

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



**MINISTRY OF LANDS, ENVIRONMENT,
FORESTS, WATER AND MINES**

**Phase 1 of the Land Reform Process for Rwanda
Development of a Strategic Road Map**

**WORKSHOP ON STRATEGIC ROAD MAP TO LAND
TENURE REFORM**

October 3-4th 2007

Summary of Proceedings

November 2007

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS	4
2.1 Opening Remarks.....	4
2.2 The Need for Reform	5
2.3 The Road Map to Land Reform	6
2.4 Framework for Stakeholder Support – Funding Arrangements.....	8
2.5 Land Tenure Regularisation - a Short Film	
2.6 Urban Land Reform – Issues and Options	9
2.7 Closing Remarks	10
3. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS	12
3.1 Day 1; Comments and Discussions.....	12
3.2 Day 2; Comments and Discussions.....	15
4. LIST OF RESOLUTIONS	18
4.1 The Two Key Resolutions of the SRM Workshop	18
4.2 Other Resolutions.....	18
5. SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK	21
5.1 Feed-Back Form Responses.....	21
5.2 Comments and Suggestions	23
4.3 Final Words.....	25
ANNEX 1 - SAMPLE FEEDBACK FORM	

**National Land Tenure Reform Programme – Strategic Road Map Workshop
3rd and 4th October 2007**

THE STRATEGIC ROAD MAP TO LAND TENURE REFORM

WORKSHOP REPORT

1. Introduction

The Workshop

On 3rd and 4th October 2007 MINITERE's National Land Tenure Reform Programme (NLTRP) held a Workshop at the Mille Collines Hotel, Kigali, to launch the draft Strategic Road Map (SRM) for the implementation of national land tenure reform in Rwanda. More than 198 delegates representing the whole range of national and district level stakeholders attended over the two days.

Objectives

The four main objectives of the Workshop were to:

- inform stakeholders about the need for national land tenure reform under the 2005 Organic Land Law;
- present the draft SRM for the implementation of national land tenure reform;
- set out a framework for stakeholder support;
- highlight some key issues to resolve (e.g. process of land reform, urban issues, wetlands).

Delegates

Day 1 of the SRM Workshop was provided for implementers at the local level – district leaders, land officers, and representatives of NGOs – and was mostly conducted in Kinyarwanda. Day 2 was targeted at key national level stakeholders from government ministries and agencies and the donor community and was mostly conducted in English. Full tri-lingual translation services were made available to delegates on both days (English, French and Kinyarwanda).

Summary of Proceedings

The structure of proceedings was the same on both days, with three presentations relating to the SRM in the morning, followed by the screening of a short film about land tenure regularisation (LTR) programme and a presentation on urban land issues in the afternoon. This was followed by open discussion and debate. At the instigation of the Workshop Facilitator, the Deputy Registrar of Land Titles for the Northern Zone, Mr Damascène Munyangaju, 'Resolutions' were compiled at the end of the afternoon discussions on both days and read to the delegates. Feed-Back Forms in French and English were provided to all delegates.

Five presentations were provided. The opening remarks set the context of what had been covered during the October 2006 workshop at RIAM. This was followed by '**The Need for Reform**' which again summarised all of the issues that emerged from the 2006 field consultations and the 2007 field trials.

This was followed by an outline of the '**Strategic Road Map for Land Reform**' consisting of the three interrelated elements;

- Policy and legal framework;
- Regularisation of land tenure (LTR);
- Land management organisations.

Under these headings **MINITERE's** current priorities are as follows;

- finalising the secondary legislation required under the Organic Land Law;
- finalising the procedures and regulations for LTR and land administration;
- producing guidelines for land registration and public advice;
- establishing the National Land Centre – preparing the Office of the Registrars to open for business;
- establishing fully functioning District Land Bureaux and Commissions;
- building capacity at central and district level
- extending the trial LTR work to other districts.

The fourth presentation set out the **'Framework for Stakeholder Support – Funding Arrangements'**.

A more detailed presentation on **Land Reform in Urban Areas** was given in the afternoon session followed by discussion and preparation of resolutions.

A draft SRM document with costs and work programmes has been prepared, however this will be discussed within MINITERE before it is finally presented to Government and placed in the public domain.

Structure of Workshop Report

The remainder of this Report is divided into four parts:

- Summary of Proceedings
- Summary of Discussions
- List of Resolutions
- Summary of Feedback

Further details on any of the issues raised can be obtained from the NLTRP team at lr_phase1@yahoo.co.uk. Soft copies of presentations are available in English and French.

2. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

2.1 Opening Remarks

The Honourable Minister of State for Lands and Environment, Mme Patricia Hajabakiga, opened the Workshop on both days. She was officially welcomed by the Registrar of Land Titles, Mr Eugène Rurangwa, who invited all delegates to freely give their inputs.

The Honourable Minister of State explained the background and context of the Workshop, which followed an Inception Workshop in Kigali in February 2006 and the pre-trial Workshop at RIAM in Murambi in October 2006 to outline key issues and present results so far. The third workshop was to present the draft SRM for stakeholders' validation and information.

The Hon Minister advised delegates of the substantial progress that has been made since the Murambi Workshop including the drafting and completion of several pieces of secondary legislation, the presentation of the National Land Centre Law to Parliament, the appointment and swearing-in of the Registrar and five Deputy Registrars and the completion and analysis of three out of the four LTR field trials (Karongi, Musanze, and Gasabo). She reminded delegates that land is the most important challenge facing Rwanda, but that there is now a window of opportunity to move the land reform process forward in a cost-efficient and productive manner.

The Honourable Minister of State highlighted some of the key benefits of implementing land reform:

- security of land tenure supports social harmony, good governance and poverty reduction;
- good land use management transforms development;
- an efficient land administration system reduces disputes and supports the land market;
- land reform supports environmental management and planned urbanisation;
- land reform also builds on decentralisation and public sector reforms.

The Honourable Minister of State acknowledged the support of DFID and USAID in the land reform process and thanked all stakeholders in advance for the future support she expects from them. She concluded her opening remarks by stressing her desire to consult fully with stakeholders on the proposed strategy during this two-day Workshop, before proceeding with its implementation. She thanked everyone for attending, saying that it symbolised the scale of commitment to land reform for sustainable development. She then declared the Workshop officially open.

On Day 2, the Deputy Registrar of Land Titles for the Northern Zone invited the DFID Head of Mission, Ms Sandra Pepera, to provide opening remarks to the proceedings. Ms Pepera confirmed that DFID has been pleased to support the land reform process in Rwanda since 2002. She reminded delegates that the Organic Land Law protects people's land rights, but that now they need to be helped to obtain proof of those rights through formal registration. She acknowledged MINITERE as the impartial custodian of all land in Rwanda. Ms Pepera emphasised that poverty elimination depends on wealth creation more than on aid; this requires investment which must be underpinned by people having confidence in their property rights. She made a special plea to the Rwandan government to find space for the inhabitants of informal settlements, who she described as being among the poorest and weakest of Rwandan citizens, especially if they have to be resettled. Ms Pepera concluded by asking the if she could see some gender-disaggregated data from the LTR field trial in Nyamugali cell (Gatsata sector, Gasabo District) that she had visited on her arrival in Rwanda.

On both days, the Deputy Registrar of Land Titles for the Northern Zone then invited the team leader of the NLTRP, Mr Clive English to address delegates. Mr English outlined the primary task of this Workshop as being to reach simple, equitable and feasible solutions to Rwanda's land problems. He noted that the proposals contained within the draft SRM do not come from an ideological standpoint but have evolved from wide-ranging discussions, consultations and field trials within Rwanda, as well

as from international best practice. The DFID-funded support project's most significant conclusions are that while the issues may be complex, the solutions are often easier than is often thought, and that the Rwandan public in particular is ready for the implementation of land reform.

Mr English reminded delegates of the three main outputs of the DFID-funded project:

- an effective implementation plan (the SRM) supported by trial interventions;
- capacity development of MINITERE and the central and decentralised institutions to implement the SRM;
- established mechanisms for complementary support from donors within a clear framework.

The five main themes of the Murambi Workshop in October 2006 were the legal aspects, the institutional structures, the field consultations, the stakeholder framework, and land use planning. The purpose of this Workshop was to move the land reform process forward with facts, figures and budgets. Mr English concluded his remarks by thanking everyone who had participated in the LTR field trials, and he gave particular thanks to the MINITERE field teams who had led the work.

2.2 The Need for Reform

The first slide presentation of the Workshop was made by the NLTRP's Local Institutions Capacity Building and Stakeholder Coordination Officer, Mr Thierry Hoza Ngoga, on Day 1 (presented in Kinyarwanda), and by Mr Clive English on Day 2 (presented in English with both English and French slides). The emphasis was slightly different for each day, focusing on the need to sensitise the key implementers at local level about the overall need for national land tenure reform on Day 1, and on the need to inform key national level stakeholders about the situation on the ground and the data on land ownership and planning resulting from the trials work on Day 2.

The first half of the presentation outlined the need for land reform in Rwanda. It contextualised the need within *Vision 2020* and highlighted the contribution that improved security of land tenure and an efficient land administration system and land market can make to social harmony, urbanisation and agricultural transformation. The strong public demand for land reform and formal/legal documentation was also noted, as well as the general public's confidence in statutory law (especially among vulnerable groups), although it was observed that:

- 1) greater clarity is still required about the expropriation process as it is being applied on the ground; and
- 2) a framework is still required to enable families to determine how to legally allocate land rights among themselves (within the household).

Rising population and rural-urban migration is contributing to localised land pressures ('hot – spots'), which present significant challenges in some Districts. A unified national approach to land tenure reform is therefore urgently needed, to support more effective land management and planning.

The second half of the presentation concentrated on describing the current situation on the ground, drawing especially on data generated during the first two LTR field trials in Biguhu cell (Ruganda sector, Karongi District) and Nyamugali cell (Gatsata sector, Gasabo District).

Contrasts were noted between the relatively greater importance of inheritance as a means of access to/acquiring land in Biguhu (rural) and of purchase in Nyamugali (urban), and it was pointed out that the majority of people taking part in LTR in both areas had no documents to support their claim to ownership at all. Other data were briefly presented on:

- land prices (which are rising in both urban and rural areas);

- landholdings and land use (numbers and sizes of parcels held by households, small fragmented holdings)
- absentee land holders (mostly living within Rwanda though some were outside the country);
- land disputes (very few unresolved disputes recorded in trial areas, mostly within families).

The presentation concluded by explaining that the implementation of LTR together with the successful completion of the secondary legislation would show how the existing informal land tenure arrangements in Rwanda can be brought within the legal framework of the Organic Land Law.

2.3 The Road Map to Land Reform

The second presentation of the Workshop was made by the NLTRP's Institutions and Capacity Building Specialist, Mr John Bosco Iyadema (in Kinyarwanda), on Day 1, and jointly by Mr Clive English and Mr Iyadema (in English with both English and French slide presentations) on Day 2. Its purpose was to outline the main components of the draft SRM.

The draft SRM envisages that the implementation of national land tenure reform will take place in four phases:

- Phase 1 – 2005-08 – short-term preparation of the implementation plan and phasing of reforms (current phase)
- Phase 2 – 2009-11 – medium-term implementation
- Phase 3 – 2012-16 – Five Year Plan 1
- Phase 4 – 2017-21 – Five Year Plan 2

Under this framework all land in Rwanda could be formally registered under the new land law and administration system by the end of Phase 4 in 2021, with every Rwandan having formal rights and supporting documents for their land.

The three elements of the SRM were addressed in turn within this time frame;

- Implementing the new policy and legal framework;
- Regularising land tenure (LTR);
- Establishing land management organisations.

The nature of the new policy and legal framework was clarified and its main provisions explained:

- formalisation of all land tenure in Rwanda through mandatory and accessible land registration and titling;
- national land use planning and development control;
- leases of different length for different categories of land and full ownership for land containing investments;
- creation of a new registration system, with 'zones' that match but are autonomous from 'provinces', and a new institutional framework for land administration services which will be largely bottom up from cell and *umudugudu* level working through sectors and districts to the zonal registrars, in line with the decentralisation policy;
- detailed secondary and tertiary legislation (regulations, guidelines and procedures manuals) on all aspects of participatory land tenure regularisation, land administration and management in Rwanda.

The field testing of tenure regularisation that has been taking place in 2007 was then outlined. The idea behind the field testing was to test the implementation proposals for the systematic first registration of land and the public response to them. The LTR method proposed in the draft SRM was explained using images from the field trials to show the different steps in the process.

So far, the first three LTR field trials have clarified land rights for over 2,800 households on over 14,000 land holdings. The issue remains, however, as to whether the method can be replicated in other parts of the country, and how, in order to achieve the first registration of all land nationally.

It is currently estimated that nationwide there are almost 8 million land parcels in over 2,140 cells. Figures relating to the time and cost required to carry out the proposed LTR method in individual cells were also presented and extrapolated to all districts according to the number of cells per district. Costs are higher in urban areas.

Issues arising in the LTR field trials which remain to be resolved include:

- urban land settlement (planning, resettlement, plot densification and rights of informal settlers);
- wetlands (tenure arrangements, use and management);
- land consolidation and sub-division (inheritance, fragmentation and land sharing);
- family rights and land registration (need for more concrete advice);
- investment and grant of full ownership title;
- land-related revenues and taxation (the potential contribution of the land administration system to the economic growth strategy).

Levels of public participation in the LTR field trials have been determined by the quality of local leadership. The importance of good leadership in the LTR process was emphasised. It was also pointed out to delegates by Mr Iyadema on Day 1 that in some places district land officials have not been very involved in the LTR field trials, even though they are the ones who will have to lead the process in due course.

On Day 2 it was emphasised that the new registration system must not conflict with the functioning of the well developed informal land market, which means that the 'right' system is needed to achieve customer 'buy-in' to enable it to succeed. Finally, the information and issues arising from the LTR trials provide an informed basis for developing land administration systems based on a land parcel based registration system.

The presentation then addressed land governance issues and land management organisations. Mr Iyadema (on both days) explained that there will be a centralised agency – the National Land Centre – that will set all standards and guidelines for land administration and planning but that all these functions will be decentralised to the districts, sectors and cells. A number of organisational charts were presented to illustrate the institutional framework and how the registration procedures will function within it.

The development of the new land institutions will be phased to meet levels of demand and service requirements. For example, a District Land Officer can be appointed first and then other staff appointed in as the District Land Bureau's work evolves and expands. The draft SRM also includes proposals for an LTR Support Team to operate from 2008 to 2011 that would concentrate solely on field regularisation and processing of records for delivery to the Registrars. This would enable the District Land Bureaux to concentrate on development of procedures and systems and deal with day to day land-related business. The Support Team would set targets and priorities in coordination with the District priorities, the Office of the Registrar and MINITERE.

Other issues addressed were those of overall capacity building (long-term postgraduate training and short- medium term ‘learning by doing’ (i.e. implementation) and in-country short courses) and the need for individual strategic plans for the institutions of the District Land Bureaux and the National Land Centre/Office of the Registrars.

On Day 1, delegates from the districts were asked to indicate who had established District Land Bureaux – only 11 districts appeared to have done this at the time of writing.

The presentation concluded by identifying the key events that need to happen on time over the next 12 months, during the remainder of Phase 1, if the draft SRM is to be implemented as outlined to delegates. This includes the completion of several more pieces of secondary legislation and the commencement of the ICF-funded ‘Land Registration Support Project’ (US\$3.2 million over 3 years). The aim is to make a public announcement in mid-2008 that the Land Registry is ‘Open for Business’, at least centrally (in the National Land Centre and Office of the Registrars) and in the four NLTRP trial districts.

2.4 Framework for Stakeholder Support – Funding Arrangements

The third presentation was made by Mr John Bosco Iyadema on Day 1 and by Mr Clive English on Day 2.

This presentation first reminded delegates of the need to take a holistic view of land reform, of who the different stakeholders in land reform are, and of the different aspects of land reform which stakeholders are already engaged with. The different aspects were grouped into five categories, building on the analysis of agencies and issues that was presented at the Murambi Workshop in October 2006:

- policy and legal and regulatory framework;
- land governance organisations;
- technical (National Land Centre);
- issues based programmes;
- monitoring and evaluation.

Several existing or proposed programmes for stakeholder support were identified:

- the development of the National Land Centre and the Office of the Registrars;
- the development of the District Land Bureaux;
- an LTR Support Team for Phase 2 of the draft SRM;
- the development of land use plans (national and municipal) and establishment of spatial planning capability;
- the development and refining of secondary and tertiary legislation (regulations, guidelines and procedures manuals for land administration and LTR).

Funding requirements/options were put forward with distinctions made between central government funding, district government funding and donor support. Preliminary cost and cost recovery/revenue estimates for the Four Phases of the draft SRM were outlined, with particular emphasis on the cost of LTR. These figures were based on demographic projections and landholding estimates, with demand for service projections based on gaining public ‘buy-in’ through systematic, transparent and participatory first registration of land by sector and district. Districts may make a loss during the first few years of implementation but cost recovery and revenues should follow in later years. Urban districts may need to subsidise rural districts, at least initially, but there should first be a full review of all taxes, fees and charges relating to land.

The presentation concluded by outlining some of the risks inherent in trying to implement the draft SRM, but noted that the overall costs are relatively low and that the draft SRM is therefore implementable with long-term commitment and support, especially in terms of finance from donors. The key thing is to ‘make the sale’ only when everything is ready to go, as it is vitally important not to publicly announce that ‘Land is Open for Business’ and then fail to perform.

2.5 Land Tenure Regularisation – a Short Film

On both days delegates were shown a short film about LTR. The film showed the process of LTR in operation and included comments from the Registrar of Land Titles, MINITERE staff involved in the LTR field trials, land holders and land committee members at *umudugudu* and cell level. The film is tri-lingual and can be shown in Kinyarwanda, English or French.

2.6 Urban Land Reform – Issues and Options

The fourth and final presentation of the Workshop was made by the NLTRP’s Urban Land Consultant, Mr Geoffrey Payne. Mr Payne first reviewed the urban land issues in Rwanda which are due mainly to the rising urban population through natural growth and rural to urban migration – from 1 million to 2 million people in Kigali City between 2007 and 2018 on current projections.

The challenge is to improve existing urban areas and also accommodate the future urban population. Seventy percent of Rwanda’s urban population live in informal settlements, which are not all illegal but instead form a continuum of claims and rights to land. These settlements need to be integrated into the formal planning system while planned development is also expanded. Mr Payne set out two clear options for improving informal settlements and integrating them into the development of the city more effectively:

- 1) LTR combined with in-site upgrading, or
- 2) expropriation and redevelopment.

On LTR and upgrading of existing informal settlements, Mr Payne set out the many benefits to the inhabitants and to society at large, including:

- tenure and job security for inhabitants;
- maintenance of community cohesion and support;
- stimulation of investment in house upgrading by the inhabitants;
- minimisation of development costs and of the amount of new land needed for urban expansion.

These benefits far outweigh the limitations and difficulties, such as the need to relocate some people, the difficulties of regularising very small or irregular land parcels, and the fact that in-site upgrading may be incremental. LTR combined with in-site upgrading is also considered as international best practice under the HABITAT agenda which Rwanda has signed up to.

However, a key issue is timing – regularising all urban informal settlements at one time minimises market distortion but puts a heavy burden on land administration agencies, while regularising a few areas at a time is easier for land agencies to manage but can maximise land market distortion, as land prices in urban areas are determined more by location and level of tenure security than by land quality.

Mr Payne proposed that those informal settlements which need to be relocated for environmental/health reasons be identified quickly and that Permits to Occupy (PTO) be granted to the inhabitants to remain there until new sites have been identified and prepared for them. This would

improve the tenure security of the inhabitants while redevelopment and resettlement plans are put in place. For inhabitants of informal settlements which do not need to be relocated but which can be upgraded in-site, Mr Payne proposed an incremental approach to improving tenure security.

The fastest rates for the first registration of land presented in the draft SRM might mean that land is not registered in some parts of Rwanda for up to 12 years, but this will not be acceptable in Kigali City.

Instead, Mr Payne proposed that areas of Kigali City be designated for LTR work as planned in the draft SRM (7 cells per district per year from 2012) but that Community Land Permits (CLPs) also be granted to all *imidugudu* in Kigali City on a demand-driven basis. The CLPs would be initially valid for 3-5 years but could be renewed on request at the discretion of the Registrar of Land Titles. Individuals living within the *umudugudu* could apply for registration of their land at any time, on an individual basis or in a more organised way, but the CLP would, meanwhile, provide a basic level of tenure security to all landowners within the *umudugudu*. Both of Mr Payne's proposals are aimed at stabilising the current urban situation by providing a basic level of tenure security to all urban residents.

On expropriation and redevelopment of existing informal settlements, Mr Payne noted that this is both expensive and unpopular, especially if done directly by the state, and often leads the displaced persons to create similar settlement in another area. He made several suggestions to improve the process of private expropriation guided by the state, which has the potential to be more efficient and more equitable. For example, private developers can be encouraged to acquire sites for formal, commercially-based urban development from the inhabitants of informal settlements on a 'willing-seller, willing-buyer' basis. He shared the example from Ankara, Turkey, where the inhabitants often acquire units in the new development rather than cash, benefiting both themselves, as they retain a property in the same area, and the developer, who does not need to pay cash up-front for the land.

As regards planning for future urban growth, Mr Payne observed that building standards must be appropriate if access to legal housing is to be affordable for most households in Kigali City. He gave a rough estimate of the required land budget for the projected urban population growth in Kigali City as being 238ha annually (based on only one household per plot), and he emphasised that LTR can help increase municipal revenues to meet the costs of upgrading urban infrastructure.

He concluded by identifying that the next steps on LTR and in-site upgrading should be to prepare detailed proposals for CLPs and launch them as an interim tenure status in Kigali City. The next steps on expropriation and redevelopment should be to identify those existing informal settlements which need to be relocated on environmental/health grounds, prepare detailed proposals for PTOs and start planning for relocation. In addition, large numbers of para-surveyors need to be trained as quickly as possible to enable LTR to take place as soon as possible in the urban areas.

2.7 Closing Remarks

The presentation on urban land issues was followed on both days of the Workshop by an extended open discussion, summarised in **Section 2** of this Report. The discussion ended with the List of Resolutions made by delegates on each day (presented in **Section 3**).

The Registrar of Land Titles closed Day 1 of the Workshop on behalf of the Honourable Minister of State for Lands and Environment and the Secretary-General of MINITERE, Mr Emmanuel Nsanzumuganwa. He thanked everyone for their contributions and reiterated that land is a very important asset for the population and the country as a whole such that everyone needs to take measures to ensure it is used efficiently. He promised to abide by the Resolutions of the Workshop and said they are all in line with what MINITERE is doing already. He also said it could all be done before 2020 as delegates requested (see Sections 2, 3 and 4). He expressed trust in all stakeholders and asked them to continue to give their full cooperation in helping to fulfil this land reform mission.

At the end of Day 2 of the Workshop, the Team Leader promised to review the time-frame of the draft SRM and look at ways to move faster with LTR and the process of first registration, and also to more clearly define the needed programmes and keep stakeholders informed about this so they can provide support.

The Honourable Minister of State for Lands and Environment then formally closed the Workshop by thanking delegates for attending and actively participating and promising to take into account all their comments and concerns. She informed delegates that the draft SRM will be tabled before Cabinet very soon, and she also added that a Communiqué is being sent to all districts informing them that computers and GPSs are ready to be collected at MINITERE as soon as districts have established their District Land Bureaux.

3. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

This section summarises the key discussions that arose from the proceedings.

3.1 Day 1; Comments and Discussions

Expropriation

There were calls for the Expropriation Law to be revised to favour developers better. The Honourable Minister of State explained that according to the Constitution people need to be properly compensated if their rights are being violated, so if their land rights are being violated through expropriation they have to be paid fair, market value compensation. She said that it is not constitutional to favour developers as such. She gave the example of the Caisse Sociale houses in Gacuriro, whereby the former landowners received only small compensation for their avocado trees etc., but then the houses were sold for RwF 22 million or 23 million and are now selling for RwF 50 million. The former landowners had to go and buy new land at the market rate but they did not receive that in compensation for their land. The Honourable Minister of State insisted that fair compensation for the land must be based on market value.

Later there was a call for expropriation to be looked at case by case, because whatever amount of compensation people are given for their land they might not use the money well. The question was asked as to how to make sure that the money received in compensation is not spent unwisely so that people become landless. There is a need to find ways of making sure people buy replacement property.

Land Values

The claim that rural people's wealth will rise as rural land values rise was questioned by one delegate. Mr English explained that now people will be able to realise the value of their land by selling it legally, so decisions about how to manage their land or whether to sell it would be part of their livelihood strategies.

Land Claims, Disputes and Family Rights Issues

A question was asked about whether people would be prevented from registering their rights during LTR if counter claims were made, and about rights of prescription. A related question was about how mediators could resolve land disputes falling outside their jurisdiction, i.e. how disputes would be resolved on high-value land.

The Deputy Registrar of Land Titles for the Northern Zone clarified that disputes on high-value land would be dealt with by the Land Commissions and the courts, while Mr English explained that disputes and counter claims would not hold up the LTR process. Instead, they would be recorded and referred to mediation so that land rights could then be registered with a caveat preventing sales in advance of final resolution. The Registrar of Land Titles stressed that final registration would not take place without further investigations of disputed land, but he also observed that the land demarcation and adjudication process proposed in the draft SRM is a good modern technique for land registration which involves the population and can help resolve disputes on the ground.

Intra-family land disputes were raised as an important and serious issue, and one delegate said that it was wrong for MINITERE to play them down in the presentations by saying they were not an issue in the LTR field trials. [Intra family disputes were in fact not played down in the presentation. The figures indicate that disputes are relatively few in number – less than 2 percent of the 14,500 holdings that were regularised - though this is not to suggest that they are not important].

The Registrar of Land Titles agreed that intra-family disputes are an important issue and then informed delegates about various programmes from the International Justice Mission (an NGO) and

USAID, who have a programme for developing procedures for resolving land disputes and will help with training mediators and individuals to solve disputes themselves. The presentations also suggested a requirement for provision of a Family Law Manual that can be used to guide and inform all households and the Registrar on how to register land in specific family/household situations.

There was a long exchange on family rights issues, with one delegate emphasising the public's lack of understanding, for example about which children and wives have land rights in polygamous families. It was claimed that the 1999 Succession Law is not fully respected or followed to the letter and the delegate asked how to tackle the problems around family rights that are emerging in the field. The Deputy Registrar of Land Titles for the Northern Zone asked delegates to be very clear about where they find conflicts between the Succession Law and the implementation of LTR. He said that all interests in land are being recorded in accordance with the matrimonial regime under the Succession Law. Regarding court cases on issues of family land rights, the Registrar of Land Titles said it is important to look at the basis of the cases before the courts – what is the source of the land conflict, is it between husband and wife or between parent and child? Mr Iyadema then clarified that children have succession rights, not just interests in land, and that the Organic Land Law is very clear that all family members have land rights.

There were calls for training for *Abunzi* and training for local authorities on dispute resolution. One delegate who had participated in the Nyamugali LTR trial said that although they had learned many things, local authorities still needed more training on dispute resolution.

Costs of Implementation and District Readiness

There was much discussion about the practical aspects of implementation, leading from several interventions made by the Honourable Minister of State during the presentation on stakeholder support and funding arrangements. She explained to delegates that national activities on land would help to build capacity and empower districts to carry out the land reform work. For example, training on how to use the satellite images and parcel maps might come from the National Land Centre budget. Delegates from the districts were asked by Mr English if it would be possible for every district to carry out LTR in one cell during 2009, incrementally increasing this from one year to the next. All agreed it was possible. The Honourable Minister of State then said that if MINITERE provides the technical know-how and base maps and training and shows the districts what to do that some districts could even do more than is proposed in the draft SRM. Mr Iyadema informed delegates that National Land Centre staffing and LTR procedures manuals would be ready in the first quarter of 2008, so roll-out among the districts should be quite feasible within the proposed time-frame.

It was pointed out by one delegate that the costs of LTR will surely vary geographically, being different in mountainous areas to flat areas. Mr English acknowledged this variation but said that the figures presented to the conference were only intended as averages. He invited delegates to look at the detailed figures if they wish.

The Registrar of Land Titles reminded delegates that the duties of District Land Officers are now clear, that stamps, letters and seals are ready for them to use, and that from now on any letter not signed by the District Land Officer will not have legal value. This is in accordance with a recent Ministerial Circular sent to District Mayors. The Deputy Registrar of Land Titles for the Northern Zone asked delegates to go back to their districts and read the Circular. Mr Iyadema added that the law establishing District Land Bureaux has been there for one year already, so districts need to all follow the law and stop giving out documents illegally.

Time-Frame for Implementation

The Honourable Minister of State then enlivened the discussion by asking whether it would really take until 2021 to formally register all land in the country – she wanted to know if it was possible to go faster. She asked, for example, what resources would be needed to finish by 2015? She then requested the DFID-funded support project to produce some alternative scenarios, showing the cost implications of going faster, so as to compare that with the proposals put forward in the draft SRM to

finish by 2021. The Honourable Minister of State explained that Rwandans need to see why land registration cannot be done any faster than is being proposed in the draft SRM, but that if it is possible to go faster then that would be better. Mr English and Mr Iyadema explained that under the proposals an LTR Support Team would take the lead on first land registration for the next four years while district capacity is developed, and then from 2012 every district in the country would need to carry out LTR in at least 7 cells per year, requiring an annual budget of RwF 50 million per district.

The proposed time-frame continued to be a major focus of the afternoon's discussion, with several delegates suggesting that, given the level of commitment in the districts, and with community participation, LTR should be able to be carried out within 5 years, or maybe even within 2 years, and thus much faster than proposed in the draft SRM. However, the Registrar of Land Titles reminded delegates that if the process goes too fast this could cause more problems, especially in cases where land claims are disputed and with the limited capacity of the Office of the Registrar and LTR Support Team to process the claims. He noted that it takes time to find the bona fide landowners and register them, and that even with money you cannot curtail some of the steps needed to carry out LTR. Technology will be used as much as possible to speed up the process but some procedures cannot be fast-tracked.

Mr Payne observed that if all land is to be regularised within 5 years as the Honourable Minister of State had suggested as a possibility, then 1 title would need to be issued every 15 seconds of every working day for the next 5 years. This is a big task, making an incremental approach in urban areas more necessary. Mr Payne also informed delegates that less than 60% of all land in the UK is registered, and he explained that parcels really only need to be registered when they come onto the market and are involved in transactions. He requested Rwandans to bear that in mind rather than set too ambitious a target to complete the whole country.

Vulnerable Groups

One delegate raised the issue of needing to distinguish between different vulnerable groups and devise specific practical measures to support their land rights according to their particular needs and land-related concerns. The Registrar of Land Titles said this would be done, especially as regards the needs of those left behind by history, but he also noted that not all vulnerable groups should expect to have a land-related solution to their problems and he reminded delegates that the Government's vision is have people moving out of agriculture. Mr Payne added that no-one had yet mentioned the situation of tenants, yet land registration can often put up their housing costs making them a vulnerable group too.

Role of Civil Society in M&E

There was some discussion about the need to involve civil society and the private sector in monitoring and evaluation, and the Registrar of Land Titles encouraged this, saying that consultation and inclusion of all stakeholders in the land reform process is very important. He said MINITERE would continue to work together with civil society stakeholders as they did in preparing the Organic Land Law itself.

Redistribution and Land Rights of Returning Refugees

The issue of the land rights of returning refugees was raised by one delegate, who said that these people may believe that land reform is going to provide them with land. Careful sensitisation was called for so people would know that there will be no redistribution of land during LTR, especially among the youth who need to be informed that livelihoods will not only come from land in future. The Registrar of Land Titles agreed fully with these comments.

Land and Environment Links

Questions were asked about the links between the Organic Land Law and the Environment Law. It was claimed that some people do not know what lands are wetlands etc., so there needs to be an audit of where the protected wetlands are. Mr English said that there is confusion between the two laws as to how categories of wetlands and floodplains are to be determined on the ground. He informed delegates that REMA is about to contract a consultant to conduct an audit of wetlands and their usage.

Another question was asked about how wetlands will be managed as they are under MINITERE but, at present, districts are in charge of allocating land in them. The Registrar of Land Titles replied that only the Land Commissions will be able to allocate land owned by the state, including wetlands, so the previous situation whereby wetlands have been allocated by districts should stop.

Development of Kigali City

Mr Payne was asked by one delegate how the visual aspect of the central business district in Kigali City could be improved, given that 80% of the housing stock there is informal. This delegate echoed the earlier discussion about expropriation, acknowledging the need for compensation but claiming that investors and developers still need special incentives to help renew the City. He was concerned that fair compensation for residents of informal settlements would lead to lack of development.

Mr Payne said that the problem can be solved if the government provides good land use plans and a regulatory framework that permits commercially viable development. He explained again in more detail that compensation does not need to be in terms of cash, using the example from Turkey, where ‘squatters’ become knowledgeable about market prices and request 2 or 3 apartments in a multi-storey block that a developer wants to build on their land – one for them, one to rent out, and maybe one to give to their offspring. Developers do not need to pay cash up-front but instead set the prices of the other apartments to get their profit overall, and the squatters retain housing in a good location while the City gets planned urban development. Once there is a commercially viable regulatory framework then the market and private developers can take over and develop the central business district in Kigali City in this way.

Mr Iyadema added that land in the central business district is already above the average market price for the rest of Kigali City. Private investors and developers can choose where to invest and should not get special incentives. If they want cheaper land for development they just have to go outside the central business district, but if they want that location then they have to pay the existing landowners more, as the land has higher intrinsic value. He noted that the problem in Rwanda is that investors and developers have been used to getting free land, so they still want this.

3.2 Day 2; Comments and Discussions

Institutional Structures and Relationships

A major issue was raised about the structural relationship between MINITERE and the National Land Centre, especially on planning issues. For example, who would be responsible for planning and finance – planning in the overall sense, not the technical land use planning sense? The Registrar of Land Titles and the Honourable Minister of State clarified this – the National Land Centre for spatial planning and MINITERE for administrative planning. Related questions were about the co-ordination of structures at district level – the National Land Centre is under MINITERE but who will District Land Officers report to if they are recruited and paid for by the districts?

Mr Iyadema clarified that the organisational charts shown in the second presentation were not in standard MIFOTRA format but had been used to illustrate the new structures only. He also explained that the National Land Centre will be a specialised agency of MINITERE and will take over most of the technical functions that MINITERE can no longer perform. The Honourable Minister of State confirmed this and said that MINITERE will remain with the level of policy while the National Land Centre does the technical work; MINITERE will remain with only 2 people dealing with land.

On coordination at district level, Mr Iyadema explained that the District Land Bureaux will be responsible for all technical functions relating to land, so they will be technically responsible to the Office of the Registrars and the National Land Centre, but they will be administratively responsible to the Mayors, in the same way as applies to other district departments. He added that the organisational charts for District Land Bureaux staffing that were presented were indicative, and that it would be up

to individual districts to decide exactly what posts they needed. MINITERE has developed job descriptions to guide districts, and suggested a minimum structure, but as demand for services increases over time districts are free to recruit additional staff.

The issue of who will pay for the District Land Bureaux staff was also raised. Mr Iyadema explained that this should not be a problem as the extra staff will replace those who currently work in the district land unit – the District Land Bureaux will not come in addition to this existing unit but will replace it. Also, the principle is that the District Land Bureaux will generate revenues in due course which will contribute to their running costs. Hence the need for phasing, having few staff initially and then taking more on as more services are provided and more revenues are generated.

There were calls for District Mayors to be given more support with understanding the proposed structures, as it is currently the Mayors who deal with land issues day to day and they need advice on how to work with the new District Land Bureaux. Leaders need training and support so they can give leadership to the new institutions.

Redistribution and Land Sharing

Issues of land sharing and redistribution were also raised by delegates, as well as the issue of what will happen during registration of land belonging to those Rwandans still living outside the country. How will District Land Bureaux share land in their areas, as this is a political issue not a technical one? The Registrar of Land Titles answered this by saying that land sharing is provided for in the Organic Land Law and will take place in accordance with a new decree regulating it. He also emphasised that no registration of a land parcel will take place while there are still residual problems among the population over its allocation. The NLTRP's Legal Adviser then reminded delegates that registration is not just a one-time event. Future changes of land ownership also need to be registered, whether they arise through inheritance or transactions or land sharing. So, when land sharing happens in future, the new situation will need to be registered.

It was observed that some individuals in the Northern Province refuse to share land and go to court, so if it is a government policy then the executive and the judiciary need to have the same understanding about land sharing. The Gishwati Forest case and the recent Eastern Province experience of demarcation and land redistribution involving the Rwanda Defence Force in Umutara were then raised. The Registrar of Land Titles reminded delegates that there are procedures being drafted to regulate land sharing and said that people receiving land in Gishwati Forest and Umutara will receive proper documents in due course. The Honourable Minister of State said that a specific study of the land sharing problem should be carried out in the Northern Province.

Costs of Land Registration

It was suggested by one delegate that the public should contribute to the costs of registration as they will be the ones who get the benefits of it if their land disputes become easier to resolve. Mr English emphasised in response that in urban areas the potential revenues generated from land administration services should easily cover costs but that little could be recovered from the rural economy. Careful consideration should be given as to how the costs of first registration through LTR for individuals in the rural areas at least should be covered. One proposal is that it should be free with fees and charges only being introduced for subsequent transactions. However, some additional discussion is needed on this following completion of the field trials.

Another delegate suggested that the costs of implementing the draft SRM should be considered in light of the huge potential gains in the field of justice and good governance. The Honourable Minister of State agreed that once the LTR field trials are scaled up then land conflict will be reduced and this should reduce costs in other sectors. She also pointed out to delegates that the SRM had not been drafted when the EDPRS was finalised, but that once the SRM is formally approved it will be incorporated into the EDPRS.

A question was asked about the costs of transferring and mortgaging land and the Honourable Minister of State then addressed the issue of land taxes head on. She said that, although this issue is outside MINITERE's mandate, the current 6% tax on land sales is comparatively very high compared to all other countries and will significantly hinder the development of a legal land market. She informed delegates that MINITERE is discussing the whole issue of land taxes, fees and charges with MINECOFIN and the banks. Mr English added that the formal land administration system is in competition with the current informal arrangements and if charges are too high in the new (formal) system people will not 'buy-in' and the proposed reforms will not succeed. The NLTRP Legal Adviser added that if taxes on land transfers are too high then the Register will become obsolete, so this issue must be addressed in terms both of maintaining the Register and as part of overall policy on taxation and revenue.

Kigali City and Urban Land

There was a question about how to resolve problems of misallocation of plots in urban areas, where it is not as easy as in rural areas to call the neighbours as witnesses. A question was also asked about the role of Kigali City in land allocation. Mr Iyadema confirmed that the City has to approve land allocation applications but that it will be the Registrars who issue titles, not the Mayor.

The Registrar of Land Titles said that much of the work in the urban areas will be carried out by the private sector, such as valuation and surveying. If an urban district wants to prepare an area for redevelopment, they can prepare plans and contract out the surveying etc. and the District Land Bureau can oversee the contract without the District Land Bureau staff having to do everything themselves.

Comments were made about the failures of other African countries who have tried to demolish/eradicate informal settlements – this supported Mr Payne's proposals that in-site upgrading of existing informal settlements needs to be promoted. Planning can be seen as preventive medicine to help prevent the future growth of informal settlements, but those that already exist must be upgraded within the overall planning framework. Mr Payne agreed but said that the numerous administrative steps in the planning process at present are a huge burden to better and more efficient planning.

Time-frame for Implementation

As on Day 1, Mr English was asked directly about the time-frame for implementation. 15 years to finish the first registration of land was considered as excessively long and problems will become more complex. Mr English was asked to shorten the time-frame and review the scenario so that it could all be finished by 2015 at the latest. The Honourable Minister of State echoed this and said that it is important to know what hinders faster progress – is it cost, is it manpower? She expressed concern that such a gradual process as proposed in the draft SRM would not be equitable as it would raise the issue of how to decide which cells to regularise and which cells to keep waiting – which people should benefit first? Mr English said that hotspots can be prioritised, but that basically to shorten the time taken by half requires a doubling of the budget and considerable extra processing capacity. Mr English accepted that the Rwandan public is willing to mobilise for land reform to take place faster, but said that in other countries it had been hard to achieve a 'big bang' of rapid first registration. He undertook to discuss the speed of implementation in detail with the districts and then prepare new figures.

Land Consolidation

Land consolidation and land subdivision was also raised as an issue. Land consolidation could conflict with land sharing, so guidance was called for on how to implement the different aspects of land policy in future. The NLTRP Legal Adviser noted that land will go off the Register in due course if the social issue of land fragmentation is not addressed – informal subdivision will continue and the Register will become obsolete and non-reflective of the future situation on the ground. But Mr Iyadema said that if you consolidate land use rather than land itself, then it does not matter how many landowners are registered on a parcel.

4. LIST OF RESOLUTIONS

There were 2 key resolutions that emerged from the discussions during both days of the Workshop, as well as ten more specific resolutions arising on Day 1, with nine on Day 2, organised here by topic.

4.1 The Two Key Resolutions of the SRM Workshop

1. “To provide a ‘fast-track scenario’ to show the cost implications and feasibility of moving faster with land tenure regularisation – the first registration of land – than the draft Strategic Road Map currently proposes, and to help establish what the real obstacles to faster progress really are.”

(Proposed by the Honourable Minister of State for Lands and Environment and the representative of Kigali Institute of Education)

- This would help all land reform stakeholders and implementers to determine whether the proposed plan for all first registration of land to be completed by 2021 is really the best one, given the desirability of scaling-up land registration much faster than currently proposed in the interests of the equity of all Rwandan citizens.

2. “To consider the long term cost-savings in the areas of justice and good governance from land tenure regularisation and the implementation of national land tenure reform.”

(Proposed by the Honourable Minister of State for Lands and Environment and the Governor of the Southern Province)

- This approach could help all stakeholders to see the actual financial cost of implementing the reforms in a better perspective.

4.2 Other Resolutions

Institutions and Training

1. All districts to start implementing and respecting the Organic Land Law and the proposed land reform process by ensuring that they follow the recent Circular issued by the Honourable Minister of State for Lands and Environment, which informed District Land Officers that they should now take legal responsibility for signing all documents relating to land.

(Proposed by the Deputy Registrar of Land Titles for the Northern Zone)

2. Establish a programme for the Registrars to go out to the districts and meet the new District Land Officers in order to explain the laws and proposed land reform process to them and help them get started in their work.

(Proposed by the Vice-Mayor (Economic Affairs) of Huye District)

3. Provide training for district leaderships (Mayors, District Councils and District Executive Committees) in order to help them fully support the new District Land Bureaux.

(Proposed by the Gasabo District Mayor)

4. Provide training to authorities and mediators at local level on legal issues so that they can be better able to resolve disputes with legal clarity, especially those disputes relating to family issues.

(Proposed by the Nyamugali Cell Coordinator and the Executive Secretary of HAGURUKA)

5. Provide training for lawyers involved in implementing the Organic Land Law so that they develop a shared understanding of the Organic Land Law and the principles of the National Land Policy that lie behind it.

(Proposed by the Deputy Registrar of Land Titles for the Northern Zone)

6. Continue to provide clarification and sensitisation on the linkages between the National Land Centre and MINITERE, and on the technical and administrative responsibilities, staffing and reporting arrangements for the District Land Bureaux.
(Proposed by the Governor of the Northern Province, the Secretary-General of MIFOTRA and the Bulera District Mayor)
7. Try to work as much as possible at local level, using existing local capacity, rather than being overly-reliant on professionals, as the will to implement land reform and land registration quickly is strong at grassroots level.
(Proposed by the Vice-Mayor (Economic Affairs) of Gatsibo District)

Land Registration, Land Sharing, Land Consolidation and Land Redistribution

8. Provide more information and sensitisation regarding how future land sharing will take place, and how this will affect land registration, especially so as to help ensure that both the judicial and executive branches of government share the same understanding on these issues.
(Proposed by the Governor of the Northern Province and the Bulera District Mayor)
 - The Honourable Minister of State for Lands and Environment proposed that a specific study of land sharing problems in the Northern Province should be carried out in order to fully understand the issues there, and she proposed to hold a specific meeting on this once the research is complete.
9. Establish guiding principles to show how both land sharing (for social reasons) and land consolidation (for economic reasons) can be implemented and to provide public sensitisation on this.
(Proposed by the Assistant Representative of the FAO)
10. Undertake greater sensitisation of the public on the role of land in economic development and livelihoods, as part of the process of informing the public clearly that this land reform will not mean a redistribution of land to the landless.
(Proposed by the District Land Officer of Gatsibo District)
11. Enable participants in land registration to contribute towards the costs of the process as they will be the ones getting a direct benefit.
(Proposed by the Gasabo District Mayor)

Monitoring and Evaluation

12. Include stakeholders from the private sector and civil society in the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of national land tenure reform.
(Proposed by the Executive Secretary of PROFEMMES TWESE HAMWE)

Urban Issues

13. Undertake further investigation and analysis of how to deal with the problems of mis-allocation and multiple allocations of plots in urban areas, especially Kigali City.
(Proposed by the Gasabo District Mayor)
14. Conduct an inventory of informal settlements in Kigali and the municipalities to assist in deciding the urban strategy.
(Proposed by the Managing Director of MATRIX, Kenya)

Research and Advice for the Public

15. Carefully review the 2005 Organic Land Law and the 1999 Succession Law so as to avoid conflict and problems on issues of family land rights and be better able to advise the public on these issues.
(Proposed by the i/c Lobbying and Advocacy of IMBARAGA)
16. Undertake more detailed research on the land problems of different categories of vulnerable groups in order to identify specific solutions to their land problems and generate specific practical measures to help vulnerable groups.
(Proposed by the i/c Human Rights of COPORWA)
17. Clarify the links between the Organic Land Law and the Environment Law, and at the same time undertake a full audit of Rwanda's wetlands so that they can be properly legally protected under these laws.
(Proposed by the i/c Environment and Natural Resources of Muhanga District)
18. Investigate issues of expropriation and compensation more, including trying to find ways of ensuring that people whose land is expropriated are settled on other land.
(Proposed by the Country Coordinator of ARD Inc)
19. Organise a forum for Rwandan research and education institutions to co-operate on addressing the various outstanding issues that remain in the land reform process.
(Proposed by representative of Kigali Institute of Education)
 - The NLTRP Team Leader proposed that this should focus on operationalising existing research findings into public advice and guidelines.

5. SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK

5.1 Feed-Back Form Responses

Information and comments received on the 67 completed Feed-Back Forms has been analysed. Tables 1 and 2 summarise the results.

Table 1
Achievement of Workshop Objectives and Understanding of Issues

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Partly (%)	N/R ¹ (%)	Total (%)
Did the Workshop meet its Objectives overall?	48 (72)	1 (1)	15 (22)	3 (5)	67 (100)
Do you now clearly understand the need for national land tenure reform, and for having formal, legal land registration and land administration services accessible to all Rwandans?	63 (94)	0 (0)	2 (3)	2 (3)	67 (100)
Has the Workshop advanced your knowledge and understanding of the requirements for the implementation of national land tenure reform?	59 (88)	0 (0)	7 (11)	1 (1)	67 (100)
Do you now clearly understand the full scale and nature of what is involved in national land tenure reform?	42 (63)	4 (6)	19 (28)	2 (3)	67 (100)
Do you now clearly understand the proposed framework for stakeholder support?	34 (51)	4 (6)	21 (31)	8 (12)	67 (100)
Has the Workshop advanced your knowledge and understanding of what is involved in the process of land tenure reform in urban and rural areas?	47 (70)	0 (0)	11 (16)	9 (14)	67 (100)
Should Rwanda proceed with implementing the Strategic Road Map?	52 (78)	0 (0)	4 (6)	11 (16)	67 (100)

¹N/R = Non-Response. The numbers of non-responses are higher for the last three questions listed in the table as several delegates missed out completely the back page of the Feed-Back Form.

In general the majority of delegates who completed Feed-Back Forms answered the various questions set out in the table positively, demonstrating that the SRM Workshop had achieved its four main objectives. Only a small percentage of delegates who completed the Feed-Back Forms gave negative answers to the questions.

In particular, an overwhelming majority of delegates who completed the Feed-Back Forms agreed that they now understood the need for national land tenure reform (94%) and that the SRM Workshop had advanced their knowledge and understanding of the requirements for its implementation (88%). A high proportion of those completing the Feed-Back Forms also agreed that the SRM Workshop had met its objectives overall (72%), that they now clearly understood the scale and nature of what is involved in national land tenure reform (63%), that the SRM Workshop had advanced their

knowledge and understanding of the land reform process in urban and rural areas (70%), and that Rwanda should proceed with implementing the draft SRM (78%).

The main area of concern to emerge from the Feed-Back Forms centres on delegates' understanding of the proposed framework for stakeholder support – a small majority of those completing the Feed-Back Forms agreed that they now clearly understood the proposed framework (51%), but 31% said they only partly understood it and 12% provided no response on this issue. The individual comments received (see below) provide some clarification of what is needed to improve this situation.

Table 2
Potential Extent of Stakeholder Support for Implementation of the Draft SRM

What will you or your organisation consider doing to help with implementing the Strategic Road Map?	Number Considering Districts (% of N=26)	Number Considering Donor/NGO (% of N=12)	Number Considering Others (% of N=29)	Number Considering Total (% of N=67)
Provide information to the general public?	23 (88)	5 (42)	12 (41)	40 (60)
Provide community level information and/or extension services?	16 (62)	6 (50)	8 (28)	30 (45)
Provide legal support and information services?	13 (50)	4 (33)	8 (28)	25 (37)
Provide technical training to different land institutions at local level (e.g. on GIS, remote sensing, surveying or databases)?	14 (54)	0 (0)	4 (14)	18 (27)
Provide administrative training to different land institutions at local level (e.g. on PR skills or record-keeping)?	14 (54)	0 (0)	4 (14)	18 (27)
Provide training and technical assistance to the National Land Centre?	7 (27)	1 (8)	6 (21)	14 (21)
Provide institutional and/or organisational development to land management organisations?	10 (38)	0 (0)	2 (7)	12 (18)
Provide equipment to different land institutions?	10 (38)	0 (0)	2 (7)	12 (18)
Provide direct technical support (e.g. production of publicity materials or drafting of additional secondary legislation)?	7 (27)	2 (17)	2 (7)	11 (16)
Provide funding?	10 (38)	3 (25)	4 (14)	17 (25)

Table 2 suggests there is willingness on the part of stakeholders to support the implementation of the draft SRM, with 16% or more of all delegates who completed Feed-Back Forms expressing their willingness to consider helping on each of the 10 different aspects of support set out in the table.

Three specific expressions of support were also received: from DED (a donor agency), to provide community level information and/or extension services in a pilot upgrading project in Gatsata sector, Gasabo District; from Geneva Global Inc (a consultancy firm), to provide funding for rural land use if they are provided with guidelines on this; and from International Alert (an NGO), to provide support in monitoring and managing land conflicts.

The three most popular aspects for support overall were those relating to the provision of information – to the public and local communities and on legal issues. A total of 25% of delegates who completed Feed-Back Forms also expressed their willingness to consider provision of funding

Representatives of donors and NGOs were mainly interested in supporting implementation through the provision of information and also through funding and the provision of direct technical support. Other delegates (e.g. 17 delegates who completed the Feed-Back Forms anonymously, plus a small number from Government ministries and agencies, the private sector and the LTR trial cells) lent mainly towards provision of information and training.

5.2 Comments and Suggestions

The Feed-Back Forms made provision for delegates to write their own comments and suggestions on all the questions being asked. A number of generally positive comments were made, indicating that the four main objectives of the Workshop have been achieved.

“The necessity of this reform is understandable and it has been well explained.” (Anonymous)

“With the presentation made by Payne, it is clear that it is necessary to have appropriate strategies for each type of place (urban and rural).” (Gasana Ildephonse)

“Of course one must take all necessary precautions. There will be problems to surmount, but it will not be like climbing a mountain. Whatever it takes is fine – the stakes are too high to fail.” (Anonymous)

“Land reform is a task which will take a long time to achieve but which must be done with sensitivity it constitutes the foundation of all activities to do with land.” (Remy Niyibizi, Imbaraga)

However, several delegates also expressed concerns that there had not been sufficient time, given the scope of the issues to be dealt with, and that there was in particular insufficient time for debate from the floor, due to too much time being taken on responses from the platform. Requests were made for soft copies of the presentations (these are available from lr_phase1@yahoo.co.uk), and further dissemination was called for, especially at district level. One delegate stated that:

“This term – Strategic Road Map – leaves me confused.” (Anonymous)

A few specific issues were mentioned as requiring further clarification and explanation:

“Didn’t get well how the spatial data relating to land registration should be managed...Didn’t get well the system that will be used for the rural land registration.” (Marie Christine D. Simbizi, CGIS-NUR)

“Revenues from the districts were not clear. Taxation issues on land must be clarified. Wetlands management not clarified...The proposed structures are good but their ability to quickly provide a quality service remains to be seen.” (Anonymous)

“How will environmental management committees and land committees at cell level interact, land being part of the environment?” (Suzanne Uwimana, Muhanga District)

“It would have been better to contact the local participants at district level in preparing this draft because I see that they do not understand the role that they are going to play in executing the SRM.” (Christian Twahirwa, MINICOM)

“Certain points remain to be clarified, notably the resolution of conflicts surrounding land registration for couples living outside legal marriage.” (Christine Tuyisenge, Haguruka)

“It is necessary to study the case of land left by genocide victims. Who will that land be registered to?” (Anonymous)

Two major issues emerged in the Feed-Back Forms, concerning the time-frame for implementation and the proposed framework for stakeholder support. The comments on the time-frame reflected those made during the afternoon discussions, but the comments on the framework for stakeholder support provided additional information about what is still needed.

On the time-frame for implementation:

“Big query about speed. If it is only a matter of financial resources to achieve LTR in 5 years, a plan should be put to donors.” (Rodney Dyer, DFID)

“If technical, financial and human resources are available, I suggest you to be quick; each day of delay brings another issue!!..The delay you propose for the exercise is too long. Is it possible to review the scenarios to reduce time?” (Frederick Gatera, KIE)

“Implementation is the hardest nut to crack, but as we go deeper and deeper we will gain experience to speed up the whole process.” (Damas Muhororo, Kayonza District)

“The suggestions made by some of the delegates about the long duration for land registration must be taken into consideration.” (Anonymous)

“The registration of land parcels will take too long – 15 years for certain districts having more than 100 cells. Is there no way to register parcels in less time?” (Anonymous)

“It’s necessary to accelerate the process.” (Fidèle Ndayisaba)

“The duration of implementation must be reduced in order to interest donors in involving themselves in financing this land reform operation.” (Anonymous)

On the framework for stakeholder support:

“It’s not clear. There must be more explanation.” (Director of Lands, Girambi District)

“The stakeholders are numerous but the part of each one is not well defined.” (Félicien Ngendahimana, Kirehe Land Bureau)

“Take into account that District Development Plans are for 5 years (2008-2012).” (Suzanne Uwimana, Muhanga District)

“More info needed (or clarity of presentation) on funding gap that donors are being asked to address i.e. total costs – normal recurrent cost – expected revenue generation.” (Rodney Dyer, DFID)

“There is a need of a training needs assessment to be addressed to potential institutions that can support, in this case e.g. CGIS-NUR.” (Marie Christine D. Simbizi, CGIS-NUR)

“Certain organisations like Imbaraga have not seen their role or were not mentioned in the process, even though they have been working on land issues for a long time...Rwanda must continue [with implementing the SRM] but it is necessary to involve other actors for the process to take place more quickly because, for many development programmes, land reform is a condition of their realisation.” (Remy Niyibizi, Imbaraga)

Other comments were addressed to the practical aspects of implementation:

“I hope it will be quickly decentralised to where the real work is to be done rather than keeping it at MINITERE and on paper.” (Geoffrey Zawadi, Bugesera District)

“Please quickly give the District Land Bureaux the necessary materials, procedures manuals and legal documents.” (Charles Twayigize, Ngoma District)

“A way to shorten the duration and to minimise or utilise more rationally the resources at cell level and in MINITERE must be found. One can simplify the operation especially in respect of the procedures. It would be better to elaborate the work plan in conjunction with the decentralised entities.” (Silas Nyirindekwe, Bugesera District)

“[The SRM should be implemented] but only if it incorporates the recommendations emerging from this Workshop. This policy comes at the right moment and will resolve several land problems, but local institutions must be supported for it to be feasibly and effectively implemented.” (Serge Ndayitabi, Nyamagabe District)

“The problem is that districts do not have land use master plans to give them guidance. Elaboration of such plans implies resources which districts do not have at their disposal...The different costs are estimates and need to correspond to the activities that will be carried out considering the cells (some of which are inaccessible), the type of relief and the ecology...The text is illegible on this important page [showing costs].” (Suzanne Uwimana, Muhanga District)

Several additional comments and suggestions on a number of other issues were also made on the Feed-Back Forms :

“Prepare debates on the television and radio for a good presentation and understanding of the changes to come.” (Aldolphe Simbizi, MINADEF)

“Land reform comes at the right time but it would be better to have an independent commission which is not dependent on any Ministries, for example like the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission.” (Anonymous)

“Land registration may give incontestable rights to some people in place of the real rightful holders of rights. E.g. People who are still exiled may return and find that their land was allocated and registered to other people. Watch out!” (Geoffrey Zawadi, Bugesera District)

4.3 Final Words

The final words resulting from the workshop are hereby quoted from the Feed-Back Form written by the Mayor of Kirehe, Patrick Nkunuzwami, one of the NLTRP's four trial districts:

“Though it may seem too complex to deal with land issues, especially in our country where land resources are indeed scarce, with your team’s efforts one’s fears, worries and uncertainties seem to be catered for...Of course, sooner or later we obviously as a nation had to address the issues pertaining to land use and land ownership. And I believe the sooner the better!..The main worry I had was the how? And who to do it? I now have a clear mind on that!...Of course, the schedule seems to be somehow as long as many miles away! And one can predict that it will also be hard since one is aware of the scale itself. I believe problems arising will be handled...Though it might be feared as somewhat long, it is comparatively short. Why short? Because we are comparing it with nothing else we ever had.”

Annex I

Sample Feed-Back Form

**National Land Tenure Reform Programme – Strategic Road Map Workshop
3rd and 4th October 2007**

FEEDBACK FORM

1. Name			
2. Affiliation/Organisation			
<p>3. The main objectives of the workshop were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inform stakeholders about the need for national land tenure reform • present the draft Strategic Road Map for the implementation of national land tenure reform • set out a framework for stakeholder support for the implementation of national land tenure reform • highlight some key issues (process of land reform, urban issues, wetlands) 			
Did the workshop meet these objectives overall?	Yes	No	Partly
Please give us your comments:			
4. Do you now clearly understand the need for national land tenure reform, and for having formal, legal land registration and land administration services, accessible to all Rwandans?	Yes	No	Partly
Please give us your comments:			
5. Has the workshop advanced your knowledge and understanding of the requirements for the implementation of national land tenure reform?	Yes	No	Partly
Please give us your comments:			
6. Do you now clearly understand the full scale and nature of what is involved in national land tenure reform?	Yes	No	Partly
Please give us your comments:			

7. Do you now clearly understand the proposed framework for stakeholder support?	Yes	No	Partly
Please give us your comments:			
8. Has the workshop advanced your knowledge and understanding of what is involved in the process of land tenure reform in urban and rural areas?	Yes	No	Partly
Please give us your comments:			
9. Should Rwanda proceed with implementing the Strategic Road Map?	Yes	No	Partly
Please give us your comments:			
<p>10. What will you or your organisation consider doing to help with implementing the Strategic Road Map? (Please tick all that apply)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide information to the general public • Provide community level information and extension services • Provide legal support and information services • Provide technical training to different land institutions at local level (e.g. on GIS, remote sensing, surveying or databases) • Provide administrative training to different land institutions at local level (e.g. on PR skills or record-keeping) • Provide training and technical assistance to the National Land Centre • Provide institutional and/or organisational development to land management organisations • Provide equipment to different land institutions • Provide direct technical support (e.g. production of publicity materials or drafting of additional secondary legislation) • Provide funding 			
Please contact Thierry Hoza Ngoga of the NLTRP team if you have any further comments, suggestions or questions regarding the Strategic Road Map or about how you might be willing and able to help implement it, at lr_phase1@yahoo.com, tel: 08872720. Thank you.			