

PD-AAN-322
 15A 31848

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Land Mapping, Titling and Registration			2. PROJECT NUMBER 497-0312	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE USAID/Indonesia
4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit, e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <u>F/83-3</u>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
5. BY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES		6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING		7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>79</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>84</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>84</u>	A. Total \$ <u>4,000,000</u> B. U.S. \$ <u>2,000,000</u>	From (month/yr.) <u>August 1981</u> To (month/yr.) <u>March 1983</u> Date of Evaluation Review <u>February-March, 1983</u>

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite three items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., program, SFAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
<p>During the period February 16 to March 16, 1983, USAID Indonesia conducted the first of two annual project evaluations which were regularly scheduled before the final project evaluation which was to be completed prior to December, 1984. This evaluation covers project activities for the period October 1981 to March 1983, as well as project operations prior to the start up date (October '81) where such are relevant to the evaluation. The primary purpose of the evaluation was to determine whether the project impact as originally envisaged is still probable and if project design/inputs are still adequate and relevant.</p> <p>Based on the results of the LMTR Project Evaluation and upon discussions held between AID representatives and the Directorate of Land Registration, certain ongoing project activities have been primarily completed. However, due to severe implementation problems to date, USAID recommends that the project be terminated and that all elements of the LMTR Project be brought to a conclusion with goods and services fully provided by September 30, 1983.</p>	Mission Director	30 September '83

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) <u>See above</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PID/T	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A.	<input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change
B.	<input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan
C.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Name and Title)

Kevin A. Rushing, Project Officer/Agronomy
 Ir. Soepranowo, Director of Land Registration
 Directorate General of Agraria

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature William P. Fuller
 Name William P. Fuller
 Date May 31, 1983

Project 497-0312

Land Mapping, Titling and Registration Evaluation Report

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	2
Findings	4
Project Description Background Information	4
Project Status and Evaluation	5
Evaluation Findings - Summary/General	5
Evaluation Findings - Specific	5
Project Administration	6
Project Management	7
Program Design	8
Program Implementation	9
General	10
Specific	10
Recommendations	19
Project Functional Activities	19
Project Management	20
Program/Project Design	21
Program/Project Priorities and Scheduling	22
Project Implementation Activities	23
Specific	23
Body of Report	31
Assessment of the Project Impact on the Beneficiaries	31
Assessment of the Logical Framework Matrix	32
Assessment of BLM Consultant Role	46
Assessment of Financial inputs	49
Appendices	53

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On August 29, 1980, the Agency for International Development (AID) entered into a Grant Agreement with the Republic of Indonesia, Directorate General of Agraria (DGA) under which assistance was to be given to DGA in its efforts to accelerate land mapping, titling and registration in rural areas of Indonesia by developing cost and time effective methods of land record keeping, mapping and administration.

Project outputs were to include socio-economic studies, surveys and other evidence documenting the effects of land mapping, titling and registration upon the rural poor; trained Government of Indonesia officials in fields critical to the successful design, implementation and evaluation of land mapping, titling and registration projects; and, tested and evaluated systems of accelerated land mapping, titling and registration on-line and ready for implementation on a large-scale basis.

The grant provides a three year performance period and a total amount, including the Government of Indonesia contribution of approximately \$ 4.0 million dollars (U.S.). The Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) has been extended to December 31, 1984. Technical assistance services for performance of the project was accomplished by a PASA between AID and the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior (BLM).

During the period February 16 to March 16, 1983 USAID/Indonesia conducted the first of two annual project evaluations which are regularly scheduled before the final project evaluation which is to be completed prior to December, 1984. This evaluation covers project activities for the period October, 1981 to March, 1983, as well as project operations prior to start date (October, 1981) where such are relevant to the evaluation. The primary purpose of the evaluation was to determine whether the project impact as originally envisaged is still probable and if the project design/inputs are still adequate and relevant.

Evaluation findings are :

- achievement of project objectives, goals and purpose will not be of the magnitude or comprehensiveness contemplated in the original project paper.
- the sector goal (increased access to land) and beneficiary objective (benefits of land registration to rural population) of the project will probably not be as demonstrable as contemplated.
- recommendations for revised systems of land registration, based on project tests and evaluations, will be difficult to totally implement during the remaining duration of the project.

The major reasons for the above findings appear to be overly optimistic implementation proposals, both in number and degree of comprehensiveness; an apparent lack of commitment, both in timeliness and

decision-making ability of the Directorate of Land Registration to meet the project purpose; and, the lack of a more aggressive project management position by both BLM and USAID/Indonesia.

The findings and reasons set forth above can be remedied during the remaining period of the project. Major redesign of the project is not required, and the technical assistance provided to the project by the BLM to date has been excellent with commendable work accomplishments achieved. The evaluation report, in the section on Recommendations, has been prepared in order to make the necessary adjustments, modifications and revisions in the scope/scale of the project, that will ensure achievement of the project objectives. Implementation and results of the Recommendations will be more specifically assessed and evaluated in the next regularly scheduled project evaluation.

FINDINGS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

As stated in the Project Paper (p.11) this project has two objectives. The primary objective is to

- ... assist the Directorate General Agraria (DGA) in its efforts to accelerate land mapping, titling and registration (LMTR) in rural areas of Indonesia by developing cost and time effective methods of land record keeping, mapping and administration.

The secondary objective of the project is to

- ... demonstrate that land registration and titling has economic and social benefits for the rural population.

The sector goal of the project is increased access of the rural population to land as a productive resource.

The project purpose is to increase the rate of land mapping, titling and registration and the effectiveness of land administration in rural Indonesia.

End of project status is to consist of

- ... three kecamatan areas mapped and registered in pilot project areas of Central Java (Pati), West Sumatera (Solok) and South Sulawesi (Wajo) utilizing the accelerated methods for land mapping, titling and registration.
- ... organizational structure and operating procedures within DGA commensurate with the recommendations of project reports and pilot area activity evaluations.
- ... a proposal submitted for a follow-on land mapping, titling and registration project on an expanded system basis as appropriate.

Project outputs were to include

- ... socio-economic studies, surveys and other evidence documenting the effects of land mapping, titling and registration upon the rural poor.
- ... trained Government of Indonesia officials in fields critical to the successful design, implementation and evaluation of land mapping, titling and registration projects.
- ... tested and evaluated systems of accelerated land mapping, titling and registration on-line and ready for implementation on a large-scale basis.

PROJECT STATUS AND EVALUATION

This evaluation is the first of two annual project evaluations before the final project evaluation which is tentatively scheduled to occur prior to December, 1984. The evaluation is a regularly scheduled event and was provided for in the Evaluation Plan section of the Project Paper (refer to pp. 33-34 of Project Paper).

For evaluation purposes the project start date is considered to be October, 1981. Project completion date, as extended, is December 31, 1984. This evaluation covers project activities for the period October, 1981 to March, 1983, as well as certain project operations prior to the start up date where such are relevant to the project evaluation.

The primary focus of this evaluation is to determine whether the project impact as originally envisaged is still probable and if the project design/inputs are still adequate and relevant.

Based on the project evaluation and findings, recommendations will be made to modify or revise the scope/scale of the project as needed during the remaining period of the project.

EVALUATION FINDINGS - SUMMARY/GENERAL

This evaluation has concluded, on the basis of project performance to date, that achievement of the project objectives, goal and purpose will not be of the magnitude or the comprehensiveness contemplated in the original project paper. This is particularly evident with respect to the beneficiary objective that land registration and titling has economic and social benefits for the rural population and the sector goal of increasing access of the rural population to land resources. Project findings to date on the foregoing described items indicate except where it supports national programs (e.g. transmigration, PRONA, etc) there is little or no direct relationship between land mapping, titling and registration and the project's objectives and goals. The evaluation however has disclosed that the assistance provided by USAID and the Bureau of Land Management in their recommendations and proposals will, if effectively implemented by DGA, serve to achieve the primary objective of the project, which is to develop cost and time effective methods of land record keeping, mapping and administration that will provide for an acceleration of land mapping, titling and registration activities in Indonesia.

EVALUATION FINDINGS - SPECIFIC

The evaluation findings set forth below are based on review of project written materials, reports and data files; discussions and interviews with project staff, USAID personnel, Directorate of Land Registration staff; and, technical qualifications, capabilities and experience of the evaluation team members. For various logistical reasons field trips to the three pilot area sites were not made. These visitations were not considered essential, except for certain technical mapping evaluations, to conduct this evaluation.

Project Administration

The subject project is based on a grant agreement between USAID and the Government of Indonesia signed August 29, 1980. The grant provides for a 3 year project implementation period for a total U.S. dollar amount, including Government of Indonesia contribution of approximately \$ 4.0 million dollars (U.S.). Technical assistance services for the performance of the project was accomplished by a Participating Agency Service Agreement (PASA) between USAID and the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior (BLM). The PASA was executed effective March 1, 1981. The PASA describes the various roles and functions to be performed by AID/Washington, BLM/Washington, USAID/Indonesia and BLM Project/Indonesia.

Findings:

- an inordinate delay in time occurred between execution of the grant agreement between USAID/GOI and the execution of the PASA between AID/BLM (August, 1980 - March, 1981).
- excessive time delays occurred between execution of the PASA and when the first BLM project staff member reported to project assignment in Indonesia (March, 1981 - October, 1981).
- excessive time delays occurred between execution of the PASA and arrival of total BLM project team at the project in Indonesia (mapping specialist October, 1981; systems analyst/team leader November, 1981; and land economist - February, 1982).
- from the beginning of project implementation, particularly with respect to financial and accounting transactions, numerous correspondence and discussions (e.g. cables, memos, telephone calls, etc.) were necessary between BLM/Washington, AID/Washington, USAID/Indonesia to clarify or resolve administrative provisions of the PASA. Project activities were constrained, delayed or confused by these actions. Obligation of funds for project activities were delayed in certain instances due to the necessity for PASA Amendments, execution of revised PIO/Ts, etc.
- Acceptance of BLM/Washington explanations by USAID/Indonesia for project errors, delays, information, etc. was assumed without written documentation or justification.
- BLM/Washington has not provided timely or detailed financial reports to USAID/Indonesia to enable quarterly tracking of BLM expenditures or obligations against PASA budget/funding accounts necessary to monitor project expenditures effectively. Additionally, BLM/Washington in its role as a contractor, did not perform as aggressively or as responsive to project matters as was needed.

Project Management

The project organization consists of a USAID/Indonesia Project Officer, BLM Team Leader, and a DGA Project Officer from the Directorate for Land Registration (DLR). The Director of Land Registration did not serve as Project Officer but appointed the sub-director/division Chief of Photogrammetry and Triangulation as project liaison officer, with a further assignment of a specific individual in Photogrammetry and Triangulation to serve as DLR Project Officer for day-to-day operations. Formally scheduled project management meetings were only held on an adhoc basis with the DLR. Formal project management status reports were not scheduled as often between USAID/Indonesia and the BLM Team Leader. Weekly briefings and discussions on a random basis were held between USAID/Indonesia and the BLM Team. The BLM Team Leader had to be medically evacuated to the United States in May, 1982 and did not return to the project. The BLM Mapping Specialist was appointed Acting Team Leader in June, 1982 and has remained in that capacity to the date of this evaluation.

Findings:

- the project organization established by DLR was not effective in providing the appropriate level of authority, review, and participation needed for the project to commensurate with the type of project activities being undertaken and the DGA policy guidance required.
- greater participation and involvement by the Director of Land Registration, DGA should have been required. Early alert action on the degree of participation should have been given by the former BLM Team Leader to the former USAID/Indonesia Project Officer and by the BLM Acting Team Leader to the DLR Project Officer and the new USAID/Indonesia Project Officer.
- involvement by representatives from other Directorates in DGA (e.g. Land Use, Land Rights, Land Reform) in project activities was proposed by the project team but the decision was deferred by DLR/DGA staff. Lack of the Team Leader to exert more forceful action hampered project activities on this item.
- formally scheduled project management meetings should have been held on a regular basis (e.g. weekly, bi-monthly, etc.).
- USAID/Indonesia should have required submission of written project status reports from the BLM Team.
- USAID/Indonesia and BLM/Washington should have taken immediate and expedited recruitment action to replace the BLM Team Leader/Systems Analyst. Failure to replace this key position and function on the project has had serious effects on project performance and status.
- appointment of the BLM Mapping Specialist as Acting Team Leader was in error as the individual was not qualified to serve in this capacity.

- the former USAID/Indonesia Project Officer, who had been involved in the project for over 3 years, including the original project design, was transferred in August, 1982 to USAID/Pakistan. This transfer, coupled with the absence of a BLM Team Leader, provided further loss in continuity and familiarity with the project details. The new USAID/Indonesia Project Officer assigned to the project has done an outstanding job in assumption of project duties and has rapidly become totally familiar with project activities.

Program Design

Based on review of written materials and information, discussions and meetings with DLR staff and officials at all organizational levels, and visitations - evaluation on field trips to the three pilot project areas in Central Java, West Sumatera, and South Sulawesi, the project team prepared a major report on project activities. The report (August 1982 - System Description and Recommendations) covered project activities during the period October, 1981 to May, 1982. The purpose of the report was to:

- provide a description of the existing land mapping, titling and registration system in the Republic of Indonesia.
- specify project recommendations and agreed upon proposals that would serve as the implementation activities to design, develop and evaluate a revised system of land mapping, titling and registration in Indonesia.

The report was developed within the framework of the overall project purpose, which is to increase the rate of land mapping, titling and registration and the effectiveness of land administration in rural Indonesia (Note: the subject project is specifically restricted to land registration activities in rural areas even though project recommendations may be applicable to urban situations).

The final draft of the report containing program design recommendations was essentially completed in May, 1982 but had not been discussed with DLR. Revisions and refinements in the draft report, although not significantly changing the substantive content, were made by the Directorate of Land Registration, DGA from May, 1982 until a final version of the report was approved for issuance in August, 1982. Approximately 8 meetings, lasting 4-6 hours each, were held over a 2 month period in June and July between the project team and DLR staff. Due to work commitments or other conflicts the DLR staff could usually only meet on Saturday mornings. At certain meetings only part of the DLR staff were present for the discussions. Absence of the BLM Team Leader/System Analyst greatly handicapped the discussions due to the technical basis of the recommendations dealing with system improvements or modifications. Notwithstanding the length of time devoted to discussion and rewrites the resultant effort did eventually conclude in a fully agreed upon course of action for project activities. Discussions by

USAID/Indonesia, BLM project team and representatives of the Directorate of Land Registration on implementation of the reports recommendations, have continued from May, 1982 to the date of this evaluation. Comments on implementation activities for each specific Report recommendation follow in the section of this evaluation report entitled "Project Implementation".

Findings:

- the report (August, 1982 - System Description and Recommendations), contains an excellent description of the existing land mapping, titling and registration system in Indonesia. Coverage is very comprehensive in terms of legal requirements; methods and processes of registration; and registration procedures, as well as being a technically sound description.
- the report, in terms of recommendations and proposals, is very comprehensive from a systematic standpoint but appears to be overly optimistic from what may be capable of being implemented during the project period.
- USAID/Indonesia and the BLM project team should have been assertive in forcing the Directorate of Land Registration staff respond to the recommendations and reach agreement on implementation proposals. Valuable time from the project schedule, in terms of implementation, was lost by this occurrence.
- the BLM project team and former USAID/Indonesia Project Officer should have required or encouraged greater participation by the Directorate of Land Registration staff in the formulation and preparation of the recommendations and proposals. This action would have also provided the opportunity to obtain a greater degree of DGA participation in project implementation viability. Absence of the Team Leader/System Analyst severely hampered this effort. Actual participation by the Director, rather than only DLR staff, would also have facilitated actions on this item.

Project Implementation

The overall objective of the August, 1982 Report was to recommend improvements, changes, or revisions in the overall system of land mapping, titling and registration in the Republic of Indonesia. These recommendations were focused on work activities that would provide for registration system improvement and effectiveness of registration operations. A number of the recommendations were identified or proposed for testing and evaluation purposes on a short term basis (i.e. during the duration of the project), while others were designed to be implemented on a long term basis.

The findings set forth below are keyed to the Recommendations and Proposal section of the Report (pp. 49-97) and are identified by title and number where applicable.

Findings: (General)

- the recommendations made are a comprehensive identification and description of changes or revisions which should be made in the basic registration system. The recommendations are made in the context of a total systems approach and, taken together as an entity, would provide data and information to develop a revised system for improvement in the overall registration system. Certain of the recommendations cannot be implemented without forcing implementation of others and others could be independently implemented. To be totally responsive, all of the recommendations should be implemented although in varying degrees of completeness. The recommendations and proposals may be excessively ambitious and may need further scaling down in terms of scope and the degree of effort to be required. Additionally, the use of the Pati, Solok and Wajo areas as pilot sites has not worked out as originally contemplated. Distance to the sites from the project office, coupled with other logistical constraints (e.g. security clearance requirements, site visitation approval, scheduling, etc.) have all contributed to the nonviability of the sites as pilots for testing and evaluation purposes. Severe budgetary constraints of GOI/DGA/DLR funding availability for travel, per diem, and other support service expenses has also served to limit the use of the sites as true pilot areas. Because of the limited use of the areas as pilots, with the exception of Solok for orthophotographic mapping tests, it is apparent that the pilot areas concept (i.e. for testing and evaluation of LMR improvements) has not worked out and will probably not be viable for the remainder of the project.

Findings (Specific)

#1 Program Policy Development, Organization and Management

Findings:

- at the present time the BLM project team is assembling copies of pertinent documents that relate to registration goals and objectives, program priorities and targets/plans/projections for registration. The preliminary review of documents obtained to date, although not yet complete, indicates that the majority of the documents are very general in scope. They do not appear to be specific or quantitative enough to be of much value in formulation of overall goals or objectives that could serve as a basis for future land registration program development and budget formulation.
- with respect to program priorities, the same observation as is made above with respect to program goals and objectives is applicable. The BLM project team has identified a major problem that with the large volume of registrations to be accomplished, together with the less than optimum annual budget of DGA for such activities, it is absolutely essential that some type of framework for registration priorities must be established.

A proposal for establishment of such a priority system has been identified by the BLM project team (refer to pp. 13-17 of February 1, 1983 Revised Draft Report entitled : Land Registration - Socio-Economic Benefits and Priorities in Rural Indonesia). (Refer to Recommendations section of this evaluation report for action plan on this item).

until further work on program priorities, regulatory study and review (Recommendation #6), and forms and decision documentation evaluation (Recommendation #7) is completed, with assessment and implications of organizational aspects identified, the short term Management Advisor assignment to the project should be deferred. Organizational analyses and evaluations at the present time would be premature.

#2 Data and Statistics for Program Analysis

Findings:

- acquisition of a small computer system has been completed and delivered to the project office and is awaiting final installation. Modifications in office facilities (e.g. power supply and air conditioning) are necessary for the system to operate effectively. Contract action to implement the required changes has been taken by DGA but current work activities on this item are being delayed pending modification actions.
- further work needs to be done on preparation of program specifications and program management information which are scaled or delineated as to the specific data and information needs for land registration (Recommendations/Discussions items c.(2) and (3), pp 52-53 of report).
- due to logistical problems and distance to the three pilot sites, a decision has been made to select a test site or sites in closer proximity to Jakarta where the BLM project team could monitor and evaluate testing and program operations on a more timely, regularly scheduled, and intensive basis.
- additional development work is necessary to more fully describe/outline the type of management information/program management system needed by DGA/DLR. A re-evaluation and possible expansion of this task area has been recommended (Refer to Recommendations section of this evaluation report).
- additional work to formulate a basic land ownership data base system that will meet DGA's needs will have to be undertaken. Primary emphasis should be placed on data needs from a management information system (MIS) standpoint for controlling and managing the land registration process. A special project (e.g. PRONA) could be selected for a testing an MIS program.

- the project team has recommended a test program regarding the registration process (refer to page 9 of the February 1, 1983 Revised Draft of Land Registration Socio-Economic Benefits and Priorities in Rural Indonesia Report). Early action by DGA/DLR to agree to this program should be taken.

#3 Cost/Effectiveness Analysis of Alternative Registration Systems

Findings:

- action on implementation of this task area should be deferred until a later date in the project. Further development of cost data, approach to use, etc. will be necessary before any substantive work activities can be undertaken.
- the report [p. 55 at d. Proposals (1) and (2)] indicates that several outlines (procedures for analysis and cost-effectiveness approach) were to be prepared. These outlines have not been prepared as of the date of this evaluation.
- review of project files does not indicate that data on cost information has been collected to begin the cost effectiveness analysis [refer to p. 56 at Team Decision on Final Proposals item f.(3)].

#4 Socio-Economic Benefits Evaluation

Findings:

This task area was identified in the original Project Paper as a major demonstration objective of the project (refer to page 4 of Project Paper" to demonstrate that land registration and titling has economic and social benefits for the rural population") Additionally, the Project Paper hypothesized that land registration (i.e. lack of proof of ownership) constrained the rural population in terms of economic development (e.g. restricts credit availability, disincentive to improve land, blocks future land reform redistribution programs, etc.) (refer to pp. 2-4 Description of Project section in Project Paper).

Considerable conceptual and development work by the project team was undertaken in an attempt to develop a framework for analysis and evaluation which would establish a sound basis for identification, description and measurement of the benefits of land registration. This work resulted in directing research and study activities at policy and program needs rather than on conducting "academic institutional research" as was outlined and proposed in the original Project Paper. Conclusions of

this work indicate that lack of knowledge on the benefit aspects of land registration could have a direct bearing on the type of revised program that this project is designed to accomplish. Preliminary suggestions as to how to evaluate benefits are contained in the Report (pp. 56-62). Implementation of the agreed upon proposals by DGA and implementation of the recommendations for obtaining beneficiary information has only been partially carried out to date. Alternative proposals, of a lesser scale and scope have been recommended by the project team to DGA/DLR. At the present time DGA has only agreed to research/study on the benefits of land registration as it supports national land development projects (e.g. NES, rice land conversion, transmigration, etc.). Reluctance to utilize Indonesian universities for these studies has been evident by DGA.

Some information on socio-economic constraints to land registration has been obtained in order to serve as program design criteria for a revised/accelerated land registration program. This information is not quantitative in most cases and is largely intuitive. More quantitative information is probably necessary if the land registration system is to be improved and made more procedurally and operationally effective.

The BLM project team has prepared a separate report entitled : Land Registration - Socio-Economic Benefits and Priorities in Rural Indonesia, Revised Draft, February 1, 1983, which is a discussion paper on the subject of benefits and contains some case studies on benefits of registration to certain types of projects. Item III of the report : Socio-Economic Obstacles To and Priorities for Accelerated Land Registration, contains an overview on the subject. This report also indicates that information on beneficiary impacts of land registration, except for national projects, are lacking or, at best, not sufficiently identified to serve as criteria for revised registration system design that would facilitate registration activities on the normal or base program of registration. Budget constraints of DGA limit registration activities on any massive scale to national projects (e.g. PRONA, transmigration, etc.).

Conclusions drawn by this evaluation are :

- the entire task area of evaluating socio-economic benefits of registration in the normal or base program situation needs to be re-evaluated. The purpose of obtaining information on the benefits and their possible impacts on registration activities would provide assistance to the DGA on priority national development project work as well as for day-to-day base program activities.
- both "in-house" (i.e. Home Affairs) studies and contracts with Indonesian Universities should be utilized to obtain proper perspectives for both operational aspects as well as basic socio-economic research.

Further specifics on restructuring of this task area are contained in the "Recommendations Section" of this Evaluation Report.

#5 Public Information Program

Findings:

Acceptance of the recommendations and proposals for this task area by DLR/DGA has been obtained, however, there is reluctance to fully implement this recommendation by DGA.. The major theme of this task area is to "take the land registration program to the people." Project findings to date indicate that the low rate of registrations may be due to the inability or reluctance of land owners to travel to DLR/DGA offices for registration purposes. The proposals for this task area will be used to test a more active, potential registration program and to aggressively work with landowners to encourage and facilitate registration activities. Immediate actions that should be taken are:

- an implementation proposal prepared describing alternatives or options for a "traveling Agraria office"/"office on wheels" concept. Early selection of a preferred alternative by DLR/DGA should be obtained in order to allow adequate time to design, develop and construct an office which would be used to test the viability of the concept in an actual, in-operation situation.
- an area or areas (e.g. desa, kecamatan, etc.) in close proximity to Jakarta should be selected by DLR/BLM project team to serve as the test site for both the office on wheels, as well as the other proposals (news media, audio visual, etc.). Logistical problems with the three pilot areas does not permit a responsive test program.
- the BLM project team should initiate immediate action with the DGA, Home Affairs and Information Departments to identify the various packages of program proposals specified in the Report. Assistance from the Bureau of Land Management is required to facilitate this efforts. The team recommended use of a BLM Public Information Specialist to assist in this area, however the proposal was not accepted by DLR/DGA.

#6 Legislative and Regulatory Study and Review

Findings:

- the short term legal advisors [refer to Decision f.(1) on p.67 of Report] have reported to the project as recommended. The U.S.A. advisor reported February 5, 1983 and the Philippines advisor reported February 23, 1983.

- primary emphasis for this task area will be oriented to a regulatory evaluation program rather than a review of the Basic Agrarian Law. Implementation of regulations at field office level of operations on a day-to-day basis is the major issue to be evaluated.
- integration of study efforts for this task area and Task Area #7 - Forms and Decision Documentation Evaluation must be accomplished as they comprise a "package".
- specifics of technical items to be studied and evaluated in this task area are contained in the Recommendations Section of this evaluation.

#7 Forms and Decision Documentation Evaluation

Findings:

- DLR/DGA has accepted the recommendations and proposals for this task area. A major project effort must be devoted to this task area as it has been identified as a major constraint to a streamlined or more expedited approach to land registration.
- because of the interrelationships of forms data with regulatory requirements, Task Area 6 and 7 must be worked on a package or integrated basis.
- primary emphasis for this task area should be directed to simplification, removal of unnecessary or non-essential information, and consolidation of multi-purpose forms.
- certification requirements by local officials are unnecessarily complex and numerous redundancies are evident.

#8 Land Ownership Data System

Findings:

- the proposals initially advanced by the BLM project team for this area were extremely broad and probably within the scope of this project, could not be effectively implemented.
- partial implementation of a portion of this task area will be tested by automation of the name card (daftar nama) filing system. Testing will be accomplished with the use of the project Apple III computer system. A package program for this purpose has been obtained and is presently being evaluated. Findings from this activity will be used in assessment of other data system needs.

- lack of inclusion of other organizational units of DGA (Land Use, Land Rights, Land Reform) will severely constrain and limit the utility of the data system to be designed under this task area.

#9 Fees and Charges

Findings:

- the recommendations of the BLM project team in the Report (p.76) were overly extensive and cannot be totally implemented within the scope of the project. Certain aspects of fees have been reviewed and are contained in the February 1, 1983 Revised Draft Report.

#10 Storage of Land Mapping, Titling and Registration Records

Findings:

- expedite action to purchase and install a lands records microfilm equipment unit as soon as possible. Preliminary cost information has been obtained. A minimum or essential unit should be obtained to serve as a test facility only.
- to adequately test the use of the microfilm facility, a decision has been made to select a test area/pilot area in closer proximity to the project office in Jakarta. Closer access to project staff would enable more effective monitoring of design, development and implementation activities.
- action to evaluate a digital data bank, interactive graphics, and other highly sophisticated technological records management and maintenance systems should be dropped from the project due to the limited ability of DGA to implement such systems.

#11 Cadastral Tie to National Geodetic Net and National Reference System

Findings:

- the BLM project team recommendations should have been framed in stronger terms as to the long-range implications and affects of local coordinate systems versus national network systems.
- more extensive discussions and working relationships with BAKOSURTANAL should have been established.
- the BLM project team should have prepared a position paper or specific proposal on establishment of a National Reference System for use as a cadastral base. This paper should have been submitted to BAKOSURTANAL for review, discussions and evaluation.

- project files need to be documented or supported by written reports/data for this task area.

#12 Orthophotographic Bases

Findings:

- The control survey to establish the horizontal and vertical data for the approximate 2,000 hectare area selected for the orthophotographic test is complete. Specifications were prepared and signed by the GOI and BLM project team mid July 1982 and the contract signed at the end of September 1982. Agraria was not satisfied with the BLM Project Team technical assistance in preparing specifications. The specifications were signed off by the BLM Project Team with little or no review of the document. The contractor started the survey in October 1982 finishing final position and elevation computation data in January, 1983. Reproduction of the orthophotographic bases has not as yet been contracted and it appears that it could be late April or May, 1983 before the bases will be completed, and a comparative evaluation with plain rectified photographic bases, as well as ground survey parcel measurements could be initiated.
- With regard to establishing error tolerance in producing the map bases for land titling and registration, a partial input has been obtained from the IPEDA (tax office) specifying the tolerance that office has set in measuring a parcel or series of parcel areal measurements. The GOI has terrain elevation tolerance specifications they use for planning those areas that will be mapped from rectified photographic bases and these will have to be mapped by ground survey or possibly orthophotographic bases.
- The present rectified photographic bases are reproduced on paper and not a stable based film. This in itself introduces an additional error as these bases are subject to varying room or facility environmental controls (ie. humidity and heat) which can cause contraction and/or expansion (scale change) of the bases. This is an integral part in the determination of an overall accuracy tolerance determination. Use of paper has been used due to budget allowances/constraints.
- The ultimate decision on the accuracy tolerance and the results of the orthophotographic base test will have a definite effect on the equipment purchase plan.
- Information and recommendations on acceptability of error, tolerance limits, etc. from a technical as well as land registration program impacts and effects has not been prepared by the BLM project team.

#13 Technical Equipment and Software Systems

Findings:

- the inventory of equipment, for both terrestrial and photogrammetric operations, maintained by DLR was completed February 4, 1983. Evaluation of capability to complete or expand registration activities with available equipment is currently underway by the BLM project team.
- due to slippage in completion of the orthophotographic bases in the Solok, West Sumatera pilot site, action to develop an estimate of optimal areas requiring orthophotographic map bases has not been completed.
- decisions regarding certain commodity purchases (e.g. analytical plotter, aerial triangulation procedure, etc.) have been deferred until a later date in the project. Equipment purchases from the World Bank Urban Mapping Project and the test results from Solok orthophotographic base work will provide criteria to use in equipment purchase specifications.
- until major decisions are made by DLR/DGA on the framework for an improved, accelerated system for land registration, technical equipment and software system assessment should be deferred.

#14 Training Program - Administration and Organizational Development

Findings:

- action to develop recommendations for a training program to submit to the Education Board, Departemen Dalam Negeri, has not been taken. Absence of the Team Leader/Systems Analyst position has seriously constrained development of this proposal. An early action response by the new systems analyst will be necessary.
- the project team has prepared an outline of a long-term, graduate level training program for a designated individual to receive an MA/MS degree in Agrarian Affairs, oriented to management objectives at an appropriate educational institution in the United States. DLR/DGA has not responded positively to this proposal. (Refer to a similar problem in Findings for task Area #15).

#15 Technical Training Program

Findings:

- the project team has developed a comprehensive technical training program. This program includes a mix of both short-term and long-term training, including proposals for both technical training in-country in Indonesia, as well as long-term, graduate level education in the United States.
- the BLM project team has identified a deficiency in trained instructors. Action should be taken to identify qualified candidates to begin instructor training.
- all of the training proposals in the LMTR Recommendations Report (pp. 96-97) are well thought out and are essential if long-term improvements in registration operations are to be achieved.
- major emphasis to implement both technical training and administrative and organizational development (Task Area #14) training must be given high priority in the remaining phase of the project. Delays by DLR/DGA in commitment to the training program and in the allocation of specifically named individuals is seriously jeopardizing implementation of the training program. Crucial milestone dates, particularly for long-term graduate level training in the United States, are rapidly approaching.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations set forth below have been developed to serve as guidance or directive type of information for the conduct of work activities during the remaining period of the project.

Recommendations have been grouped into two categories. These are :

Project Functional Activities Project Implementation Activities

Project Functional Activities are general areas of actions that must be taken if the project objectives and purpose are to be effectively achieved.

Project Implementation Activities are specific areas of actions that are based on the findings of this evaluation. Specific recommendations are keyed or referenced to the Findings Section of the Evaluation Report and to the Task Area numeric designations in the August, 1982 Report.

Project Functional Activities

Based on the findings of the evaluation the following recommendations are made :

Project Management

- A technical Advisory/Steering Committee should be established. Membership on the Committee should consist of : a representative from each Directorate of DGA (Land Registration, Land Titling, Land Use, and Land Reform), the BLM Project Team Leader, and the USAID/Indonesia Project officer. Directorate or Sub Director designees would be preferred to provide the proper authority level. Additionally, the Project Liasion Officer designee from DLR would also be a member of the Committee. The function of the Committee would be to provide project policy guidance, project activity review and evaluation, project operations monitoring and information sharing. The Committee should meet on a regularly scheduled bases at least monthly, or more often if necessary, with a formal agenda and specific assignments indicated. Formal notes of the meeting and recorded information on discussions, decisions, problems, etc. shall be completed after the meeting and transmitted to each Committee member. The Committee should also plan and arrange a quarterly meeting with the Director General of Agraria and/or the Secretary to the Director General to brief him/them on project progress, problems or other matters of interest.
- The Committee should also designate a specific individual in each Directorate as a Technical Liasion Representative to the Project team to serve as a contact for project information, data, questions, etc. on day-to-day project activities.
- The BLM Project Team should schedule a monthly briefing and progress reporting meeting with the Director of Land Registration. Active participation by the Director in project activities and operations is a necessity if the project is to effectively implemented.
- The USAID/Indonesia Project Officer should require the BLM Team Leader to submit written project status reports on a monthly basis as a minimum. Informal oral briefing sessions between the Project Officer and Team Leader should also be held on a weekly basis. Similar reports and briefings should also be required between the DLR Project Officer and the BLM Team Leader.
- BLM/Washington should be required to submit monthly project financial management reports to the USAID/Indonesia Project Officer and BLM Team Leader. Reports submitted should be keyed or cross-referenced to PASA Accounts/Line Item Categories and should contain information by such categories on both current reporting period as well as expenditures totals from project start through current report period. Clarifying explanations for all items reported should be included.
- BLM/Washington should be required by USAID/Indonesia and AID/Washington to respond in a more timely fashion to requests and communications. Due to logistical problems of distance, time, etc. immediate or rapid turn-around response by BLM/Washington is essential. BLM/Washington should also take a more active role in monitoring project operations, problems, status, etc.

- The USAID/Indonesia Project Officer should serve as the Project Team Leader until the new BLM Team Leader arrives for assignment in Indonesia. The BLM Mapping Specialist, currently serving as Acting Team Leader, should be relieved of this responsibility and assigned on a full-time basis to mapping activities.
- The new BLM Team Leader and USAID/Indonesia Project Officer, together with project staff, should be required to develop a project schedule or project activity chart/calendar indicating the critical milestone dates, project study/reports/papers due dates or scheduled completion dates, etc., for the remaining duration of the project. Commitment of adherence to the schedule, by approval, should be obtained from DLR.
- The new BLM Team Leader and DLR Project Officer should provide greater opportunities to DLR staff members to perform work assignments on project activities. Specific work or task assignments should be made, both for training and development purposes, as well as for performance of specifically assigned tasks to assist project personnel.

Program/Project Design

- The original project design, as contained in the Project Paper (refer to Project Paper - Detailed Description of Project and Project Analysis, pp. 9-25), should not be changed. The original project purpose and objectives may still be achieved although not in the degree or extent as originally contemplated. Minor modifications or redesign efforts have already been made and additional revisions may be necessary at subsequent periods in the project.
- the original goal (i.e. land registration system improvement and operational performance enhancement) will be met provided the various Recommendations and Proposals prepared by the BLM project team (refer to August, 1982 System Description and Recommendations Report) are implemented in a timely and effective manner by the BLM project team and DLR/DGA.
- The secondary objective of the project (i.e. demonstrate that land registration has economic and social benefits) will probably not be demonstrable to the degree or extent as originally contemplated in the Project Paper.
- The end of the project status will not include the completed mapped and registered three pilot areas. Modification of the project, to use the pilot areas for a different purpose, areas will be required due to a number of logistical and project problems. Except for very limited purposes the existing pilot areas should be dropped from any extensive testing and evaluation activities.

- The new BLM Team Leader, together with project staff, OLR and USAID/Indonesia should re-evaluate the program design/implementation Recommendations/Proposals contained in the August, 1982 Report, for the purpose of scaling-down, modifying the scope, and prioritizing the various Recommendations. Alternative approaches and methods to accomplish certain Recommendations should also be developed.
- Primary emphasis during the remainder of the project should be directed at land registration system improvements and modifications rather than registration beneficiary assessments. A more limited impact assessment of the benefits of registration is recommended. Post-registration evaluations or surveys should be utilized rather than pre-registration attitude or perception surveys. A special study of registration impacts regarding adat ownership on a communal basis (e.g. kaum) should be undertaken to analyze these types of unique ownership and registration situations.
- If USAID and the DGA want to implement program/project redesign efforts, it may be necessary to utilize a greater number and different types of short-term consultants/experts/specialists than originally contemplated. Project funding levels appear to be fully adequate to accommodate all such expenditures.

Program/Project Priorities and Scheduling

- The August, 1982 project report on Recommendations and Proposals may be overly optimistic in terms of what may actually be accomplished during the remainder of the project. The Recommendations are substantive and if totally implemented as proposed, would provide information and analyses for land registration system improvements. However, at the present time they are too extensive as to present problems for the BLM project team and OLR to implement during the duration of the project. A re-evaluation of the Recommendations should be made as soon as possible.
- The re-evaluation should provide that all of the Recommendations and Proposals are to be implemented and/or tested. However, each task area should be scoped out on a "level of effort basis" (i.e. some to be done to a greater depth of analysis than others; some to be deferred to later stages of the project; some to be accomplished by different or alternative approaches; etc.).
- As a result of the re-evaluation, the various Recommendations should be grouped into categories. Suggested categories are :
 - those which provide the opportunity to develop methods and procedures which will facilitate land registration system improvements.
 - those which offer potential or secondary benefits opportunity for system improvements.

- those which may provide data of significance to project purposes but which are not major constraints or barriers to registration system improvements.
- Recommended for categorization as of priority for future project implementation activities are:
 - 2 - Data and Statistics for Program Analysis (MIS)
 - 5 - Public Information Program
 - 6 - Legislative and Regulatory Review
 - 7 - Forms and Decision Documentation in Evaluation
 - 8 - Land Ownership Data System (LIS)
 - 14 - Training Program - Administrative and Organizational Development
 - 15 - Technical Training Program
- Recommended for categorization as of lesser priority but requiring project work are:
 - 1 - Program Policy Development, Organization and Management
 - 4 - Socio-Economic Benefits Evaluation
 - 10 - Storage and Maintenance of LMR Records
 - 12 - Orthophotographic Bases
- Recommended for categorization as low priority are :
 - 3 - Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Alternative Registration System
 - 9 - Fees and Charges
 - 11 - Cadastral Tie to National Geodetic Net and National Reference System
 - 13 - Technical Equipment and Software System

Based on the prioritization of the project task areas specified above, and with DLR approval, the tasks should be displayed on a project schedule or project activity chart/calendar (refer to project scheduling recommendations included above under Project Management) for scheduling and performance purposes.

Project Implementation Activities

The recommendations that follow are organized by task area as referenced in the August, 1982 Report - System Description and Recommendations. Additionally, the recommendations are also keyed to the Findings section of this evaluation report by reference to the same numeric task area designations.

#1 Program Policy Development, Organization and Management

- Upon completion of the documents review, an assessment should be made to determine if information on goals and objectives is specific enough to assist in a registration program and budget development. A concept paper should be prepared outlining the

role of goals and objectives in formulation of program requirements. The paper should relate goals and objectives to constraints on an expanded and/or accelerated land registration program and additionally should relate the matter of goals and objectives to program priorities.

- Further development work should be completed on the establishment of the land registration priority system proposal prepared by the BLM project team. Linkage of the priority system to program goals and objectives should be described in further detail. Relationships and constraints of a priority system to registration system improvements and effectiveness should be clearly specified. With the large volume of land registrations yet to be completed in Indonesia it is essential that some type of priority system be established if registrations are to be accomplished in a reasonable time period and effective manner.
- Assignment of the short term Management Advisor should be deferred until a later date. Work assignments should be oriented to the various functions and responsibilities of organizational units and government officials involved or required in the land registration process. Particular assessments should be made at the kabupaten level unit of DLR/DGA capability to perform registrations utilizing a revised system of land registration as developed by the BLM project team. Constraints and/or opportunities to improve registration operations (e.g. delegation of authority, signature level on letters of decision, etc.) should be emphasized. Consideration could be given to a contract effort with a private consultant services organization in lieu of a short term advisor for this task area.

#2 Data and Statistics for Program Analysis

- Further action to complete final installation of the project small computer system should be taken as soon as possible.
- Development work should be initiated on specifications (i.e. output units) to be included in the design of a Management Information System (MIS) (Refer also to Recommendations for Task Area #8 on this subject).
- Early action by DLR to select the new test site or sites should be taken. The BLM project team should establish the types of data to be collected on the new pilot area(s). A PRONA area should be selected for evaluation to assist DGA/DLR in development of data which would provide immediate program benefits.
- The test program regarding the land registration process recommended by the BLM project team in the February 1, 1983 "Revised Draft of Land Registration Socio-Economic Benefits and Priorities" report should be implemented as part of the MIS design effort.

#3 Cost/Effectiveness Analysis of Alternative Registration Systems

- Limited additional development work to define and describe the work activities for this task area is necessary but should be deferred until a later date in the project and should be scaled down.
- Primary emphasis should be placed on cost effectiveness of systematic registration approaches versus sporadic approaches. Cost findings contrasting ground survey (terrestrial) methods with photogrammetric methods should be documented. Cost effectiveness of alternative levels of accuracy/error in mapping and survey should be included.

#4 Socio-Economic Benefits Evaluation

The BLM project team should continue to refine and re-evaluate the Recommendations and Proposals for this task area. Emphasis should be placed on development of benefit information that could be used as design information input for inclusion in the Public Information Program task area (Task Area #5). A major portion of the "appeal" for registration must be oriented to informing land owners/potential registrants of the benefits of registration to encourage and solicit registration applications.

- Action should be taken to develop a scope of work/outline of services for a consultant study by Andalas University, Padang, West Sumatera on land registration problems with respect to adat law and communal ownership (i.e. kaum).
- Action should be taken to meet with and discuss possible research studies to be accomplished by Home Affairs research units. Study should be directed to benefit assessments of land registration to the public (i.e. the State) and for special projects. Normal or base program situations should be emphasized.
- Attitude surveys with rural land owners as to the benefits of land registration should be dropped pending evaluation of information received from the studies outlined above.
- Sample surveys of land owner responses on a post-registration basis should be conducted in the pilot area of Solok to use for comparison purposes with the new site(s) selected as test areas near or in proximity to Jakarta. The surveys should be scheduled when a significant percentage or number of registrations are completed in the Solok pilot area to assure a reasonable sample basis.
- Additional development work should be done by the BLM project team to identify benefits on registration for special projects/or priority projects which are associated with national development project objectives.

- A sample survey (e.g. interviews, discussions, meetings, etc.) should be developed in test areas where the PRONA (Proyek Operasi Nasional Agraria) registration program has been completed. Information obtained on a post registration basis of a PRONA area could provide data that would assist in establishing future registration areas and additionally, could provide supportive data for further work on the registration priorities task area (refer to Recommendations for Task Area #1). A short term TDY Research Economist should be assigned to the project to design the survey and to prepare the contract proposal/scope of work for a prospective Indonesian university contractor.

#5 Public Information Program

- Early action to select the new site(s) close to Jakarta should be taken in order for the BLM project team to commence and/or further refine the test programs which will be conducted. Statistical data for the test site(s) should be obtained as soon as possible (e.g. number of parcels, number of land owners, population, etc.).
- A concept paper should be prepared describing alternatives or options for the "office on wheels/mobile registration unit" concept. An early decision on the preferred alternative by DLR/DGA is necessary in order to allow adequate time to design and construct the unit which will be used for test and evaluation purposes. Timely action on this item is essential as it is a major component of the "taking the program to the people" approach which is to be tested (i.e. old method versus new method).
- The new BLM Team Leader/Systems Analyst should take the major role and responsibility for this entire task area due to its critical function in the revised registration system. Because of the long lead time and involvement of a number of different Indonesian government departments for certain proposals, immediate action to commence development of the proposals must be taken. Short term TDY services of a Bureau of Land Management Public Information/Affairs specialist should be obtained.

#6 Legislative and Regulatory Study and Review

- The two short term legal advisors should be assigned an Indonesian (DLR or DGA) counterpart legal advisor who they would work with and discuss project matters, findings, etc.
- Evaluation of regulations affecting land registration specifically should be emphasized. Primary orientation of the regulatory evaluation should be on the operational (i.e. field office level of DGA) implementation of the regulations. Among items to be included are:

- a. Restructuring/organization of regulations.
 - b. Removal or eliminating burdensome requirements on applicants.
 - c. Streamlining of regulations.
 - d. Revised language to simplify, clarify, and be more "non-legal" in expression.
 - e. Reduction of number, volume and size of regulations.
 - f. Documentation of the titling process.
 - g. Latitude discretionary authority of DGA officials in issuing titles.
- Because of the close tie between regulatory requirements (i.e. implementing BAL) and registration requirements (i.e. applicant qualifications, application form requirements, etc.), this task area, and Task Area #7, should be worked on a package or integrated basis.
 - A special study should be made to evaluate the existing certification requirements and to develop recommendations for elimination of non-essential certifications, reduction in the number of certifications, and in standardized - uniform formats. The study should also address land ownership evidence requirements and develop recommendations for minimum standards of acceptance.
 - The legal advisor from the Philippines should provide comparison findings of regulations utilized in the Philippines versus the United States versus Indonesia.

#7 Forms and Decision Documentation Evaluation

- A complete review and evaluation of all forms used in the land registration process should be made. Emphasis in the review should be :
 - a. Simplification of forms.
 - b. Removal of non-essential information requests.
 - c. Combination or consolidation of forms.
 - d. Opportunities for development of multi purpose forms.
 - e. Standardization of size, and format.
 - f. Opportunity for color coding or designation.
 - g. Reduction in the number of forms.
- A special study should be made of DLR/DGA decision documentation procedures and requirements. Particular work should be done with a view to simplification, streamlining, formats, etc.
- The regulatory study and review (Task Area #6) should also include an evaluation of the functions and responsibilities of the "land deed official". The evaluation should provide recommendations on the "certification" and "documentation" functions of the "land deed official" and how such functions could be changed or modified to facilitate the land registration process.

The specific recommendations listed above for Task Area 6 and 7, are not intended to limit the scope or restrict areas of investigation that would provide possible improvements in registration, documents or procedures.

#8 Land Ownership Data System

- Action to develop the various components of this system should be deferred pending results of the test run and evaluation of the name card (daftar nama) automation effort. The BLM project team however should be developing recommendations on the types or categories of ownership data which should be included in a data system.
- Modification of the project office facilities to permit installation of the small computer system should be completed as soon as possible.
- System design requirements (user needs) should be discussed with the technical Advisory/Steering Committee as soon as possible.

#9 Fees and Charges

- Any extensive work in this task area should be dropped. General information on the effects and constraints of fees on land registration should continue to be collected and evaluated.
- The BLM project team should re-evaluate this task area to scale down the work to be undertaken. Emphasis on constraint affects of fees and charges should be used.
- The proposed approach to fee arrangements recommended by the BLM project team in the February 1, 1983 Revised Draft of Land Registration Socio-Economic Benefits and Priorities report should be implemented for testing purposes.
- the special studies on fees recommended by the BLM project team (refer to p. 10-12 of the February 1, 1983 Revised Draft of Land Registration - Socio-Economic Benefits and Priorities in Rural Indonesia Report) should be further developed for use on a test and evaluation basis.

#10 Storage of Land Mapping, Titling and Registration Records

- A micro-film equipment unit should be purchased as soon as possible. Technical guidance on unit specifications should be obtained from the Bureau of Land Management. Roll film specifications should be included for testing purposes as opposed to a micro-fiche format.

- Action to design and develop other systems of records management (e.g. digital data base, interactive graphics, etc.) should be dropped from the project.
- A short term Records Management Specialist from the Bureau of Land Management should be assigned to the project to provide guidance on the design of an appropriate records management system.

#11 Cadastral tie to National Geodetic Net and National Reference System

- The BLM project team should prepare a position paper or proposal on establishment of a national reference system for use as a cadastral base. The paper should discuss implications and affects of local coordinate systems versus national network systems. Primary emphasis should be placed on what the tie-in problems are and their affects on land registration activities from a long-term standpoint.

#12 Orthophotographic Bases Recommendations

- The orthophotographic bases test should be completed and results evaluated for resultant accuracy, time and cost analyses.
- Accuracy tolerance specifications should continue to be evaluated with respect to the cadastral map base being a multipurpose base that could be used for tax purposes, possibly planning purposes by public works and others.
- If ultimate accuracy specifications are established by the GOI with a requirement for a high degree of precision, consideration must be given to reproducing rectified photographic bases on stable based film.
- The BLM project team should prepare guidelines/standards/recommendations for DGA/DLR consideration and review. These materials should specify error tolerance under such factors and conditions as different slope, land value, cost-effectiveness, physical boundary requirements, etc. Emphasis should be on acceptable limits for use in rural land registration operations and situations.

#13 Technical Equipment and Software Systems

- Decisions on equipment and software system needs should be deferred until later phases of the project. Pending final design of an improved system for land registration no further action on acquisition proposals should be taken. Exceptions are noted in this report (e.g. micro-film),

#14 Training Program - Administration and Organizational Development

- Work on this task area should be deferred until arrival of the new BLM Team Leader/Systems Analyst. Re-evaluation of work to be undertaken should be made at that time.
- Action to designate an individual from DLR/DGA for long term graduate level training in the United States should be taken immediately.

#15 Technical Training Program

- work on this task area should be deferred until arrival of the new BLM Team Leader/Systems Analyst. An exception is the short-term visitation program to the United States which had previously been scheduled for March, 1983.
- Action to designate an individual from DLR for long term graduate level training in the United States should be taken immediately.

BODY OF REPORT

Assessment of the Project Impact on the Beneficiaries

During the period of the evaluation it was not possible to assess or evaluate project impacts on beneficiaries (i.e. demonstrate that land registration and titling has economic and social benefits for the rural population of Indonesia). At this stage of the project a majority of the recommendations and proposals by the BLM Project Team have not been implemented in sufficient detail to enable any assessment of beneficiary impacts due to project recommendations.

Considerable development work on a framework for impact assessment has been completed by the BLM Project team (refer to Socio-Economic Benefits Evaluation, Task Area #4, of August, 1982 Project Report, pp. 56-62). Implementation of the agreed upon proposals for obtaining beneficiary information has not been carried out to date by DGA/DLR. The BLM Project Team has also prepared a separate report (Land Registration - Socio-Economic Benefits and Priorities in Rural Indonesia, Revised Draft, February 1, 1983) to carry out beneficiary impact work activities. This latter report is currently being reviewed by the DGA/DLR. Decisions by DGA/DLR on this report are unknown as of the date of this evaluation. Both of the reports referenced above are included in the Appendices section of this evaluation report.

The evaluation team has reached certain conclusions with respect to this task area. The Findings section of this evaluation report for this task area (pp. 4-10) recommends that the proposals made in the August, 1982 Report, pages 56-62, effort be re-examined and modified where considered necessary. The Recommendations section (pp. 19-23) provides specific guidance on the type of work activities which should be undertaken during the next phase of the project.

Results of the implementation of these Recommendations should be a major component for evaluation in the next scheduled evaluation for this project (i.e. 6-8 months from now). Dependent on this future evaluation it will then be possible to specify in greater detail, the impacts of the project recommendations on the beneficiaries.

Assessment of the Logical Framework Matrix

Summary and Conclusions

The Land Mapping, Titling and Registration (LMTR) Project is a three year project with a total funding of \$3.973 million of which \$2.000 million is in the form of a grant from the United States Government to the Government of Indonesia. The purposes of the project are (1) to increase the rate of land mapping, titling, and registration, and (2) to improve the effectiveness of land administration in Indonesia. Achievement of the above purposes depends whether the following conditions will prevail at the termination of the project.

1. an improved system of LMTR has been developed and tested in three project sites,
2. the organization and operational procedures of the Directorate General of Agraria, Department of Land Registration (DGA/DLR) has undergone changes towards more efficient LMTR,
3. proposal for a follow-on project has been submitted to the DGA, and
4. the socio-economic benefits of LMTR is documented and known to the beneficiaries including farmers, government officials and managers of special projects.

At the present rate of project implementation, there is a high probability that some of the conditions will not be met and the project purpose will not be achieved. The reasons for this are summarized briefly below:

1. The development of an improved system of LMTR that will be tested in three project sites is behind schedule. This is due to the delay in fielding the Systems Analyst, the Management Advisor and the Management Information Specialist. Although some of the basic data has been collected and preliminary work in the project sites has been initiated, a complete testable and improved LMTR systems package is yet to be developed.

2. Although guidelines towards the reorganization of DGA/DLR towards a more efficient land administration in Indonesia has been initiated, the complete organizational scheme is yet to be developed. Moreover, even if a new and more efficient organizational scheme and operating procedures are developed and proposed, there is a high probability that it will not be adopted by the Government.

3. The proposal for a follow on project is likely to be developed. However, considering the low level of achievements of the present project, the difficulty of demonstrating the socio-economic benefits of an LMTR in Indonesia, and the reluctance of DGA/DLR to pursue an

expanded project that deals not only with registration but also with the broader area of land reform, it is doubtful that a follow-on proposal would rate high priority within the GOI and donor agencies.

4. There has been an attempt to document the socio-economic benefits of LMTR. The results indicate that there are some benefits derived from registration but not in the magnitude originally anticipated. Therefore, even if a new or improved LMTR system would be developed, the organizational structure and operational procedures of the DGA/DLR are streamlined for more efficient LMTR, and a follow-on project proposal was submitted to the GOI, there is still the probability that the rate of LMTR in Indonesia will not increase because the benefits of land registration is not of the magnitude that makes it worth the time, effort and cost to the farmers and to the government.

Considering the delays in project implementation and the remaining period of project performance, it is recommended that the project outputs be scaled down to include only the development of an improved and tested system of LMTR and training of DGA officials in the various management and technical aspects of land administration in Indonesia. Even with this reduced level of output, it maybe necessary to request a no-cost extension of the PACO from December 1984 to December 1985.

Description of the Project

The Land Mapping, Titling and Registration (LMTR) Project is a three year project (1980-1983) with a total funding of \$3.973 million. The purposes of the project are to increase the rate of land mapping, titling and registration and to improve the effectiveness of land administration in Indonesia. Achievement of these purposes will lead towards the long sought goal among rural population --- access to productive resources in agriculture.

To implement this project USAID agreed to provide a grant of \$2.00 million to the GOI in the form of technical assistance; equipment required in land mapping, titling and registration; training of GOI officials and conduct research on the economic and social benefits of LMTR. The Government of Indonesia contributed \$1.973 million in counterpart funds to finance personnel, training, vehicle, office space, travel expenses, including per diem and computer time.

The purposes of the project could be been achieved if the following conditions are satisfied at the termination of the project:

1. that an improved system of land mapping, titling and registration has been devised and tested in three pilot kabupatens,
2. that the organization and administration of the Directorate General of Agraria has undergone changes towards more efficient administration of land mapping, titling and registration, and

3. that a proposal for a follow-on project will have been completed and submitted to the Government of Indonesia.

Analysis of the Logical Framework: Data and Procedures

The procedure used in the analysis of the Logical Framework follows closely the "Proposed Scope of Work for the First Annual Evaluation" prepared by the LMTR Project Officer. It is summarized briefly as follows:

- A. assessment of the timeliness and magnitude of inputs delivery,
- B. assessment of the achievement of outputs,
- C. assessment of the achievement of purpose,
- D. assessment of the validity of assumptions, and
- E. assessment of the achievement of sector goal.

In addition to the above, recommendations will be made relating to changes in project design and/or targets to make the project more in line with limitations or constraints encountered during the period of project implementation. Also the assumptions will be examined for their applicability and validity in the light of experiences gained during the past two years.

This evaluation draws heavily from conversations with the members of the Technical Assistance Team and four reports (a) "Status of LMTR Project", (b) LMTR "Project Paper", (c) "LMTR in Indonesia" and (d) "Land Registration: Socio-Economic Benefits and Priorities in Rural Indonesia".

Assessment of the Timeliness and Magnitude of Inputs Delivery

The project paper specifies the inputs as follows: (1) technical assistance, (2) commodities, (3) training, (4) pilot activities, and (5) others.

1. Technical Assistance

The Technical Assistance calls for 98 man-months of professional services consisting of three long-term consultants and four short-term consultants distributed as follows:

- a. Systems Analyst, 28 man-months
- b. Mapping Technician, 23 man-months
- c. Socio-Economic Specialist, 30 man-months
- d. Data Processing Specialist, 6 man-months
- e. Legal Adviser, 4 man-months
- f. Management Adviser, 4 man-months
- g. Management Information Specialist, 3 man-months

The BLM Project Team consisting of seven specialists, serving under varying lengths of consultancy periods are responsible for (1) analyzing present LMTR system in Indonesia, (2) developing an improved LMTR system, (3) recommending training needs, (4) advising on the design, administration, monitoring and evaluation of improved LMTR, and (5) proposing a follow-on project.

The delivery of professional services by the BLM Project Team is behind schedule and below the level called for in the Project Paper (See Annex 5). This is particularly true for the Systems Analyst, Management Advisor, Data Processing Specialist, and Management Information Specialist. The delays in fielding these members of the BLM Project Team has seriously delayed implementation of certain components of the project and performance of certain activities in the project sites. These delays will of course delay the achievement of project outputs and attainment of project purposes.

Also, examination of the Logical Framework Matrix indicates that some of the assumptions do not hold true particularly those that relate to scheduling of technical assistance and monitoring of project. If the project had been more closely monitored by BLM/W and responsive to USAID requests, it would have been obvious that delays in the delivery of technical assistance (i.e. Systems Analyst, Management Advisor) would not have seriously affected implementation and action should have been taken at an earlier stage of project implementation to get the BLM to comply with the provisions of the PASA Agreement.

As a consequence of the delay, the following project activities have been held up for future implementation:

1. development of comprehensive policy, goals, objectives and priorities has to wait for the arrival of the Systems Analyst,
2. development and testing of a computer program for improved LMTR system, analyzing the present program and comparing it with alternative systems and establishing specific procedures for analysis will have to wait for the Systems Analyst.
3. review and revision of LMTR forms, records and documentation will be constrained by the absence of the Systems Analyst. Legal Advisors have been assigned and are currently reviewing and evaluating laws and regulations on LMTR.

2. Procurement of Commodities:

The project calls for the procurement of (1) planetary camera and microfilm processor, (2) mapping tables, (3) typewriters, (4) calculators and (5) survey equipment. Additional commodities that were not originally included in the Project Paper but were procured or in the process of being procured on the recommendation of the Technical Assistance Team are a small computer system (Apple III), and a basic microfilm system unit.

Procurement and installation of this equipment is in various stages of completion. Basic office equipment such as typewriters, calculators and mapping tables have been procured. Purchase of theodolites and associated terrestrial measuring equipment has been deferred.

It appears that commodity procurement, although slightly behind schedule is not critical in affecting implementation of the project. Of a more critical significance is the absence of technical personnel to demonstrate the use and operation of this equipment to the staff of the Directorate General of Agraria, Directorate of Land Registration.

3. Training

The project calls for 104 man-months of training in the area of cartography, photogrammetry, mapping, systems analysis, land surveying, record keeping, data processing and micrographics. In addition to the technical training specified in the project paper, the BLM Project Team also recommended training on management and administration of land mapping, titling and registration.

Although the BLM Project Team has already developed a training program that was subsequently approved by the Directorate General of Agraria, Directorate of Land Registration, and identified potential trainees, actual training in country or overseas for both administrative and technical training has not yet started due to the reluctance of the Directorate General of Agraria to release some of the more promising staff. In the short run, the failure to initiate training on schedule delays attainment of project outputs which is the formation of a cadre of trained GOI personnel to support the various activities of the LMTR Project. In the long run, failure to train GOI officials will seriously affect the attainment of the project purpose, which is to accelerate the rate of land mapping, titling and registration in Indonesia.

Perhaps the assumption regarding the commitment of the GOI to train their staff had been too optimistic in the early stages of project design. Funds for training are available for in-country and overseas institutions, however, it seems that the failure of DGA/DLR to proceed raises some questions on the seriousness and commitment of DGA/DLR to proceed with the training component of the project.

4. Pilot Activities

Three areas (1) Kabupaten Pati in Central Java, (2) Kabupaten Solok in West Sumatra, and (3) Kabupaten Wajo in South Sulawesi were selected as pilot sites to test the effectiveness of an improved system of LMTR. Within these pilot sites, the Project Paper calls for testing of an improved LMTR system which will result in the issuance of titles to 66,000 farmers. In addition, the project calls for expansion to other pilot sites every year.

The activities that have been completed towards the development of a new LMTR system include (a) analysis of present system, (b) rectification of orthographic bases, (c) proposal for testing specific LMTR components, and (d) parcel identification in the project sites. In progress are the development of situation maps and an improved system of record keeping.

The development of an improved and testable LMTR system depends on the arrival of the New Systems Analyst, the Information Management Specialist, and the Management Advisor. The Systems Analyst is scheduled to join the Team on April 15, 1983 and the other specialists will come on board within six to nine months depending on project progress.

5. Others

The major contributions of the GOI to this project are expenditures related to the activities in the pilot sites, personnel, office space, and travel expenses.

Office space for the BLM Project Team is located in the Directorate General of Agraria and except for environmental conditions, it is considered adequate. GOI personnel serving as counterparts liaison to the BLM Project Team is estimated between two to four full time staff. There are no specific assistants, drivers or technicians assigned to the BLM Project Team. GOI expenditures for travel (airline ticket, per diem, etc.) have been minimum and limited. Travels to the project sites and visits to selected universities with academic programs on LMTR have been minimum and limited. Clerical and secretarial assistance for the BLM Project Team is funded from the grant.

It appears that the disbursement of GOI funds is seriously behind schedule considering that the GOI contribution is \$1.973 million. Financial analysis of their contribution is necessary to assure that disbursement of GOI funds is completed before the termination of the project or to justify a request for a no cost extension.

B. Assessment of the Achievement of Outputs

The Project Paper lists three outputs including (1) socio-economic studies, (2) trained GOI personnel, and (3) an improved system of LMTR, tested in the project site and ready for application on wider scale.

1. Socio-Economic Studies

A draft report entitled "Land Registration: Socio-Economic Benefits and Priorities in Rural Indonesia" has been completed and is presently under review by the GOI. In this study three types of benefits are discussed: (1) benefits to landowners, (2) benefits to Government, and (3) benefits to special projects. The methodology for measuring benefits was not developed, although methodology for determining priorities for large scale registration was devised.

A review of literature on the present system of LMTR has been completed and continues as needed by the project. This review and analysis will serve as a basis for assisting the Directorate General of Agraria, Directorate of Land Registration, develop a more comprehensive policy, goals, objectives and priorities for LMTR in Indonesia.

A review of the organizational structure and operating procedure of DGA is planned. Initiation of this activity has been differed until the arrival of the Management Adviser.

2. Trained GOI Personnel

Plans for technical and management training in-country or overseas and identification of potential participant trainees has been completed. However, actual training has been postponed until specific personnel assignments within DGA/DLR is finalized. Considering the remaining period of project performance, long-term graduate level degree training may have to be dropped unless a no cost extension of the project is approved by USAID.

3. An Improved System of LMTR

System design and specification for forms and operating procedures, testing, studies, etc. are being developed. The new LMTR package will be assembled and tested as soon as the testing proposals are obtained from DGA/DLR. Data required to test the new system is being prepared and alternative test activities have been proposed and are under review by the GOI. Upon completion of the design for the improved LMTR system, it will be tested against the old LMTR system for speed, economics and convenience before final modifications are made, which could be adopted for application outside of the pilot areas.

Overall, the assumptions for the achievement of outputs still hold. The reasons why achievement of outputs have been seriously delayed are due to the delays in fielding critical members of the BLM Project Team, and the delay in starting the training programs. Also the ad hoc working relationship between the BLM Project Team and DGA/DLR counterparts and the lack of focus and leadership by both parties towards achievement of project purposes have all contributed to the delays in project implementation.

In August 1982, the BLM Project Team and the DGA/DLR outlined fifty discrete activities to be completed towards attainment of project outputs and purposes. Only eleven of these activities have been completed or partially completed, fifteen are in progress or partially in progress and the remaining twenty nine are planned for future implementation. Given that the project has only one and a half years remaining for implementation, it is doubtful that all or a significant number of the purposes and outputs will be achieved by the termination of the project.

To evaluate the delays in project performance consider Table 1 below:

Table 1: LMTR: Status of Project Implementation

Activities	Status			
	Completed	In Progress	Planned	Dropped
A. Program Policy Development, Organization & Management				
1. Documents on Policy, Goals, Priorities, Obtained and Translated		X	X	
2. Comprehensive policy, Goals Objective and Priorities of the Directorate General of Agraria Developed				X
3. Short-term MGT Advisor recruited to join LMTR Team				X
B. Data for Statistics for Program Analysis				
1. Computer Acquired	X			
2. Program on Pilot Sites and other Areas Tested				X
3. Related Data from GOI Agencies Obtained		X		
C. Cost Effectiveness Analysis				
1. Methodology For Analyzing Alternative System Prepared				X
2. Existing LMTR System Tested Against Alternative Systems				X
3. General Procedure of Analysis Established				X
D. Socio-economic Benefits Evaluation				
1. Develop Methodology for Measuring Socio-econ Benefits Developed.	X (partial)	X		
2. Analysis of Benefits in Rice Conversion Areas.	X			
3. Evaluation of Socio-Economic Benefits of LMTR Completed	X		X	

Activities	Status			
	Completed	In Progress	Planned	Dropped
E. Public Information Program				
1. Use of Mass Media in Popularizing LMTR Studies			X	
2. Posters, Brochures, Pamphlets Developed and Distributed in Local Offices.			X	
3. Audiovisual Materials Developed			X	
4. Feasibility of Office on Wheels Studied.		X		
5. Plans for Conducting Seminars and Workshops Developed			X	
6. Public Information Programs Translated in Local Dialects			X	
F. Legislative Regulatory Study				
1. Legal Advisers Recruited	X			
2. Reports of Legal Advisers on Regulations, Observations and Recommendations Completed			X	
G. Forms and Documentation				
1. Forms and Documentation Procedures Reviewed			X	
2. Revised LMTR Forms Tested			X	
3. Land Office Records and Management Reviewed			X	
4. Design of Forms and Management Procedures Have been Revised			X	
H. Land Ownership Data System				
1. Feasibility Study of Automating Name Card Completed	X			

Activities	Status			
	Completed	In Progress	Planned	Dropped
2. Name Card Automation Tested		X		
3. Computer Use of Personal Filing System Tested		X		
I. Fees and Charges				
1. Fee Structure Analyzed	X (partial)		X	
2. Formula for Calculating Land Measurement Cost Developed	X (partial)		X	
J. Storage of LMTR Records				
1. System for Record Maintenance Devised		X		
2. Microfilm for Data Storage Purchased		X		
3. Staff to Operate and Maintain Equipment Trained			X	
4. Data from GOI Agencies Collected & Stored			X	
5. Uniform Identification Base from Cadastral Maps Developed			X	
K. Cadastral Tie to National Reference System				
1. BAKOSURTANAL Contacted	X			
2. Mathematical Formulation to Readjust New Control System to National Network Completed			X	
3. National Reference System for Cadastral Base Initiated		X		
L. Orthophotographic Bases				
1. Rectification of Orthophotographic Bases Completed		X		
2. Limit of Error in Land Measurement Established		X (partial)	X	

Activities	Status			
	Completed	In Progress	Planned	Dropped
M. Technical Equipment and Software Systems				
1. Inventory of Equipment at Dir.Gen. of Land Registration Completed	X			
2. Theodolites and Associated Terrestrial Measurement Equipment Purchased		X		
3. Assessment of the Ability of Private Contractors to Conduct Aerial Photography. Completed	X			
4. Program to Use Private Contractors for LMTR Developed				X
N. Training: Administration				
1. Program for Administrative Training Completed			X	
2. Training Course for Use in Capital Cities Developed			X	
O. Training: Technical				
1. Number of Existing Technical Personnel at DGA Determined		X		
2. Cadre of Trainers to Train Staff on Routine Operations Established			X	
3. DGA Personnel to Graduate Schools Admitted			X	
4. Local Universities to Give Special Courses Contracted		X(partial)	X	
5. Incentives for Satisfactory Completion of Course Provided				X

C. Assessment of the Achievement of Purposes

The purpose of this project is to increase the rate of land mapping, titling and registration in Indonesia through the implementation of a new LMTR system and improved land administration. These purposes will be achieved if the following indicators are completed at the termination of the project.

1. an improved system of LMTR has been developed and tested in three project sites,
2. new organizational structure of the DGA and improved procedures for land administration have been adopted,
3. proposal for a follow on project has been prepared and submitted to DGA.

1. An Improved System of LMTR will be Developed and Tested

This is a necessary condition for accelerating the rate of land mapping, titling and registration in Indonesia. Without an improved system that utilizes modern technology and management techniques, the rate of land mapping, titling and registration will continue at its present rate which is too slow in view of the volume of registrations that must be completed.

There is however the danger that the purpose of the project will not be achieved unless (a) the project activities are focused principally towards this purpose, (b) fielding of the Systems Analyst, Management Advisor and Management Information Specialist is accelerated, and (c) an extension of the project is approved.

2. New Organizational Structure and Improved Operational Procedures of DGA Have Been Adopted.

This purpose is not likely to be attained during the life of the project. Structural changes in the DGA or any government agency is very difficult to initiate particularly if these changes involve modifications in central (Jakarta), provincial and kabupaten offices. Unless a proposed re-organization or re-structuring conclusively demonstrates the advantages of an improved organizational scheme, there is the likelihood that the proposal for structural changes within DGA will be rejected by the Government of Indonesia.

There is a better chance of implementing improved operational procedures within the existing organizational structure. This can be accomplished internally through clear and precise definition of functions, flow-charting and analyzing the various functional activities in land mapping, titling and registration.

3. Proposal for a Follow-on-Project

This purpose may have the greatest chance of being achieved because the preparation of the proposal is a technical matter that would be designed by the BLM Project Team and the GOI counterparts. The design would be simpler, goals more realistic and responsibilities of participating agencies more specific than the present project. The follow-on-project would reflect the experiences gained from the present project. However, achievement of this purpose should be given low priority considering that the benefits of registration have not been sufficiently demonstrated and the low level of interest within DGA/DLR on activities beyond LMTR.

D. Assessment of the Validity of Assumptions.

In considering the problems encountered in achieving the purposes of the project, perhaps it may be useful to question the assumptions that (a) The GOI is committed to strengthening the staff of DGA/DLR and (b) encourages coordination among other GOI agencies. The DGA/DLR record in approving training programs and actually sending participant trainees does not support the first assumption. The lack of formal or informal linkages within DGA/DLR agencies in the implementation of LMTR Project in Indonesia does not support the second assumption.

As implied in the project paper, the development of an improved system of LMTR, improvement in land administration through changes in the organizational structure and operating procedures of DGA, and acceptance of a follow on project constitute achievement of purposes which is to increase the rate of LMTR in Indonesia. While these are necessary conditions for achievement of project purpose they are not by themselves, sufficient conditions. Increased rate of LMTR in Indonesia can only be attained if there are a perceived benefits derived from registration.

Recent socio-economic benefit analysis shows that benefits of LMTR to farmers is not of the magnitude originally expected in the project paper. As a result, it could very well happen that although a new and improved LMTR system is developed, a more efficient organization of DGA is adopted, improved operational procedures are implemented, and a follow-on proposal is developed, there is still the probability that the project purpose of increasing the rate of LMTR will not be achieved because farmers fail to perceive the benefits derived from registration.

E. Assessment of the achievement of Sector Goal

The goal of the project is to increase the access of farmers to productive resources such as credit, irrigation, land and technology. The present LMTR project will probably have a marginal effect on the access to productive resources, for the reason that land registration is not a condition to receiving government services or participating in programs designed to increase agricultural production or income of farmers.

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS																																																																																																																																												
<p>Program or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes: Increased access to productive resources by the rural population of Indonesia.</p>	<p>Necessity of Goal Achievement A. Increased demand for agricultural inputs (irrigation water, fertilizer, PVP-Seed, etc.) generated by agricultural loans secured by an increasing number of small Indonesian farmers who can prove ownership and/or use rights to the land.</p>	<p>A. Reports and records of the following CGI agencies: 1. Directorate of Agraria 2. Ministry of Agriculture 3. Central Bureau of Statistics B. Socio-economic research reports written by overseas Indonesian Social Scientists.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving goal targets: CGI's continued commitment and support to rural socio-economic equity.</p>																																																																																																																																												
<p>Project Purpose: To increase the rate of land mapping, registration and tiling and the effectiveness of land administration in Indonesia.</p>	<p>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: end of project status A. 100% hectares mapped and registered in a pilot project utilizing accelerated methods of LMR; B. Organizational structure and operating procedures within DCA consistent with the recommendations of consultant reports and pilot activity evaluation; and C. A proposal prepared by DCA for an expanded follow-on project with U.S. or other donor assistance to implement on an enlarged scale a system, or systems, or LMR developed and tested during the life of this exploratory project.</p>	<p>A. Evaluation of: 1. Pilot activities incorporating improved methods and techniques for rural land mapping, registration and tiling. 2. Organizational, structural and operational changes within the DCA to facilitate large scale adoption of improved methods and techniques developed and tested in 1. B. Visits to pilot activity areas. C. Consultant's periodic progress reports. D. DCA submits proposal to USAID for a follow-on project.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving purpose: A. CGI's policy and attention will continue to quantitatively and qualitatively strengthen DCA to facilitate rural land mapping, registration and tiling. B. Encourage interagency coordination within the CGI on a continuing basis. C. Evaluations will actually be conducted and the experience and knowledge gained will be incorporated in the design of other pilot activities and/or the follow-on project.</p>																																																																																																																																												
<p>Outputs The expected outputs include: 1. socio-economic studies, surveys, and other empirical evidence documenting the effects of LMR upon the rural poor. 2. trained CGI personnel in fields critical to the successful design, implementation, and evaluation of LMR projects. 3. a tested/evaluated system(s) of accelerated LMR on time-and ready for implementation on a large scale.</p>	<p>Measures of Outputs: A. Analysis of: 1) the managerial, technical, and legal aspects of the existing land tiling and registration system; 2) past and current tiling and registration efforts in Indonesia; 3) the effects of the organizational structure and operating procedures within the DCA upon the livelihood of the rural people. B. Recommendations for: 1) cost, time and accuracy effective methods of land mapping to meet the needs of existing and planned land registration and tiling programs in Indonesia; 2) regarding the capability of Agraria personnel to design, implement, and evaluate land registration and tiling programs; 3) modifying and simplifying the existing rural land registration and tiling system(s) used by the DCA; 4) outstanding (if feasible) various parts of the existing or proposed land mapping, registration and tiling system(s) in Indonesia.</p>	<p>A. Reports generated as a result of: 1. in-depth studies of the existing land registration & tiling system in Indonesia. 2. cost, time, and accuracy analysis of alternative mapping systems. 3. immediate and long range training needs for Agraria personnel involved in rural land mapping, registration, and tiling programs. 4. research analyzing the relationships between land tiling, agraria organizational structure and the livelihood of the rural population. 5. literature review on land tiling and registration in Indonesia with respect to the historical processes, social implications, and technical aspects involved. B. System design and specifications for forms, procedures, and standards submitted to Agraria and USAID.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving outputs: 1. research will actually be conducted and reports written 2. improved system of land mapping, registration and tiling will be designed. 3. pilot activities will be conducted. 4. training needs will actually be analyzed.</p>																																																																																																																																												
<p>Inputs:</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Project Budget Table (in \$000)</caption> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>AID¹</th> <th>CGI²</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Technical Assistance</td> <td>816</td> <td>0³</td> <td>816</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Pilot Activities</td> <td>0</td> <td>1300</td> <td>1300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Commodities</td> <td>114</td> <td>133</td> <td>247</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Training</td> <td>218</td> <td>27</td> <td>245</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Monitoring and Evaluation</td> <td>229</td> <td>20</td> <td>249</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. Other costs</td> <td>37</td> <td>65</td> <td>102</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7. Sub-total</td> <td>1431</td> <td>1625</td> <td>3056</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8. Inflation & Contingency</td> <td>369</td> <td>348</td> <td>717</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9. Total project funding</td> <td>1800</td> <td>1973</td> <td>3773</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>¹ AID grant of \$,000,000 is 50.6% of all costs. ² Total CGI assistance of 1,973,000 is 49.7% of all costs. ³ DCA support for TA will include per diem (outside of Jakarta) and all in-country travel expenses. Funding for DCA support is included in funding for pilot activities consistent with DCA budgeting procedures.</p>		AID ¹	CGI ²	TOTAL	1. Technical Assistance	816	0 ³	816	2. Pilot Activities	0	1300	1300	3. Commodities	114	133	247	4. Training	218	27	245	5. Monitoring and Evaluation	229	20	249	6. Other costs	37	65	102	7. Sub-total	1431	1625	3056	8. Inflation & Contingency	369	348	717	9. Total project funding	1800	1973	3773	<table border="1"> <caption>Disbursement Schedule (in \$000)</caption> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FY-81</th> <th>FY-82</th> <th>FY-83</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Technical Assistance</td> <td>292</td> <td>350</td> <td>174</td> <td>816</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Commodities</td> <td>30</td> <td>90</td> <td>4</td> <td>124</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Training</td> <td>60</td> <td>84</td> <td>69</td> <td>213</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Research</td> <td>70</td> <td>89</td> <td>70</td> <td>229</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Other Costs</td> <td>23</td> <td>23</td> <td>11</td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. Subtotal</td> <td>485</td> <td>630</td> <td>328</td> <td>1431</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7. Contingency</td> <td>140</td> <td>191</td> <td>90</td> <td>429</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8. Inflation</td> <td>45</td> <td>63</td> <td>32</td> <td>140</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9. Total</td> <td>670</td> <td>892</td> <td>450</td> <td>2000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <caption>CGI</caption> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>81</th> <th>82</th> <th>83</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Commodities</td> <td>35</td> <td>48</td> <td>30</td> <td>113</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Pilot activities</td> <td>410</td> <td>360</td> <td>410</td> <td>1380</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Training</td> <td>8</td> <td>11</td> <td>8</td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Research</td> <td>19</td> <td>28</td> <td>20</td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Other costs</td> <td>17</td> <td>28</td> <td>20</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. Subtotal</td> <td>490</td> <td>653</td> <td>436</td> <td>1625</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7. Contingency</td> <td>80</td> <td>105</td> <td>26</td> <td>261</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8. Inflation</td> <td>28</td> <td>35</td> <td>26</td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9. Total</td> <td>608</td> <td>793</td> <td>576</td> <td>1973</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FY-81	FY-82	FY-83	TOTAL	1. Technical Assistance	292	350	174	816	2. Commodities	30	90	4	124	3. Training	60	84	69	213	4. Research	70	89	70	229	5. Other Costs	23	23	11	57	6. Subtotal	485	630	328	1431	7. Contingency	140	191	90	429	8. Inflation	45	63	32	140	9. Total	670	892	450	2000		81	82	83	TOTAL	1. Commodities	35	48	30	113	2. Pilot activities	410	360	410	1380	3. Training	8	11	8	27	4. Research	19	28	20	67	5. Other costs	17	28	20	65	6. Subtotal	490	653	436	1625	7. Contingency	80	105	26	261	8. Inflation	28	35	26	89	9. Total	608	793	576	1973	<p>U.S.: 1. Proq. signed 2. P/O/T 3. Advisors arrive as scheduled 4. P/O/C issued 5. Training conducted 6. P/O/T issued</p> <p>CGI: 1. Proq. signed 2. Adequate transportation made available to USAID consultants and staff 3. Office space made available 4. Office equip. made available 5. Adequate # of qualified counterparts supporting USAID consultants</p>	<p>Assumptions for providing inputs: A. U.S. 1. Advisors will arrive on schedule 2. USAID/I will continually monitor the project 3. Participants will be trained 4. USAID will fund the project B. CGI 1. Sufficient DCA support in terms of budget for transportation, counterparts, and equipment will be made available to the project in a timely manner. 2. Conditions for long and short-term training will be identified.</p>
	AID ¹	CGI ²	TOTAL																																																																																																																																												
1. Technical Assistance	816	0 ³	816																																																																																																																																												
2. Pilot Activities	0	1300	1300																																																																																																																																												
3. Commodities	114	133	247																																																																																																																																												
4. Training	218	27	245																																																																																																																																												
5. Monitoring and Evaluation	229	20	249																																																																																																																																												
6. Other costs	37	65	102																																																																																																																																												
7. Sub-total	1431	1625	3056																																																																																																																																												
8. Inflation & Contingency	369	348	717																																																																																																																																												
9. Total project funding	1800	1973	3773																																																																																																																																												
	FY-81	FY-82	FY-83	TOTAL																																																																																																																																											
1. Technical Assistance	292	350	174	816																																																																																																																																											
2. Commodities	30	90	4	124																																																																																																																																											
3. Training	60	84	69	213																																																																																																																																											
4. Research	70	89	70	229																																																																																																																																											
5. Other Costs	23	23	11	57																																																																																																																																											
6. Subtotal	485	630	328	1431																																																																																																																																											
7. Contingency	140	191	90	429																																																																																																																																											
8. Inflation	45	63	32	140																																																																																																																																											
9. Total	670	892	450	2000																																																																																																																																											
	81	82	83	TOTAL																																																																																																																																											
1. Commodities	35	48	30	113																																																																																																																																											
2. Pilot activities	410	360	410	1380																																																																																																																																											
3. Training	8	11	8	27																																																																																																																																											
4. Research	19	28	20	67																																																																																																																																											
5. Other costs	17	28	20	65																																																																																																																																											
6. Subtotal	490	653	436	1625																																																																																																																																											
7. Contingency	80	105	26	261																																																																																																																																											
8. Inflation	28	35	26	89																																																																																																																																											
9. Total	608	793	576	1973																																																																																																																																											

Best Available Document

Assessment of BLM Consultant Role

1. How has the Consultant Team managed its inputs?

Based on interviews with the GOI, USAID officials, the BLM Project Team and a review of the LMTR first year report, it is evident that a tremendous effort was exerted in the early stages of project implementation. However, the delivery of professional services by the BLM Project Team is behind schedule and below the level called for in the Project Paper (See Annex 5). This is particularly true for the System Analyst, Management Advisor, Data Processing Specialist, and Management Information Specialist. The delays in fielding these members of the BLM Project Team has seriously delayed implementation of certain components of the project and performance of certain activities in the project sites. These delays will of course delay the achievement of project outputs and attainment of project purposes.

Has the field support from USAID, GOI and BLM/Washington been adequate?

From the beginning of project implementation, particularly with respect to financial and accounting transactions, numerous correspondence and discussions (e.g. cables, memos, telephone calls) were necessary between BLM/Washington, AID/Washington and USAID/Indonesia to clarify or resolve administrative provisions of the PASA. Project activities were constrained, delayed or confused by these actions. Obligation of funds for project activities were delayed in certain instances due to the necessity for PASA amendments, execution of revised PIO's, etc. In some instances acceptance of BLM/Washington explanations by USAID for project errors or delays was assumed without written documentation. USAID/Indonesia however has provided excellent support to the BLM project team.

The GOI has provided the BLM project team with the necessary logistical support (e.g. office space, local transportation, per diem, etc.) however, greater participation and involvement by the Director of Land Registration and representatives from the other Agraria Directorates is not evident.

2. What evidence exists that the GOI has or will utilize the ideas/recommendations generated by the team?

The BLM project team produced a report in August, 1982, outlining fifty activities to be completed towards attainment of the project outputs and purposes. This report may be too overly optimistic and excessively ambitious in terms of scope and the level of effort.

Of the fifty activities, only eleven activities have been completed or partially completed, fifteen are in progress or partially in progress and the remaining twenty nine are planned for future implementation. If the GOI is reluctant to implement the remaining twenty nine activities, it is doubtful the project outputs and purposes will be achieved by the end of the project.

3. Is the GOI ready to take steps to replicate the project on a larger scale? If the project is not replicated, why not?

Considering the delays in project implementation, it is recommended that a follow on LMTR project not be discussed at this time. The development of a new project would have to be a simpler, more realistic project and would not be of the magnitude as the LMTR project presently stands.

Recent socio-economic benefit analysis shows that benefits of LMTR to farmers is not of the magnitude as was expected in the original project paper. Farmers fail to perceive the benefits from registration. In discussions with DLR staff, there are no plans to increase the project size due to the GOI's low priority on land registration.

4. To what extent has USAID monitored the relationships between BLM and Agraria?

Formally scheduled project meetings with DGA/DLR were held on an ad hoc basis. Formal project management status reports were not scheduled and memorandums of conversation between the BLM Project Team and DGA/DLR were not followed up for the project file. The former and acting BLM Project Team Leader has held weekly briefings and discussions with USAID on a random basis. USAID assumed, since the BLM was the implementing agency for the project, only critical issues affecting implementation of this project would be brought to the attention of the project manager. The project organization established by DGA/DLR was not effective in providing the appropriate level of authority, review and participation needed for proper project policy guidance.

5. What are the differences between the current GOI system of LMTR and that recommended by the consultants?

The answer to this question should be referred to the August, 1982 Report prepared by the BLM Project Team.

5. What modifications are required in the types of short-term consultants actually needed and the need for continuing the long-term consultants past the initial first two years of project implementation to the end of the project?

In the LMTK project paper, the technical assistance portion calls for 98 man-months of professional services consisting of three long term consultants and four short term consultants. Since the Systems Analyst/Team Leader was medically evacuated to the U.S.

because of health reasons, there has been a serious delay in project implementation. There has been a void in the systems analysis section of this project, simply because the socio-economic specialist and mapping specialist do not have the expertise to implement this area. Both technicians have tried to fill this void waiting the arrival of the new Systems Analyst.

Work accomplishments and project interaction with GOI and USAID officials indicate that the Socio-economic Specialist has performed an admirable job. Considerable conceptual and development work by the socio-economic specialist has been undertaken in an attempt to develop a framework for analysis and evaluation which would establish a sound basis for identification, description and measurement of the benefits of land registration. At the present time, DGA/DLR has only agreed to research study on the benefits of land registration as it supports national land development projects (e.g. NES, rice land conversion, transmigration, etc.). Reluctance to utilize Indonesian universities for these studies has been evident by DGA.

Therefore, the Socio-economic specialist should divert his priorities to the recommendations on pages 25-26 of the evaluation, #4, Socio-economic benefits. This would require the Socio-Economic Specialist to extend his tour for the life of the project (December 31, 1984).

Examination of work accomplishments by the Mapping Specialist reveals a vast amount of work has been undertaken in the land mapping, photography and planning for short and long term training. Discussion with DGA/DLR staff indicate that the Mapping Specialist has provided the technology transfer specified in the LMTR project scope and therefore has fulfilled his obligation and responsibility

Therefore, it is recommended that the Mapping Specialist complete the survey and accuracy standards task assignment requested by the GOI and prepare to depart Jakarta by May 21, 1983 with a termination date from the project of May 28, 1983.

7. What progress has been made in or arranging for, the project monitoring and evaluation activities (socio-economic research) utilizing provincial academic/research institutions vs. the research directorate, or other government bodies within Agraria? What fields of study within the broad scope of land affairs have been identified/selected for further research under the socio-economic component of the project?

Refer to the August, 1982 BLM Report and pages 12-14 and 25-26 of the Evaluation Report.

8. What can be said about future evaluations of LMTR project activities and what steps shou'd be taken?

A second evaluation is scheduled prior to the Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD). This evaluation will exam if the EOPS have been met and if the project has accomplished the purposes and goals.

Scheduling time should begin September/October, 1984.

Assessment of Financial Inputs

During the course of this evaluation, the USAID/I Project Officer, USAID/I Deputy Controller and BLM Backstop Officer reviewed the financial records of USAID and BLM. This financial review was designed to help the Mission gain a better understanding of project and contractor costs.

Below is a list of recommendations that were agreed upon during the Financial Review:

- (1) USAID/Indonesia, should cable and establish the billing procedure with USAID/Washington when charges are made against the PASA
- (2) BLM Backstop Officer should establish with the BLM Finance Office a procedure for forwarding the "Standard Form 1081" to USAID.
- (3) BLM Backstop Officer should continue to break down the various PASA costs and display them on spread sheets by special project number and certify them by signature before forwarding to USAID.
- (4) BLM Backstop officer should procure the back-ordered commodities as soon as possible.
- (5) DGA/DLR should be requested to submit a listing of the amount of GOI counterpart matching funds which have been expended for/on project activities. The listing should be categorized by the counterpart funding line items in the Project Grant Agreement Budget as amended. Project expenditures should be shown through March 31, 1983.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
memorandum

DATE: March 10, 1983
COPY TO: *R. C. McClure*
ATTN OF: R. C. McClure, FIN/PA
SUBJECT: USAID Project 497-0312 (LMTR)
TO: Mr. Kevin Rushing, AGR

Enclosed you will find the current financial status of the subject, per our records. Expenditures under the PASA Core are through 9/82 only. As of 2/28/83 it appears that an accrual of \$35,000 could be added. We will make the appropriate accrual at the end of the current quarter. Approximately \$90,000 will also be accrued under housing costs. It thus appears that current expenditures (disbursements plus accruals) would approximate \$411,324.81 (\$286,324.81 disbursements plus \$125,000 accruals).

The last disbursement under the PASA was certified by AID/W and advice of charged (AOCD) to the Mission. This should have been forwarded to the Mission for certification and scheduling.

Our review indicated that the PACD of 12/31/84 is probably not adequate to accomplish the long-term training,

Enclosure: a/s

RCH/wv

PROJECT NO. 497-0112 STATUS
AS OF 2/28/83
PACD 12/31/84

DESCRIPTION	OBLIGATION	E A R M A R K	COMMITMENT	DISBURSEMENT	UNEXPANDED BALANCE	COMMENTS
Pro Ag	1,000,000.00					
PASA Core		611,318.00	611,318.00	239,381.25	371,936.75	Exp. Thru 9/82 only
PASA Other						
Housing		153,000.00	153,000.00	-	153,000.00	To be accrued
Liquidated		23,463.02	23,463.02	23,463.02	-	
Travel		16,492.93	16,493.93	14,385.22	2,107.71	
PSC (Kin)		1,769.12	1,769.12	1,769.12	-	
PSC (Mastrida)		4,609.63	4,609.63	2,767.37	1,842.26	
PSC (Helen)		5,992.43	5,992.43	1,655.69	4,336.74	
PSC (Pacubab)		18,500.00	16,002.00	-	18,500.00	
Language Training		9,350.00	2,734.54	2,734.54	6,815.46	
Books & Pub		1,000.00	168.60	168.60	831.40	
Uncommitted within PASA		154,304.87			154,304.87	
Pro Ag Amendment	1,000,000.00				976,214.00	
Computer		23,786.00	-	-	23,786.00	
TOTAL	2,000,000.00	1,023,786.00	835,550.27	286,324.81	1,713,675.19	

** An Earmark reservation is pending in the amount of \$286,000 under draft PIL #4

Review of Bureau of Land Management (BLM) financial records reveal the following expenditures for FY-82. (October, 1981 - September 30, 1982)

Descriptions	BLM Project Numbers		
	2209	2361	2363
Salary	38,190.82	40,594.82	20,245.45
Benefits	3,657.14	4,194.23	123.36
Post Differential	2,658.46	6,225.82	9,028.16
CC Retirement/Annuitant	-0-	-0-	26,686.32
Transportation/Per Diem	5,379.66	8,988.02	10,055.64
Transfer/Storage of HHE	1,364.29	6,755.34	646.88
State Department Charges	122.50	-0-	122.50
Cable Communications Charges	25.00	-0-	15.66
Contract Services/Surcharges	12,765.50	4,607.30	4,664.21
Supplies	2,223.01	1,921.10	2,076.06
Equipment	<u>2,463.65</u>	<u>1,591.22</u>	<u>2,196.26</u>
Totals	\$ 68,850.03	\$74,877.85	\$75,871.50

The grand total for the project through FY 82 is ±
\$ 219,599.38

Appendices

The following documents/reports are included as major appendices to this evaluation report.

Scope of Work - First Annual Evaluation

Project Paper - Land Mapping, Titling and Registration, 497-0312, September, 1980

Project Report - System Description and Recommendations, Land Mapping, Titling and Registration in Indonesia, August, 1982

Project Report - Land Registration Socio-Economic Benefits and Priorities in Rural Indonesia, Revised Draft, February, 1983

Miscellaneous project papers, trip reports, pilot site visitation reports, memorandums, etc. are not included and are retained in the project and USAID/Indonesia files for reference purposes.