overall objectives of the program. Also, there were times when staff turnover and staff shortage could have had negative impacts on program implementation. This was averted to some extent because the program director was able to identify, along with the ministry, alternative options for dealing with such situations. On the contrary, turnover in other senior positions had some effect on the ability of the program to complete some outputs.	Continuity leads to consistency in program focus. The drive should be to minimize the need for leadership change by giving serious consideration to the competences, experience and qualities required in the leadership positions and assess those applying for these positions against those requirements.
<b>Tenure Clarification and Declaration of Registration Sections</b>  During the LMP, the Department of Lands and Survey used several approaches to tenure clarification and mapping rural and urban compulsory registration areas. The approaches included the use of an international surveying firm to collect and organize the parcel information, the use of local surveyors to develop survey plans, the management of employed field teams to survey and map, and the use of large scale orthophotos and ground verification to compile parcel maps.  Review of the registration sections declared under the LMP indicates that the estimate of parcels in a proposed registration section is often less than the actual number mapped.	<p>The range of data collected and the extent of the databases vary with each method. Nonetheless, there is enough information from each approach to guide discussions about the data that is useful and the methods that can be efficient and cost effective as new registration sections are declared. The lessons on timeliness, quality of delivery, the range of uses of the datasets, and costs should all be taken into consideration in the discussion on options for the continuation of the declaration of compulsory registration sections.</p> <p>Several factors contribute to this situation. Two important contributors are that occupants of national lands without legal tenure are facilitated to apply for lease tenure and private lands that are subdivided may not be accounted for in the initial count, especially in areas where the compilations are not current. This is likely to be the case as new registration sections are declared. This lesson should be taken into consideration when costs are being estimated.</p> <p>More generally, at the time to extend the compulsory registration areas to other parts of the country, the Ministry will have to build on the general experience of the extensive work done by the LMP in Corozal, Orange Walk and two registration sections in Rural Belize districts and in four urban areas.</p>
<b>Need for a Shared Vision among Proponents.</b> The LMP had many proponents; including the Department of Lands and Survey, the Ministry of Natural Resources, the ministry responsible for rural development, the ministry responsible for local government, and various municipal bodies. The proponents had varying views on concepts such as village boundaries, planning and land use legislation, and access to information. Were the vision was not shared there was less progress.	The lesson is that the proponents of projects need to have shared vision about the outputs of the investments and the benefits that will be derived. The differing views on what constitutes a village serve as an example of where differing vision could stall a discussion and the achievement of an expected outcome. Where visions are not shared, the dominant proponent will seek to achieve the outcomes that matter most to them.
<b>Land Administration.</b> The LMP developed a scheme for a parcel based information system and adopted the Land Folio interface developed by Stewart International. The limitation is that the parcel based information system is only being used for compulsory registration sections. Land outside the compulsory registration areas do not benefit from the parcel based information system.	To leverage the benefit, more areas will need to be declared as compulsory registration areas.
<b>The Use of Pilot Projects and Studies.</b> The LMP	

<p>implemented several studies (business review, review of fees for service, review of options for coordination, and legislative review of land use planning) and pilot projects (formulation of community development and land use plans, delineation of village boundaries).</p> <p>Normally, studies should be used to identify options for a way forward. They should carry out analyses to support discussions on the options and guide decision making. But most of the studies carried out under the LMP were not used to make an explicit decision about a way forward. They were accepted as the final products rather than as a means for further action.</p> <p>Similarly, pilot projects should not be outputs <i>per se</i>, but should test models for implementation with the view to learn lessons that will guide a roll out process.</p>	<p>All programs should be clear about how studies will contribute to decision making processes – how to ensure that actions will be taken on the recommendations of the reports. If there is no clarity about how the studies will be used, it is likely that they will not be used. Clarity about how the studies will be used will also ensure that they review the right kind of information and provide analysis that will be useful.</p> <p>A process for the assessment and review of the performance of a pilot needs to be developed during the design of the pilot and before implementation. If the evaluation process and how the lessons will be used are not clear, it is likely that the pilot will not be assessed and the roll out will not happen.</p> <p>Also, pilot projects should be designed, implemented and evaluated by the parties who will carry out the roll out of the process. Without their participation, it is likely that the lessons will not be internalized and will not inform the discussion about the roll out.</p>
<p><b>National Land Advisory Committee.</b> The NLAC is provided for in the National Lands Act but the Act is silent on how it should be constituted or on how it should operate to carry out its function. The efforts of the LMP show that if there is no clarity about how a body operates, it will be in a difficult position to fulfill its mandate. The NLAC was reconstituted three different times during the life of the LMP and each time it became dormant without achieving the task outlined.</p>	<p>For the NLAC to fulfill its role as articulated in the National Lands Act, there has to be clarity about how it is constituted and how it operates. Providing support for its operation without due consideration and agreements about its modus operandi will make it difficult to overcome obstacles and accomplish its tasks.</p>
<p>The reasons for project delays are often attributed to the quality of the consultancies. The proper supervision of the latter by the Executing Agencies is key, as well as the EAs capacity to make decisions in case of execution delays or failure.</p>	<p>The contracts signed with the firms must systematically include clear penalties to apply in case of execution delays or failure. The triggers to apply the penalties must also be very well defined. Those mechanisms can allow the Executing Agencies to ensure a proper execution, or to make quick decisions if the firms must be replaced.</p>

## **Annexes**

- [Minutes from the Exit Workshop](#)
- [Borrower Evaluation](#)
- Presentations:
  - a) [Presentation Project Manager](#)
  - b) [Presentation Independent Evaluator](#)
- Others
  - a. [Mid-term review](#)
  - b. [Final evaluation](#)
  - c. [Final report by the Borrower](#)
  - d. [Fiscal and Transaction data from 2002 to 2008](#)

## **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

DLS	Department of Lands & Surveys
EA	Executing Agency
GPS	Global Positioning System
IT	Information Technology
LIS	Land Information System
LMP	Land Management Program
LR	Land Registry
LTU	Land Titles Unit
MNR	Ministry of Natural Resources
MRDC	Ministry of Rural Development and Culture
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NLAC	National Land Advisory Committee
PCC	Project Coordinating Committee
PMU	Project Management Unit
RIM	Registry Index Map
TC	Technical Cooperation

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Acronyms and Abbreviations.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Table of Contents.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. Basic Information .....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
<b>II. The Project.....</b>	<b>5</b>
a. Project Context.....	5
b. Project Description.....	6
<b>III. Results.....</b>	<b>8</b>
a. Outcomes .....	8
b. Externalities .....	8
c. Outputs .....	9
d. Project Costs.....	17
<b>IV. Project Implementation .....</b>	<b>18</b>
a. Analysis of Critical Factors .....	18
b. Borrower/Executing Agency Performance.....	20
c. Bank Performance .....	20
<b>V. Sustainability .....</b>	<b>21</b>
a. Analysis of Critical Factors .....	21
b. Potential Risks.....	22
c. Institutional Capacity .....	23
<b>VI. Monitoring and Evaluation .....</b>	<b>23</b>
a. Information on Results.....	23
b. Future Monitoring and Ex-Post Evaluation.....	24
<b>VII. Lessons Learned .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>VIII. Annexes.....</b>	<b>27</b>

## I. Basic Information

BASIC DATA (AMOUNTS IN US\$)	
<b>PROJECT NO:</b> BL0017	<b>TITLE:</b> Land Administration II (Known as "Land Management Program – LMP")
<b>Borrower:</b> Government of Belize <b>Executing Agency (EA):</b> Ministry of Natural Resources	<b>Date of Board Approval:</b> June 6, 2001 <b>Date of Loan Contract Effectiveness:</b> February 18, 2002 <b>Date of Eligibility for First Disbursement:</b> July 23, 2002
<b>Loan(s):</b> 1322/OC-BL <b>Sector:</b> Agriculture and Rural Development	<b>Months in Execution</b> * from Approval: 89 * from Contract Effectiveness: 80
<b>Lending Instrument:</b> Investment	<b>Disbursement Periods</b> <b>Original Date of Final Disbursement:</b> February 18, 2006 <b>Current Date of Final Disbursement:</b> June 30, 2010 <b>Cumulative Extension (Months):</b> 52 <b>Special Extension (months):</b> 29 (to allow payment of contracted commitments, realization of the final audit, reimbursement of unused revolving funds, and cancellation of undisbursed resources).
	<b>Loan Amount(s)</b> * <b>Original Amount:</b> 7,000,000 (IDB) + 1,860,000 (GoB) * <b>Current Amount:</b> 7,000,000 (IDB) + 1,860,000 (GoB) * <b>Pari Passu (if applicable):</b> YES
<b>Poverty Targeted Investment (PTI):</b> No <b>Social Equity (SEQ):</b> Yes	<b>Disbursements</b> <b>Disbursement:</b> 6,690,205 (96%) <b>Cancellation:</b> 309,795 (4%)
<b>Environmental Classification:</b> B	<b>Total Project Cost (Original Estimate):</b> 8,860,000 <b>Redirectioning:</b> NO  *  <b>On Alert Status</b> <b>Is project currently designated "on alert" by PAIS:</b> No  <b>Comments on relevance of "on alert" status for this project (if applicable):</b>

Summary Performance Classifications				
DO	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Probable (HP)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Probable (P)	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Probability (LP)	<input type="checkbox"/> Improbable (I)
IP	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory (HS)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory (S)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory (US)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unsatisfactory (VU)
SU	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Probable (HP)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Probable (P)	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Probability (LP)	<input type="checkbox"/> Improbable (I)

## **II. The Project**

### **a. Project Context**

Belize encompasses a total land area of 22,960 km<sup>2</sup> of which 5% is distributed over more than 1,060 islands. Public lands account for 46% (approximately 1 million ha) of the total land surface of Belize. These public lands are further divided into: (i) Protected areas and forest reserves which represent over 30% of the total national territory, and (ii) Other 'national lands' (16% of the total national territory) which are either already allocated under a government lease or un-leased public land. Privately held lands represent 54% (approximately 1.2 million ha) of the total national territory which consists of over 1 million ha in rural parcels greater than 40 ha. Small private urban parcels account for less than 0.1% of the total national territory. It is estimated that there exists between 90,000 and 105,000 land parcels that can eventually form part of the national cadastre. To the extent that land rights are secure and fully registered, these parcels could contribute to a dynamic real estate market that is responsive to sustainable development and private sector investment.

Building on the gains made with an earlier Bank-financed project (1017/OC-BL), the Land Administration Program II, commonly named Land Management Program (LMP), was designed to address the main problem of tenuous land security associated with the use of two separate ownership registration systems with only one of them (pursuant to the Land Registry Act) providing for effective management of land records and more secure property title associated with a unique identifier for all registered parcels. The proposed strategy was to promote the conversion of a significant portion of the country towards a single Land Registry in both rural and urban areas, with pilot activities in the latter. This was to be accompanied by the development of a capacity to resolve more complex land management functions such as land valuation, land use and national land policy in a more integrated manner. A key concept of the strategy was to sequence investments and activities in step with an institutional strengthening process that would ensure that the changes brought about by the LMP were well absorbed by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), the executing agency for the Program.

Major changes in the Ministry's policy affected the project early on. First was the issue to pursue an LIS that included not only the registry but also the Land Titles Unit, which was transferred to the Ministry just around the time of approval of the project. This delayed implementation of the Land Information System. The Ministry also decided that rather than contracting a firm to complete a business process review for the Department of Lands and Surveys, they would do it themselves. This took a long time to get off the ground and as a result the Ministry could not provide the baseline data required. Without the input of the Ministry the central government also decided that it would change the land tax law and this affected the land valuation work, and the collection of land taxes. During the period of project execution elections were held for village councils and this resulted in a change of all village councils, which greatly impeded the work on village boundaries. The work of the National Land Advisory Council was impeded by the chairman's illness, general elections in the country and a change of Minister. These events all contributed to a lack of continuity on the work of land policy reform.

## **b. Project Description**

### **i. Development Objective(s)**

The overall objective of the project is to secure more efficient and sustainable use of land resources through enhanced land security, effective land markets and the promotion of a coherent land policy framework.

The objectives stated in the Logical framework remained unchanged over the life of the LMP. The verifiable indicators remained essentially the same, though the language was improved over time to become more precise. Documentation of the improvements can be found in successive Project Performance and Monitoring Reports (PPMRs) produced by the IDB. Based on discussion with representatives of the IDB and the Program Management Unit, the log frame was not updated as the language of the verifiable indicators was improved. Nevertheless, at the time to prepare this PCR, it clearly appears that it would have been beneficial to update the log frame, for the following reasons: (i) it is actually not logical: there is a lack of causal relations between "outputs" and "outcomes"; and several targets/results presented as "outputs" are actually outcomes or milestones (ii) several baselines and targets are missing, making, in those cases, difficult to conclude about the Program performance.

### **ii. Components**

The project consisted of the following components:

**National Cadastre and Property Rights Registration.** Under this component land security in rural and urban areas was to be enhanced through the declaration of Compulsory Registration Sections and the preparation of Registry Index Maps (RIM) for each section. There would be land tenure clarification and property rights registration of an estimated 15,000 rural parcels (approximately 50% of all rural parcels to be registered) in a total of three districts. The same would happen for 500 urban parcels (approximately 2% of all urban parcels) in two registration sections in Belize City, using a streamlined approach to urban surveying and mapping based on aerial photography, survey compilations and ground verification. The holders of these parcels would be assisted with the first registration of their property rights in accordance with the Land Registered Act. In addition, approximately 5,000 rural parcels were to be surveyed and mapped, and declared as registration sections; but First Registration was not to be completed by the program. Similarly, 21,300 urban parcels in four urban areas (Orange Walk Town, Belize City, San Ignacio/Santa Elena and Dangriga) were to be mapped, and compulsory registration sections would be declared for them. However, it was expected that in both instances (rural and urban), the landholders would use their own initiative to complete the first registration.

**Expansion of Land Administration Services.** This component sought to improve the efficiency, reliability and accountability of land administration services provided by MNR. At the time that the LMP was being formulated the Ministry was managing two sets of land records. Operating two centers for land records, each with a different set of rules was increasing the complexity of service delivery and of internal activities such as land valuation, taxation and management of the parcel information system. One of the expected outcomes of this component of the LMP was a computerized and searchable database of the records of the Land



**Titles Unit (LTU) and the consolidation of at least 3000 land parcel records into the Land Registry (LR).** This consolidation was to enhance reliable and timely access to property records at the Land Registry thereby reducing the costs associated with land transactions. In the process, other land administration services would be improved. Another expected output of this component was a national parcel-based land information system. This database would be used to manage national land and land held under leasehold and freehold titles. This component also included the reconciliation of valuation records, updating of assessments and training in land valuation methodologies.

**Land Use Planning and Development Review.** This component of the LMP was to improve public sector capacity to plan for, review, and monitor land use changes; including development proposals. It was to develop and propose a decentralized national land use planning framework, prepare local land use plans and delineate village boundaries. The latter was to be undertaken in partnership with the Ministry of Rural Development and Culture (MRDC).

**Land Policy Reform and MNR Institutional Strengthening:** Under this component the LMP was to provide support to the National Land Advisory Committee (NLAC) in the formulation of policy reform recommendations. Through this component, investment would also be made for complementary institutional strengthening of MNR to implement the reforms and monitor their impact. The latter included, among various strategic improvements, the development of a performance-oriented Information Technology (IT) strategy and a Ministry-wide plan for the phased introduction of fees for services.

### **iii. Execution**

To execute the project the Executing Agency set up a Project Management Unit to take on the project's activities. Overall management of the project was the responsibility of the Project Coordinating Committee (PCC), which served as an advisory body to the EA and the PMU. The PCC comprised of representatives from the different departments and units of the Ministry of Natural Resources, and other stakeholders such as the Ministries of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF), and Rural Development, NGOs, and the City and Town Councils. It was expected that some if not all of these agencies would collaborate on some of the project's activities, e.g., adjudication process, land valuation process review, community development plans, and land policy reform. Being part of the PCC meant the agencies would have intimate knowledge about the project and its activities.

### III. Results

*All the "outcomes" and "outputs" are presented as they appeared in the original logical framework and as they were measured in the final evaluation report.*

#### a. Outcomes

ACHIEVEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES (DO)					
<b>Development Objective(s) (Purpose):</b> Secure more efficient and sustainable use of land resources through enhanced land security, effective land markets and the promotion of a coherent land policy framework.					
Key Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Planned outcomes (target at the end of project)	Achieved outcomes (date: 2008)	Comments	Classification
Ratio of total lease approvals, lease certificates and property titles (annual basis by district).	Not available	Increased by 20%	Not available	One of the agreements of the mid-term review of September 2004 is that the Ministry of Natural Resources was to provide the data after completing their "business process review" but they could never provide it.	Probable
Savings (based on average rural and urban parcel size) in the provision of land administration services compared to LAP (surveying, mapping, adjudication and registration).	Not available	Reduced by 20%.	Not available	However, even with data as of 2008, assessment of the degree to which the Development Objective was achieved would have been impeded by: (a) the absence of indicators more directly related to land tenure security; (b) the absence of a baseline together with %-based targets; (c) the nature of the indicators themselves which, in some instances, went beyond the project's scope particularly with regard to the improvement of land markets. Available data from fiscal year 2002-2003 to fiscal year 2007-2008 on land revenues collected, new mortgages and land transfers do not indicate a consistent trend and it is likely that several external factors affected these indicators.	
Increase in the number and reductions in the average time for processing land-related transactions (private parcels and national estates).	Not available	Reduced by 30%.	Not available	We estimate that the classification was "improbable" in 2008 at the end of the execution, but is "probable" in 2011, it is because (i) the improvement of land transactions (described by the current outcome indicators) would have mainly resulted from the implementation of a performing Land Information System (LIS),(ii) the design and implantation of the LIS was critically delayed during the Program and its implementation started only at the end of the execution period and (iii) the LIS operates very well in 2011 in the 3 sections of the Department of Land and Survey were it has been deployed.	

#### b. Externalities

More local surveyors are now experienced in the use of Global Positioning System (GPS) technology for conducting land surveys. They received both theoretical and practical training in the use of this technology and as a result they are capable of conducting surveys more rapidly. For the future, this is expected to reduce the cost of surveys and contribute to a more dynamic land market that should benefit both investors and landowners.

The adjudication of parcels in rural areas done by local surveyors and the issuance of some 12, 568 certificates to land owners were not project activities but could be considered as positive project externalities. These would have otherwise had to be done by the MNRE with consequent delays and inconveniences to the land owners in receiving their certificates.

### c. Outputs

*Main sources: loan proposal and final evaluation report of the Program (October 2, 2008).*

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 1: National Cadastre and Property Rights Registration					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
Sub-component 1: Cadastre, tenure clarification and registration of rural parcels (budget – US\$2,825,,000)					
Land tenure clarification and registration of definitive property rights for rural parcels	N/A	15,000 parcels in 3 districts	16,445 parcels in Corozal, Orange Walk and Belize districts	Under the loan contract, those with land interest would have needed to travel to Belmopan to process their first registration. The PCC made the decision that more progress would be made and more people would benefit if the process also included first registration. Consequently, first registration became part of the services provided under this sub component, and many of those with interest were facilitated with their first registration. Target is exceeded not only from the quantitative, but also from the qualitative point of view. However, the implementation of the sub-component suffered important delays.	Highly Satisfactory
Surveying, mapping, and declaration as registration areas for additional rural parcels	N/A	5,000 parcels	7,673 parcels		Satisfactory
Sub-component 2: Cadastre, tenure clarification and registration of urban parcels (budget – US\$78,000)					
Adjudication and registration of property rights for urban parcels	N/A	500 parcels in Belize City	1,493 parcels surveyed and declared But only 380 claims for conversion collected.	Initially, the related activities were to be undertaken by the same firm which performs the activities in the rural areas (Swede Survey) but their contract was terminated at the completion of their delivery for Orange Walk and Corozal, because of huge time overruns. So those activities were undertaken directly by the Project Management Unit. Work could not be completed due to consulting firm's failure to deliver RIMs.	Unsatisfactory
Surveying, mapping, and declaration as registration areas for additional urban parcels	N/A	20,800 parcels in Belize City, Dangriga, Orange Walk, San Ignacio/Santa Elena	20,379 parcels in the 4 cities	Although the quantitative target is met, the survey and mapping was not satisfactorily done by Finnmap (poor quality). The LMP III has to finance the parcel remediation to improve the mapping integrity of the parcels in the 4 areas.	Unsatisfactory
Sub-component 1.3: Public awareness and participation in land tenure clarification (budget – US\$200,000)					
National, district-level and local media campaigns	N/A	Campaigns completed in 3 districts	Campaigns launched in 3 districts		Satisfactory
CBOs participating in monitoring and education activities in at least 3 districts	N/A	Not available	Several Community Cased Organizations participated		Satisfactory

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 1: National Cadastre and Property Rights Registration					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
Global qualification of the component				<p>The two international consulting firms working on adjudication, survey, and mapping activities did not perform well. They were consistently behind schedule and the targets could not be met in a timely manner. Consequently, the project had to be extended to ensure completion of activities in the rural areas, and to give the firm working in urban areas time to complete its work. Activities were completed in rural areas and targets were surpassed. In addition, the project issued 12,658 certificates (lease and freehold title), which was not part of the project original design. However, in urban areas, the activities could not be completed as the consulting firm never finished the surveying &amp; mapping of the urban parcels, which prevented declaration of registration areas. Only one area was declared, the area where the pilot urban adjudication took place.</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory (because of the preponderant weight of the highly satisfactory sub-component 1, which is reflected by the budget allocation (&gt; 90% of the budget for component 1))</b></p>

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 2: Expansion of land administration services					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
<b>Sub-component 2.1: Consolidation of the Land Registry (budget – US\$148,000)</b>					
<b>Consolidation of land documents from the General Register into the Land Registry</b>	N/A	3,000 land records consolidated in 3 districts	3,153 records consolidated + 3,571 new land records developed and added to the Land Registry, for Corozal, Orange Walk and Belize districts		Highly Satisfactory
<b>Volume of land transactions handled yearly</b>	<i>Information not available</i>	Increased by 30%	<i>Information not available</i>	The land registry provided statistics for the entire country for the calendar years from 2002-2004. total approvals increased from 2,550 to 3,102 to 5,086 for the three years. However, as the project started in 2002 and LIS started been implemented in 2008, this result cannot be attributed to the Program.	<i>Classification impossible because of absence of data</i>
<b>Online access to Land Registry data</b>	No access	Access achieved for all 7 sections of the DLS + 6 district offices	No access	This was included in the contract related to the Land Information System, but the Ministry eventually decided to suspend indefinitely the implementation of online access to the Land Registry database.	Very unsatisfactory
<b>Sub-component 2.2: Improving land valuation and taxation processes (budget – US\$210,000)</b>					
<b>Valuation staff trained</b>	N/A	<i>No target</i>	9 training days provided to public and private sector valuers		Satisfactory
<b>Reconciliation of valuation records</b>	N/A	Reconciliation completed in 6 districts	Reconciliation and updating of the valuation rolls and data entry of this information and others contained in the Valuation Rolls achieved	The Government changed the land tax laws in 2004. Consequently, although the target was already met, a new tax assessment was required and the Ministry had to divert resources in order to update all land valuation records. The new assessments (including new up-date of the valuation rolls) were ongoing at the time of the final evaluation. However, the initial output achieved was not useless as the law was not retroactive.	Satisfactory
<b>Efficiency gain in land revenue collection.</b>	<i>Information not available</i>	Increased by 35%	<i>Information not available</i>	As the Revenue Section was (and is still) not fully integrated into the Land Information System, they had / have limited ability to be current on land transactions that are underway.	<i>Classification impossible because of absence of information, but probably unsatisfactory</i>
<b>Increase in the collection of arrears</b>	<i>Information not available</i>	<i>No target</i>	<i>Information not available</i>		<i>Classification impossible because of absence of information</i>
<b>Valuation methodology</b>	Not standardiz	Standardized	No change in the valuation methodology	The Ministry decided that they would not pursue this as the municipal authorities were not in favor of changing their	Very Unsatisfactory

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 2: Expansion of land administration services					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
	ed			methodology.	
Sub-component 2.3: National parcel-based information system (budget – US\$742,000)					
<b>Cadastral data, orthophoto maps and LIC GIS integrated into a parcel-based information system</b>	Parcel-based information system does not exist, data not integrated	Data integrated in the Land Information System	<b>Cadastral data, orthophoto maps and LIC data integrated</b>	Output achieved with delays, as the Ministry took time to explore the possibility of funding a LIS that would include both the Land Registry and the Land Titles Unit, which was not part of the project scope.	Satisfactory
<b>1:4:000 aerial photographs acquired and processed</b>	N/A	175 km2	Partially completed	The consulting firm hired to capture and process the photos performed very poorly and at the end of the project still had not delivered some very important products, namely, Registry Index Maps (RIM) and the Digital Terrain Models (DTM).	Unsatisfactory
<b>Delivery of land information product to towns, villages and private sector</b>	<i>Information not available</i>	"Increased" but no target	No products	No activity performed. This was ignored, emphasis was placed on online access (access via the world wide web) and ensuring that the MNREI service centers had access to the LIS.	Very Unsatisfactory
Sub-component 2.4: Institutional strengthening for land management (budget – US\$152,000)					
<b>MNREI service centers</b>	One DLS office in each district but they work on National Estate only	Centers fully operating in all districts	Land information system (LIS) developed and implemented only in 3 sections of the Department of Land and Surveys in Belmopan.	Access to the Land Folio system would have enabled the district offices to provide other services than National Estate to the public. But bandwidth had been identified as a limiting factor in the provision of access to the Land Folio system in the district centers. The Ministry was never able to propose a solution for this problem.	Very unsatisfactory
<b>Department of Land and Survey staff trained</b>	N/A	50% of staff trained	<i>Information not available</i>		<i>Classification impossible because of absence of information</i>
<b>Global qualification of the component</b>				The most significant output in this component is the development and implementation of the Land Information System, which resulted in a very performing tool, but with many delays.	<b>Satisfactory</b>

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 3: Land use planning and development review					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
Sub-component 3.1: Establishment of a decentralized national land use planning framework (budget – US\$100,000)					
Public forums completed on decentralized framework	N/A	No target	6 district and 2 regional workshops held		Satisfactory
Agreement with City and town councils on indicators and streamlined regulations	No agreement	Agreement reached	No agreement	Consultancy conducted to identify mechanisms for effective coordination and communication among various government departments, local government agencies and the general public who carry out land transactions. Role of local authorities and mechanisms for them to be effective in land use planning identified and documented. But no specific actions taken to implement the recommendations. At the time of the evaluation, no agreement was reached between the parties on the sharing of land management responsibilities. It is always difficult to get coordination and agreement at government departments in Belize. Consequently, it seems that the Ministry did not give to that inter-governmental coordination issue the priority specified in the Program, beyond the hiring of a consultant to look at the issue.	Very unsatisfactory
Number of incomplete and/or non-compliant development and subdivision applications received	Information not available	Reduced by 30%	Information not available	The project did not address those issues.	Very unsatisfactory
Compliance with development regulations	Information not available	"Increased" but no qualitative/quantitative target	Information not available		
Sub-component 3.2: Local land use planning activities (budget – US\$380,000)					
Community development plans approved	0	5 (according to logframe) 3 (according to the loan proposal narrative)	3	There is general knowledge and awareness of the existence of a community development and land use plan in the respective communities, but those plans are not used for land use and land allocation decisions. Their use is the responsibility of the Rural Development Department in the case of rural communities, and of the Housing and Planning Department and the City Council in the case of communities in Belize City. Neither of these parties were significant players in the formulation of the community plans and they did not participate in a review of the process or the products.	Unsatisfactory (initial output achieved but not used)
Boundaries for villages delineated, official village maps published and incorporated to parcel-based information system	0	80 villages (initial logframe)  Delineation of 15 village boundaries only (after midterm review)	4 village boundaries proposal prepared, of which 2 were approved, of which 1 statutory instrument prepared for signature.	Disagreement about the definition of village boundaries: for MNRE, village boundaries encompass the residential areas of villages, whereas for the Ministry of Rural Development and Culture, boundaries should include residential & agricultural land and provision for village expansion. as a result the activity commenced very late. In addition, village council elections interrupted the process by the end of the project.	Very unsatisfactory
Sub-component 3.3: Capacity building in land use planning and development review (budget – US\$20,000)					
Land use planning and	Information	"Strengthened" in	No change in	A small budget was annexed to the logframe but no activities were	Very

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 3: Land use planning and development review					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
monitoring skills	<i>n not available</i>	MNREI, Belize City and 7 town administration	comparison with the situation before the project	provisioned in the loan proposal narrative. No activity was implemented. The Ministry did not see this as a priority.	unsatisfactory
Use of the parcel-based information system by City and town planners	No parcel- based information system	"Increased", but no target	No change in comparison with the situation before the project	A small budget was annexed to the logframe but no activities were provisioned in the loan proposal narrative. No activity was implemented.	Very unsatisfactory
Global qualification of the component					<b>Very Unsatisfactory</b>



IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 4: Land policy reform and Ministry-wide institutional strengthening					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
<b>Sub-component 4.1: support for the National Land Advisory Committee (budget – US\$100,000)</b>					
<b>National Land Advisory Committee sets priorities for its agenda on an annual basis in consultation with Stakeholders</b>	No participative & annual plan	Participative & annual plan	Participative plan prepared for the 1 <sup>st</sup> year only	The NLAC was essentially a single-person committee; the NLAC's chairman's illness shortly after commencing, along with the lack of a coordinator, negatively affected the work of the NLAC. After the change in chairman, the NLAC was never able to embark on a sustained period of activity.	Unsatisfactory
<b>Expert studies on land reform options</b>	No studies	Studies commissioned and results disseminated (but no quantitative target, for instance, minimum number of studies)	No expert studies commissioned	The NLAC carried out some studies themselves. Recommendations were made to the Minister but not supported by expert studies. No evidence that anything was done with the recommendations.	Very Unsatisfactory
<b>Open forums (on the NLAC reform agenda)</b>	N/A	Held in all districts	Held in all districts		Satisfactory
<b>Sub-component 4.2: complementary institutional strengthening of MNREI (budget – US\$200,000)</b>					
<b>MNREI unit performance indicators</b>	<i>Information not available</i>	Established and linked to service and product delivery	A business process review report prepared for DLS, but indicators not used by the MNRE	The business process review took a long time, over a period where there were changes (in personnel) in various sections within DLS as well as within the Ministry as a whole. Consequently, while the review was completed (with target rates for the various processes), the strategic plan was not. In addition, the MNR decided that it would use the system of performance indicators put in place for all ministries and departments of the government. A procedures manual to promote best practice and standardization in service provision in the various sections of the Department of Lands and Survey was also developed and the final document has been accepted as reflecting the current processes, procedures and workflow. At the time of the final evaluation, what was outstanding was a process for keeping the manual current and to ensure that it would be used.	Unsatisfactory
<b>IT plan completed and put into effect</b>	0 plan	1 plan	No plan.	The work was on-going at the time of the final evaluation. The key question was to ensure that the IT plan would be completed and that it would be implemented.	Unsatisfactory
<b>Submission of quarterly financial statements and annual financial analysis report</b>	<i>Information not available</i>	<i>No target</i>	<i>Information not available</i>		<i>Classification impossible because of absence of information</i>
<b>Fees for land administration services</b>	N/A	"Revised" (according to logframe) "Introduction" (according to loan proposal narrative)	Not revised / introduced	An extensive user fee study was conducted . Based on the analysis of all cost factors for the range of services provided by the DLS and a cost recovery objective, fee revision alternatives were recommended but were never adopted, as the MNR was not in agreement with the propositions.	Unsatisfactory

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Component 4: Land policy reform and Ministry-wide institutional strengthening					
Key Output Indicators	Baseline	Planned outputs (target at the end of project)	Achieved outputs (date: October 2008)	Comments	Classification
Global qualification of the component					Unsatisfactory

## d. Project Costs


Total Project Cost – Planned (US\$ 000)			Total Project Cost – Actual (US\$ 000)			% Difference	
	IDB	GOB	Total		IDB	GOB	Total
<b>Project</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>1,196</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>1,079.70</b>	<b>663.4</b>	<b>1,766.00</b>
<b>Admin.</b>				<b>Admin.</b>			
PMU	800	-	800	PMU	1,057.40	292.1	1,354.70
Seconded Personnel	-	356	356	Seconded Personnel		371.3	371.3
Final Eval.	40	-	40	Final Eval.	22.3	-	40
<b>Direct Costs</b>	<b>4,655</b>	<b>1,265</b>	<b>5,920</b>	<b>Direct Costs</b>	<b>4,506.10</b>	<b>884.4</b>	<b>5,698.20</b>
<b>Cadastre &amp; Property</b>	<b>2,603</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>3,103</b>	<b>Cadastre &amp; Property</b>	<b>2,330.30</b>	<b>178.1</b>	<b>2,569.40</b>
Rural Adjud.	2,325	-	2,325	Rural Adjud.	2,191.40	-	2,222.20
Rural Surveys	-	500	500	Rural Surveys		178.1	178.1
Urban Adjud.	78	-	78	Urban Adjud.	9.8	-	24
Public Awaren.	200	-	200	Public Awaren.	129.1	-	145.1
<b>Land Admin. Services</b>	<b>1,252</b>	<b>765</b>	<b>2,023</b>	<b>Land Admin. Services</b>	<b>1,613.70</b>	<b>673.4</b>	<b>2,421.20</b>
Consolidation of Registry	148	-	148	Consolidation of Registry	22.8	-	29.7
Valuation & Taxation	210	-	210	Valuation & Taxation	154.2	32	186.2
Land Info. Management	742	-	742	Land Info. Management	1,036.30	50	1,198.40
Instit. Strengthening	152	765	923	Instit. Strengthening	400.4	591.4	1,006.90
<b>Land Use Planning &amp; Dev. Review</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>Land Use Planning &amp; Dev. Review</b>	<b>264.4</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>300.3</b>
National Framework	100	-	100	National Framework	59.9	-	62.3
Local Land Use Planning	380	-	380	Local Land Use Planning	204.6	-	216
Capacity Building	20	-	20	Capacity Building		-	22
<b>Land Policy Reform &amp; MNR Streng.</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>Land Policy Reform &amp; MNR Streng.</b>	<b>297.6</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>407.3</b>
NLAC	100	-	100	NLAC	55.2	-	68
MNR Strength.	200	-	200	MNR Strength.	242.4	32.9	339.3
<b>Auditing</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>Auditing</b>	<b>67.6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Unallocated</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>Unallocated</b>		<b>9.3</b>	<b>10.9</b>
<b>Capitalization Charges</b>	<b>1,076</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>1,150</b>	<b>Capitalization Charges</b>	<b>1,011.00</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>1,085.00</b>
F.I.V.	70	-	70	F.I.V.	5	-	5
Interest	1,006	-	1,006	Interest	1,006.00	-	1,006.00
Credit Comm.	-	Credit Comm.	74	Credit Comm.			
Rotating fund				Rotating fund	25.80	-	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,000</b>	<b>1,860</b>	<b>8,860</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,690.20</b>	<b>1,633.10</b>	<b>8,323.30</b>
				<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>-2.6</b>

Component 1 showed a reduction in costs due to the lower than expected cost of rural surveys, the inability to complete the urban adjudication activities, and lower cost of consulting services. The LMP was very smart in its selection of registration sections for this subcomponent Surveying, and Declaration of Other Rural Registration Sections. It opted to assign registration sections with large agricultural parcels to Swede Survey and contracted local surveyors to survey and map parcels within and near to villages. As a result of its decisions on how to allocate the registration sections, savings of more than half million Belize dollars accrued.

The cost of Component 2 increased as a result of the increased cost of the LIS. The reduction of costs in component 3 was a result of the reduced cost of consulting services.

Component 4 showed an increase as a result of the cost of contracting the IT specialist for the MNR over the extension period. There was a significant increase in project administration expenses due to the extension of the project.

The overall project cost was reduced slightly due to decreased expenditure by the MNR for rural surveys and for building expansion.

#### **IV. Project Implementation**

##### **a. Analysis of Critical Factors**

<b>POSITIVE FACTORS</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<b>Effect on output(s) / outcome(s)</b>
Mr. Lindsay Belisle, who has served at the highest administrative and technical levels of the Ministry of Natural Resources and was understanding land management and the operations of Government, was appointed Program Manager of the LMP and remained in that position for the duration of the project.	Both knowledge sets were essential to the implementation of the LMP in a way that keeps the government engaged. This also provided much needed continuity, especially since there was significant turnover in senior personnel over the life of the LMP. The overall result is a satisfactory implementation of the project.

<b>NEGATIVE FACTORS</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<b>Effect on output(s) / outcome(s)</b>
<b><i>Project Design / Component 1 (National Cadastre and Property Rights Registration)</i></b>	
<b><i>Project design / Component 2 (Expansion of Land Administration Services)</i></b>	
The budget set aside for the parcel-based information system did not allow for an all inclusive system. The intention was for a system to be implemented at the Department of Lands & Surveys (DLS). However, at the start of the project the MNR decided that such a system would not meet its needs. The MNR made this decision based on the fact that the LTU was recently transferred from the General Registry, which was under the Judiciary, to the MNR. It quickly became apparent that the LTU needed to be automated and this was brought to the attention of the Bank.	The Bank agreed and provided assistance in the form of a TC to develop a proposal for a complete system, but this delayed implementation of the parcel-based information system under the LMP.
<b><i>Contract Management / Component 2 (Expansion of Land Administration Services)</i></b>	
The international consulting firm contracted to carry out the aerial photo acquisition and production of the ensuing cadastral maps performed very poorly. Though there were major delays the Executing Agency (EA) decided not to terminate the contract as there were concerns about the transferability of the work being done, that is, the EA was	As a result, the urban adjudication and registration activities could not be completed as originally planned.

NEGATIVE FACTORS	
Description	Effect on output(s) / outcome(s)
of the opinion that the required work did not lend itself to a smooth and simple transfer to another firm. It was felt that transferring the work to a new entity would have resulted in considerable delays, and may have even required a complete restart of the activity. The consulting firm continued to work but by the deadline did not produce the cadastral maps required for the urban adjudication activity.	
<b><i>MNR Change of Priority / Component 2 (Expansion of Land Administration Services)</i></b>	
Two years after the start of project execution, the Government changed the land tax laws.	This affected the valuation reconciliation activity by requiring new valuation assessments. This not only delayed the completion of the reconciliation, which in turn impacted the collection of land taxes, but it also complicated the entire tax collection system. Firstly, the DLS had to deploy already scarce human resources to complete the required assessments. Secondly, the DLS now had to collect taxes at different rates for a given land parcel. This led to a reduced rate of tax collection.
<b><i>MNR Change of Priority / Component 4 (Land Policy Reform and Ministry-wide Institutional Strengthening)</i></b>	
To improve the delivery of services the Ministry was to expand its office space within two years of the start of the project. However, this office expansion was never realized. Instead the Ministry refurbished some offices but this was insufficient to meet the new demands.	Additional staff could not be accommodated nor was there sufficient storage space for the products of the adjudication activities.
<b><i>Internal Management of Land Policy / Component 3 (Land Use Planning and Development Review)</i></b>	
Before the activity of delineation of village boundaries could be undertaken, the MRDC and the MNR had to agree on what constituted a village's boundary.	An agreement could not be reached and as a result the Ministry and the Bank agreed that efforts would be directed at defining the boundaries for a smaller subset of 15 villages, down from the original target of 80 villages. These villages were selected based on the perception that there was a general consensus about what should be the village's boundaries. Work proceeded slowly on this activity as several meetings had to be held with each village council.
The activity was also interrupted by the village council elections, which resulted in a change in all village councils.	This change required additional meetings to inform the new village councils about the work to establish village boundaries. By the end of the project only two of the 15 villages received approval of their boundaries and one was passed into law.
<b><i>Internal Management of Land Policy / Component 4 (Land Policy Reform and Ministry-wide Institutional Strengthening)</i></b>	
The land policy reform activities were to be carried out by the NLAC, a body consisting of 14 members appointed by the Minister of Natural Resources, with the support of the LMP. NLAC members work on a voluntary basis and are chosen from across all sectors including, public and private sectors, non-governmental organizations (NGO) and the political party in opposition. Given that it's the Minister that appoints the members, the perception is that the NLAC remains only as long as the Minister remains.	This perception can affect the work and may have affected the work as it related to the project as at times it appeared that the committee was non functional due to general elections and a change in the Minister responsible for the MNR.
The work of the NLAC depended a great deal on the efforts of the chairman of the NLAC. Consequently, when the chairman became ill and eventually left, the NLAC did not function. Second, support from the LMP, in the administrative area, was not consistent as the LMP was unable to keep the services of a part-time consultant to act as coordinator of the NLAC.	Besides the public consultations, little other activity was undertaken by the NLAC; especially, the critical land policy reform issues were not addressed as envisioned. The NLAC never developed the terms of reference for hiring experts in charge of studies on land policy reform options. The NLAC did submit policy recommendations on land allocation and land acquisition to the Minister but these were developed by the committee members using the information gathered at the forums conducted throughout the country. These recommendations did not result in any meaningful change in land policy.

## **b. Borrower/Executing Agency Performance**

The EA set up a PMU to assist with the execution of the project. Overall management of the project was the responsibility of the Project Coordinating Committee (PCC), which served as an advisory body to the EA and the PMU. The PCC comprised of representatives from the different departments and units of the Ministry of Natural Resources, and other stakeholders such as the Ministries of Agriculture and Fisheries, and Rural Development, NGOs, and the City and Town Councils.

### **PMU Performance:**

The PMU moved quickly to contract the needed consulting firms and individual consultants to carry out the project's activities. As a result most of the project's activities started on time. The activities that did not start were outside the PMU's control and included the LIS development, land valuation process improvement, land policy review and the MNR institutional strengthening activities.

In managing the contracts the PMU maintained constant contact with all consultants. Nevertheless, there were delays in a number of areas even though PMU repeatedly requested that contractors improve their performance.

The PMU moved quickly to process deliverables from all consultants with the bulk of the workload coming from component 1 activities.

### **MNR Performance:**

Besides the delays due to consultants' performance there were delays in executing activities as a result of an inability to take required decisions, for example, village boundaries. Also, the MNR proceeded rather slowly with the activities it was responsible for, which included most of the activities in components 2, 3 & 4. As a result those that were completed took until the end of the project though they could have been done before.

**Performance: Satisfactory**

## **c. Bank Performance**

The Bank supported the EA as best as it could with the available human resources for the duration of the LMP. The relationship between the Bank and the EA was always cordial and mutually respectful. From early in the LMP it was obvious that the project was not fully conceptualized as modifications in the project design had to be made for the wider benefit to the public and for greater efficiency and economy of operations and which caused some delays in project implementation. Examples are amendment of the loan contract to support quality and cost vs least cost for the survey contract; the selection of districts for adjudication; the delineation of village boundaries, and others. Also, the Bank's cumbersome process and procedures for the selection and hiring of consultants and the need to get the Bank's approval for everything in advance affected the project performance. For example, to purchase a cheap computer monitor to allow a data entry clerk work to continue had to be delayed for many days because three

quotations had to be obtained and subsequent approval had to be first received from the Bank.

On the other hand, the Bank supported the EA in obtaining TC funds to get a consultancy to explore the possibility of co-financing for a wider LIS but this did not materialize and delayed the implementation of the LIS in accordance with the loan contract. The Bank also met with the survey and adjudication contractor to discuss the delays in deliverables, however, the Bank was not amenable to the inclusion of a financial penalty clause in any contract as an incentive for contractor's to deliver on time.

Two key areas where the EA could have benefitted more are from direct support from a Natural Resources Management Specialist and a Financial Specialist. None of these specialists were resident in Belize for the full duration of the LMP and resident Bank staff was assigned to monitor the project. This affected timely decision making resulting in project delays as information had to be forwarded to Bank specialist outside Belize for decisions to be made and then forwarded back to the EA. With respect to the finance and accounts activities, the LMP faced some challenges that created a few delays in the payment of invoices and salaries and the preparation of the audited financial statements in a timely manner. It appeared that there was no set policy nor procedures to follow as every Financial Specialist that visited changed the way submissions are to be done. Future projects could benefit from the development of an integrated manual of accounting procedures and standards at the start of the project to include topics such as finance, accounting, stores and standards of accounting entry, among others. Despite above challenges, the EA, PMU and Bank worked very closely together to minimize potential delays and which resulted in a successful project that is benefitting Belizeans and others with their land transactions.

Performance: Satisfactory.

## V. Sustainability

### a. Analysis of Critical Factors

Description	Consequences on Sustainability	Next steps
<b><i>Institutional Strengthening and Technology Transfer</i></b>		
Significant efforts were made by the MNR and the PCU to integrate the implementation of the LMP into the work and operations of the Department of Lands and Surveys (DLS). In fact, many of the employees within the program were seconded from the Ministry and/or shared office space with two sections of DLS.	As a result, the Program was not seen as being distinct from the Ministry. Rather, it was seen as a program that was contributing to capacity building within the MNR, and specifically, the DLS. This emphasis on integration made it easier for knowledge transfer to occur.	The institutional design of futures projects should consider that lesson learnt to ensure sustainability ( <i>the current LMP III director is actually a MNR civil servant</i> ).
Operation of the Land Registry has now become an important activity within the DLS, with significant gains in record management through the use of digital technology. This technology introduced by the LMP is robust and it has increased efficiency in the sections of DLS where it is currently deployed.	In order to be fully sustainable, the Ministry needs to complete the deployment of the LIS in all sections of the DLS and the district offices. This will further expand the utility of the parcel based information system. It is also important that decisions be made about how to extend the compulsory registration areas to cover	Future projects (current LMP III and future phases) must take those recommendations into account ( <i>the main output expected from LMP III is actually the finalization of the deployment of the LIS</i> ).

	the entire country that is not managed under the National Parks Systems Act or the Forest Act. The expansion in land administration services should be sustainable since it can be accompanied with increased revenues collected by the MNR as long as the issue of cost recovery is addressed.	
Continuous training of staff to use the technology, and training of specialists to manage and maintain the software is a long term challenge that will need to be grappled with.	If the training issues are addressed, the investment in the expansion of the number of registration sections and the land administration services will be sustainable. The Land Registry will also be in a position to expand the number of registration sections and land parcels managed.	Continuous training is key to avoiding the erosion of knowledge and competences due to too many routine work and staff turnover, and to ensuring the sustainability of new technologies. MNRE should budget resources to ensure recurrent training for the staff that uses the newly deployed LIS ( <i>this is actually budgeted in LMP III</i> ).
The LMP facilitated the preparation of an operations manual that captures the improved processes used by the DLS for land administration activities. All heads of sections participated in the compilation of processes and in the review of the documentation.	The operations manual is now deployed, but over time, as the LIS is deployed in other sections of DLS and in the district offices and for other reasons, processes and procedures will change and new processes and procedures will be added.	It is important that there is a clearly articulated process for updating the manual and disseminating updates. This will help prevent the manual from becoming obsolete, thereby further adding to sustainability of the technology transfer.
<b>Cost Recovery</b>		
An extensive user fee study was conducted within the context of the LMP. Options for fee revisions were recommended based on an analysis of cost factors for the range of services provided by the DLS.	Those recommendations have not been adopted, and no alternative fee structure was considered. This activity seems to have ended with completion of the study.	The subject of fees for services, particularly with a view of ensuring the sustainability of reliable land administrative services, should be revisited in the future ( <i>it is actually considered in LMP III</i> ).
<b>Land Use Planning</b>		
Nothing has been done with the community development plans, and the draft legislation for a decentralized land use framework developed under the LMP has not reached Cabinet for their consideration	Sustainable gains in land use planning and delineation of village boundaries have not been achieved	The shift towards a more integrated approach to land use planning is more likely once the Physical Planning Section of the Ministry is brought into the LIS thereby facilitating linkages with DLS.
This activity did not gain momentum within DLS or the MNR	It is not likely that the MNR will continue to invest in village boundaries after the LMP	In hindsight, there would have been more value in mapping the land parcels and the assets of villages. Such data could serve useful to disaster mitigation and response organizations and to the village councils. Such an activity should probably be pursued through the Ministry of Rural Development.

The Bank has had a continued presence in the country in this sector. Since 1997, three loans have been approved. The LMP III now in execution was important to provide continuity to the work started under the LMP II. In the longer term, any future support of this sector should look into strengthening national capacity for planning, implementing and maintaining the work being carried out.

## **b. Potential Risks**

The main risk to sustainability would have been the potential failure to continue implementation of the LIS at the three DLS sections where it had been deployed. However, as of 2011, it clearly appears that the LIS has been fully and continuously



used in those sections, with a high level of satisfaction from the staff. Additionally, the four remaining sections of DLS (National Estates, Valuation, Physical Planning and Land Titles) show impatience and excitement to have the same very useful and performing tool deployed at their level by 2012.

### **c. Institutional Capacity**

As mentioned in section V.a., the integration of the Program into the work and operations of the Department of Lands and Surveys contributed significantly in enhancing the capacity of the MNR to sustain the gains achieved, particularly in three key units of the DSL (Land registry, Survey and Mapping, and the Land Information Center). Overall institutional capacity was also enhanced through training of the Valuation Section, a business process review and the preparation of the Operations Manual for DLS. The sustainability of the Program achievements will be monitored during the implementation of the "Land Management Program III" (project BL-L1008, loan 2208/OC-BL), which started at the beginning of 2010 and is the continuity of the LMP.

## **VI. Monitoring and Evaluation**

### **a. Information on Results**

A mid-term review was conducted in September 2004 and concluded that execution overall had been satisfactory. One of the main issues, resulting from a key weakness of the Program design, was the need to compile a baseline for quantitative indicators agreed upon for monitoring and evaluation. Indeed, the Loan Proposal had underscored that the measurement of the program's impact would require the collection of statistical data during the 4-year period of execution to establish the baseline situation and to determine the changes occurring as a result of the LMP. The Ministry and the PMU agreed to include the 2002 baseline in the next progress report prepared by the PMU. The submission of this baseline data by the MNR was, however, delayed, by lack of capacity to collect the necessary information. Consequently, it was agreed in 2006 that the Bank would fund a consultancy for the collection of baseline and monitoring data for 2002-2008. This consultancy, which resulted in the design of software for the generation of statistical reports, was completed in April 2008 just a few months prior to the completion of the LMP. However, those indicators went beyond the project's scope (the indicators: stamp duty collected, land tax payable, land tax paid, land rent payable, land rent paid, new mortgages, and land transfers, were more related to the long term impact of the improvement of land management in Belize, and were not usable to evaluate the achievement of the project outcomes), and available data from fiscal year 2002-2003 to fiscal year 2007-2008 on land revenues collected, new mortgages and land transfers do not indicate a consistent trend and it is likely that several external factors affected these indicators. Consequently, the routine monitoring of the program was focused only on the achievement of activities and outputs, while the measurement of the progress of outcomes remained impossible.

Both a final report prepared by the PMU, and an independent final evaluation, have also been conducted and provide detailed information on results.

The mid-term review report, the final report and the final evaluation report are presented in Annexes.

## **b. Future Monitoring and Ex-Post Evaluation**

The project outcomes and potential future impacts of LMP will be monitored during the implementation of the "Land Management Program III". The high level indicators (impact and outcome levels) will be obtained through the operation of the Land Information System itself, which was designed and partially deployed during LMP and will be expanded to the 7 sections of the DLS and the 6 district offices by the end of 2012.

## **VII. Lessons Learned**

<b>Situations</b>	<b>Lessons learnt</b>
<p><b>Evaluability and clarity of the objectives of the Program.</b> It is not always possible / easy to precisely assess the achievement of the Program, by lack of vertical logic of the intervention (what can be attributed to the intervention?) and absence of systematic and clear baseline and target for all the indicators.</p> <p>The components (1 and 2) that had the best results were those that had the clearest objectives and most clearly articulated benchmarks. On the contrary, in component 3, nothing was articulated in the benchmark so its accomplishment could not be used to measure the success of achievement of the component or of the Program;.</p> <p>What would be done with its results was not clear. Consequently, though the community development plans were prepared, nothing was done with them. Similarly, the benchmark for component 4 did not measure achievement of the range of activities that were to be completed.</p>	<p>The results matrix needs to be perfectly logical, with outcomes, outputs and milestones clearly stated and articulated, and baseline and targets need to be clearly defined.</p> <p>Not doing so</p> <p>(i) can result in bad implementation, because what needs to be done and by which organizations / agencies / stakeholders will also not be clear, and/or less emphasis may be given to the objective and benchmarks that are confused or appear not to be relevant;</p> <p>(ii) impedes the evaluation of the project achievements.</p>
<p><b>Integration.</b> The implementation of the program was integrated into the work and operations of the DLS. Many of the employees within the program were employees of the Ministry. The Program also shared office space with two sections of DLS. The LMP was not seen as being distinct from the Ministry. Rather, it was seen as a program that was contributing to capacity building (skills development, process improvement and institutional strengthening) within the MNR, and specifically, the DLS. The result of this integration within the DLS was that components 1 and 2 of the LMP, that had the most direct benefit and beneficial change to the work of the DLS, were the most successful in their implementation. The same level of integration did not occur with other stakeholders / beneficiaries. As a result, component 3, which had the potential to impact the work of the Ministry of Local Government, the Ministry of Housing, the Rural Development Department and the municipal and village governments, did not performed well. Component 4 could have impacted the work of the MNR with respect to its land and natural resource policies and processes, but as the Program was not integrated into the general work and processes of the Ministry, it did not give the expected results.</p>	<p>The concept of being "a part of" rather than "apart from", makes it easier for ownership and knowledge transfer to occur.</p> <p>The less integrated the key stakeholders and beneficiaries were, the less successful was the program in delivering the expected outputs.</p>
<p><b>Government Commitment.</b> The Government in general and the Ministry of Natural Resources in particular is committed to implementing the Registered Land Act, and there is a commitment to improvement in land</p>	<p>In any project, the commitment of the stakeholders is critical to success and to the achievement of the project objectives.</p>

administration. The result is that there was significant progress in Component One and Component Two of the LMP. The situation is exactly opposite for components 3 and 4, with very few commitment from stakeholders and very few achievements (or studies and pilots were achieved, but not followed by actions).	
<p><b>Continuity in Program Administration.</b> The Director of the Program served from the inception to completion of the LMP. His experience and knowledge of the sector and the Ministry helped to prioritize work that would most advance the overall objectives of the program. Also, there were times when staff turnover and staff shortage could have had negative impacts on program implementation. This was averted to some extent because the program director was able to identify, along with the ministry, alternative options for dealing with such situations.</p> <p>On the contrary, turnover in other senior positions had some effect on the ability of the program to complete some outputs.</p>	Continuity leads to consistency in program focus. The drive should be to minimize the need for leadership change by giving serious consideration to the competences, experience and qualities required in the leadership positions and assess those applying for these positions against those requirements.
<p><b>Tenure Clarification and Declaration of Registration Sections</b></p> <p>During the LMP, the Department of Lands and Survey used several approaches to tenure clarification and mapping rural and urban compulsory registration areas. The approaches included the use of an international surveying firm to collect and organize the parcel information, the use of local surveyors to develop survey plans, the management of employed field teams to survey and map, and the use of large scale orthophotos and ground verification to compile parcel maps.</p> <p>Review of the registration sections declared under the LMP indicates that the estimate of parcels in a proposed registration section is often less than the actual number mapped.</p>	<p>The range of data collected and the extent of the databases vary with each method. Nonetheless, there is enough information from each approach to guide discussions about the data that is useful and the methods that can be efficient and cost effective as new registration sections are declared. The lessons on timeliness, quality of delivery, the range of uses of the datasets, and costs should all be taken into consideration in the discussion on options for the continuation of the declaration of compulsory registration sections.</p> <p>Several factors contribute to this situation. Two important contributors are that occupants of national lands without legal tenure are facilitated to apply for lease tenure and private lands that are subdivided may not be accounted for in the initial count, especially in areas where the compilations are not current. This is likely to be the case as new registration sections are declared. This lesson should be taken into consideration when costs are being estimated.</p> <p>More generally, at the time to extend the compulsory registration areas to other parts of the country, the Ministry will have to build on the general experience of the extensive work done by the LMP in Corozal, Orange Walk and two registration sections in Rural Belize districts and in four urban areas.</p>
<p><b>Need for a Shared Vision among Proponents.</b> The LMP had many proponents; including the Department of Lands and Survey, the Ministry of Natural Resources, the ministry responsible for rural development, the ministry responsible for local government, and various municipal bodies. The proponents had varying views on concepts such as village boundaries, planning and land use legislation, and access to information. Were the vision was not shared there was less progress.</p>	The lesson is that the proponents of projects need to have shared vision about the outputs of the investments and the benefits that will be derived. The differing views on what constitutes a village serve as an example of where differing vision could stall a discussion and the achievement of an expected outcome. Where visions are not shared, the dominant proponent will seek to achieve the outcomes that matter most to them.
<p><b>Land Administration.</b> The LMP developed a scheme for a parcel based information system and adopted the Land Folio interface developed by Stewart International. The limitation is that the parcel based information system is only being used for compulsory registration sections. Land outside the compulsory registration areas do not benefit from the parcel based information system.</p>	To leverage the benefit, more areas will need to be declared as compulsory registration areas.
<b>The Use of Pilot Projects and Studies.</b> The LMP	

<p>implemented several studies (business review, review of fees for service, review of options for coordination, and legislative review of land use planning) and pilot projects (formulation of community development and land use plans, delineation of village boundaries).</p> <p>Normally, studies should be used to identify options for a way forward. They should carry out analyses to support discussions on the options and guide decision making. But most of the studies carried out under the LMP were not used to make an explicit decision about a way forward. They were accepted as the final products rather than as a means for further action.</p> <p>Similarly, pilot projects should not be outputs <i>per se</i>, but should test models for implementation with the view to learn lessons that will guide a roll out process.</p>	<p>All programs should be clear about how studies will contribute to decision making processes – how to ensure that actions will be taken on the recommendations of the reports. If there is no clarity about how the studies will be used, it is likely that they will not be used. Clarity about how the studies will be used will also ensure that they review the right kind of information and provide analysis that will be useful.</p> <p>A process for the assessment and review of the performance of a pilot needs to be developed during the design of the pilot and before implementation. If the evaluation process and how the lessons will be used are not clear, it is likely that the pilot will not be assessed and the roll out will not happen.</p> <p>Also, pilot projects should be designed, implemented and evaluated by the parties who will carry out the roll out of the process. Without their participation, it is likely that the lessons will not be internalized and will not inform the discussion about the roll out.</p>
<p><b>National Land Advisory Committee.</b> The NLAC is provided for in the National Lands Act but the Act is silent on how it should be constituted or on how it should operate to carry out its function. The efforts of the LMP show that if there is no clarity about how a body operates, it will be in a difficult position to fulfill its mandate. The NLAC was reconstituted three different times during the life of the LMP and each time it became dormant without achieving the task outlined.</p>	<p>For the NLAC to fulfill its role as articulated in the National Lands Act, there has to be clarity about how it is constituted and how it operates. Providing support for its operation without due consideration and agreements about its <i>modus operandi</i> will make it difficult to overcome obstacles and accomplish its tasks.</p>
<p>The reasons for project delays are often attributed to the quality of the consultancies. The proper supervision of the latter by the Executing Agencies is key, as well as the EAs capacity to make decisions in case of execution delays or failure.</p>	<p>The contracts signed with the firms must systematically include clear penalties to apply in case of execution delays or failure. The triggers to apply the penalties must also be very well defined. Those mechanisms can allow the Executing Agencies to ensure a proper execution, or to make quick decisions if the firms must be replaced.</p>

## **Annexes**

- [Minutes from the Exit Workshop](#)
- [Borrower Evaluation](#)
- Presentations:
  - a) [Presentation Project Manager](#)
  - b) [Presentation Independent Evaluator](#)
- Others
  - a. [Mid-term review](#)
  - b. [Final evaluation](#)
  - c. [Final report by the Borrower](#)
  - d. [Fiscal and Transaction data from 2002 to 2008](#)