



Department  
for International  
Development



# DFID Land Governance for Economic Development



How we learn  
from our land programmes

17 October 2016

## Default PCM in DFID

- Scoping, programme design - relying on outsourced technical expertise with some in-house QA and business case design and approval process
- ToR to contract out delivery, with scope of formal M&E usually dependent on programme size
- Regular reporting to DFID lead advisor
- *But...* most of the core expertise and learning resides with the contractor - DFID is not yet very good at pulling this learning into DFID and informing further implementation and design of new programmes



## DFID Learning – work in progress

**We need to get better** - in particular we are promising strong delivery, impact and VFM in an upscaled portfolio of land and land related programmes and investments...

### ICAI DFID Learning Review - Recommendations

**Recommendation 1:** DFID needs to focus on consistent and continuous organisational learning based on the experience of DFID, its partners and contractors and the measurement of its impact, in particular during the implementation phase of its activities.

**Recommendation 2:** All DFID managers should be held accountable for conducting continuous reviews from which lessons are drawn about what works and where impact is actually being achieved for intended beneficiaries.

**Recommendation 3:** All information commissioned and collected (such as annual reviews and evaluations) should be synthesised so that the relevant lessons are accessible and readily usable across the organisation. The focus must be on practical and easy-to-use information. Knowhow should be valued as much as knowledge.

**Recommendation 4:** Staff need to be given more time to acquire experience in the field and share lessons about what works and does not work on the ground.

**Recommendation 5:** DFID needs to continue to encourage a culture of free and full communication about what does and does not work. Staff should be encouraged always to base their decisions on evidence, without any bias to the positive.

## LEGEND – Land: Enhancing Governance for Economic Development

This is why **LEGEND** has a strong evidence, learning and knowledge management component....

### Knowledge Outputs

- The fourth [LEGEND Land Policy Bulletins](#) published in May (women & land) + 5<sup>TH</sup> just out (land & urbanisation)
- **State of the Land Debate reports:** [Strengthening Land Governance](#) , next one to be on business models that work
- **Evidence Updates:** land governance and population dynamics, gender...
- **Analytical papers:** Land and corruption, legacy issues, community disputes (turning into conflict for an investment), ...

**Strong learning and sharing components** in partner activities, and also in LEGEND Challenge Fund

**UK Land Forum** – to share and debate evidence and resulting action

## LEGEND – supporting learning – internally and more broadly

The component of interest today is the **annual Land Portfolio Review** undertaken by external experts of our portfolio of land and land related programmes and investments.

[https://landportal.info/sites/landportal.info/files/DFID's%20land%20portfolio%20and%20programmes\\_0.pdf](https://landportal.info/sites/landportal.info/files/DFID's%20land%20portfolio%20and%20programmes_0.pdf)



## The portfolio review - How we do it and what goes into it

- Collaboration between technical experts, lead advisor and key clients within DFID and among partners
- First one was a baseline - desk review and rather generic; second review is now underway
- Future reviews can shift in approach and focus
- Not only dedicated land programmes, but (increasingly) programmes that need land to do whatever they do (also helps us understand better where support is needed, maximise impact and better manage risk of such programmes)



# Initial feedback on portfolio review 1

- Senior management:  
The Portfolio Overview was the first time that they had seen **something that enabled people to look horizontally across DFID programmes and compare and contrast.**
- An **excellent model for learning about different issues** that DFID advisors face in designing and implementing programmes.



# Main messages from portfolio review 1

1. DFID funds around 25 programmes that work on land, **almost all of which have achieved or outperformed their objectives and have helped strengthen tenure security for their beneficiaries.**
2. Successful land programmes are not uniform in their approach, but have all been **grounded in strong understanding of local practices and norms.** The political sensitivities of land programmes call for politically-smart design, flexibility and long-term commitment.
3. Programmes that carry out land registration **must in parallel invest to ensure land administration services are fit for purpose.** Both registration activities and administration services should be designed to suit the needs of women and vulnerable groups, including the poorest.



4. **The best programmes for LTR also support people to use their newly won tenure security for a productive purpose**, so they see the benefits of their certificate. This adds greatly to sustainability. (Example: LIFT)
5. Also **need to measure broader impacts**: Programmes **should avoid missing impacts on social and economic empowerment**, even if these are harder to measure. But beware of optimism bias and jumping to conclusions about impacts!
6. In supporting investment facilities, DFID puts considerable resources into projects with land-related risks. **Better information management systems are needed to keep DFID informed of these risks**, and what the entities making investments are doing to address them.

Land-related risks are currently not prominent in DFID's partner/grantee risk registries, and annual review exercises do not regularly report on land issues unless and until these have surfaced. This is too late to manage the risk well and too late to deliver

# Questions and next steps

- We now have the portfolio review instrument. Did it work?  
What do we need to do better?  
Where should the key information sit going forward,  
how should it be made available,  
and how will we have better programmes going forward?
- How do we and partners get better at risk analysis and management in land related programmes and investments that do not focus on improving land governance?

2<sup>nd</sup> land portfolio review now kicking off,  
to be finalised  
and published late 2016/early 2017



# Thank you.

