



2014:28

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Leif Danielsson
Mykhailo Cheremshynskyi
Johanna Lindström

Evaluation of Results of Support to Land Administration Systems in Belarus and Georgia, from 1998 to 2014

Final Report

Evaluation of Results of Support to Land Administration Systems in Belarus and Georgia, from 1998 to 2014

**Final Report
April 2014**

**Leif Danielsson
Mykhailo Cheremshynskyi
Johanna Lindström**

Authors: Leif Danielsson, Mykhailo Cheremshynskyi and Johanna Lindström

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2014:28

Commissioned by Sida, Department for Europe Latin America, Eastern Europe Unit

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: April 2014

Published by Citat 2014

Art. no. Sida61752en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61752en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Abbreviations and Acronyms	8
Preface.....	10
Executive Summary.....	11
Executive Summary (Russian).....	14
1 Introduction.....	16
2 Rationale and purpose of the evaluation.....	18
3 Methodology	22
4 Real Property Market in Belarus.....	26
5 Capacity building of NAPR in Georgia.....	60
6 Comparative analysis.....	90
Annex 1 – ToR.....	93
Annex 2 – List of documents	103
Annex 3 – List of interviewees.....	106
Annex 4 – Evaluation Program in Belarus.....	108
Annex 5 – Evaluation Program in Georgia.....	110
Annex 6 – List of project activities and timeline – Belarus	111
Annex 7 – List of project activities and timeline – Georgia.....	113



BelNITszem	Belarusian Land Survey Research Institute
CGD	Cartography & Geodesy Department
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CORS	Continuously Operating Reference Station
CRA	Civil Registry Agency
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ETRS	European Terrestrial Reference System
EU	European Union
EU-PCC	European Union - Permanent Committee on Cadastre
GDG	Geocentric Datum of Georgia
GIS	Geographic Information System
GLONASS	Globalnaya Navigatsionnaya Sputnikovaya Sistema
GNSS	Global Navigation Satellite System
GoG	Government of Georgia
Goskomimushestvo	State Property Committee (former Goskomzem)
Goskomzem	Gosodartveny Komiteta Zemlya
GPS	Global Positioning System
GRS80	Geodetic Reference System 1980
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IGS	International GNSS Service
INSPIRE	Infrastructure for Spatial Information in Europe
IRUP	State Institute for Urban and Regional Planning
ITRS	International Terrestrial Reference System
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
KtK	Kvinna till Kvinna
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
NAPR	National Agency for Public Registry
NBE	National Bureau of Enforcement
NCA	National Cadastre Agency of Belarus
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation

NIRUP IPPS	Institute of Applied and Program Systems
NSDI	National Spatial Data Infrastructure
RBM	Results-Based Management
SEPA	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SWEPOS	Swedish Positioning System
TI	Transparency International
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECE WPLA	United Nations Economic Committee for Europe, Working Party on Land Administration
UTM	Universal Transverse Mercator
WB	World Bank
WGS84	World Geodetic System 1984

This evaluation was contracted by Sida through the Framework Agreement for Sida Reviews, Evaluations and Advisory Services on Results Frameworks and conducted by SIPU International. The evaluation team consists of the Team Leader Leif Danielsson and international expert Mykhailo Cheremshynskyi, with support from gender expert Johanna Lindström and quality assurance expert Björn Bengtsson.

The findings of the report are entirely the responsibility of the team and cannot be taken as expression of official Sida policies or viewpoints.

The evaluation team has been greatly assisted by the Land Reform Association in Belarus, the National Agency for Property Registration in Georgia, the Swedish Embassies in Belarus and Georgia, Lantmäteriet and Sida as well as all other stakeholders and individuals interviewed. We would like to express our appreciation for their support and collaboration.

This report presents the observations and findings of the evaluation of the Sida funded projects in Belarus and in Georgia, conducted during the period February- April 2014. The field mission related to the project “Development of Real Property Market in the Republic of Belarus” was conducted March 05-11, 2014 and field mission related to the project “Capacity Building & Improved Client Services at the National Agency of Public Registry (NAPR) in Georgia” was conducted March 12-20, 2014. The projects are implemented by Lantmäteriet (The Swedish Mapping, Cadastral and Land Registration Authority).

The Swedish cooperation and support of Belarus in the development of the property market and land registration started in 1998. The most recent phase of support titled “Support to Development of Complementary Functions to the Belarusian Real Property Administrative System” was initiated in 2010 and is the main focus of this evaluation. The budget for this phase of the project is 12.4 MSEK. In Belarus the direct cooperating partner and coordinator of activities is NGO Land Reform Association. The project targets institutions and agencies under the auspices of the State Property Committee (Goskomimushestvo), the Ministry of Communication and Information, and Ministry of Architecture and Construction.

The recent stage of Swedish cooperation with Georgia started in 2008 and the Capacity Building & Improved Client Services at the National Agency of Public Registry (NAPR) in Georgia was implemented in the period 2008-2013. The budget of this stage of cooperation was SEK 23.5 million. The main cooperating partner is National Agency for Property Registry under the Ministry of Justice.

The project implementation in Belarus is in its final stages with completion in May 2014 and the project in Georgia was completed in June 2013. The evaluation is focused on the medium to long range results and impacts of the two projects in their respective country. The evaluation demonstrates that the projects’ implementation can be considered satisfactory and in general the main objectives of the projects have been achieved.

BELARUS

There is evidence that the project in Belarus has succeeded in its objectives for the current period in establishing a new geodetic network based on Continuously Operating Reference Stations (CORS), contributing to the further development of e-government, introducing new urban planning methodology, and ensuring citizen participation through public hearings. A methodology for property valuation and provi-

sion of fair and equitable compensation of public acquisition of property has also been developed.

The assessment of the project gives evidence that the Swedish cooperation have made substantial contribution to the changes that have taken place in the land administration services. The mere fact that the government itself has formulated programs for the development of the state registration of real property rights attest to the longevity and sustainable commitment to pursue the effectiveness of the sector. This will have an impact in both the social and economic development due to the increase in individual property rights, establishment of land ownership, selling and buying properties, and investor activities.

The impact on the services of the National Cadastral Agency (NCA) has affected private sector development in Belarus in a positive way. Discussions with the private sector actors reveal that even though there are improvements in the services from NCA, there are still obstacles for the market to expand. There is a need for a new approach of working with real estate agents as partners and a more positive attitude towards investors as expressed by the private sector. Despite that a lot of information is available on-line from NCA, the lines of communication and the paper flow still need to be improved.

The project is found to be very relevant in terms of contributing to changes in the Belarusian society, corresponding to the strategies of Swedish aid to Belarus during the project period, and also links very well with the EU Partnership Agenda for Eastern Europe.

Recommendations for possible future cooperation are to consolidate the achievements reached so far and to provide support to solidify the effects and ensure the intended impact.

GEORGIA

The Swedish cooperation with NAPR has made substantial contributions to the changes that have taken place in the land administration sector in Georgia. The organisational capacity building of NAPR improved the management culture, increased the efficiency of the organisation, prepared and implemented customer oriented strategy of system development as well as contribution to development of a new organisational structure corresponding to the growing responsibilities of the NAPR.

The improvement of the IT solution, establishment of the back-up system and system for archiving of documents has impacted on increasing the security of land transactions and improvement of the quality of the land registration services. The CORS network has contributed to the improvement and unification of cadastral services across the country, quality of parcel boundaries data, and efficiency of the land surveying and reduction of the land disputes in a nearest perspective.

In general the project reached the established objectives including improvement of the NAPR strategic management development, improvement of quality of the services and other objectives. The mass valuation objective has not been achieved nor the impact of the public awareness campaign.

Despite significant progress made by Georgia in establishing a corruption free and transparent land administration service, there is still a lot to do to improve the security of land tenure and land transaction, reliability of the data and increase public confidence in the land registration services. Recommendations for future possible cooperation include support in the standardization of the cadastral procedures, establishment of proper Quality Assurance and Quality Control QA/QC system in NAPR, system for the certification/licensing of private sector land surveying companies, and support in the establishment of National Spatial Data Infrastructure.

В настоящем отчете представлены замечания и выводы оценочной миссии проекта финансируемого Шведским Агентством Развития Международного Сотрудничества (SIDA) в Беларуси, проведенной в период с февраля по апрель 2014.

Оценочная миссия проекта «Развитие рынка недвижимости в Республике Беларусь» включала визит в Беларусь в период 5 - 11 марта 2014, анализ материалов и подготовку отчета а также участие в заключительной международной конференции 9-10 апреля 2014 года. Проект реализуется Lantmäteriet (Шведское Агентство по Картографии, Кадастру и Земельной Регистрации). Реализация проекта находится на финальной стадии и его завершение планируется в мае 2014 года.

Целью данной миссии была оценка средне- и долгосрочных результатов проекта, а также определение наиболее подходящих перспектив для возможного продолжения сотрудничества для дальнейшего развития рынка недвижимости в контексте Программы Европейского Союза по развитию партнерства для стран Восточной Европы. Оценка показывает, что реализация проекта может считаться удовлетворительной и основные цели проекта в общем достигнуты.

Программа сотрудничества с Беларусью в вопросах рынка и управления недвижимостью продолжается на постоянной основе с 1998 года и включает 5 основных этапов. Первый и второй этапы охватывали период 1998-2001 годы и сосредоточивались на повышении информированности белорусских специалистов и руководителей о западных методах управления земельными ресурсами и рынком недвижимости в рыночной экономике. Целью третьего и четвертого этапов ("Развитие рынка недвижимой собственности в Республике Беларусь"), охватывающих период с 2002 по 2009 год, было оказание технической помощи Национальному Кадастровому Агентству (НКА), а также развитие прочной правовой и административной основы рынка недвижимости.

В центре внимания этой оценочной миссии находился последний этап сотрудничества - проект под названием «Поддержка развития дополнительных функций системы управления недвижимого имущества» начатый в 2010 году. Партнерами проекта с белорусской стороны выступали НПО Ассоциация Земельная Реформа, институты и учреждения Государственного комитета по

имуществу (Госкомимущество), Министерство связи и информатизации, а также Министерство архитектуры и строительства Республики Беларусь.

Данный проект достиг поставленных целей в создании новой геодезической сети на основе постоянно действующих базовых станций (CORS), внес вклад в дальнейшее развитие электронного правительства, разработку новой методологии в городском планировании а также обеспечения участия граждан в планировании развития территорий через проведение общественных обсуждений проектов. Кроме того, при поддержке проекта разработана методология оценки имущества для справедливой и соразмерной компенсации в случае его отчуждения для общественных нужд, а также сделаны подготовительные шаги для введения массовой оценки недвижимости.

Оценка проекта свидетельствует о существенном позитивном влиянии шведского сотрудничества на изменения, которые произошли в сфере управления недвижимостью и земельными ресурсами. Правительство Беларуси также разработало программы для дальнейшего развития государственной регистрации вещных прав на недвижимость, которые свидетельствуют об устойчивости развития системы в долгосрочной перспективе. Все это окажет позитивное влияние на социально-экономическое развитие, в связи с улучшением системы регистрации имущественных прав, установление права собственности на землю, развитие рынка недвижимости, включая улучшение инвестиционной привлекательности экономики.

Проект достиг поставленных целей с точки зрения вклада в позитивные изменения в белорусском обществе. Проект соответствует стратегии шведской помощи Беларуси, а также хорошо согласуется с Программой ЕС по развитию партнерства для стран Восточной Европы. Рекомендации для возможного будущего сотрудничества направлены на консолидацию результатов, достигнутых ранее и оказание поддержки в укреплении успешного сотрудничества в сфере совершенствования управления земельными ресурсами и дальнейшего развития рынка недвижимости.

This report presents the major observations and findings during the evaluation of "Results of Support to Land Administration Systems in Belarus and Georgia, from 1998 to 2014".

Land administration agencies play an important role in implementing land policies. They provide data that are vital for securing ownership rights and property taxation, which are both prerequisites for planning and investment. These agencies can also provide mechanisms that limit corruption, by providing transparent systems on tenure, land use and property transfers.

In the East European context, the support to land administration systems has been one important means to contribute to closer social and economic integration of some of the Eastern Partnership countries with the rest of Europe.

In the case of Belarus, a project implemented jointly by the National Land Survey of Sweden, Lantmäteriet, and the Belarusian organization "NGO Land Reform" was initiated in 1998 to provide technical and capacity support to Belarusian cadastral services with the aim of developing a market-based property system.

In Georgia, Sida started supporting the project "Capacity Building and Improved Client Services at the National Agency of Public Registry (NAPR)". NAPR is the state agency under the Ministry of Justice of Georgia that enjoys high level of independence. It is responsible for registering property, issuing titles, registering transactions related to the property, geodesy and cartography.

The evaluation took place February – April 2014 and the evaluation mission to Belarus was carried out March 5 – 12 and to Georgia March 12 – 20. The evaluation team consisted of Mr. Leif Danielsson (Team Leader), Mr. Mykhailo Cheremshynskyi, and Johanna Lindström¹. This report summarizes the team's main observations, conclusions and recommendations.

¹ The evaluation mission team to Belarus and Georgia consisted of Mr. Leif Danielsson and Mr. Mykhailo Cheremshynskyi

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the assignment is attached as Annex 1. The main purpose of the evaluation is to identify the medium and long-term results and lessons achieved by the cooperation and to identify the most relevant focus for possible continued support. A start-up meeting was held at Sida where it was agreed that the evaluation would cover the latest contract periods, i.e. 2010-2014 for Belarus and 2008-2012 for Georgia.

The evaluation started with a desk study of the project documents for the review periods. A listing of the documents is attached in annex 2. Prior to the field visits the team leader met with the project manager from Lantmäteriet and an inception meeting was held at Sida. The evaluation methodology is further commented upon in section 3 and a list of interviewees is included as Annex 3.

2.1 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

According to the TOR for Evaluation of Results of Support to Land Administration Systems in Belarus and Georgia, from 1998 to 2014, dated 2014-01-31, the evaluation has two overall objectives:

- To identify, and illustrate with evidence, the medium- and long-term results and lessons achieved by the land administration projects financed by Sida in Belarus and Georgia as compared to the project's objectives;
- To identify the most relevant focus for eventual continued support, in the context of the Eastern Partnership Agenda and the new regional strategy for Swedish support to the Eastern Partnership countries (forthcoming 2014), and suggest how to integrate a gender equality perspective, as an input to the decision on a possible new project phase starting in 2014.

2.2 EVALUATION OBJECT AND SCOPE

The evaluation objects are two projects implemented approximately in the same time period by Lantmäteriet in Belarus and in Georgia. Both projects have been on-going for some time and have been subject to previous evaluation. The scope as agreed with Sida is to focus on the most recent intervention and draw conclusions compared to previous evaluations.

2.2.1 Belarus

The project in Belarus has been on-going since 1998 and has consisted of 5 phases, whereas the first two phases covered the period 1998-1999 and 1999-2001 and mainly focused to increase the knowledge among Belarusian decision makers on western land management practises and real estate market in a market economy. The third phase covered the period 2002-2005 and was widened to include assistance to the National Cadastre Agency (NCA) and development of a solid legal and administrative foundation and the fourth phase on 2005-2009 and was termed "Development of Real Property Market in the Republic of Belarus".

The most recent phase was initiated in 2010 and is titled "Support to Development of Complementary Functions to the Belarusian Real Property Administrative System" and is the main focus of this evaluation. The budget for this phase is 12.4 MSEK.

The co-operating partners in Belarus are the State Property Committee, Belaerocosmogeodesia, NCA, Belarusian Land Survey Research Institute (BelNITszem), Ministry of Communication and Information, State Institute for Urban and Regional Plan-

ning (IRUP), Ministry of Communication and Information, Institute of Applied and Program Systems (NIRUP IPPS) and NGO Land Reform Association. The development objective of the project is *“Create a more effective system for land administration and a more effective system for physical planning in Belarus”*.

2.2.2 Georgia

Sida has been supporting the National Agency of Public Registry (NAPR) since 2000 through Lantmäteriet. The current project “Capacity Building and Improved Client Services at NAPR of Georgia” started in 2008 and was planned to have been concluded in December 2011. However, the project was granted a no-cost extension twice, the first until December 2012 and then until June 2013.

The total budget for the project was 23.5 MSEK. The intervention logic for this project is a twinning arrangement between NAPR and Lantmäteriet. NAPR has similar functions and responsibilities in Georgia as Lantmäteriet in Sweden and both organisations are the responsible agency for land administration in their respective country.

The overall objective of the project is *“sustainable social and economic development of the nation based on well-functioning land administration, including secured property rights and rational use of land”*.

The immediate scope of the evaluation is to assess and compare the medium- and long-term results and lessons achieved during the implementation of the two projects.

2.3 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The ToR identifies some evaluation questions and criteria to be applied within the framework of the evaluation objective:

- (1) To identify, and illustrate with evidence, the medium- and long-term results and lessons achieved by the projects during the third project phase, during 2010-2014 in Belarus and in 2008-2013 in Georgia, as compared to the project’s objectives:

General:

- How and to what extent have the projects contributed to develop systems for mass valuation of real property, and strengthened the systems for valuation and compensation for public acquisition of real property?²

² Discussed in section 4.2.1, 4.3, and 5.2.6, 5.3

- How and to what extent has the projects contributed to the creation of new geodetic systems for Belarus and Georgia, and what are the benefits for the society?³
- How and to what extent have the projects contributed to improved land administration services in Belarus and Georgia, and what are the more long-term impacts of these services in Belarusian and Georgian societies in terms of social and economic development?⁴
- How and to what extent have the projects contributed to development of systems for e-Government?⁵
- What role do the results of these project results play in the context of the EU Eastern Partnership?⁶

Belarus:

- Has the project in Belarus, led to capacity development within the NGO Land Reform – in what ways, and how could these capacities develop further through a possible new project phase?⁷
- In the Belarusian case, how and to what extent has the project impacted upon the efficiency of urban planning, and what are the implications of these results for private sector development?⁸
- In Belarus, has the contribution enhanced citizens' participation in decision-making - how?

Georgia:

- In Georgia where there have been some cases of property rights violation as indicated by NGOs and other studies/reports - how the project contributed to improvement of transparency in ownership and avoiding infringement of property rights.⁹

³ Discussed in section 4.2.2, 4.3, and 5.2.5, 5.3

⁴ Discussed in section 4.2.3 and 4.3, and 5.2.1, 5.3

⁵ Discussed in section 4.2.3, and 5.2.2, 5.2.4

⁶ Discussed in section 4.3, and 5.3

⁷ Discussed in section 4.1.2 and 4.2.1

⁸ This and the following question is discussed in 4.2.5

⁹ Discussed in section 5.2.3 and 5.3

- (2) To discuss strengths and weaknesses, as well as the reasons behind these, of the respective project: ¹⁰
- What are the major strengths of the intervention and the reasons behind these?
 - What are the major weaknesses of the intervention and the reasons behind these?
 - What are the prospects for sustainability of the results achieved through the intervention?
- (3) To identify and propose the most relevant focus areas for a possible new project phase in each country, including how to integrate a gender perspective: ¹¹
- If new project phases would be initialised, what would be the most relevant focus of such a new support in Belarus and Georgia?
 - In what ways could a new project phase in Belarus enhance capacities within the NGO Land Reform?
 - How could gender equality be integrated in the eventual new project phases in Belarus and Georgia in relevant ways?
 - How could interconnections between the eventual new project phase and private sector development/development of small and medium sized companies (SMEs) be strengthened?
 - How should the new projects be shaped in order to be as relevant as possible for the EUs Eastern Partnership Agenda as well as for the new regional strategy for Swedish support to the Eastern Partnership region?

¹⁰ Discussed in section 4.4 and 5.4

¹¹ Discussed in section 4.5, 4.6, 5.5 and 5.6

3.1 PHASES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation took place in three phases; (1) an inception and desk review, (2) Implementation, and (3) Reporting.

3.1.1 Inception and Desk Review

The first phase of the assignment was an inception period which included the desk review and discussions with stakeholders in Sweden. A start-up meeting with Sida desk officers was held early in order to capture the salient points for the evaluation, identification of stakeholders and to discuss the various step of the assignment.

The first phase of the assignment involved the following elements:

- An initial desk review of relevant documents and project descriptions. Preparation of methodological approach.
- Identification of relevant stakeholders besides those already suggested by Sida.
- Preparation of short inception report, including QA input and a detailed methodology based on discussion with Sida.
- Planning and organizing the field trip, including booking interviews and logistics arrangements.
- Meetings with Swedish stakeholders, i.e. Sida desk officers in Stockholm and project teams at Lantmäteriet.
- Compilation of primary data

3.1.2 Field visits and collection of information

The field visits to Belarus and Georgia were organized in order to collect the information on site about the results and outputs of the projects and the evidence of the project performance as well as to identify the needs of future development in the land administration sector and possible organization of new projects to support such development. Each field visit included briefing meetings at the beginning of the field visit and debriefing meetings at the end of each field visit with the Swedish Embas-

sy/Country Sida office¹² as well as briefing and debriefing meetings with project partners and main stakeholders.

The visits included interviews with the projects' recipients, main stakeholders and identified project beneficiaries, and review of locally available information regarding the projects complemented by studying websites of relevance to the project.

The meetings and interviews also included in depth discussion of the project results, analysis of the lessons learnt during the project implementation, the extent to which issues and project risks were identified and mitigated, collection and in depth analysis of information and opinions regarding the project results. This included in addition discussion of the needs of future development, identification of target groups for the support and goals and objectives of possible future project. The methodology was based on a participatory approach in consultation with project stakeholders to validate findings and conclusions. Multiple and independent sources were approached in order to triangulate and to ensure the credibility of the evaluation.

The visits also included collecting of information on gender and land property issues and how the project improved gender equality in the area of land and property tenure in both countries.

The field visits started in Belarus on March 5 and continued in Georgia the following week on March 12. The detailed visiting plans are attached as annex 4 and 5.

3.1.3 Reporting

The report is based on the results of the field visits, interviews with the project stakeholders and analysis of collected data and information as well as reviewed publications and project reports. It was submitted to Sida, Lantmäteriet and the NGO Land Reform Association for commenting prior to the concluding conference in Minsk organized by the project. Further distribution of the draft report was on the discretion of the recipients of the report.

Comments on the draft report were requested to be received prior to the workshop in Minsk in order to incorporate any changes before the presentation at the conference. The evaluation report describes the context of the development intervention, including policy context, development agency and partner policies, objectives and strategies. The information provided through the documents, interviews as well as other

¹² Pertains to Georgia since there is no Sida office in Belarus.

sources of information will be analyzed with focus on the projects' results and possible impacts.

The evaluation team has focused on identifying validity and reliability of the information sources used as well as the limitations related to the information sources. As far as possible the information has been cross validated to assess validity and reliability.

Reporting of the findings in the draft report took place during the project seminar in Minsk being held 10-11 of April focussing mainly on the Belarusian project.

3.2 GENDER FOCUS OF THIS EVALUATION

The recent mapping of Sida's assistance to land administration¹³ notes the following:

- Gender and human rights are closely connect to issues around access to land
- However, Sida has not worked with a dual focus on human rights and gender and land governance in their programming.

The mapping categorizes the human rights and gender related land governance interventions in the following way:

- Land initiatives with subordinate human rights or gender components
- Land initiatives with a primary focus on human rights or gender components
- Human rights or gender initiatives with a subordinate land rights component

The initiatives in Georgia and Belarus should be categorized in the first group, as neither initiative has any primary objectives relating to gender. Gender mainstreaming should be based on a structured approach with practical initiatives with measurable outputs and outcomes.¹⁴ The focus of the evaluation has been to explore the extent to which this is happening:

- Are there any targeted measures? E.g. specific measures targeted at women? Are targeted measures based on target group analysis (including but not limited to gender analysis)?
- Are there integrated measures? E.g. is gender concerns integrated into overall project goals?

¹³ http://www.sida.se/Publications/Import/pdf/sv/201013-Mapping-and-review-of-Sida8217s-Assistance-to-Land-Policy-Report-Land-administration-and-Land-Governance_3113.pdf

¹⁴ On equal footing. Policy for gender equality and the rights and role of women in Sweden's international development.

- Do measures focus on women's practical needs and/or long-term strategic interests?
- Are there identified measurable indicators in relation to these measures? Are there baselines, are there targets?
- What results can be observed for these measurable indicators?
- Is there policy dialogue conducted by Sida and/or the partner in relation to gender as part of these initiatives?

3.3 LIMITATIONS

Given the available time and resources for carrying out the evaluation it proved to be difficult to arrive at definite conclusions on the way forward in both Belarus and Georgia for the projects. An assessment of the proposed future projects is an assignment by itself as any discussion about the future requires more time than was available. Various options for a possible continuation were presented during the conference in Minsk and will also be presented and discussed when a similar venue is organized for Georgia.

The request from Sida to present a comparative analysis between the projects has proven to be a bit of a challenge. The context in which the two projects have been implemented and the differences in the intervention approach makes it difficult to draw any substantial conclusions. However, an attempt has been made to draw examples of similarities and differences in the implementation and achievement of results.

The Belarusian project was started in 1998 and was evaluated in 2008. The evaluation of the project in 2008 has been used as a baseline for the work of the evaluation team as the main focus of the evaluation has been to make an assessment of the results of the current project.

Land management projects are mainly implemented case by case and with a very long range perspective of achieving result. Assessing the medium and long-term results for the two projects within the time-frame given has proven to be an intricate task, in particular taking into consideration the lack of result based progress reporting. Nevertheless, as far as it has been possible the evaluation tried to analyze the data in such a way that results can be extrapolated and that certain impacts can be identified.

4.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

4.1.1 Project background

Sida has supported the land administration sector in Belarus since 1998 and initially Swedesurvey and later Lantmäteriet have been the partners on the Swedish side and the NGO Land Reform Association on the Belarusian side. The support has been provided in 5 different phases with separate contracts as outlined below. The project being evaluated is the last phase which started in 2010. This phase is referred to as “the project” in this report.

The first project (1998-1999) was to provide Belarusian decision-makers and experts with information and knowledge about the role and functioning of the real estate market in a market-economy.¹⁵ It consisted of a) a study visit to Sweden, b) a series of seminars in major cities for 200 decision-makers and c) production and publication of a book “Land resource administration – the practice in Sweden”. The project budget was 895 000 SEK.

The second project (1999-2001) had the same purpose but was expanded and included a) seminars on land law and land use planning (180 participants), b) study visits to Sweden (22 experts), c) participation in UNECE WPLA and FIG meetings, d) study visits to Poland and Lithuania, e) advisory assistance for the development of the legislation, and f) equipment to the Land Reform Association office in Minsk¹⁶. The project budget was 2.2 MSEK.

The third cooperation agreement was also the first cooperation with Goskomzem (now Goskomimushestvo)¹⁷ and its subordinated agencies the National Cadastre Agency (NCA) and Belaerocosmogeodezia; it covered the period 2002 - 2005. The overall aim of the project was the modernization of the Belarusian real property mar-

¹⁵ Development of Real Property Market in the Republic of Belarus, Sida Evaluation 2008:19; Åke Sahlin, Maksym Kalyta, 1998.

¹⁶ Ibid

¹⁷ The State Property Committee.

ket through increased awareness among decision-makers and senior administrators¹⁸. The project budget was 3.5 MSEK.

The project purpose was the development of a solid legal and administrative foundation for the real property market. The target groups for the project were NCA management and senior specialists, Goskomzem management and senior specialists, Oblast and Minsk municipal administrations responsible for land administration as well as members of the National Assembly Committee for land legislation. The activities included study visits and seminars, production of seven books and brochures, further advisory support in the area of legislation, participation in two international events (WPLA), and a feasibility study regarding assistance to Goskomzem (human resource development and training of trainers).¹⁹

The fourth project, also with cooperation with Goscomimushestvo, was implemented 2005 – 2009 with a project budget of 8.13 MSEK. The overall objective of this project was “to facilitate the development of a real property market in Belarus through bridging the knowledge gap among civil servants and the general public in Western European land management practices, measures and the institutions that are necessary to establish in order to carry out the transition process”.

The project objectives were to increase awareness, knowledge and experience among officials in the field of land administration, regarding requirements, demands and solutions for a modern land administration system, further strengthen NCA to develop into a modern and well-functioning cadastre organization, strengthen the development of a solid legal and administrative foundation on which the emerging real property market can rely and support privatization through introduction of market-related valuation methods.

This project was only covering one ministry (or similar), i.e. Goscomimushestvo (former Goskomzem). Goscomimushestvo is the committee heading National Cadastre Agency (NCA), RUP Belaerocosmogeodesia, RUP Belgeodesia, and RUP BelNITszem.²⁰

The project was approved by Sida in June 2005 but the project suffered from difficulties in getting it formally registered in both 2005 and 2006 and was eventually regis-

¹⁸ Development of Real Property Market in the Republic of Belarus, Sida Evaluation 2008:19; Åke Sahlin, Maksym Kalyta, 1998.

¹⁹ Ibid

²⁰ RUP – State Unitary Enterprise

tered in May 2007. The project was extended from June 2008 to December 2009 to account for this delay.

Both projects in 2002-2005 and 2007-2009 were implemented under the title of “Development of Real Property Market in the Republic of Belarus”.

In 2009 Lantmäteriet submitted a proposal for a continued cooperation in Belarus for the period 2010 – 2012 which was approved by Sida in June 2010. The title of the cooperation is “Support to the Development of Complementary Functions to the Belarusian Real Property Administrative system”.

The cooperation partners were extended this time to be between State Property Committee (Goscomimushestvo), Ministry of Communication and Information and Ministry of Architecture and Construction, coordinated through the NGO Land Reform Association in Belarus and Lantmäteriet. One specific difference in this project was that the National Cadastre Agency was not included as a main cooperating partner, but would participate in seminars and study tours.

The cooperation agreement was signed with Sida in June 2010 for the contribution of 12.4 MSEK. This time an agreement was signed with the three governmental institutions and registration was accomplished in November 2010. Due to varying factors locally in Belarus and availability of experts from Sweden a no-cost prolongation was approved by Sida to first December 2013 and then later to May 2014.²¹

4.1.2 Project organisation

The project organization mainly consists of a project manager from Lantmäteriet and a project manager in Belarus at the NGO Land Reform Association. This is also how the previous projects have been managed in practice. In the evaluation report of 2008, it was stated that a Steering Committee was to be set up comprising representatives’ from all participating Government agencies, ministries and NGOs. In the current project proposal and the Sida decision memo, this is not mentioned and the project proposal does not elaborate in detail on the project organization.

It is evident that the coordination between Lantmäteriet, the Land Reform association and the stakeholders is deemed effective by the cooperating partners. Regular meetings have been held in Minsk in addition to frequent e-mails. Formal deliberations and agreements were held by consultations between the Land Reform Association

²¹ Application for prolongation of the project, Lantmäteriet, 2013-10-30. Prolongation was approved by Sida on 2013-05-22 and 2013-11-07.

and the various organizations participating in the project. The Swedish project managers made an effort to meet with the main project partners during each visit.

The Land Reform Association has been the main Belarusian partner to Sida and Lantmäteriet/ Swedesurvey since the beginning of the collaboration in 1998. The Association was established and registered as an NGO in late 1995 and is through its members, represented in four regions of Belarus as well as in Minsk. Through the support of the project the organization has managed to get a certain international recognition, it is affiliated to FIG (International Federation of Surveyors) and it has been given the opportunity to nominate representatives for participation in UNECE WPLA meetings.

The Land Reform Association's programme of activities seems to be more or less equivalent to the project operations. Considering the particular political and institutional conditions under which the project is being implemented, the qualifications of the NGA, the evaluation team find the approach taken functional and effective, See further section 4.2.5.

4.1.3 Project objectives and components

In a LFA-seminar conducted in January 2009 five problem areas were identified:

- Inefficient land valuation methodology
- Outdated geodetic systems
- Inefficient exchange of information between state agencies
- Inefficient urban planning methodology
- Low qualifications of land administration.

This was derived partly as a consequence of low activities in the property market and in the privatization process, low interest for investments which in turn leads to slow process of renovation of the urban environment. In the log frame the development objective for the project was formulated as:

Create a more effective system for land administration and more effective system for physical planning in Belarus.

The project objective was formulated as:

Land administration aspects shall play a relevant role in National Cadastre Agencies neighbouring sectors, as a way of rising the effectiveness of development of society and within other sectors dependent on accessible and accurate geographic information and to deepen the democratic participation of citizens in different decisions.

The project objective was operationalized in 5 main project components:

- Elaboration of methodology for valuation and compensation for public acquisition of real property
- Supporting the creation of a new geodetic system for Belarus, connected to the rest of Western Europe.

- Improvement of information supply and exchange in the field of real property administration (e-Government)
- Improvement of methodology for urban planning.
- Capacity Support to NGO Land Reform

The log frame specifies output for all components except the first one and there is an output for a sixth area; “Systems for updating qualifications of experts in real property administration”, which is not elaborated in the proposal itself but is congruent with the problems areas stated above. Indicators and activities are also attached to the log frame.

The reporting on the project has been done on a semi-annual basis with a six-month report and a 12 months report. The progress reports are very detailed in reporting activities that have taken place along with attachments describing the program for the visits. The reporting lacks an account of the progress within each component and its related activity/output. The indicators described in the log frame are not easy to use in practice and there is a total lack of targets set according to the SMART²² methodology. This may be a contributing factor why the reporting mainly concern input to the different activities and to some extent output. A discussion relating to outcome/results/impact is lacking.

4.2 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION BY COMPONENT

4.2.1 Valuation methodology and compensation for public acquisition of real property

According to the project proposal the objective of this project component is “the elaboration of methodology for valuation and compensation for public acquisition of real property”. The analysis of the problem was presented as an inefficient system for compensation of losses when land is expropriated and that the quality of valuation is low.

Property valuation is considered an important element of land administration systems and as a basis for establishment of transparent and fair compensation in the case of public acquisition of real property, to establish basis for taxation of property, and to provide a justifiable base for setting prices for privatization, and collateral for mortgages among other uses. This is one of a number of issues to be better resolved in the area of land tenure security, as well as the improvement of the investment climate in Belarus.

²² Specific, measurable, applicable, relevant, and time-bound

Initially, the focus was mainly on valuation for the purpose of providing compensation of losses and mass valuation was later included. This was based on the need for mass valuation as a general reference for the individual property valuation. The two main collaborating partners are BelNITSzem²³ and NCA²⁴. BelNITSzem is responsible for individual valuation and compensation for losses while NCA is responsible for mass valuation.

The BelNITSzem have published five documents on the methodology of the individual property valuation with the support of the project. This includes three Technical Codes of Standard Practices (TCP) in land valuation for forestry and perennial crops, commercial and industrial property and buildings/objects of uncompleted construction, which were adopted in 2011-2013 and then adjusted and updated based on the results of seminars carried out with the support of the project. The project also supported BelNITSzem in the use of GIS technology for property valuation and presented practical examples of such use.

Workshops with the Swedish experts has also provided valuable input to the amendment of legislation, according to BelNITSzem, to ensure that compensation is based on the market value rather than the costs of the assets. The result of this support is that the individual property valuation is now carried out according to a transparent, uniform and standardized procedure, understandable for property owners or investors. This allows for fair compensation in the case of compulsory acquisition of property and better protection of the investors or property owners as well as reduction of conflicts in such cases.

Support has also been given to BelNITSzem to develop software for “generating standard valuation reports for permanent buildings as real property objects, for exercising data exchange and decentralized data processing.”²⁵ This software has been updated and amended but has yet to be used on a large scale. The evaluation team was also informed that it has been difficult to keep the software updated to reflect the latest legislation changes and that it is in need of another update. There is clear evidence that the project have produced tangible results for the process of individual valuation within BelNITSzem. However, the valuation department at the BelNITSzem is to be merged with another organization under the auspices of the State Property

²³ BelNITSZem – Belarus’ Research Institute for Land Survey, Geodesy and Cartography); Actually BelNITSZem is under the reorganization and soon will be merged with another state enterprise Bel-GiproZem - State Unitary Design Enterprise on land management and land use planning

²⁴ National Cadastral Agency

²⁵ Project Report: Semiannual 2012, 2012-11-30

Committee that also deals with valuations, which creates some uncertainties for the sustainability of the project outcome.

The process of **mass valuation** is the responsibility of NCA and despite efforts during this project, as during the previous project, it does not seem as if tangible results have appeared as of yet. However, the knowledge and capacity to appreciate the complexity and the intrinsic value of the implementation of a mass value system is apparent within NCA, and NCA informed that the methodology for mass valuation as well as a draft of relevant legislation is under development based on the collaboration with the Swedish experts. The main problem appears to have been persuading the Taxation office and the Ministry of Finance, but it appears as if this hurdle has been overcome. One tangible outcome of the support in this area is the creation of a Price Register where sales prices from property transactions are being registered. This information is readily available on the NCA website along with the property information and will be used as a reference for the mass valuation.²⁶

A pilot project of mass valuation is being discussed to be implemented in one administrative district in the Brest region, and after an evaluation, be implemented on a larger scale. The main problem appears to be the relative lack of property formation, which must take place before any valuation process and NCA is looking for a cost effective approach to property formation by using remote sensing. Based on the outcome of the pilot project, a program for mass valuation is included in the land administration sector development program for 2014-2018.

The main mode of intervention appears to be smaller workshops where the issues are being discussed and presentations are made both by the Swedish experts and by the NCA staff. Input to this component has been provided through eight visits to Minsk by Swedish experts; two study trips to Sweden and four seminars in Minsk. During some of the expert visits to Minsk the expert also presented papers during conferences. During 2011 through mid-year 2013 the workshops, seminars and study trips provided capacity building to 152 participants.

According to the staff in the valuation department of NCA and the management of BelNITszem, more hands-on input from the Swedish experts in developing the methodology and to assist in the pilot phase would be welcome.

Conclusion: The project appears to have contributed to the achievement of a fair and equitable valuation and compensation framework to be applied in public acquisition of property. The development of the software is not at its final stage according to staff

²⁶ The information on cadastral value of land and property is available at <http://vl.nca.by/>

within BelNITszem due to changes in the legislation and loss of competent programmers within BelNITszem. Hence, substantial support to the framework has been a project result. The challenge for the future is to make better use of the framework.

The progress with the mass valuation scheme appears to be slower and tangible output is not yet available to assess the progress. On the other hand, it is evident the staff within NCA has been thoroughly trained and capacity has been built within the organization to move the concept further. It is expected that the pilot project will be initiated within short should the funding for it become available.

The interviews with the main project beneficiaries BelNITszem and NCA verified that the project has contributed substantially to the development of mass valuation procedures and individual property valuation which has had positive impact on the development of a transparent property market.

4.2.2 Supporting the creation of a new geodetic system for Belarus

The need for a modern unified reference system based on a network of permanent GPS stations is regarded as a prerequisite for standard and consistent spatial data. Such a system is considered to be of great benefit for the whole society, e.g. map production, within the land management sector, for the cadastral and housing businesses and for securing property rights. Previously there were two existing base GPS reference stations, and one of these stations was funded by the Sida project. The main objective of this component was to establish a pilot project based on 10 permanent reference stations in the Minsk region and upgrade the Minsk station to an IGS²⁷ station. The project was to fund the procurement of 10 GPS stations while the Belarus government through its agency Belaerocosmogeodezia would finance the construction of the concrete pillars and equipment needed at each station. Further capacity building of the Belarusian experts was considered to be required in addition to the support already provided during the previous projects.

When the project was started in 2010 the CORS (Continuously Operated Reference Station) network was already being rolled out on a nation-wide basis and due to an efficient procurement process the 10 GPS station provided by the project became 17. These 17 stations were being added to the already installed 30 GPS stations and the Belarusian government procured another 17 receivers to bring it up to a total of 64 GPS stations homogeneously covering the entire Belarus, except for some parts where densification is required to achieve planned design. There is now a plan to bring the number of GPS station up to 99 stations distributed over the country (aver-

²⁷ International Global Navigational Satellite System Station

age distance about 30 km between stations) to allow the availability of positioning services with high accuracy (better than 20-30 mm). Besides providing the equipment, the project has provided specialized software for the GNSS data processing²⁸ and extensive capacity building of the Belaerocosmogeodezia in running the network and fine-tuning it using the Bernese software and G-Trans.²⁹

The system is now in full use, it provides measurements on a lateral basis with the accuracy of 20-30 mm while the previous system was providing approximately up to 1 meter. Users are corporations, energy companies, private surveying companies, and individuals (about 20% of the users), currently there are 110 authorized users bringing in 200 000 USD in user fees (2013). The benefit to society is substantial; not only does the system provide for accurate measurements of boundaries, the property formations are being done much faster and theoretically the cost for getting the coordinates for a plot could be reduced by 75%.

The services are appreciated by the customers and interviews with GeoCart and other two private surveying companies confirmed that they are satisfied with CORS services and are using the services, which allow not only increasing the accuracy and reliability of the land surveying, but also significantly reducing the time of surveying for the benefit of governmental and commercial clients, landowners and tenants.

One particular reflection to be made is that when it became obvious that the geodetic network was being rolled out on a nation-wide basis rather than establishing a pilot network in the Minsk region, it does not appear that a dialog took place between Lantmäteriet and Sida for the use of the funding for a completely different approach. It would seem appropriate that an amendment should have been made to the contract for using the funding for this completely new situation even though it did not affect the initial budget allocations.

Another vital point in the competence and capacity building is that it seems to be limited to very few people inside of the Belaerocosmogeodezia of running the system and the software; this is a risk factor that needs to be assessed in terms of sustainability. It could also be argued whether very complex software such as Bernese software should be run by the agency; it might be better maintained in one of the technical universities.

²⁸ The Bernese GNSS software is a scientific, high precision, multi-GNSS data processing software, used by the Center for Orbit Determination in Europe for its international (IGS) and European (EUREF/EPN) activities.

²⁹ G-Trans is a software for transformation of coordinate systems developed by Lantmäteriet

The future need is to expand the geodetic system for height measurements by a high accuracy Geoid model for Belarus, allowing for determination of accurate height of the points in relation to the sea level.

Eight expert visits was part of the project implementation with two consultants at each visit. Additionally, two study visits to Sweden were made with the purpose of studying the Swedish Positioning System (SWEPOS) system, as well as a study visit to Latvia. 25% of the projects total financial resources were allocated to this component.

Conclusion: The project has successfully provided 17 base GPS receivers to the Belarusian geodetic network and a new highly accurate system has been created for Belarus which can and will be connected to the rest of the Western Europe. The support to the Belaerocosmogeodezia was not concluded by the time of the evaluation and two more visits were planned. However, it would seem as if the objective of the support has been reached. As similar systems are being used in developed countries and are considered relevant in view of its contribution to positive socio economic effects, safeguarding of property rights and the development of surveying services in land management, it is likely that the same effects will be reached in Belarus – albeit that this evaluation is not able to fully establish that this will be the case in terms of impact.

However, there are some clouds in the horizon as it appears as if some Ministries are moving to exclude private surveyors from the market by imposing some financial restrictions for providing surveying services to large projects. This would be unfortunate, as this would greatly hamper the benefits of such a system to the private sector and it would also minimize the competence and the services available for people requiring surveying services to register their properties.

The stakeholders are satisfied with the project and admitted significant contribution of the project to the design of the NGCN (National Geodetic Control Network), and capacity building of the personnel to run and maintain the CORS network.

The interviews with the private surveying companies demonstrated that the services provided by the CORS, are widely used and appreciated, allowing further improvement of the accuracy and reliability of the cadastral data.

The sustainability of the computation of the GNSS observations using Bernese software requires additional measures and closer cooperation with the academic institutions to involve more professionals in Belarus, as well as the establishment of accurate Geoid model which is a comprehensive exercise that requires not only substantial financial resources, but also high technical expertise, experience and knowledge. The implementation of this component can be considered as satisfactory and efficient, keeping in the mind the resources that were invested and the results obtained, includ-

ing the financial resources (revenue) of the CORS services and improvement of land survey data quality and reliability.

4.2.3 Improvement of information supply and exchange in the field of real property administration (e-Government)

The UN in 2006 defined e-Government as “the employment of the Internet and the world-wide-web for delivering government information and services to the citizens”. E-government is under development in many countries to improve and facilitate the operation of government and the delivery of government information and services to businesses and citizens, including the services in the area of land administration, property registration and cadastre, urban planning etc. Belarus, like other countries, makes efforts in the development of e-government, but it is a long and complicated process that requires substantial resources and support to all levels of government.

The purpose of this component was to improve information supply and exchange in the field of real property administration. Certain problems were to be addressed, such as that information flows between government agencies are slow, not updated and sometimes unreliable; insufficient state information services and lack of coordination; lack of digital archives of documents among others. The main collaborating partner in this component is the Applied Software Systems Institute (NIRUP IPPS), but most other relevant actors were involved as well. The IPPS is run as a profit driven state company. They provide turn-key applications and information security solutions on special information systems for governmental services.

The project provided input through five visits by six different Swedish experts, two study trips to Sweden for 10 representatives of IPPS, one representing a real estate agent in the private sector and one representative from the Centre for Protection of Property Rights. A study trip was organized in 2013 to visit NAPR³⁰ in Georgia to learn from their e-government experiences and applications as well as a return visit by two NAPR experts to hold a seminar and discussions with various stakeholders in e-services. The visit to NAPR in Georgia resulted in a list of eleven recommendations. There is also an active involvement in e-government by the former Director of NCA in this component, Mr. Sergei Shavrov.

The IPPS have used their experience from the project to create a platform for providing IT-services to government institutions and development of a nationwide system to connect various data systems to enable government institutions to share data. A presidential ordinance has also been issued for the establishment of a verification center

³⁰ National Agency for Public Registry.

for digital authentication of users of e-services. The IPPS stated that the main outcome of the project seminars has been to provide a vision and examples of how e-government and e-services can be developed and the study visits have been important to enhance the visions and exemplify the implementations. However, the Director of IPPS noted that to implement these services it would have been useful to gain more practical experience; to learn how it is being done is needed to complement the knowledge of the benefits of such services.

According to the project proposal, the responsibility of developing a digital archiving system as well as the development of e-services lies with the IPPS. There is a pilot project at IPPS to develop an Open Archival Information System (OAIS) and the Ministry of Justice has taken a decision to form a special “Technical Committee on Digital Archives”. Three business unions have created a Belarus E-delegation where two project members are engaged. However, discussions with the IPPS and NCA reveal that a digital archiving system of old paper archives has not been realized. New property registrations and the changes into the property database are being digitally archived. Applications that are presented to the registration offices are scanned and saved and the paper forms are returned to the applicant.

The development of e-services is a long process in any country and progress in Belarus has been significant. One example of this is the governmental portal to provide a cluster of e-services, www.portal.gov.by where 40 governmental agencies and ministries are listed. There is a wide array of services listed and this can be sorted by department or by services. The National Center of E-services is also established as main operator of governmental information resources and responsible for internet services.

The time for property and transactions registration has been significantly reduced (1 day for issuance of certificate and regular registration procedure less than 7 days) which have placed Belarus in third place in Doing Business rating of the World Bank for property registration.

The NCA statistics shows the increasing number of registered property objects, from 5,392,334 in 2010 to 6,157,221 in 2012 in the registry (growth about 14%). The number of queries to the registry and digital transactions is also increasing from 3,873,251 queries in 2010 (including 66% digital) to 7,859,775 in 2012 (including 83% digital). In general the number of transactions doubled over a period of two years and the number of digital transactions increased by about 2.5 times. The extent of which the project has contributed to this is not possible to assess, however, the

stakeholders interviewed have attested that the project has been instrumental in providing good examples for e-services, which has had a significant impact.

The National Cadastral Agency demonstrated developments of a public cadastral map for Belarus in a test mode which is also linked with the on-going work with the addressing system. This is also a good example of the result of integration and openness of data.³¹

Another interesting development of e-service is a web site offering information of available real property and is being driven by private sector actors, among which are the Tvoja Stolitsa.³²

Even though these developments are not a direct output of the projects current phase, it is probably safe to assume that the project has influenced the development of these e-services.

Conclusion: The development of e-services in Belarus has evolved considerably and there is clear evidence of the increased provision of services in many sectors. The services provided by NCA in the real property sector as demonstrated to the evaluation team is also impressive but the actual progress during this project is unclear. The support in this area is claimed to have contributed to the improvement of the land and property registration services to achieve 3rd position in the Doing Business rating of the World Bank.

The private sector maintains that it is still difficult to get certified information from this system and this must be obtained from NCA by the use of a courier. Digital signature is a service which would improve the market development.

The extent of the development of a digital archive of old paper records has not been possible to assess though the evaluation team has been informed that it is under consideration.

A clear linkage between the development of e-services and the provision of support by the project is not possible to establish, other than it is reasonable to presume that the input has provided capacity building in forming the vision and creating a way forward for building the e-government platform. However, the e-services for land

³¹ www.map.nca.gov.by

³² www.realt.by

administration and property registration provided by NCA are clearly linked to the support given by the project.

4.2.4 Improvement of methodology for urban planning

The objectives of this component are improved methodology for urban planning and involvement of citizen's participation in the process of urban planning. According to the Project Proposal, the main issues identified in the area of urban planning were lack of participation of citizens in the process of decision making and the need to improve the methodology of planning using GIS technology. Planned outputs of the project were an improved and published methodology of urban planning, as well as involving citizens in the process of urban planning.

The main project stakeholders for this component were the Ministry of Architecture and Construction of Belarus (MACB), the Minsk City Chief Architect Office (MCCAO) and the State Institute for Urban and Regional Planning (IRUP), which also took part in the previous stage of the project.

The project provided input to this component through eight visits by Swedish experts. Three of these visits included seminars in Vitebsk, Gomel, and Grodno. Two study visits were made, one to Stockholm and one to Copenhagen. Purchase of software for traffic flow planning was financed by the project.³³ The project provided support in many different ways and the interviews demonstrated that there is a good working climate with the IRUP and that the ideas conveyed, and also observed during the visits to Stockholm, fell on fertile grounds.

The first major outcome of the cooperation was a draft regulation on "Standards for holding public debates in the sphere of architecture, city planning and construction". This draft regulation was revised and presented to the Cabinet of Ministers of Belarus by IRUP through the Minister, and this regulation was passed in June 2011. The regulation was a direct result of the first seminar held in Minsk, which was also attended by Chief Architects from Vitebsk and Gomel regions. The application and working procedures were elaborated during the following seminars and the institute was assisted in an awareness campaign for the implementation of the regulation in other regions for overcoming the resistance of holding public hearings. A tangible outcome of this is that public hearings are now being held on a more regular basis and is used as an input to the planning process in an earlier stage. Recently a new, differently

³³ VISSIM 5.10. VISSIM is a behaviour-based simulation developed to model urban traffic and public transport operations and flows of pedestrians.

structured version³⁴, of the public hearing methodology has been approved by the Cabinet of Ministers, entering into force beginning of April 2014.³⁵ Examples of the public hearing methodology was presented to the evaluation team and in particular referencing the outcome of the hearing in Borovliani, where a master plan was revised after three rounds of hearings, and one in Gomel, where the design was updated and also certain facilities were moved as a result of the hearings.

Other tangible effects of the cooperation is the use of 3D modelling of planning solutions; standard solutions for the development of residential areas; and including bicycle lanes (a direct outcome of the visit to Stockholm). The seminars have also provided suggestions for changes in laws and regulations for town planning. Seminars in “Enhancing Urban Spatial Planning” were held in Minsk, Gomel and Grodno. Another in-direct result of the cooperation between the Swedish experts and the IRUP is that the Institute won a tender to develop an old airport into an energy efficient residential area. During a visit to Brest and discussions with the Mayor and city architects, the Mayor provided the Institute with a plot for a pilot study of “novelty solutions” of building residential areas. Part of the planning solutions is to create “greener” cities by taking into account environmental issues, e.g. providing bicycle lanes.

However, while the deputy minister of Architecture and Construction confirm a substantial input of the project in the improvement of the planning procedures and especially implementation of the public hearing, he noted that the expectations were even higher.

Other outcome of the project is the development of “Guidelines for the Belarusian Government’s Town Planning Policy for 2011-2015 (Presidents Ordinance #385) and “Belarus’ Spatial Development Plan 2013 (awaiting approval).

Conclusions: Though it is difficult to directly link results and outcomes of this component to the objectives in absence of clear targets there are some very important conclusions that can be made. The regulation for public hearings has strengthened the democratic input in the urban planning process and environmental protection and there are cases where draft physical plans have been changed after holding public hearings.

³⁴ According to the Vice Minister of Architecture and Construction

³⁵ The newly approved methodology changes the approach to public hearings by introducing mainly two forms: “public information and study of public opinion” and “meeting and discussion commission of representatives”. According to some publications, these changes is narrowing the participation of public in the open discussion of the projects (i.e. see <http://drozdava.by/novosti/obschestvennye-slushaniya-s-1-aprelja-fa.html>)

The interviews with officials from the Institute, the chief Architect in Minsk and the Deputy Minister confirm that the seminars held in Minsk, and in the regions, have improved the decision-making process for physical planning conditions and prospects for living conditions. In addition, it supported the development of new approaches to city planning, and capacity building and familiarization of Belarusian experts with new methodologies and new technology in the master planning.

The Chief Architect also noted that participants now speak the same language and share the same vision on how to achieve multifunctional plans where different views are integrated with issues such as working with investors, planning for tourism, the development of bicycle infrastructure, regulation of traffic, and problem with increasing pollution. During the visits to the Institute and the Office of the Chief Architect of Minsk the evaluation team was shown 3D concept drawings which clearly indicate new thinking in urban planning and were told that this was an outcome of the project.

The main indirect achievement and result of this component is the democratization of the process and improvement of the transparency of decision making in the area of urban planning. The development of the procedure for public hearings and public participation was established by the resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers, which was supported by the project.

It can be concluded that the specialized target group that drives this process further and ensures a more substantial national roll-out are well prepared and knowledgeable. It is up to national initiatives to use the capacity building for the intended purpose.

4.2.5 Capacity support to NGO Land Reform

There is no clear objective formulated for the capacity support to the NGO Land Reform other than that the project proposal³⁶ specifies that the NGO shall be supported to increase its capacity to carry out project organization and coordination activities by financing costs for premises, personnel, Internet fees and equipment. The previous evaluation in 2008 recommended that an element of capacity building of the NGO Land Reform should be included. For various reasons, this was not deemed possible during the project design.³⁷

³⁶ "Support to Development of Complementary Functions to the Belarusian Real Property Administrative System", Project proposal, Lantmäteriet, June 2010

³⁷ Åke Sahlin, Maksym Kalyta; Development of Real Property Market in the Republic of Belarus, April 2008, Sida Evaluation 2008:19.

As far as it has been possible to determine from the budget, this input has been provided to the NGO Land Reform and in return the organization has provided coordination support to the project locally in Belarus. The NGO Land Reform has been responsible for contacts with more than 10 project partners and participants including state authorities and agencies and has been responsible for the project organization in Belarus in terms of expert visits, seminars and study visits to Sweden; management of the financial support, and reporting to Lantmäteriet.

The NGO has organized transparent cooperation between the different stakeholders of the project and formalized it via the “Agreement of Cooperation in the Project Implementation” between three state authorities; Goscomimushestvo³⁸, the Ministry for Information and Communication and the Ministry for Architecture and Construction. This agreement formed a basis for the formal registration of the project with Belarusian authorities in 2010 and was as such pivotal for registration without any delay according to the NGO.

NGO Land Reform together with the other stakeholders demonstrates strong ownership of the project, with effective organization and coordination of the project activities. The main project owner has for all practical purposes been NGO Land Reform though the Goscomimushestvo must be regarded as the main representative of the cooperating ministries. The close collaboration and coordination with the Lantmäteriet and the local project manager is substantiated by 12 visits to Minsk by the Swedish project manager during the project.

It is clear that the coordination and the integration of the support given by the NGO has contributed to a smooth working relationship between the government agencies and enabled communication between upper and lower level staff and technicians. This has facilitated inter-agency communication and a culture of working together which is a precondition for achieving results, albeit primarily in the form of outputs. The focus of each mission by the Swedish experts as well as each study visit to Sweden has been prepared locally by stakeholders, coordinated by the NGO, indicating that the project has been very client driven with high local ownership.

The coordination input to the project has been extensive. In the period from October 2010 to March 2014 32 visits of Swedish experts (1 planned in April, 2014) were carried out, 11 seminars in Belarus as well as 11 study visits to Sweden or other countries (i.e. Georgia, Denmark, Latvia) were implemented, including visits of Belarusian experts to participate in seminars of international professional organizations. The

³⁸ State Property Committee

Swedish experts contributed a total 120 days of visits and 28 days for seminars. Some of the tangible results of the capacity support to the NGO are the support of the maintenance and development of information being provided through its webpage.³⁹ The portal is continuously updated and provides a good information resource for land management experts, students as well as public in general who is interested in the progress of the development in land management area and the NGO also publishes reports on project activities and participation at FIG meetings.

The project has also supported publishing of the book on the “Structuring of land resources and regulation of land use in Belarus”⁴⁰ as well as a book about international heritage Struve Arc, which monuments are in the territory of Belarus⁴¹.

The NGO is in an excellent position to promote change in the sector in many ways but at the same time it has to balance its position and make strategic choices carefully. It can be concluded that the Land Reform association has during this project focused on the best for the project rather than its own development and strive for the future. With the new outlook on public-private partnership that appears to be emerging⁴² the support to NGO Land Reform might take another form in future whereas its links with similar organizations internationally can be strengthened and its position in FIG, where it is a member, can be promoted. The NGO Land Reform could quite possibly be a vehicle to form professional associations in the field of surveying, thus organizing the private sector for stronger participation in land surveying. The current main weak point is the lack of alternative funding outside of this project and the limitations set by the current legislation.

Conclusion: There is strong evidence that the progress of this project would not have been as tangible should it not have a strong local actor such as NGO Land Reform with sector competence for coordination. It is a good example of a well-functioning cooperation between the civil society and state agencies willing to make democratic changes and development of the society. Keeping in mind that no specific capacity building to the NGO has taken place as part of the project objectives over all the years, it is difficult to entangle how and to what extent the NGO has been strengthened over the years.

³⁹ NGO Land Reform portal (in Russian), www.land-reform.com

⁴⁰ Pomelov A.S., “Structuring of land resources and regulation of land use in Belarus”, 527 p. BeINITSZem, Minsk, 2013, (in Russian)

⁴¹ Mkrtychan Vladimir, The Struve Geodetic Arc: Pathway to global recognition. NGO Land Reform, 257 p. Minsk, 2013, (in Russian & English)

⁴² There is a pending new law on PPP in which it is said that NGOs may be included and have a stronger participatory position.

The NGO Land Reform demonstrate good coordination and organization of project activities as well as in the provision and dissemination of information about project activities via the web-portal, knowledge transfer on modern approach and technologies in the land management and establishment of close cooperation links in this area between Belarusian experts and contact with international experts and organizations which can be of use in future steps of cooperation.

The capacity and network of the organization is deemed to be an asset in the development of the property market as well as in promoting the private sector and civil society involvement. Avenues should be explored for how a possible continuation phase could strengthen the association without jeopardizing its situation and credibility as perceived by the collaborating government institutions.

4.2.6 Improvement of systems for updating qualifications in real property administration⁴³

This project component is not explicitly presented in the project proposal but is included as one of the outputs in the log frame from the LFA seminar in January 2009. The objectives are two-fold, 1) Improve systems for updating qualifications of experts in real property administration by publishing two books and participation in international events and 2) Spreading experience from Belarusian land administration projects to other countries of transition.

The publishing of two books have already been discussed previously in section 4.2.1 and has been accomplished. Participation in international events has generally taking place through participation by Mr. Sergei Shavrov in the UNECE WPLA meetings and where he has presented papers. This has taken place four times. Mr. Sergei Shavrov and Mr. Miroslav Kobasa participated in a FIG working week in Rome together, and Ms. Ina Lavrinovich (IRUP) participated in a UN Conference on Social Housing in 2014. Two more meetings in FIG and UNECE WPLA are planned for the spring of 2014.

In April 2014, an International Conference took place in Minsk with participation from neighbouring countries and Swedish experts from Lantmäteriet. This Conference discussed the benefits and outcomes as well as long-term effects in Belarus, resulting from the cooperation program with Lantmäteriet, thus spreading the experience from Belarus to other neighbouring countries.

⁴³ As mentioned, this component is not specifically in the original project plan, but could be considered as part of the capacity support to NGO Land Reform and adding to its institutional capacity and credibility. Linked also to the evaluation questions

Conclusion: Inasmuch as there are no specific targets set for this component the outcome of the activities or any tangible impacts are difficult to assess in relation to its objective. Having said that, by establishing strong ties with the Belarusian State Technology University it can be assumed that these experiences will be assimilated into the teaching at the university, as well as infused into the work of e-government through Mr. Sergei Shavrov. One reflection is that Mr. Miroslav Kobasa having a pivotal role in the project as well as in the land management sector, could have been given resources to participate more extensively in international gatherings to further strengthen the network of NGO Land Reform.

The title of this project component is also slightly misleading as it implies that a systematic approach was to be taken to develop systems and other approaches, to ensure that qualifications in the Belarusian real property administration was furthered. This does not negate the benefits of having presence in these important forums, but there is some uncertainty to which extent the outcome may have a multiplying effect. This is an important area of capacity building in the Belarusian society which should be taken into consideration for the future.

4.3 OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

The assessment of the various project components as described above give evidence to that the Swedish cooperation with the Land Reform Association, the State Property Committee and the various agencies have made substantial contributions to the changes that have taken place in the land administration services. The mere fact that the government itself have formulated programs for the development of the state registration of real property rights (2009-2013 and 2014- 2018) attest to the longevity and sustainable commitment of the government to pursue the effectiveness of the sector. This will have an impact in both the social and economic development due to the increase in individual property rights, establishment of land ownership, selling and buying properties, investor activities and so on as described previously and later in this report.

The impact on the services of NCA has affected the private sector development in Belarus in a positive way. What can be seen is that a property market has been developed, but discussions with private sector actors reveal that even though there are improvements in the services from NCA there are still obstacles for the market to expand. There is a need for a new view by the government of working with real estate agents as partners and a more positive view towards investors. Despite that a lot of information is available on-line from NCA such as property register, price register and the availability of statistics on property transactions, the lines of communication and the paper flow still needs to be improved. Documents must be requisitioned from NCA and picked up by courier; this could be solved by establishing authorized users

such as notaries, banks and even real estate agents. In the long-term, services like this may be introduced as it has been done in Georgia.

The establishment of the geodetic network could have provided opportunities for the surveying companies, but as have been discussed previously this is being endangered by some of the restrictions that are being contemplated by the government.

The results and effects of this project and previous phases link-up with aspects in the EU Eastern Partnership:

- It strengthens sector cooperation and economic integration through to participation in networks such as FIG and the UNECE WPLA, by linking the geodetic network with the European networks.
- It contributes to the development of democracy and rule of law, and human rights by establishing property rights, laws and regulations in connection with registration and transparency of data in registries.
- The exchange of experiences and approach to solving challenges in the land management sector by including several European experiences and experts contributes to bringing the countries together and develop closer cooperation and exchange of experiences

The evaluation questions and criteria presented previously in this report have been elaborated upon above in section 4.2 further discussed in the following sections.

4.3.1 Project Relevance

Relevance is normally defined as the extent to which a development intervention conforms to the needs and priorities of targets groups and the policies of countries and donors. However, in the case of Belarus it becomes a bit special. The general view of the policies of Belarus is that they do not particularly reflect a willingness to improve transparency, market development, democratization and human rights. In that perspective, looking from the side of the donor and the targets groups, the project becomes relevant as it aims to transform and change policies within Belarus. Consequently, the relevance perspective will have to be considered from the perspective of the societal changes that is assumed to be needed and of the people of Belarus, the target groups and the policies of the donor.

As discussed previously, an effective land management system, property registration and a functioning real property market supports the development of society. It strengthens the property rights of the owners, ensures true demarcation of property boundaries, offers the owners protection from arbitrary decisions from authorities, and ensures fair compensation for real property acquisition. It also reduces the risk of corruption as the administrative procedures become streamlined and registration of property can be done transparent, according to the law and without interference of any officials.

Land registration and a real property market also contributes to the development of the national economy by providing systems whereas the property can be mortgaged and contribute to the financing of investments in small businesses. It further creates confidence in the land management, which would contribute to attracting investors to invest in construction of commercial property and housing, and this helps the private sector to grow and further the development of democratic civil organizations promoting societal change.

Having said this, this evaluation also finds the Belarusian environment is in a state of change. The government agencies participating in this project appear to be willing to make changes in the way they are operating and serving the society. The level of transparency is sometimes surprising. The NCA has achieved remarkable achievements through the e-services and Belarus is regarded as the third best country for property registration. The passing of a regulation requiring public consultations for urban development, substantial government investments in realizing the development of a new highly accurate geodetic network, as well as formulating action plans for the development of the land management sector in line with the project objectives is signaling changes.⁴⁴ All of this makes the project highly relevant in furthering democratization, safeguarding rights (for both women and men), enabling a better land management for agriculture, and promoting market development.

The Swedish Strategy for aid initiatives in Belarus 2011-2014 outlines strategic considerations on which the cooperation between Sweden and Belarus is to be based. The evaluation team's view of the relevance in relation to some considerations in the three sectors the aid is based on, Democracy, human rights and gender equality, Environment, and Market development is:

- The cooperating partners in the project have demonstrated a will for change ranging from property valuation for fair equitable compensation, new urban planning methodologies, development of e-services for transparency and ease of processing. In many cases seminars have included representatives from local and regional levels and at times seminars have been organized outside of Minsk.
- This project is founded on information and communication technology to further transparency, protect individual's property rights, development of e-services even outside of the land management area, the creation of a CORS network to ensure rightful measurements of property.

⁴⁴ Council of Ministers: Program of development of the state registration of real property rights 2014 - 2018

- The component for urban development have introduced methods to stress the environmental implications in new development and planning techniques
- The long standing collaboration with the Land Reform Association represents support to the civil society where capacity development is based on its integral activities.
- The elements of the previous projects as well as the current project has focused on creating conditions for the establishment of a market in line with land administration standards and principles in most European countries, which help foster a shift to a market economy.

Conclusion: The project is considered relevant in regards to the Strategy for Swedish aid initiatives in Belarus and the needs and priorities of the target groups and the Belarusian government.

4.3.2 Project Effectiveness

Project effectiveness is usually defined as the extent to which a development intervention objectives are achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

The development objective and the project objective (purpose) are stated in the project proposal to Sida as well as in Sida's assessment memo. Surprisingly enough we find no reference to the stated objectives at the project level or at the "output" levels in any of the periodical reports. Neither are the indicators for achievements presented nor their fulfilment. The periodical reports elaborate on each output level describing activities performed (input) and achievement (output) during the reporting period. Only in a few instances are outcomes reported. One clear weakness is the lack of clearly stated targets; this by itself makes it difficult to report the level of attainment of lower level objectives as well as the project objective.

Judging from the discussion above relating to the findings of each component certain conclusions can be made of the assessments. On an overall basis the project has achieved what appear to be the relative objectives of each component. High fulfilment can be assessed to have been achieved in the creation of a new geodetic system, Improvement of methodology for urban planning and public hearings to involve people in the process of urban planning, and improved information supply and exchange (e-Government).

The elaboration of the methodology for valuation and compensation for acquisition of real property appears to have achieved its objective while mass valuation have through seminars managed to exchange experience and an understanding of the complexity, but not really demonstrated any clear outcome or output in form of an Belarusian methodology. It should also be noted that mass valuation was not clearly stated as an output from the start, but was added along the way.

The capacity support provided to Land Reform Association was only stated as financial input and purchase of equipment. All of this has been accomplished. Any specific objectives or targets in regards to capacity building of the NGO were not provided in the project proposal. Interviews with the chairman of the NGO confirmed that no such objective was in the project for various reasons, mostly strategic. Nonetheless, it is clear that the project builds credibility and status to the NGO, which on the international arena is an advantage but not necessarily an advantage locally.

The assessment of the extent the project has contributed is difficult to judge in the absence of clear indicators or SMART targets. In the case of the geodetic network, it is clear that the process had already started when the project began, but the planning and the capacity building of the stakeholder was initiated already in the previous project which adds to its fulfilment.

Conclusion: The assessment of the project effectiveness shows that all components have reached their stated objectives except for the mass valuation where there is no clear evidence of having reached an elaborated methodology for Belarus. However, in an assessment of the mass valuation activity it might be concluded that it may have been achieved because the objective is stated very ambiguous. In a possible continuation of this project it would be prudent to revisit the objectives to attain a level that is realistic to achieve.

4.3.3 Project Efficiency

Project efficiency is usually defined as the extent to which the cost of a development intervention can be justified by its results, taking alternatives into account.

One challenge in assessing project efficiency is that the project is still on-going and reporting of disbursements is not available awaiting the final report. Thus the revised budget as of 2013-10-29 must be used. Another problem is how we should value the different project component outputs in relation to the financial input. In many cases there is no measurable output or outcome that can be valued in economical or social terms. One way of assessing the efficiency of the project is to review the resource consumption in relation to the activities performed and form an opinion on the extent they seem reasonable considering the character of the activity.

- Equipment purchases for the project were 15% of the total budget. However, this amount includes the investment of 17 GPS receivers and software for the CORS network which is almost 75% of the purchases.
- In comparison with the relative input of expert visits, study tours and local seminars, the resource allocation for each component appears reasonable. The creation of the geodetic system and the urban planning components has the largest allocation which also is congruent with the input.

- One area that is relatively large compared to the resource allocation of other components in the project is project management and administration in Sweden. This may need to be explained in the final report when actual disbursements are reported.

Conclusion: Comparing the achievements of NCA in the area of land registration, high ranking in the World Bank Doing Business rating, achievement of better transparency of land administration, the creation of a CORS network and achievements in urban planning with the financial input the intervention can be considered as efficient. However, the efficiency of relatively high administrative expenditures on project management requires additional justification.

4.3.4 Project Sustainability and Impact⁴⁵

Project sustainability can be usually be defined as follows: A project is sustainable when it continues to deliver benefits to the project beneficiaries and/or other stakeholders for an extended period after the financial support has been terminated. Impact is defined as the totality of the effects of a development intervention, positive or negative, intended or unintended.

The project is consistent with the national priorities and state programs of development for the area of land administration for 2009-2014 approved by the Government in 2009⁴⁶ and it is also consistent with the draft proposal of a new program of development in the area of land registration for 2014-2018. The activities of the program, including the activities supported by the project are also financially supported by the government from the state budget or from other sources of financing.

The establishment of the CORS network contributes to the increase of quality and reliability of relatively expensive land surveys and cadastral data as well as the development of private land surveying business, increasing the competition in this market and potentially reducing the cost for the customers and land owners. The contribution to the capacity building in the area land administration is that the majority of the experts that have received training with the project support are still working in the system and can apply their knowledge for its further development.

The above mentioned program documents have mainly been developed using the concepts developed in the Swedish cooperation program. These program documents portray the commitment by the government to continue improving and developing the

⁴⁵ This section of the report mainly linked to the general evaluation questions.

⁴⁶ Program for development of the system of registration of immovable property, rights and transactions. Approved by the the Cabinet of Ministers of Republic of Belarus no 294 as of 09.03.2009.

National Cadastral Agency and other institutions in the sector. This linked with the substantial investment in the new geodetic network gives reasonable assurance that the capacity gained during the project will be sustained.

One example of the risks to sustainability may be the intentions of monopolization of the land surveying market by establishment of conditions excluding private land surveying companies from the bids for some projects. This will reduce the competition and lead to the increasing of the costs of services for end users.

Another risk of sustainability is the monitoring and the upkeep of the geodetic network, due to scarcity of staff being able to handle the software being used to maintain the system. This risk could be reduced by involving the university in this highly technical operation.

The project has introduced many changes in the NCA that has had an impact in the society in terms of noticeable increase in service quality and transparency, not to say the least in institutions closely linked with the NCA. These impacts have necessitated other institutions to implement changes in their own operating environment which is clearly demonstrated in the on-going project. The project impact can be considered as organizational, technological, business, social etc. impacts. Thus the project already has a positive impact in many of these areas.

The project has contributed to human resources development, establishment and strengthening of the professionalism in organization and structure of NCA and other stakeholders. The contribution to the establishment of functional CORS network is an example and evidence of technological impact of the project, which allowed not only increasing the quality of the services but also reducing of the time of land surveys for end users and property owners.

The establishment of the computerized property registration system supported by the project has a social impact providing reliable and fast land registration services for the customers and securing the property rights; this impact will most likely create a demand for more e-services from other institutions.

Conclusion: The evaluation has as one of its objectives to identify the medium and long-term results and impacts of this support in the Belarusian society in terms of social and economic development. When reviewing the cooperation and analysing the effects of the previous projects and the on-going, the magnitude of such an exercise is vast. In order to do a complete scan of the effects and impacts the team would have had to engage in discussions with many more actors in the society, public and private, central, regional and local government. This was simply not possible within the time frame of this evaluation.

What can be deduced is that the systems implemented in the National Cadastre Agency will have a long-term effect on the property market in establishing property rights, development of market prices and cadastral maps. All of this will contribute to de-

mocracy and the rule of law. The CORS network will enable the agency to establish maps of property with less likelihood of conflicts which will ease the registration process and most likely will improve the registration rate. As mentioned previously, similar systems are being used in other countries and have had long-term effects on the socio-economic development, thus it is likely that the same will be reached in Belarus, even though that this evaluation is not able to fully establish with evidence that this will be the case in terms of impact.

A summation of what has been reported in the previous sections should give an indication of the extent of the expected impact in the society.

4.3.5 Cross-cutting issues

The evaluation report of 2008 makes the following conclusion on cross-cutting issues:” *Neither the 2005 project document, nor the 2007 project agreement makes any reference to gender mainstreaming, environmental protection or any other policy-based cross-cutting issue. Likewise, regular project reports and technical/mission reports do not contain any analysis regarding such issues”, and the report continues “This is unfortunate considering that there are many aspects of gender awareness and environmental protection that could have been mainstreamed as well as the fact that there seems to be a low level of awareness in Belarus regarding the questions.”*

The evaluation further recommends that the cross-cutting issues should be taken into account during the project design phase.

However, this does not seem to have been taken as a priority during the implementation of the project. This evaluation concurs with this statement and concludes that there is not much progress in this area for the project being evaluated.

The project proposal of 2010 does include some short statements in regards to gender, environment, and European coordination.

i. Gender

Belarusian legislation does not discriminate against women in relation to rights of ownership or access to land, and access to property other than land. All property bought before a marriage remains the sole property of the partner who purchased it, while property that is bought by either party during a marriage is considered to be joint property, and cannot be sold without the permission of both spouses. There is also no legal discrimination against women in regard to access to bank loans and credit, and government schemes in place to support women would-be entrepreneurs.

According to the 2010 shadow report to the CEDAW committee, it is difficult for anyone to gain access to credit, male or female, as credit is expensive and inaccessible.⁴⁷

The project proposal in 2010 mentioned that gender issues will be mainstreamed through the project in the following manner:

- Safeguard that project activities are planned so that men and women have equal opportunities to participate
- Produce gender disaggregated statistics on participation in project activities
- Secure the interest of equal opportunities of men and women in possibilities to acquire property and to secure property rights in land administration procedures
- Make involved officials aware of the gender issue and that they have a responsibility to safeguard equal right in their daily activities

However, the log frame did not include any mention of gender and the only reporting of the gender mainstreaming that appears in the reporting is gender disaggregated statistics for the reporting periods. The last report being the semi-annual report 2013 reported a proportion of 45% women and 55 % men for that reporting period and aggregated for 2011-2013 the proportions are 52 % women and 48 % men.

When applying the evaluation questions during interviews the persons had difficulties understanding the relevance and could not give any examples of mainstreaming activities. The evaluation concludes that:

- Gender is not mainstreamed in the project. Here the project is seen as gender neutral and there has been no analysis of gender issues. In addition, there is no analysis on reasons for not mainstreaming gender / being able to report on mainstreaming efforts
- In the latter phases in the project, reporting on gender seems to be forced – it is not based on specific activities, but rather the project has tried to find positive results relating to gender, such as pointing to the use of Swedish female experts as role models and the hope that female project participants will go on to become managers. But these ‘results’ are not part of project objectives.
- There does not seem to be continuous dialogue on gender issues between Lantmäteriet and NGO Land Reform on the one hand, and stakeholders on the other hand. The extent to which a continuous dialogue between Sida and the project partners (Lantmäteriet and NGO Land Reform) on gender issues and

⁴⁷ <http://genderindex.org/country/belarus>

mainstreaming has taken place has not been clearly established. Such a policy dialogue is important to integrate in a possible continuation.

ii. Environment

The project proposal includes one statement in regards to environment: *“The project implementation will be planned and implemented in a manner that contributes to a good environment. A more efficient land administration will deliver information that will assist the government in Belarus to improve the formulation and implementation of a sustainable environmental policy. In this way, the project will actively contribute to improvements of the environment”*.

The mainstreaming of environmental issues is mainly found in the Urban planning component and in the new planning methodology of creating “Greener Cities”, bicycle lanes etc. In the log-frame there is one activity mentioned in regards to environmental issues; Environmental Impact Assessment methodology.⁴⁸ The assessment team has not been able to verify the extent of which this activity has been implemented. Other systematic mainstreaming of environmental issues has not been verified in the reports or discussions.

4.4 REFLECTIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Despite of the success in the project implementation there are still many areas with exiting or emerging issues to be resolved. Some of these issues can be summarized as follows:

- Low percentage of the territory coverage with the registration data (less than 21%) and low number of registered properties. This is in general excluding non-registered property from the formal market and has thus a negative implications for property and property transactions security;
- The need of greater transparency and openness of the land registry and information access for public to increase the security of the registration and exclude any corruptive behaviour;
- The registration data integrity, security and near real time update is still the issues hampering the security of the information system, quality of the services and having negative implications on increasing the public confidence to the land registry;

⁴⁸ During the study visit to Stockholm in May 2012, a visit was made to Hammarby Sjöstrand where the group was informed on how the various environmental issues were considered during the planning.

- Lack of Integration with other public information systems (civil registry, tax registry etc.) is another issue that has negative impacts on the establishment of efficient e-government system that can provide near real-time registries update and increase the security of property transactions;
- Lack of appropriate registration data archive including reliable records/documents management system, low level of electronic transaction in property register and a need to increase the use of electronic documents;
- Need to improve procedures of technical errors correction in the registry and streamline the procedure of correction errors in registration;
- No “one stop shop” concept implemented yet, need to bring the registration services closer to customers;
- The master planning needs improvement towards establishment of comfortable habitats for citizens, environment protection and wider public participation in urban planning and development;
- The urban planning component appears not to be linked to the other parts of the capacity building program and discussions confirm that the linkages and exchange of experiences have been minimal. It is most certain that there are synergies that could and should be exploited between the cadastral parts of the project and the urban planning part. A lesson learned is that this should be more emphasized in a possible continuation if this component remains in the project.

Above are some issues that require resolution in order to consolidate results and achievements of the initiative. The resolution of these issues requires high level of expertise and practical experience that may not be already available in the country and for this reason further support from the donor organizations and international community should be welcome. The project partners have also indicated that neighbouring countries involved in similar development projects in the real property sector can offer valuable insight in problems encountered in post-soviet countries. Regional conferences to discuss different approaches and solutions would be a valuable tool to strengthen the capacity building in countries such as the Baltic States, Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine, and Georgia. This would also closely link to the Swedish strategy for Eastern Europe 2014- 2020.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ Results strategy for Sweden's reform cooperation with Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans and Turkey, 2014 - 2020

Among the lessons learned is the use of the NGO for the coordination of project activities within the specific conditions of Belarus (many stakeholders), which demonstrated to be efficient and successful. Contributing factors for this is the independence of the NGO in relation to the participating organizations, but also that the NGO does have a vested interest in developing the sector. The potential of the NGO to effectively manage the project and a possible future project is great and its presumable good capacity to involve its members in the future would be a big asset to the project.

Another lesson learnt is a need for more careful planning of project activities and better identification, assessment and management of the project risks to avoid project delays and need of the time extension.

The beneficiaries have demonstrated strong project ownership reflected in the establishment of the cooperation agreement between three government authorities that are the main project stakeholders, careful planning of each visit and follow-up of the issues appearing between the visits, documenting of all project activities. The project activities, organization of the seminars and study visits are demand driven since the agenda for the expert's visits, the study tours is mainly set by the host organizations, reflecting their needs at that particular time. However, such an approach may also lead to losing the focus on the project objectives and derailing some activities out of the planned scope⁵⁰.

The methodology and approach to the intervention of the project, to organize technical reviews, discussions and presentations in seminars allows for capacity building of more people and could be regarded as a contribution to efficiency. The relatively infrequent visits of the experts, mainly engaged in seminars and workshops with seemingly very little involvement in the on-going change process may have reduced the effectiveness of the project and may have contributed to a less outcome driven process. This has also been pointed out in some of our discussions, that a more hands-on driven approach in addition to the theoretical discussions would be desirable.

All project stakeholders almost unanimously expressed their satisfaction of the project support and cooperation with Swedish counterpart. What was most appreciated is training on a modern approach to the property registration, urban development, the

⁵⁰ The interviews with the project team and project participants reveals that project activities were to a great extent guided by the implementing organisation; however a more proactive approach of the consultant to the project development and implementation in a specific Belarus conditions may also have advantages to establish more close cooperation between different components and organizations and achieve better synergy effect.

technology, knowledge transfer as well as establishment of the contacts and exchange of opinions with Swedish partners and the international professional organizations.

The project participants from public authorities, organizations and the private sector demonstrated commitment (including financial), self-motivation and enthusiasm in the implementation of project activities. This commitment and self-motivation can be considered as one of the project's strengths.

The project contribution to capacity building has brought the Belarusian expertise in the area of land registration and provision of the land administration services to a new much higher level. This has in turn demonstrated a need of more in depth knowledge of some more narrow areas (like system security, web-access to the services and related issues, new approach to a master planning etc.). This should be taken into consideration when planning a new phase of support as it, depending of the intervention planned, will require high level of expertise in the areas that may be out of the responsibilities or capacity of the current project partner Lantmäteriet.

4.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

Sida is recommended to continue the support to the real property market in Belarus.

The Land Reform Association should continue to be the local partner but if possible should be given a broader role in the project by bringing in other civil society organisations with direct or in-direct interest in the real property market and/or land management sector.

On the Swedish side, it is recommended that Lantmäteriet should not be the sole cooperating partner. As discussed previously, the cooperating partners have at this point reached a level of capacity building as a result of the institutional cooperation with Lantmäteriet. However, future capacity building needs, as well as decision of areas that shall be included in a possible new phase, may require Lantmäteriet to form relationships with other and complementary organisations and partners. If this is possible or not, within the conditions for a formal institutional cooperation framework, is not within the scope of this report to analyse. A tendering process for the project might not be in the best interest of the recipient organisations in Belarus, but may also be an injection of new value-adding perspectives.

The project contribution resulted in the establishment of a sustainable property registration system in Belarus and the next stage is that the intervention should be directed towards a consolidation of the achievements of previous stages of the project and the support in the extension of the functionality of registration system, increasing the transparency of the procedures, quality of the services and data availability for the public.

The project preparation of the next cooperation project is recommended to take a more result based approach in planning the intervention taking into account the result

chains, giving more focus to outputs, outcomes and results. This should also be reflected in the periodical reporting of the project.

The project management is recommended to take a more proactive approach in a dialogue with the stakeholders in setting the agenda for the different expert visits, seminars etc. to ensure that they are in line with the intended results and outcomes.

Development of the recommendations from the visit to Georgia and in particular considering the concept of authorized users.

Cross-cutting issues need to be taken into account already at the project design to make sure that the issues are taken seriously by the implementing partners. These issues should also be included in results framework to ensure that outcomes are being reported in the reporting procedures. With regards to gender, there needs to be a detailed gender analysis conducted to see where specific targeted might be appropriate, in relation to overall project objectives. Gender as a dialogue issue between Sida and the partners may also need to be strengthened.

4.6 FUTURE COOPERATION AND SUPPORT

Based on the lessons learned and brief analysis of the needs of land administration systems the list of actions can be summarized as follows:

- Support of the NGO, including in project management and coordination, strengthening contacts with international organization, improving PPP including with private surveying business and additional support to strengthening the private business in providing land survey services;
- Improvement of land registry data management, availability and security, implementation of the Land Administration Domain Model (LADM) Standard, support in the enhancement of the public access to the registration data through the development of public cadastral map, support in the development of the strategy towards the centralization of the Property Registry;
- Support in the enhancement of the registration procedures to achieve a real-time registration and data availability, reducing the time of registration, development strategy of integration of land registry with other public registers and achievement of near real-time registration data update; support of the establishment of the registry of the land parcels available for investments;
- Support in the building of addressing system and establishment of address register in NCA (including the development of the methodologies, addressing data modelling, system design and architecture etc.);
- Support in the implementation of the one-stop-shop concept (including “front-office” and “back-office” approach) in registration procedures, development of the methodology of such registration and use of authorized users (notaries,

banks, etc.), simplification and streamlining of registration procedures and access to the information including online access, sms notifications etc., use of electronic forms for application of registration etc.

- Further support in the development and implementation of mass valuation methodology, methodological support of mass valuation pilot project planned in one district in Brest region and one district of Minsk city; additional support of individual valuation of the property for the compensation for smooth phasing out of the support in the individual valuation and concentrating on mass valuation;
- Support in the implementation of the pilot project on master-plan development, including the participation of planners/architects from both sides in the pilot project, continuation of capacity building in the use of modern technology and tool for master planning and urban development including public participation in the urban planning;
- Support in increasing the number of registered properties, methodological support in the property formation, methodological support of the pilot project on a mass property formation, development of the methodology on using the airborne or satellite imagery in the process of property formation and mass valuation;
- Support in the development of the methodology and capacity building in the establishment of the geoid model (mainly assist in the development of strategy, technical specifications and implementation plan for geoid model);
- Capacity building for the University – development of new curriculum on the land administration master degree, strengthening of contacts with Swedish universities, exchange of students; building of capacity and expertise in the area of real estate development and property market;

The next stage of development may also consider the development of the strategy of the phasing-out of the support in the area of land administration and concentrating on other important areas of support in building of civil society and a vibrant private sector.

5.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

5.1.1 Project background

When Georgia became independent the Government started privatisation of land and real estate property. In 1992 about one million households in rural areas were given land (approximately 1 ha) and in urban areas flats and apartments were privatized and given to those living there. The registration of property rights and the creation of a cadastre were assigned to the State Department for Land Management (SDLM). In 2004 the National Agency for Public Registry (NAPR) was established as a successor to SDLM as a legal entity under The Ministry of Justice. NAPR is intended to be self-financing based on fees for its services, which it also has achieved.

Sida has supported the land administration sector in Georgia since 2000 and initially Swedesurvey and later Lantmäteriet have been the partners on the Swedish side and National Agency of Public Registry under the Ministry of Justice of Georgia on the Georgian side. The project was named “Management and training support project for Registration and Cadastre”.

The second project phase 2005–2008 (SEK 20 million) was implemented within the Swedish regional strategy of support to human rights and economic development. The project was important for NAPR as it assisted in the establishment of the central data bases, facilitating of data exchange among its territorial offices, harmonizing the property registration process, and developing the software for online access by the authorized users. The project was successfully completed in 2008 and new phase of support started the same year.

The most evident impact to which this project contributed is that NAPR proved to be able to deal with the increased market transactions that resulted from an increasingly active land market all over the country. More precisely, the project through support by expert visits and trainings developed not only a central database and procedures for data exchange with registration offices in the districts all over Georgia but also

supported development of software for the first on-line services for customers and accessibility for authorized users such as banks.⁵¹

The objective of the project implemented in 2008-2013, “Capacity Building and Improved Client Services at NAPR of Georgia”, was to support NAPR to provide efficient, transparent and cost-effective services according to unified strategic guidelines and technical standards and with reliable real property information, managed by a sustainable land administration organization. The project is thus expected to contribute to sustainable social and economic development of the nation, based on a well-functioning land administration, including secured property rights and a rational use of land (overall objective). This is the project being evaluated, called “the project” in the report.

5.1.2 Project organisation

The project partners were NAPR and Lantmäteriet. NAPR and Lantmäteriet each appointed representatives for a Steering Committee to be chaired by the Chairman of NAPR. Sida was invited to participate in the steering committee but declined. The main task of the Steering Committee was to decide on plans and budgets that have been formulated by the project team. The Steering Committee had the full responsibility for project planning, follow-up, steering and efficient use of resources. The steering committee met 8 times during project, the first meeting in October 2008 and the last meeting in March 2013.

The Steering Committee appointed a Project Manager, paid by NAPR. The Project Manager was responsible for the overall implementation including the overall coordination of the work in the project and external and internal contacts for the documentation of the project. A Project Adviser from Lantmäteriet was to assist the Project Manager and act as team leader for the Swedish group of experts. The adviser would assist the Project Manager to plan and co-ordinate the Swedish input and contributed as technical expert as well. Two support staff was also hired for the project.⁵²

Stakeholders partly influencing the project implementation were: Ministry of Justice under which NAPR is subordinated; Banks, Notaries and private surveyors, i.e. authorised users of NAPR services; Ministry of Economy, involved in development of land policies; other donor projects in the land administration sector.

⁵¹ Assesment Memo, Sida, Kakha Khimshiashvili/Kerstin Gyllhammar, May 2008

⁵² Project Proposal: Capacity building and improved client services at NAPR of Georgia, undated. Inception Report , November 2008, Appendix 1

The project was initially planned for 4 years starting June 1, 2008 and ending in December 2011. However, in August 2008 in the early days of the project it was temporarily suspended due to the armed conflict between Georgia and Russia and could resume its activities in October-November 2008. In October 2011 the project submitted a request to Sida for a no-cost extension of the project until end 2012, which was granted by Sida. At the end of 2012 another no-cost extension, this time for six months, until 30 June 2013 was also approved by Sida.

Consequently, the total duration of the project was 50 month and included 228 activities.

5.1.3 Project objectives and components

During a LFA- workshop in December 2007 a problem analysis was performed which identified a number of problems that formed the basis for the project proposal. The focal problem was identified as “insufficient land administration services”. The focal problem meant that NAPR, at that time, could not provide the number of services required by all stakeholders or without support provide the quality, content and capacity of each service that was required.

This lead to the formulation of the long-term **Overall Objective** to which the project was to contribute to:

“Sustainable social and economic development of the nation based on well-functioning land administration, including secured property rights and rational use of land”.

The Project Objective was formulated as:

“NAPR provides efficient, transparent and cost-effective services according to unified strategic guidelines and technical standards and with reliable real property information, managed by a sustainable land administration organisation”⁵³.

The project objective was further operationalized in the project proposal into six (6) main results/outputs of the project:

1. Adequate capacity for provision of the land administration services of NAPR achieved;
2. The development of the NAPR IT system for land administration quality assured;

⁵³ Project Proposal Capacity building and improved client services at NAPR of Georgia. Landmateriet, NAPR 2008.

3. Awareness and improvement of the context within which NAPR operates achieved;
4. Quality, reliability and consistency of real property information improved;
5. Efficient procedures for cadastral data update established;
6. Methodologies and procedures for mass valuation introduced;

An inception report was presented in November 2008 after taking stock of the developments, since the formulation of the project proposal and other events that had taken place. The inception report updated the activity plan by adding and subtracting some activities but the main output areas remained.

In the Terms of Reference for Project time extension dated November 2011 some objectives and results were updated including:

- Completed reference system with GPS stations fully operational;
- Property information covering all Georgia;
- Implemented national infrastructure for spatial information;

Other objectives and results were a little rephrased but in general were similar to the ones provided in the initial project proposal of 2008 and the inception report.

The reporting on the project has been done on a semi-annual basis with a six-month report and a 12 months report. When analysing these progress reports, they lack detailed reporting on activities that have taken place, and an account of the progress within each component and its related activity/output/outcome based on identified indicators. The indicators described in the log frame are not easy to use in practice and there is a lack of targets set according to the SMART methodology. It is difficult to determine the extent of fulfilment of output areas from the progress reports.

5.2 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.2.1 Organisation and operations

The main objective of this project component⁵⁴ was defined as “Adequate capacity for provision of the land administration services of NAPR achieved”. The component also included planned sub-results as follows: 1) standard model for services provided at TROs⁵⁵ developed, approved and piloted and staff sufficiently trained; 2) interaction with notaries through development of unified electronic books of registry and related processes improved; 3) organisational plan for NAPR, including its vertical structure and sector (department) development, including strategic goal setting estab-

⁵⁴ In the project proposal this is referred to as Result areas, which sometimes is confused with sub-results within the result area. In this report we refer this highest level as a project component.

⁵⁵ Territorial Registration Offices

lished and updated annually; and 4) human resources and competence development plan for NAPR developed.

This component of the project was mainly concentrated on the NAPR staff and management to enhance the capacity of the team in operating in a changing environment. This looks feasible from the points of view of rapid growth of the NAPR as an organisation and its responsibilities, huge technological changes alongside with the need to run everyday operations and services.

The project support for this component included 16 visits of Swedish experts (in total about 143 man days) and quite a number of seminars and training courses on strategic planning, management, human resources management, salaries setting, English language, project management etc. This component also included 8 workshops for Georgian experts, 7 training courses and 1 seminar. All this constitutes as being the largest input compared to other components (about 40% of the total number of seminars and workshops in the project and about 139 participants).

In addition to the workshops and training courses the study visits to Sweden, participation in the international organisation activities etc. were also carried out under this component, including 13 UNECE WPLA⁵⁶ workshops, 3 EUREF Symposiums, 3 INSPIRE and 2 Eurogeographics meetings. These visits and meetings allowed the staff to establish necessary contacts with international professional organisations, learning international experience and contributed to the capacity building in the area of management as well as increasing technical expertise of the NAPR staff.

Such massive interventions therefore contributed significantly to reaching the objectives of the component, which was to enhance the capacity of NAPR management and improve operations of the NAPR, even in the changing management environment. The organizational development strategy of NAPR was elaborated and adopted at the management level. Interviews with NAPR confirmed that despite of recent changes of the Chairman of NAPR and a new organisational structure the majority of personnel that received the training within the project is still with NAPR.

However, it is also necessary to take into consideration that the changes in the NAPR top management during the last few years of the project brought about some uncertainty regarding the strategic approach of the new management and the sustainability of previously elaborated strategy. The new organisational structure is a different di-

⁵⁶ UNECE WPLA – Working Party on Land Administration of UN Economic Commission for Europe

rection of management than the previous one as it introduces several management levels which could indicate a new look on internal governance.

The preparation of the strategy as well as discussions of the functionality and organisation of the registration services and capacity building in this area did, according to staff interviewed, influence the changes of the management culture in the NAPR towards a more open and more customers' oriented culture and attitude. It also contributed to the analysis of the NAPR organisational structure, its operation and recommendations regarding the structure, as well as consequent development and approval in February 2014 of a new structure of the NAPR, which is under the implementation.

The project supported also the establishment of an Intranet, which contributed to the direct and more efficient communication between the staff within the NAPR central office as well as with the regional offices, improving the information flow, reducing paper works and enhancement of the efficiency of the management in the organisation.

The NAPR also succeeded in establishing good cooperation with other agencies, as well as involving the private sector (notaries, banks, land surveyors etc.) as authorised users of the system. The implementation of the authorised user's concept contributed to the improvement of the efficiency and security of the registration services, significantly reducing the expenses of customer and time and in addition to the implementation of the front and back office concept almost eliminated the corruption in the registration process.

In 2009 the project supported the elaboration of a strategic plan for NAPR for the period 2010-2012. Another strategy process was started in 2012 for development of a strategic plan for the period 2013-2015.⁵⁷

The project also supported the capacity building in the areas of financial management, marketing, information management etc. These issues were also discussed during the visits of Swedish experts during the Study visits to Sweden. The seminar and training on the presentation technique as well as the topics of strategic management of new businesses in NAPR were carried out.

Organization and operation and the management of NAPR on all levels has succeeded to meet changes and demands of services from customers and the general public in-

⁵⁷ Report on Strategic Planning, Lantmäteriet, March 2012

cluding proper management of internal developments along with running the daily operation and services.

Conclusions: This component contributed to the establishment of strong and customer oriented state agency providing secure and affordable land registration services for the customers. Adequate capacity for provision of the land administration services has been achieved; however the issue of the sustainability of the developed strategies is still not clear due to uncertain effects that may be caused by changes of the top management and adoption of a new organisational structure of the NAPR.

5.2.2 IT-development

Objective: The development of the NAPR IT system for land administration quality assured.

Efficient and reliable information system plays an important role in the land registration services, improving the reliability of the land administration services, transparency and security of property transactions, reducing the time and cost of transaction. It contributes also to the public confidence of the land/property registry.

The NAPR achieved in general good results in the development of the information system that provided a basis for the integration of a number of public registries and establishment of Public Service Hall that works as one stop-shop. The implementation of the idea of authorized users (i.e. banks, notary offices, real estate agents etc.) significantly improved the quality of land registration services and reduced processing time for the customers (about few hours or less for simple transaction of property).

The project input to the development of the IT infrastructure is also quite substantial - 18 visits of Swedish experts (8 experts and about 198 man days) as well 5 seminars and workshops, 2 specialized training courses on IT issues and 2 study visits of IT personnel to Sweden as familiarization with Swedish IT solutions.

In addition the project supported the finalization of the NAPR back-up and disaster recovery system, purchasing the back-up servers and disaster recovery solution for the NAPR. The project assisted in the development of the Disaster Recovery Plan for NAPR, which is important as NAPR runs about 30 different systems that serve not only the business of NAPR but also other public agencies. This also contributed to a great extent to the establishment of secure, high level of performance, and reliable registration services.

The annual reviews of the IT system and infrastructure, preparation of recommendations to NAPR for its further development, system test plans and risk analysis were carried out together with Georgian experts. The project contributed also to the strategy of the IT development for 2009-2012 and 2013-2015.⁵⁸

The project contributed to the capacity building of the IT staff, which was confirmed and highly appreciated during the interviews with the NAPR IT personnel. NAPR IT-department has expanded over the years and along with successful IT-solutions, the department also serves other state agencies with development of software and systems for their needs. According to the Data Exchange Agency, the NAPR IT system is one of most sophisticated and successful in the public sector and many government institutions are requesting the IT services from NAPR saving the resources such way⁵⁹. This is a confirmation of the completion of another sub-objective of this component – “staff capable of independent structured system development, in accordance with modern methods and quality awareness”. However, keeping highly professionals and self-motivated staff in the public service is a challenge and this may be one of the main challenges of system sustainability and was perceived as a real concern by the management. This could also be an indication that the HR-component of compensation schemes not fully solved this issue.

Conclusions: The IT development component can be considered successful in contributing to establish stable, reliable, affordable, and efficient services for customers. The established NAPR IT system has potential for further development, improvement of the level of digital on-line services. For this reason the IT component result can be considered as potentially sustainable.

However, the issues of cadastral data quality and reliability, as well as the procedures of the correction of technical errors should be resolved yet to ensure “high quality land administration services”. The establishment of highly secure and high quality land administration services also requires substantial increase of the number of registered properties in the country, especially for rural and agricultural property.

⁵⁸ It should be noted also that the Lantmäteriet annual as well as project completion reports are very generic, without providing a clear evidence of what exactly was done, i.e. the description of deliverables and analysis of the impact of project activities and expected outcomes. The reporting needs to be improved.

⁵⁹ The National Bureau of Enforcement is using the NAPR IT services as well as the support in the development and implementation of the applications required to carry out their functions.

5.2.3 Publicity, Awareness and New Proposals

Objective: Awareness and improvement of the context within which NAPR operates achieved. All heads at NAPR are well acquainted with the overall Georgian Land Administration sector, within which NAPR operates

The development of the two mentioned strategies, in both cases in a workshop setting, has acquainted the management of NAPR of the context within which the organization is operating in and the challenges and opportunities it is facing.

Regarding the publicity and public awareness campaign there was not so much done, as according to the NAPR staff, the efforts were more concentrated on the internal capacity building and cadastral standardization. The two week TV advertisement campaign for NAPR was carried out using TV International Ltd in Tbilisi. There is no direct evidence of the results and outcomes of this campaign and impact on the public awareness as the objectives and indicators to measure the results are not identified in the project documents. The evaluation team has not found any indication of any follow-up of the effects of this media campaign. On other hand, all the people we met hold NAPR in very high regard and viewed it as a very competent, credible organization.

There is however information from Transparency International Georgia regarding some deficiencies of registration of property for recreational purposes and also some irregularities which should have taken place a few years back during an attempt of mass registration. It is important that the organization deal with these issues through a transparent process in a dialogue with, in this case, Transparency International. Even if NAPR cannot solve the issue it is important to have the discussion to make sure that the allegations are taken seriously and it does not happen again. As far as we have been able to determine the project was not actively involved in these activities, but the Swedish project manager raised the issue during the strategic planning process.

Establishing of an Intranet was intended as an output of this area. The NAPR staff interviewed confirmed that the intranet has enabled the organization to reach out with the same information to all employees and this has had an impact in the organization, especially in the offices outside of Tbilisi. The evidence of these effects are however weak as there is little reported on this in the annual reports and that the evaluation team only met with the staff in Tbilisi. The project also supported the review of the new corporate web-site, and preparation of recommendations regarding the design of the site, web-standards and functions, future development and e-services. According

to a visit report, the current corporate website has been ranked in 2012 as number two in the whole of Georgia.⁶⁰

The third output in this area deals with legislation. The indicator says legislation for property registration is in use and no need for change. However, we have not been able to verify what legislation that have been subject to review and have been amended or changed. Interviews with stakeholders have told us that the legislation regarding property registration is not clear and that there is a need for a legislative reform. This would indicate that this part require additional work.

Conclusion: The evaluation team has not found conclusive evidence that this result area has been completely fulfilled.

Indications from stakeholders in the sector claim that it is unclear how mismatches between property rights on paper and in the registry shall be sorted out and other similar issues. There are several examples where the need for a legislative reform has been raised.

A publicity campaign was implemented, but there is no evidence of a follow-up of the effects or if any further campaigns were implemented by NAPR. The internal awareness raising has been accomplished mainly by the formulation of the strategic plans and the development and implementation of an Intranet. Hence, internal communication has been improved. The perceived outcome for this component was however, to create an awareness of the policy, strategy, business and legal context of NAPR to a broader public. The extent to which this has been accomplished was not possible to assess.

5.2.4 Data Quality Improvement

Objective: Quality, reliability and consistency of real property information improved.

The main issue is that while the reliability of newly registered property data is satisfactory, old records from the period 1992–2005 are of variable quality and reliability.

The main results of this component has been to contribute to improved reliability of the property registration process through the minimization of risks of keeping information stored in paper form, conversion of registration documents to digital form and archiving the documents.

⁶⁰ Report on Information and Communication management, Lantmäteriet, December 2012

In 2011-2012 almost all paper archives in the Tbilisi area, including NAPR archives, were scanned. The scanned paper documents have been sent to the new archive building of the National Archives of Georgia. Both digital and paper archives are established and NAPR uses digital data in its daily operations. This has contributed not only to increasing the data security, but also the reliability of the process and significantly reducing the time of registration. The project assisted in organizing the new archives with storage equipment.

The project financed a “pilot study for verification of quality of existing real property information and proposals for measures to improve the quality”. A main issue with the cadastral data is that only less than one third of the properties in rural areas are registered (in urban areas assumed up-to 70% of properties are registered) and much higher rate of land registration is required to improve the reliability of the registry and security of property transactions. The issues with cadastral boundary surveys are mainly relevant for rural areas and with agriculture land.

The pilot project on data quality verification was carried out by a local private surveying company in the relatively small pilot area (about 350 parcels in summer housing area) in Lisi districts in February-May 2012. The pilot project included the verification of legal and cadastral data for registered property, demarcation of parcels, field checking of registered property boundaries. The results of the pilot demonstrated a number of issues with the property boundaries, locations of the parcels etc. and only a relatively small number of parcel data was found correct. The corrected cadastral data as well as the report on lessons learned and recommendations was provided to NAPR by the surveying company.⁶¹

In the area of address registry Swedish experts have supported the work with setting up addresses in the Tbilisi area and to elaborate standards both in Georgia and during study visits in Sweden. To further assist in the development of the address registry experts from Latvia were used, as it turned out that their system for dealing with the conversion was more closely related to the Georgian situation than the Swedish. The experience from the Soviet era was important. The project also negotiated with Google and the outcome of this is that Google now is using data from NAPR.

The project input to this component included 9 visits of 8 experts (all together about 67 man days) as well as workshops on data quality. In addition the project purchased

⁶¹ Interviews with the Tbilisi Group

book scanners with necessary software and equipment for the scanning centre as well as sliding shelves for the archive centre of NAPR.

Conclusions: In general the objectives of this component have been achieved, contributing to the establishment of the data and documents archive system that has positive impact on the improvement of the quality, reliability and consistency of registration data and information.

The project contributed to the creation of the awareness and identification of problems and issues with the registration and cadastral data quality. The NAPR and private companies interviewed demonstrated the understanding of the issues and measures required to improve the data reliability and quality. Additional support may be required in this area especially in the development of the methodology for data correction and necessary changes in the legislation in this respect.

5.2.5 Cadastral Data Update procedures and Standards

Objective: Quality, reliability and consistency of real property information improved.

In the initial Project Proposal of 2008, this component included the sub-result – *“Feasibility study for establishment of a permanent national GPS reference network accomplished”* which was planned to be completed during year one of the project. Later in the proposal for the project extension in 2011 the results had been changed to – *“completed reference system with GPS stations fully operational”*.

The interview with the geodetic section of the NAPR and live demonstration of the system in Control Centre confirmed that the CORS Network is established and functional. The CORS Network, covering the entire country, actually consists of 20 stations including 4 stations purchased within the Sida financed project, 14 stations purchased via World Bank, and 1 station presented by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) plus one receiver that is used as redundancy to replace any station in the case of problems. The information about the network is available online on the computing centre web-site <http://geocors.napr.gov.ge>.

The CORS network has more than 110 registered customers (from 1 up-to 3-4 rover receivers each). The CORS services are widely used, including by the private sector, which is confirmed by Spider data. In the period from November 2011 to March 2014 about 22,545 hours of services are provided (in average about 4,500 connections per month). The CORS services, including Real Time Kinematics (RTK) service, are currently free of charge but starting from April 2014 fees will be charged for using the system (about 800 USD per year per one rover receiver).

The Swedish experts provided the support and assistance to Georgian experts in the computation of a quasi-geoid model for Georgia based on the EGM-08, GPS observation of ellipsoidal heights and levelling data. The quasi-geoid model was computed in

2012 and its estimated accuracy achieved is about 10 cm what allows using it for topographic surveys in many areas.

The benefits of the system are obvious: in addition to reduction of time for land surveys and increasing its accuracy the CORS allows the standardization and regularization of land surveys for the entire country, future introduction of coordinates based fixed boundaries as well the use of the system for topographic surveys and spatial data capturing in general.

The project support included a feasibility study report on CORS Network, 7 visits of Swedish expert (55 man days of visits), one seminar on SWEPOS (15 participants), and one day seminar on CORS network. The project, in addition to the purchase of 4 GPS receivers for CORS stations, purchased 13 rover receivers for land surveying, which are leased to private surveying companies. It is evident that project contributed to the achievement of the results among other actors, such as the World Bank and EU. The Geodesy Section's officials interviewed appreciated the support and confirmed its importance for the CORS system development.

For future sustainability there is a need of training, education and building of competence on the modern geodesy and surveying area and which is a request from NAPR as well as from the private sector. This issue may be addressed and handled in a new project.

Another planned sub-result of this component was *“Cadastral standards developed and implemented”*. The development of specifications and standards for cadastral surveys was planned in 2011 but this activity was considered as partly depending on the CORS network establishment and partly on changes in the structure of NAPR and for this reason it was postponed for 2012.

The draft cadastral standard was developed with the support from Swedish experts and a final version was presented in the seminar “Geo-CORS and Cadastral Standards in Georgia” held in Georgia in May 2013.⁶² While developing the standards, it was also noted that the implementation of cadastral standards requires some review and updating of the legal framework in the area of property registration, especially regarding additional responsibilities and mandates of NAPR on the correction of technical errors and issuance of technical regulations in this area, among others.

⁶² Report on Cadastral Standard, GEL1 F-09, NAPR and Lantmäteriet, May 2013

The draft cadastral standard proposal elaborated general principles, agency responsibilities, technical requirements, quality control, etc. but it may require additional reviews. This would entail discussing it with technical experts from the private sector land survey companies and update to establish an appropriate technical framework for land surveys. Despite of the real need of such standards, they are not implemented yet. Such delay may be related to the need of the updates of the legal framework and also connected with changes of the structure and management of the NAPR.

The interviews with NAPR and private sector confirmed an urgent need of such standards to improve the data quality and standardize cadastral procedures and finally to achieve the uniformity of such services across the country. The certification of surveying companies and some kind of licensing, both of the companies and the surveyors as well, is also required to improve the quality of services, to significantly reduce the boundaries issues as well as land disputes.

The project support in this area was 6 visits (65 man days of 8 Swedish experts) in the period 2009- 2013. Seminars on the NSDI and INSPIRE initiative as driving force in the development of the European Spatial Data Infrastructure (ESDI) as well as the development of many National SDI's were also held to introduce the SDI and outline its importance for the country.

The visits of Swedish experts, discussion of the issues on organization of cadastral surveys in different countries, participation of Georgian experts in the work of international professional organizations like FIG, UNECE WPLA, EuroGeographics, EUREF etc. contributed to capacity building of the project stakeholders and understanding of the need of a professional organization in the area of cadastral surveys to improve the professional level of services as well as the quality of the data.

Another planned sub-result of this component was “*Association for Cadastral Surveyors established*”⁶³. The interview with private real estate and land survey company “Tbilisi Group” confirmed that a NGO “Georgia Professional Surveyors Association” has been established and registered in November 2013. The main role of the organization is to support the capacity building among the private sector surveyors, improvement of the quality of the works. The establishment of such an organization is an initiative of 12 private surveying companies that are founders of this NGO.

⁶³ The establishment of a surveyor association was included in the initial project proposal as one of the activities in the LFA along with consultancy support to the association, training for surveyors, and support for a surveyor's certification program. However, this was no longer part of the result table in the inception report. The inception report does not include any elaboration of this change. The evaluation team findings confirm that there is a need for support for establishing an association and that it is an important factor for getting quality data in the surveying process.

The initiative should be welcomed and it is a significant step forward in the increasing of the professionalism of private companies, uniformity of the land surveys across the sector and reliability of cadastral data. The NGO may also be instrumental for the improvement of the quality of land surveys, increasing public confidence to the land registry and strengthening of public private partnership in the area of land administration. Even though there is no direct evidence linking this to the project, it can be assumed that the capacity building efforts contributed to the understanding of the need and the establishment of such an association by the private sector itself.

Conclusions: The objectives of this component have in general been achieved with the establishment of the GORS network and support in the development of the cadastral standards. However additional efforts are still required from NAPR and Ministry of Justice to finalize the standards and implement them. The issues of standards implementation is not resolved and project objective cannot be considered as accomplished in this respect.

The issues of the certification of land survey companies should also be resolved and the project appears to have decided to not to include these issues and the strengthening of private sector capacity and its professional level. The Georgia Professional Surveyors Association will need support and capacity building to play its role in the sector.

5.2.6 Mass Land Valuation

Objective: Methodologies and procedures for mass valuation introduced.

The objective of this component was to be further elaborated and substantiated by a feasibility study on mass valuation and the development of the recommendations and support in the area of mass valuation methodologies and procedures to the responsible implementers.

The rationale for this project component was based on the assumption that mass valuation data would be of the interest to the authorities in establishing property values as a basis for taxation, for banks when approving mortgages, for real estate agents when selling property, as well as for property owners.

The support in the area of mass valuation included 7 visits (17 man days), study visit to Sweden, seminar, training course and workshop on mass valuation. Cooperation with the Association for Protection of Landowners' Rights was also established as they offer training for property valuation. These activities contributed to better understanding of the need of mass valuation and capacity building in this area.

Unfortunately, this component did not achieve the development and introduction of the mass valuation methodology. One of the reasons may be that the mass valuation is not a responsibility of NAPR and it is not formally assigned to any state authority. From another side there is still lack of understanding of the needs and benefits of the

mass valuation system for the taxation among appropriate state authorities, since property taxes are collected by local authorities and other stakeholders like banks and real estate agents perform their own valuation.

The progress on this component was halted awaiting clearer instructions on the role of NAPR in the area of mass valuation.

Conclusions: The project component contributed to better understanding of the need of mass valuation. It is not clear from progress reports why the attempt to introduce mass valuation was not successful. No tangible outputs are identified. Therefore, at a general level, the objective of this component was not achieved. There is still a need for establishing mass valuation and a price registry as part of the property registry, but at the moment it does not seem to be perceived as a priority inside NAPR or within the relevant ministries.

5.3 OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

The assessment of the various project components as described previously give evidence that the Swedish cooperation with NAPR have made substantial contributions to the changes that have taken place in the land administration sector in Georgia. The development of two strategy documents in 2009 and 2012 gives credence to the seriousness and longevity this is taken by the management of NAPR and builds confidence for a sustainable commitment to pursue the continued effectiveness and development of the sector. It is evident that the progress that has been made has had an impact on the social and economic development in Georgia. This was attested by the private sector, the bank and the notary in terms of increased activity in the property market, availability and ease of services being provided to companies and ordinary citizens. Achieving the highest rank in the Doing Business World Bank rating of 2012 is the confirmation of Georgian success and the development of NAPR as a result of capacity building in all areas.

The project has enabled NAPR to strengthen its management capabilities by providing a strategic outlook, not only on a corporate level but also on departmental levels. Internal communications were reported to have been strengthened and a strong corporate culture developed.

In the field of land management the introduction of the Public Service Halls (PSH) created a challenge for NAPR in that the front end of registration was moved from NAPR into the PSH administration. Thus the focus in the back office processing of data became more important and an increasing importance on the data quality emerged as part of the project.

During the project period NAPR also took on additional responsibilities such as creation of the address registry and the company registry. This was also included in the project; much of this was due to the strengthening of the IT capabilities of NAPR.

The establishment of the geodetic network is major accomplishment during this project period, and the project was partly contributing to this achievement. The system has been embraced by the private sector actors interviewed and the data provided by the control centre for the network shows that it is being used extensively.

The government and NAPR should exercise great caution and openness in dealing with the reports regarding violation of property rights. There appears to be several reports of property rights violations from different periods in the past. The most serious appears to be the development of several recreational projects, where the Svaneti complex is cited as an example. A report⁶⁴ on protection of property rights by among others Transparency International concludes that *“The construction of infrastructural projects (airport, ski-run) were initiated in such a way that locals were deprived of the possibility to register ownership rights to land plots in traditional possession in these territories”*.

Though this is not connected with any project activities, it would seem as if the legislative issue connected with traditional ownership rights could have been addressed by the project management as it affects the confidence of NAPR and the effectiveness of the GoG to secure property rights.

Georgia is part of the EU Eastern Partnership Agenda and as such it is included in the strategies for the Swedish support to the Eastern Europe. It should be noted that when the current project was designed there was a different strategy in force which was later update and replaced with a new strategy in 2010⁶⁵. The assessment largely concludes that the project is in line with these strategies as discussed later in this report. However, substantial weaknesses have been noted in the area of gender and environmental issues.

In reference to the Eastern Partnership agenda and its principles the results and effects of this project is in a general sense in coherence with those principles:

⁶⁴ Problems related to the Protection of Property Rights - The case of Mestia, Protection of Property Rights in New Touristic Zones of Georgia” by four Non-Governmental Organizations: Association “Green Alternative”, “Georgian Young Lawyers’ Association”, “Transparency International - Georgia” and “Georgian Regional Media Association”, 2011

⁶⁵ Strategy for Southern Caucasus 2006-2009 and Strategy for Georgia 2010-2013.

- It strengthens sector cooperation and economic integration through to participation in networks such as FIG and the UNECME-WPLA, by linking the geodetic network with the European networks.
- It contributes to the development of democracy and rule of law, and human rights by establishing property rights, laws and regulations in connection with registration and transparency of data in registries.
- The exchange of experiences and approach to solving challenges in the land management sector by including several European experiences and experts contributes to bringing the countries together and develop closer cooperation and exchange of experiences.

5.3.1 Project Relevance

After the collapse of Soviet system, the Republic of Georgia demonstrated tremendous progress in the privatization of land starting from the initial transfers of farmland from 1300 collective and state farms in 1992.

Extensive program of land and related property privatization required the establishment of appropriate system for securing the property rights, including the system for land registration and cadastral surveys.

Previous phase of the Sida support in 2005-2008 was concentrated on support of the development of the land registration system, establishing central data bases, facilitate data exchange among the its territorial offices, harmonise the property registration process, and develop software for online access by the authorised users.

The responsibilities and functions of the NAPR were growing from the time of its establishment and the main objective as defined by the Government of Georgia was the establishment of the customer-oriented and transparent land registration system providing affordable services for the population and businesses and transition to the e-registration and e-cadastre. Georgia demonstrated a political will and policy, based upon the support of economic development and improvement of investment environment, which is an inevitable precondition for development of an immovable property market and business in the country. The project was designed to provide support and technical assistance to enable NAPR to grow in line with the overall development the expectations established by the Government of Georgia.

The Swedish strategy for cooperation with Georgia 2006 - 2009 specified support to enhanced capacity in public institutions promoting democratic and effective governance, and promoting sustainable economic development.⁶⁶ The Swedish strategy for support to Georgia in 2010-2013 concentrated on three sectors: democracy, human rights and gender equality; the environment; and market development.⁶⁷ The support to NAPR is in line with both of these strategies. A well functioning land and property market is one of the key elements in building a market economy in a country. Well managed and properly working institutions contribute to reduced corruption, property protection and improved business climate. The main weak part in the relevance to the strategies appears to be the achievements within gender equality (see further discussion below).

Conclusions: The project is considered relevant in regards to the Strategy for Swedish aid initiatives in Georgia and the needs and priorities of the target groups and the government of Georgia. However, even if the project is relevant for some parts of the Swedish strategy, it is not well established to what extent it has contributed to gender equality. None of the progress reports have elaborated on these issues.

5.3.2 Project Effectiveness

The development objective and the project objective (purpose) is stated as to assist NAPR to build capacity to become a sustainable organisation providing efficient, transparent and cost-effective services in a twinning like cooperation aiming at long term relation between the two organisations. The project objective was defined as “NAPR provides efficient, transparent and cost-effective services according to unified strategic guidelines and technical standards and with reliable real property information, managed by a sustainable land administration organisation” and project activities were planned to achieve such objective.

Due to changes in the external environment, and the need of project time extension the project results/outputs were slightly modified, keeping the overall objective the same. The modification of the objectives is a usual practice in a changing environment and it requires careful documenting of the reasons of such changes. On the other hand, it may also indicate a weak baseline and need of more careful gap analysis and identification of risks at the project inception to avoid the discrepancies between planned and achieved results. In this case developments that took place between the

⁶⁶ Strategy for development cooperation with Southern Caucasus January 2006 – December 2009

⁶⁷ Strategy for development cooperation with Georgia. January 2010 – December 2013. Sida, January 2010.

initial LFA-seminar and the start of the project were connected with the pace NAPR was developing and the need for the inception phase was obvious.

When relating the findings of each component of the project with the results indicated in the Project completion report⁶⁸ the project in general can be considered to have developed positively in achieving the objectives. However, the achievements are not completely fulfilled for all components of the project. The mass valuation methodology did not reach planned objective, which indicates the need of a stronger baseline study at project design stage and deeper risk analysis as it became clear during implementation that all the prerequisites for a successful conclusion were not there. The project result chart indicates a near fulfilment of the IT result area for “a working management system for change management, user support, and keeping track of system versions”. The results of the Publicity & Awareness are difficult to validate with clear evidence as it relates to the impact of the public awareness campaign and the constraints in the legislation for property registration.

The project contribution to the NAPR organisational capacity building improved the management culture, increased the efficiency of the organisation, prepared and implemented customer oriented strategy of system development as well as contribution to development of a new organisational structure corresponding to the growing responsibilities of the NAPR. Georgia established a system of transparent public registry, with services affordable for the population. Furthermore, some of the activities are not directly linked to project activities but are in a general sense an outcome of the project since NAPR has built capacity to manage change processes by itself, e.g. IT services to the Enforcement Agency, the company registry, website for sale of property, and the address registry. The new organizational structure is such a case which was mainly finalized after the completion of the project with the help of a local consultant.

The improvement of the IT solution, establishment of the back-up system as well as system for archiving of documents impacted on increasing the security of land transactions and improvement of the quality of the land registration services. The CORS contributed to the improvement and unification of cadastral services across the country, quality of parcel boundaries data, and efficiency of the land surveying and reduction of the land disputes in a nearest perspective.

⁶⁸ The project completion report does not elaborate on the outputs or outcomes for achieving the result but mainly indicate a percentage of achievement. The evaluation team have linked its findings towards the indicated perceived achievement in the completion report.

The Project Completion Report provides information and statistics regarding the achievements of NAPR in the land administration system development. However, due to lack of clear follow-up of the project indicators it is difficult to link directly the project contribution with the system achievements and separate planned and non-intended results.

Conclusions: The project effectiveness assessment shows that in general the project reached the established objectives including improvement of the NAPR strategic management development, improvement of the quality of the services and other objectives. The mass valuation objective is not achieved, which confirm the need of better baseline study during project planning and inception stage. It is also difficult to provide evidence of the effect or the impact of the public awareness campaign. There is also a need for legal framework improvements in regards to property registration.

5.3.3 Project Efficiency

The assessment of the project efficiency presents some challenges in the way the budget has been structured in relation to the implementation of activities. The following are some conclusions based on the information available:

- There is a large budget item of “other” which includes study visits, workshops conferences, international training courses, and local training courses. This is 16.5 % (3,4MSEK) of the total amount used. How this should be correlated to the list of activities in the annex project in numbers is not clear. However, assuming that this includes all the study tours, workshops, and training where more than 874 people have benefitted from this, then this would make it seem reasonable.
- The equipment was 21 % (4.4 MSEK) of the total disbursed. Information is not readily available to relate the equipment to each activity, however some of the activities were more relying on equipment purchases than other.
- The funds used by each components of the project appear to be relative to the output/outcome and their relative importance in the project proposal. This is demonstrated by actual amounts for where Organization and operation, IT, and Cadastral Standards have used 2.0 -2.2 MSEK each, while Data Quality is about half of this and Publicity & Awareness and Valuation at about 150 000 SEK each which would correspond to the observed output.
- Project Management and Administration used 4.9 MSEK (24 %), which would include the entire project organization in Tbilisi and in Sweden.
- 2.7 MSEK was left unused at the end of the project, which after two extensions is quite unusual. The completion report does not provide any specific analysis of this. One probable conclusion is that the project was over-financed from start.

In general it can be concluded that the project have generated some substantial contributions to the development of NAPR and the performance of NAPR today probably justifies the investment that has been done.

5.3.4 Project Sustainability and Impact

A project is sustainable when it continues to deliver benefits to the project beneficiaries and/or other stakeholders for an extended period after the financial support has been terminated. The project sustainability includes internal factors as quality of project planning, project ownership, resources for continuation, leadership etc. The external factors can be related mainly to the institutional support and support from the national authorities. The project can be considered sustainable if the project main outputs and deliverables are part of the national or sector strategy of development.

The interviews with the NAPR and main stakeholders demonstrated that, despite some issues with the feasibility of mass valuation intervention and the need of the project time extension due to mainly external factors the project was properly planned and the NAPR demonstrated strong project ownership. The project management from both sides demonstrated the leadership in the organization and implementation of about 228 project activities. The project as well as project recipients also provided enough resources to ensure the implementation of project activities.

The Ministry of Justice and NAPR demonstrated good institutional support to the project. The strategies of the NAPR development prepared with the assistance from the project were approved and enacted by the Ministry. The project activities are in compliance with planned objectives and activities of the approved strategy.

The Public Registry system established with long term support of Sida collected GEL 44 million in fees from property transactions in 2011, making NAPR financially independent of the Georgian Treasury or external support and creating good grounds for the financial sustainability of the project results. The technological and organizational sustainability of the project results may require some additional support in human capacity building of NAPR as well as of the private sector, especially for land surveying companies, to enable not only establishing quality assurance and quality control system but also to increase the quality and reliability of cadastral services.

The implementation of the concept of one stop service, bringing the registration services close to the customers through the authorized users (bank, notaries, real estate agents etc.) as well as the establishment of transparent and unprecedented openness of the registry and information is another key element of the sustainability of the land registration system. While the system is providing quick, reliable and affordable property registration services it has a huge positive social impact.

The establishment of CORS network and respective services has an impact not only on the accuracy of data but also on the development of the private surveying sector and improvement of the quality of their services for customers. The improvement of

the business procedures and regulation for the cadastral sector is still the issue that should be addressed and resolved to secure the quality of the services.

The project seems to have had a positive impact on the improvement of the management and technological capacity of the NAPR, building a new organizational structure of NAPR, improvement of the efficiency and changing of management culture, which was admitted by most of interviewed persons. However, frequent changes of the top management during the last two years require the update of the developed strategy and confirmation of established goals and objectives.

Another indirect project impact may be the recent establishment of a professional association in the area of land surveying. It is difficult to provide an evidence of direct link with the project or contribution to its establishment but presumably the discussions with the Swedish experts, international seminars and study visits brought about the understanding of the need of such a professional organization to enhance the quality of services.

Conclusions: The project results can be considered as sustainable in a medium and long term perspective and it is clear that the project has had an impact on the development of NAPR and may in the long-term have positive effects on the Georgian society and business sector.

5.3.5 Cross-cutting issues

i. Gender

The right to property is guaranteed on an equal basis under the Georgian constitution (article 21). Women and men have the same rights to purchase, own and administer property and land. Women and men have the same rights of access to property other than land and both spouses have equal legal rights of ownership over the couple's joint property.

There are no legal restrictions on women's access to credit. Women's access to bank loans is improving in rural areas thanks to specific programmes and credit unions. According to the 2004 CEDAW report, women made up almost half of credit union members. The fact that these credit unions exist and are mentioned in the CEDAW report would indicate that in rural areas in particular, it is difficult for women to access other forms of credit (such as bank loans).

The project documents do not elaborate much on the gender issue. Gender is treated as a special issue and measures on gender are not integrated into the log frame. It is thus unclear how it should be reported on. The project proposal and TOR mentions certain activities with regards to gender:

- About 40 percent of registered titles are held by women, but there is a general perception that women are not de-facto title holders. Raising awareness that women are equally entitled to hold titles to property and facilitating the process to encourage households to include women on the title are key issues.

- Plans for awareness campaigns to promote NAPR services and include specific elements designed to encourage women to register their property and to empower them to use these assets to secure loans. In doing this the project will try to use results and experiences from other Sida-projects, focusing on gender issues, such as “Kvinna till Kvinna”.
- Gender issues have to influence the planning of all activities in the program, planning of training and selection of members in workgroups etc. with the aim to provide women and men equal opportunities to participate in project activities.

The agreement between Sida and NAPR notes that: gender equality as a Sida focus area needs to be a subject for continuous dialogue during the agreement phase.

The reporting on achievement on the proposed gender activities is however very scarce. The annual report from 2009 mentions that the work in the Human Resources area were to include gender issues and that a contact had been established with the NGO Kvinna-to-Kvinna to address the gender perspective.

None of the other annual reports 2008-2012 mention specifically gender activities. In the quality assessment of March 2010 it is stated that the contact with the NGO had been established and that gender activities should be included in the work plan. The second quality assessment in 2012 does not mention gender issues at all.

The completion report states that the gender perspective has been a natural aspect of the work in the project. Activities in the project have been implemented by experts of both sexes and participants from the Georgian side have been gender balanced. The annex “project in numbers” in the completion report presents gender disaggregated data on project participation in different activities and shows an overall gender balance of 55% men and 45% women.

The evaluation team has not found any supporting documentation that awareness campaigns have been targeted directly towards women or that any specific gender analysis has been done nor is there any evidence that the work plan was amended to include any gender based activities as recommended by the first quality assessment.

There is no information in the annual reporting that the contact with the NGO Kvinna-to-Kvinna did result in anything tangible. A contact with the organisation verified that there had been discussions but could not establish any outcome of this contact, mainly because the staff was fairly new and had no information.

The Mid-term review⁶⁹ states that a gender analysis was conducted during the inception phase and has been undertaken in subsequent workshops and seminars. This was not possible to verify and the inception report does not report on such gender analysis. If this would have been a focus it would be expected to appear in the inception report. The only gender analysis appears in the conclusion report and concerns data on participation in various activities.

The field visit concluded that discussions relating to gender equality during the interviews at both NAPR and stakeholders were not very constructive as most did not see gender issues as “a problem”. Gender equality was first and foremost approached in terms of quantitative breakdowns of male vs. female participants in trainings or among staff. This was also a sentiment being concluded in a recent study by Sida.⁷⁰

Conclusions: Gender equality has not been subject to any substantial and concrete initiatives, but rather commented upon when different project components may have had a positive influence on the rights of women

ii. Environment

Environmental aspects are not being proactively referred to in the project proposal. It concludes that a cadastre and land registration system will provide information about land rights, the use of land and the right of lands. This information is essential for any kind of environmental monitoring. It further states that all activities shall be evaluated from the point of their potential impact on the planning.

The annual report 2010 describes possibilities that the property register could be expanded to include environmental information of relevance for land use planning. However, plans for the coming period were not put into the activity list. In the quality assessment in 2012 it was stated that the integrity, data quality, and the coverage of property registration must be improved before multi-use of the register could be used, e.g. in environmental protection.

The completion report reports on the issue as: “Regarding the perspective of environment the project has addressed it indirectly.The project result gives conditions necessary for any kind of planning and activities in line of the environment perspective. NAPR is working and developing sets of data that will meet many demands which also covers the environmental perspective”. It further suggests that develop-

⁶⁹ Review of the project Capacity Building & Improved Client Services at The National Agency of Public Registry (NAPR) in Georgia, Indevelop, July 2012 Sida evaluation 2012:11

⁷⁰ Review of the Results of Sweden's Development Cooperation Strategy in Georgia, Vera Devine, Jessica Rothman, Indevelop 2013

ment within NSDI⁷¹ would enable more common use of geographical data and land information.

The conclusion is that though practical uses of the information in the registry can be used for environmental purposes, no specific activity was part of the program and no “un-intended” result was found to have been produced within the project.

5.4 REFLECTIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Georgia is in the top position in the World Bank Doing business rating regarding the land registration; there is institutional support of the system, high government commitment to its development, and positive perspectives of the sustainability of the project results. All of this is good ground for optimism in the case of the Georgia project.

Despite that Georgia has demonstrated success in the establishment of effective public registry including land and cadastral registries and the project success and contribution to the establishment of such system there are still areas with existing or emerging issues and challenges to be resolved including legal, administrative and technological issues.

Some of the issues are summarized below:

- Property registration in the rural areas are at a relatively low level – this is leading to difficulties in the protection of property rights for agriculture land; bottlenecks in the procedure of first registration process and inappropriate technical limitations and reservations in registration process; the work of local government commissions on privatizations requires the improvement of transparency and efficiency;
- The issues related with inaccurate and unreliable cadastral data on property boundaries and location of parcels (inherited from fast privatization process directed mainly to break a state monopoly) including the contribution of some land privatization projects, leads to boundaries disputes and rejection of the property registration;
- Partially sub-standard cadastral survey and quality assurance procedures resulting in low quality and non-reliable cadastral data, jeopardizing the registration process and leading to numerous land disputes. The resolution of these issues requires not only establishment of appropriate quality assurance system in cadastral surveys but also improvement of the regulatory framework to re-

⁷¹ National spatial data infrastructure

solve the problems with inherited legacy data and information on property from land privatisation process;

- Need for the improvement of the legislation and regulations in the area of land administration, which is in some cases non-systematic, based on ad-hock approach and not addressing the underlying problems. This impact in turn leads to problems of the property rights protection indicated by the Transparency International Georgia especially in the case of development projects in rural areas and compulsory acquisition of land for public purposes. There is therefore a need for an open policy debate of the issues and improvement of the legal framework in the area of land registration and cadastre;
- Judging from some interviews it looks like the issues with cadastral data quality and intentions to find a simple solution lead to the ideas of monopolisation of the cadastral surveys and bringing them exclusively to the state organisations. Such an approach generally results in additional budget expenses, reducing the role of an extensive private sector and may have negative social implications without resolving the main problem. The capacity building of the private sector, improvement of regulations, quality assurance procedures and improving works supervision and quality control capacity of the geodetic department of NAPR is a more effective way of resolving this issue in the short and long term perspective.
- Lack of a system for public participation in the approval of land development projects, including lack of a transparent process of public hearings, public awareness etc. This issue also requires open policy debate to find appropriate solution that will protect property rights and block attempt of land grabbing and land speculation in huge development areas;
- Issues and bottlenecks in the property acquisition for public needs and related issues of fair compensation based on transparent information of property valuation; the resolution of the issues of mass property valuation require additional capacity and methodological support to establish required system.
- Support to NGOs, communication and cooperation between NAPR and NGOs is another issue to resolve. The ambition should be that NGOs working in the area of right monitoring will establish close communicating with NAPR in order to contribute to the resolution of land tenure issues as well as proactive approach in the prevention of possible conflicts.

The resolution of the issues above will consolidate the project results and achievements in land administration sector development as well as increase quality of the services and public confidence in the land registration system.

A need for more careful baseline studies or better analysis of risks and assumptions at the project preparation stage to reduce the impact of the assumption that are not properly grounded as in the case of the mass valuation of the property is among the

lessons of the project. The identification of risks and management should be improved to avoid project delays. However, the actual extension of the project time that was agreed to can be considered as beneficial for the NAPR and project outputs as it allowed to cover the period of management changes and keep continuous capacity building.

The need of properly planned and extensive public information and awareness campaign to deliver the message about the benefits of property rights formalisation and creation of motivation mechanism to encourage rural population to register the property is another lesson of the project.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

Sida is recommended to consider continued support to the NAPR and the real property sector in Georgia.

Project preparation for the next cooperation phase is recommended in order to take a more result based approach in planning the intervention taking into account the result chain, giving more focus to outputs, outcomes and results. This should also be reflected in the periodical reporting of the project.

The development of NAPR over the past cooperation period is impressive and the services being provided are highly appreciated in the property sector. Hence it is recommended that continued support should concentrate on consolidating the achievement under this project and close the gaps that have been identified. Continued support to NAPR shall also connect to the lessons learned and reflection in the previous chapter. The following section 5.6 outlines possible areas for support to NAPR.

Initiate a dialogue with the private sector for strengthening of the services provided by surveying companies and surveyors to achieve higher quality and support to the surveyor association and University program in land administration and Geomatics. Consider making the use of CORS mandatory when doing property formation.

Cross-cutting issues need to be taken into account already at the project design stage to make sure that the issues are taken seriously by the implementing partners. These issues should also be included in results framework to ensure that outcome is being reported in the reporting procedures. With regards to gender, there needs to be a detailed gender analysis conducted to see where specific targeted might be appropriate, in relation to overall project objectives. Gender as a dialogue issue between Sida and the partners may also need to be strengthened.

During the execution of the project a vast number of reports were submitted by the experts visiting Georgia. These reports could have provided a wealth of information to the evaluation team. Unfortunately these reports were not catalogued despite that each report was given a unique number. A simple registry could easily have been set

up and it would have been easy to request pertinent reports. This is strongly recommended for the future.

The Project Result Chart in the completion report lists result areas as 100% achieved without any elaboration on the specific output that enabled the project to reach the fulfilment of the indicator or outcome. This is also in most cases difficult to follow in the periodic reporting, which would benefit of being more analytical with references to project results linked to a result framework.

5.6 FUTURE COOPERATION AND SUPPORT

The results strategy for Sweden's reform cooperation with Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans and Turkey for the period 2014–2020 has as one of the objectives “*The Strengthened democracy, greater respect for human rights and a more fully developed state under the rule of law, focusing on strengthened public administration and judicial systems*”. Land administration (land registration and cadastre) is one of the most important elements of public administration services that contribute to protection of property rights as one of the fundamental human rights.

Despite significant progress made by Georgia to establish a corruption free and transparent land administration service there is still a lot to do to improve the security of land tenure and land transaction, reliability of the data, and increase public confidence to the land registration services. Based on the lessons learned and brief analysis of the needs on land administration system the list of actions can be summarized as follows:

- Support in the standardization of the cadastral procedures, including establishment of business process for cadastral survey, manual of best practices, standards, procedure and accuracy requirements, and regulations and implementation of standardized cadastral procedures for all companies acting in the land survey market to reducing the land disputes by increasing the accuracy and reliability of the cadastral and land survey data and reducing the time for the surveys;
- Support to the establishment of proper Quality Assurance and Quality Control system in NAPR, system for the certification/licensing of private sector land surveying companies, including the support of a Land Survey Professional Association in increasing the quality of cadastral surveys;
- Methodological support of mass land valuation process (but only after establishing that there is a will to introduce mass valuation), continuation of the capacity building in this area, establishment of proper registry, including property contract price registry, development of proposals on amendments to current legislation and regulation to achieve increasing the transparency of the compensation of the property compulsory acquisition and better public information on the property value;

- Support in the establishment of National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI), development of a NSDI strategy, study the needs on legal and regulation frame enhancement and respective recommendations, to increase the use of spatial data for urban development, and environment protection;
- Support in the development of a Land Information System, development of the strategy, technical specifications and system architecture, and implementation plan;
- Policy debates on regulatory changes – support in the review of the legal frame of the property registration, improving the procedures of correction of technical error of registration, need of licensing of private land surveying companies, and gender policy debate;
- Public Private Partnership – support to the NGOs monitoring the issues with the property rights, establishment of communication and cooperation between the NGOs and NAPR in this field, support to the communication and cooperation between different project related to the property rights;
- Support a capacity building and twinning program for Universities in the area of Geomatics and land administration, support in the preparation of curricula in this areas, and training for teachers in new methods of training;
- Support to the preparation of the land tenure public awareness to resolve the issues of relatively low level of registered property in rural areas, development of the strategy and implementation plan to inform the rural population about the benefits of the formalization and registration of property rights for the tenure security and increase the level of registered properties in rural areas;

The measures above will allow consolidation of the achievement of the previous phases of support in the area of land administration, boost the number of registered properties and increase a tenure security for entire country.

The evaluation team was requested to do a comparative analysis between the two projects outside the terms of reference. The analysis shows that there are many similarities as well as many differences.

The land market in both countries is at different level of development. Georgia is characterised by much higher level of land privatisation and respectively higher activity of the property transactions on the market which allowed the registry to make high yearly turnover leading towards self-financing. Comparing the land administration systems of both countries should be admitted that Georgian system is much more opened and almost all information is available to the general public, which is one of the factors that had an impact of eliminating of all kinds of corruptive practices during land registration. In Belarus, present steps are made towards a more open cadastral data by establishment of public cadastral map in a test mode, however data openness and availability for the public is lower as compared to Georgia.

In both countries the government believes in the long term effects of an effective land administration to contribute to a growing property market which will have a positive effect on the social and economic development of the respective country. A customer oriented approach to property registration and provision of cadastral information is prioritized with the expectation that this will lead to increased property rights and an increased will by the population for first registration of property. However, in both countries there is a struggle to achieve high registration in the rural areas.

E-services are a growing component in both countries, but are a more predominant factor in Georgia where additional services have been developed in an increasing rate. However Belarus is increasing its focus on e-services and is now developing several new services. One hampering factor in Belarus appears to be the extent of openness in sharing data.

Implementation of a high precision CORS network to achieve accurate positioning is a major priority in both countries; the development of both these systems exceeded the expectations of both projects which had anticipated running feasibility and pilot projects. In both countries strong achievements were made and both networks are now operating and are providing services to a large number of users, both to the public and private sector.

In Belarus, in addition to the support of the land registration, land valuation and cadastre, the project also included support in the urban planning development as a part of the land management system as well as in the area of e-government. This was not

introduced in Georgia, where the focus was maintained at the land administration and cadastral services.

The project in Belarus succeeded in the valuation of property for compulsory acquisition of land as well as in building of background for mass valuation. These activities were considered as very important by the recipient organisations and methodological document to support the process were developed with the support of the project and implemented. In Georgia, the project did not manage to build acceptance for a mass valuation methodology or creation of a price registry.

The intervention mode of the support by Lantmäteriet appears to follow the same methodology in both projects by providing smaller workshops between the visiting experts and the staff of the cooperating institutions or agencies in addition to seminars and study tours.

The main difference between the two projects is that in Georgia there is one cadastral agency in charge of the vital functions as the main cooperating partner, while in Belarus the functions and the responsibilities are divided among several actors. The project in Belarus had to coordinate the project activities among three ministries and four institutions and the effect on the projects is that the project management in Georgia was a bit easier as it was between two parties while in Belarus there was a local NGO coordinating between the local partners. The problem in Belarus was more of creating a uniform outlook and integration between the actors than the effectiveness of the coordination. In this case the NGO Land Reform played the role of coordination body and succeeded in the coordination of project activities and establishment of productive cooperation between all actors of the project.

The cadastral data quality is still the issues to resolve in both countries and additional efforts are required especially in a case of Georgia where the rate of land privatisation is much higher. The development of QA/QC system and capacity building and support for the private surveying business should be carefully addressed in both countries to improve a data quality, reliability of registers and reduce the cost of cadastral/land surveying services.

In both countries there is a need for a professional association in the land surveying sector to support its development, increasing the efficiency the improving the quality of land administration services. Such an organisation (Georgian Professional Surveyors Association) was recently established in the Georgia as an initiative of private land surveying companies. The issue of the establishment of such association in Belarus is under the discussion.

It would appear as if the vision and the strategies of the developments in the sector were easier to communicate inside NAPR in Georgia and that the linkages between the project components became more visible leading to more extensive achievements. It is also probable that being one organisation for managing change is easier and more

effective than if the same is to be achieved among several organisations trying to share the same vision. Such arrangement allowed for the concentration of efforts on land registration, cadastral and related issues as CORS network, standardisation of cadastral procedures.

The creation of the Public Service Halls (PSH) in Georgia was in many ways an imaginative invention where all registration facilities were assembled in one place with centralized IT-services provided by NAPR. This in combination with the authorized users' concept has contributed to the success of NAPR in providing high customer service and high achievement in providing new services.

Having said this, it should also be noted that the NAPR is a much larger organisation with good availability of resources and the project budget in Georgia was much larger than that of Belarus.

It is noteworthy that both countries have achieved high acclaim for its achievements in the effectiveness of property registration as shown by being very high ranked in the World Bank "Doing Business" rating, Georgia in the first place and Belarus in the third.

Terms of Reference for Evaluation of Results of Support to Land Administration Systems in Belarus and Georgia, from 1998 to 2014

Date: 2014-01-31

Case number: 2010-000783

Background

Opportunities to secure and transfer user's and ownership rights, by legal means, depend on the existence, and the forms of, land policies and cadastres (land administration systems). Land administration agencies play an important role in implementing land policies. They provide data that are vital for securing ownership rights and property taxation, which are both prerequisites for planning and investment. These agencies can also provide mechanisms that limit corruption, by providing transparent systems on tenure, land use and property transfers.⁷² As argued by the EU Land Policy and Sida's position paper on natural resource tenure, land rights need to be dealt with in a holistic manner.⁷³ Cadastres regulate not only ownership, but also other important issues such as natural resource management and user's rights of various groups of society. The FAO guidelines on good governance in land tenure and administration emphasize the need for land administrations to include effective, accountable and transparent cadastres, tenure security and information provision on property rights.⁷⁴ Competition with global investors for land acquisitions increases the vulnerability of people who are poor and dependent on land.⁷⁵ Recent EU debates on development issues have highlighted the linkages between land rights and development⁷⁶ and the International Federation of Surveyors and the World Bank have jointly called for improved land governance.⁷⁷ Sida supports the development of cadastres in partner countries in Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe to secure people's access to land on the one hand, and to strengthen markets on the other hand.⁷⁸

⁷² Land Administration – Why, Swedish National Land Survey, Sida February 2008.

⁷³ EU Land Policy Guidelines, EU Task Force on Land Tenure, November 2004; Natural Resource Tenure. A Position paper for Sida. Sida, 2007.

⁷⁴ Guidelines on Good Governance in Land Tenure and Administration, FAO 2007.

⁷⁵ International Land Coalition, Providing Access to Land: Challenges and Solutions, www.landcoalition.org

⁷⁶ See http://www.eudevdays.eu/agenda/events/land_grabbing_en.htm

⁷⁷ www.fig.net

⁷⁸ Natural Resource Tenure. A Position Paper for Sida, Sida 2007; Land Administration – Why. Swedish

In the East European context, the support to land administration systems has been one important means to contribute to closer social and economic integration of some of the Eastern Partnership countries with the rest of Europe (see <http://eeas.europa.eu/enp/> and “Eastern Partnership – Joint Declaration of the Eastern Partnership Summit”, Vilnius, 28-29 November 2013).

In the case of Belarus, a project implemented jointly by the National Land Survey of Sweden, Lantmäteriet, and the Belarusian organisation “NGO Land Reform” was initiated in 1998 to provide technical and capacity support to Belarusian cadastral services with the aim to develop a market-based property system.⁷⁹ NGO Land Reform consists of a small group of professionals that promote reforms in property administration and management in Belarus. A second phase of the project was started in 2002 and was subject to an external evaluation in 2008.⁸⁰ Among the evaluation’s conclusions from the results of the Belarusian project during 1998-2002 are the following:

- i) There is strong evidence that the project has been successful in making Belarusian officials and experts aware of institutions, procedures and mechanisms in a modern land administration system;
- ii) Swedish support has been particularly important considering that no other country has been providing such support of considerable size in Belarus;
- iii) Some activities have included the regions although the scarce resources within NGO Land Reform have somewhat limited the objective to work across the country;
- iv) NGO Land Reform works with several core institutions, such as the National Cadastre Agency and Committee for State Property, and thereby reduces dependency on one actor;
- v) The institutional network in combination with professional and social skills of a few leading persons within NGO Land Reform have been key to the project’s achievements;
- vi) The project has been adapted in relevant ways to the particular situation in Belarus;
- vii) There has been a lack of efforts to mainstream gender and other cross-cutting issues;
- viii) Support is still needed for further developments of capacities of NGO Land Reform and the property market in general in Belarus, through more focused activities.

National Land Survey. Sida, February 2008.

⁷⁹ See documentation in case 2010-000783.

⁸⁰ Sahlin Åke and Kalyta Maksym, Development of Real Property Market in the Republic of Belarus, Sida Evaluation 2008:19.

A third phase of the project has been implemented during the period 2010-2014 with the aim to further adapt and develop methods and techniques that were introduced through earlier project phases. A total sum of 12.4 MSEK has been allocated during 2010-2014.⁸¹ As stated in the contract of the project, the aim shall be to enhance the role played by cadastral services in order to improve the efficiency of planning as well as in other sectors that depend on accessible geographical information, and to enhance citizens' participation in decision-making.⁸² The most important results as reported from the project during 2013 are as follows⁸³:

- i) NGO Land Reform has had the capacity to efficiently administrate, organise and coordinate activities such as meetings, training and seminars amongst the Belarusian partners, including State Property Committee, Ministry for Information and Communication, Ministry for Architecture and Construction, business associations, etc.;
- ii) Training material on modern land administration is now available for Belarusian officials;
- iii) A new geodetic system, including 63 permanent reference stations, for Belarus is functioning and connected to the European system;
- iv) A system for e-government according to EU standards is being developed in Belarus;
- v) New methodology for property classification and valuation is being developed;
- vi) The ranking of "efficiency of property transfer" in Belarus on the World Bank "Doing Business" index, has improved to the ranking "2" in 2013, compared to the ranking "10" for Belarus in 2010;
- vii) Methodology has been developed and implemented for physical planning that includes mechanisms for citizens' participation.

In Georgia in 2008, Sida started supporting the project "Capacity Building and Improved Client Services at the National Agency of Public Registry"⁸⁴. The project was implemented by Lantmäteriet⁸⁵ while recipient of the support was National Agency of Public Registry (NAPR) of Georgia.

NAPR is the state agency under the Ministry of Justice of Georgia that enjoys high level of independence. It is responsible for registering property, issuing titles, registering transactions related to the property, etc. Recently on the top those responsibilities NAPR became responsible for geodesy and cartography.

⁸¹ Contribution 7600417301.

⁸² Contract C01186.

⁸³ Conclusion on Performance, 2013-08-13, Case 2010-000783.

⁸⁴ Contribution No 76003992

⁸⁵ Contract C00557

The project initial duration was 2008 - 2011. However Sida granted to the project a no-cost extension until the mid of the year 2013 as by the end of 2011 there were some funds left within the project budget.

The overall objective to which the project would contribute is “sustainable social and economic development of the nation, based on a well-functioning land administration, including secured property rights and a rational use of land”.

The project objective is defined as “NAPR provides efficient, transparent and cost-effective services according to unified strategic guidelines and technical standards and with reliable real property information, managed by a sustainable land administration organisation”.

The initial Project Document described six outcomes to be achieved:

- a) Adequate capacity for the provision of land administration services of NAPR achieved;
- b) Development of the NAPR IT system for land administration quality assured;
- c) Awareness and improvement of the context within which NAPR operates achieved;
- d) Quality, reliability and consistency of real property information improved;
- e) Efficient procedures for cadastral data update established; and
- f) Methodologies and procedures for mass valuation introduced.

Close to the project completion stage, both NAPR and Lantmäteriet approached Sida with the request to fund one more project phase. Sida is regarding a possibility to start a new project in 2014.

In Belarus, the land administration project is to be phased out during 2014 and NGO Land Reform and Lantmäteriet have equally proposed to Sida that a new project is to start during 2014, building upon results and lessons from earlier project phases.

Together with the project partners in Belarus and Georgia and at Lantmäteriet, Sida has decided to conduct an external evaluation during February-April 2014 for two main reasons:

- i) To identify, and illustrate with evidence, the medium- and long-term results and lessons achieved by the projects implemented in Belarus and Georgia with Swedish funding during the project periods 1998-2014 respectively 2008-2014 as compared to the project's objectives;
- ii) To identify the most relevant focus for eventual continued support, in the context of the Eastern Partnership Agenda (see <http://eeas.europa.eu/enp/> and “Eastern Partnership – Joint Declaration of the Eastern Partnership Summit”, Vilnius, 28-29 November 2013) and the new regional strategy for Swedish support to the Eastern Partnership countries (forthcoming 2014), and suggest how to integrate a gender equality perspective, as an input to the decision on a possible new project phase starting in 2014.

Evaluation Purpose and Objective

This evaluation has the following overall objectives:

- i) To identify, and illustrate with evidence, the medium- and long-term results and lessons achieved by the land administration projects financed by Sida in Belarus and Georgia as compared to the project's objectives;
- ii) To identify the most relevant focus for eventual continued support, in the context of the Eastern Partnership Agenda (see <http://eeas.europa.eu/enp/> and “Eastern Partnership – Joint Declaration of the Eastern Partnership Summit”, Vilnius, 28-29 November 2013) and the new regional strategy for Swedish support to the Eastern Partnership countries (forthcoming 2014), and suggest how to integrate a gender equality perspective, as an input to the decision on a possible new project phase starting in 2014.

The main users of the evaluation results and recommendations will be the Belarusian and Georgian stakeholders, Lantmäteriet and Sida.

Scope and Delimitations

The evaluation shall cover the projects: a) “Support to the Development of Real property Market” during 1998-2014 in Belarus, and b) “Capacity Building and Improved Client Services at National Agency of Public Registry” during 2008-2013 in Georgia. It shall identify the main results, on the basis of clear evidence, in relation to all objectives of the projects and propose a relevant focus in line with the Eastern Partnership and the regional strategy for Swedish support to Eastern Europe, which includes a gender equality perspective, for possible new project phases starting in 2014.

Organisation, Management and Stakeholders

The evaluation will be managed by Sida and conducted in a participatory manner that allows for the main project partners to comment on both the terms of references and the draft conclusions of the evaluation. It shall be presented during a concluding project conference that is planned to take place in Minsk 10-11 April 2014 in order to reach out to relevant Belarusian stakeholders, as well as partners from the whole Eastern Partnership region, i.e. from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine, as well as international and European partners. A second, more focused workshop will be held either in Georgia or in Stockholm, to provide for some more project specific input for the new project appraisals.

Among the relevant stakeholders that should be interviewed in the evaluation are the following agencies that have been responsible for the practical work in the respective subprojects in Belarus:

National Cadastre Agency,

address: 220005 Krasnozvezdnyi Pereulok, 12, office 318 Minsk, Republic of Belarus

phone: +375 17 285 39 26, +375 17 294 81 53

e-mail: nca@nca.by

Contact person:

Andrei Filipenko, General Director, Filipenko@nca.by;

Olga Berezovskaya, First Deputy Director General olga@nca.by www.nca.by

BelNITzem,

address: 220005 Kazintsa str. 86/3 Minsk, Republic of Belarus

phone: +375 17 278 86 88 +375 17 278 38 30

e-mail: belzem@mail.bn.by <http://www.belzem.by>

Contact person:

Aleksandr Pomelov, Director, pomelov@mail.bn.by +37529 610 2730;

Lubov Sayapina (person in charge), Chief Evaluation Office, belocenka@mail.ru, +375291364535

Belaerocosmogeodesia,

address: 220108 Prospekt Masherova10/ 12 Minsk, Republic of Belarus

phone: +375 17 284 35 32 +375 17 284 32 43

e-mail: mail@geo.by www.geo.by

Contact person:

Sergei Zabagonskij, Director, mail@geo.by, +37529 6848536

Andrei Anashenkov, Chief Engineer, mail@geo.by, +37529 6848560

BelNIIPgradostroitelstva,

address: 220002 Masherova Ave. 29, Minsk, Republic of Belarus

phone: +375 17 334-00-26 +375 17 286-08-96

e-mail: prim@irup.by www.irup.by

Contact person:

Victor Ivlichev, Director. +37529 6340311

Aleksandr Khizhniak, Deputy Director for Management and General Affairs, alexkhizn@gmail.com +375293066500

Software Applied System Institute (IPPS)

address: 220013 Belomorskaja str., 18, Minsk, Republic of Belarus

phone: +375 17 290-07-66

e-mail: info@ipps.by <http://infores.mpt.gov.by/>

Contact person:

Sergei Shavrov, Senior Researcher, shavrov@ipps.by +375296520643

The following private companies should also be interviewed:

“Tvoja Stolitsa” GROUP OF COMPANIES

address: 220125, Shafarnianskaya Str., 11, “PORT” BC, Minsk, Republic of Belarus

phone: +375 17 284 04 45

e-mail: 001@t-s.by www.t-s.by

Contact person:

Vladimir Davidovich, Chief, 001@t-s.by +37529 6842724

UE “GeoKart”

address: 220113, Melezha str., 1, office 1212 “Parus” Business Center Minsk, Republic of Belarus

phone: +375 17 268-50-40

e-mail: geokart2000@mail.ru www.geokart.by

Contact person:

Viktor Veksin, Director, geokart2000@mail.ru +37529 6246802

In Georgia, among the relevant project partners to include in the evaluation process are:

National Agency of Public Registry (NAPR)

Address: 2 Saint Nicholas/Nino Chkheidze Street, 0102, Tbilisi

Phone: [995 32 2 405 405](tel:995322405405)

Contact person: Ms Eka Meskhidze, emeskhidze@napr.gov.ge

Some of authorised used of NAPR defined together with NAPR

Civil Society organisations (watch dogs) that surveying transparency of organisations, corruption level and quality of services provided, e.g. Transparency International Georgia (TI) www.transparency.ge/en; Institute for Development of Freedom of Information (IDFI) www.opendata.ge

Evaluation Questions and Criteria

Within the framework of the evaluation objective as stated above the evaluation should include the following more specific evaluation questions:

- (1) To identify, and illustrate with evidence, the medium- and long-term results and lessons achieved by the projects during the third project phase, during 2010-2014 in Belarus and in 2008-2013 in Georgia, as compared to the project's objectives:
 - How and to what extent have the projects contributed to improved land administration services in Belarus and Georgia, and what are the more long-term impacts of these services in Belarusian and Georgian society in terms of social and economic development?
 - In the Belarusian case, how and to what extent has the project impacted upon the efficiency of urban planning, and what are the implications of these results for private sector development?
 - In Belarus, has the contribution enhanced citizens' participation in decision-making - how?
 - Has the project in Belarus, led to capacity development within NGO Land Reform – in what ways, and how could these capacities develop further through a possible new project phase?
 - In Georgia where there have been some cases of property rights violation as indicated by NGOs⁸⁶ and other studies/reports⁸⁷ - how the project contributed to

⁸⁶ Stripped Property Rights in Georgia, third Report, March 2012. http://transparency.ge/sites/default/files/post_attachments/StrippedPropertyRights_April2012_Eng_0.pdf

⁸⁷ GEORGIA IN TRANSITION - Report on the human rights dimension: background, steps taken and remaining challenges, September 2013, page 40 <http://www.sida.se/Global/Countries%20and%20regions/Europe%20incl.%20Central%20Asia/Georgia/Georgia%20in%20Transition-Hammarberg.pdf>

improvement of transparency in ownership and avoiding infringement of property rights.

- How and to what extent has the projects contributed to the creation of new geodetic systems for Belarus and Georgia, and what are the benefits for the society?
- How and to what extent have the projects contributed to develop systems for mass valuation of real property, and strengthened the systems for valuation and compensation for public acquisition of real property?
- How and to what extent have the projects contributed to development of systems for e-Government?
- What role do the results of these project results play in the context of the EU Eastern Partnership?

(2) To discuss strengths and weaknesses, as well as the reasons behind these, of the project:

- What are the major strengths of the intervention and the reasons behind these?
- What are the major weaknesses of the intervention and the reasons behind these?
- What are the prospects for sustainability of the results achieved through the intervention?

(3) To identify and propose the most relevant focus areas for a possible new project phase, including how to integrate a gender perspective:

- If new project phases would be initialised, what would be the most relevant focus of such a new support in Belarus and Georgia?
- In what ways could a new project phase in Belarus enhance capacities within NGO Land Reform?
- How could gender equality be integrated in the eventual new project phases in Belarus and Georgia in relevant ways?
- How could interconnections between the eventual new project phase and private sector development/development of small and medium sized companies (SMEs) be strengthened?
- How should the new projects be shaped in order to be as relevant as possible for the EUs Eastern Partnership Agenda as well as for the new regional strategy for Swedish support to the Eastern Partnership region?

Conclusions, Recommendation and Lessons Learned

The evaluation shall focus its conclusions on the project's medium- and long term results. On the basis of lessons learned it shall recommend focus areas for an eventual new project phase.

Approach and Methodology

The identification and assessment of results shall be clearly based on evidence from multiple and independent sources, on the basis of triangulation, in order to enhance the credibility of the evaluation. The methodology should also be based on a participatory approach and allow for consultation with the relevant stakeholders of the project in or-

der to validate findings and conclusions. A detailed methodology and work plan shall be proposed by the consultant in the inception report.

Time Schedule

The following time schedule is suggested for the evaluation process:

<u>Activity/Deliverables</u>	<u>Timing/date</u>
<i>Inception report with elaborated methodology, and meeting with Sida</i>	<i>February 2014</i>
<i>Methodology agreed with Sida</i>	<i>February 2014</i>
<i>Data collection in Sweden, Belarus and Georgia</i>	<i>March 2014</i>
<i>Evaluation report presented at seminars, in Minsk and Tbilisi or Stockholm</i>	<i>April 2014</i>
<i><u>Final evaluation report, revised according to comments at seminars</u></i>	<i><u>May 2014</u></i>

The final synthesis report shall be written in English and must not exceed 50 pages, excluding annexes. The consultant contracted for this assignment is responsible for ensuring that the final report reflects the OECD DAC Evaluation Quality Standards,⁸⁸ structured according to the format for Sida evaluations (see Annex B) and written in good English.

Reporting and Communication

Reporting will consist of meetings, an inception report, the evaluation report and presentations at a conference in Minsk 10 – 11 April 2014, respectively at a smaller seminar in either Tbilisi or Stockholm.

The evaluator shall also fill in the main recommendations in the template enclosed for Sida's management response for evaluations.

The final synthesis report shall be written in English and must not exceed 50 pages, excluding annexes. The consultant contracted for this assignment is responsible for ensuring that the final report reflects the OECD DAC Evaluation Quality Standards,⁸⁹ structured according to the format for Sida evaluations (see Annex B) and written in good English.

Resources

It is estimated that this assignment will take around four person months of services. The total costs must not exceed 850 000 SEK. The consultant shall present a detailed budget and a corresponding work plan in the offer for this assignment.

⁸⁸ www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork

⁸⁹ www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork

Evaluation Team Qualification

The consultant must have relevant academic education, documented experience of working with and/or reviewing donor (preferably Sida) support to land administration and governance issues including gender mainstreaming, experience of having conducted at least two similar assignments, and very good knowledge of both Swedish and English.

The evaluators must be independent of the evaluated activities and have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.

References

Conclusion on Performance, Sida 2013-08-13, Case 2010-000783

Eastern Partnership – Joint Declaration of the Eastern Partnership Summit, Vilnius, 28-29 November 2013

EU Land Policy Guidelines, EU Task Force on Land Tenure, November 2004; Natural Guidelines on Good Governance in Land Tenure and Administration, FAO 2007

International Land Coalition, Providing Access to Land: Challenges and Solutions, www.landcoalition.org

Natural Resource Tenure. A Position Paper for Sida, Sida 2007

OECD DAC Evaluation Quality Standards, www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork

Resource Tenure. A Position Paper for Sida. Sida, 2007

Sahlin Åke and Kalyta Maksym, Development of Real Property Market in the Republic of Belarus, Sida Evaluation 2008:19

Swedish National Land Survey, Land Administration – Why, Sida February 2008

Sida decisions and agreements concerning the project 2010-2014

Reports from Lantmäteriet 2010-2014

Annexes

Sida's Template for Evaluation Reports

Sida's Template for Management Response for Evaluation

Belarus:

Annual Plan of Operation Belarus 2012-2014, Lantmäteriet, 2014-02-24

Annual Plan of Visits 2010-2011, Land Reform Association

Annual Plan of Visits 2012, Land Reform Association

Annual Plan of Visits 2013, Land Reform Association

Annual Plan of Visits 2014, Land Reform Association

Annual Report 2010 Belarus, Lantmäteriet, 2011-10-19

Annual Report 2011 Belarus, Lantmäteriet, 2012-03-06

Annual Report 2012 Belarus, Lantmäteriet, 2013-05-28

Application to Sida for extension to 2014, Lantmäteriet, 2013-10-30

Avropskontrakt Sida – Lantmäteriet, 2010-06-22

Bedömningspromemoria av projekt förslag 2010-2012, Sida, no date

Conclusion on Performance Belarus (Swedish), Sida, 2013-08-23

Cooperation Agreement in Belarus (Russian), October 2010

Development of Real Property Market in the Republic of Belarus, Åke Sahlin, Maksym Kalyta. May 2008, Sida Evaluations 2008:19

Equipment procured within the project 2010-2014, Land Reform Association, March 2014

Expert Visit Report e-Government, Jesper M. Paasch, February 2014

Expert Visit Report Geodesy, Andreas Engfeldt and Gunnar Hedling, December 2010

Expert Visit Report Geodesy, Gunnar Hedling and Tina Kempe, April 2011

Expert Visit Report Geodesy, Lotti Jivall, March 2014

Expert Visit Report Physical Planning, Mats Jarnhammar & Klas Klasson, February 2014

Expert Visit Report Valuation, Arne Sundqvist, October 2010

Expert Visit Report Valuation, Hans Söderblom, May 2012

Expert Visit Report Valuation, Karl Hafström Magnérus, February 2014

Final Report 2005 – 2009 Belarus, Lantmäteriet, December 2009

Joint Declaration of the Eastern Partnership Summit, Vilnius, 28-29 November 2013

Lantmäteri 3 insatsstöd Beslut, Sida, 2010-06-21

Lantmäteri 3 insatsstöd Memo, Sida, 2010-06-21

Lantmäteriet Tilläggsavtal, Sida, 2013-05-22

Lantmäteriet Tilläggsavtal, Sida, 2013-11-11

Mapping and review of Sidas Assistance to Land Policy Reform, Land administration, and Land Governance, Bo Tegnäs, Ann-Katrine Myles, Henrik Alffram, Mats Lundberg, November 2010, UTV Working paper 2010:13

Natural Resource Tenure. A Position Paper for Sida, Sida 2007

On Equal Footing: Policy for gender equality and the rights and role of women In Sweden's international development cooperation 2010–2015, MFA Sweden, 2010

Presentation of the Eastern Europe Partnership(ppt)

Project Proposal "Support to Development of Complementary Functions to the Belarusian Real Property Administrative System 2010 – 2012", Lantmäteriet, 2010

Project Proposal Belarus 2014 – 2017 (draft), Lantmäteriet, Land Reform Association, 2013-11-18

Report on visit 2013 to Belarus, Jurg Kaufmann, 130324

Result proposal for cooperation with Eastern Europe 2014 – 2020, Sida, 2013-05-22

Results strategy for Sweden's reform cooperation with Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans and Turkey 2014-2020, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden, 2013-05-22

Semiannual report 2013 Belarus, Lantmäteriet, 2014-01-15

Strategy for Swedish aid initiatives in Belarus January 2011 – December 2014, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden

Study visit from Belarus valuation team -20120416 – 20120420, Lantmäteriet, May 2012

Support to Development of Complementary Functions to the Belarusian Real Property Administrative System 2010 - 2012, Lantmäteriet, 2010

Tillägg till Avropskontrakt mellan Sida och Lantmäteriet, Sida 2013-11-15

Georgia:

Amendment of specific agreement between Sida and NAPR,Sida, 2011-11-29

Amendment to Project ToR, Sida 2011-11-29

Annual Report January December 2009, Lantmäteriet

Annual_Report_Januari December_2010, Lantmäteriet

Annual_Report_Januari December_2011, Lantmäteriet

Annual_Report_Januari December_2012, Lantmäteriet

Assessment Memo NAPR, Sida, 2008-05-14

Assessment of Project Proposal "Capacity Building and Improved Client Services at NAPR of Georgia", Tim Greenhow (team leader), Åke Sahlin, SIPU International,19 March 2008

Completion Report NAPR Lantmateriet Capacity Building and Improved Client Services, Lantmäteriet, 2013

Decision on contribution, Sida, 2008-05-26

GEL 1 H 19_first quality assessment, Lantmäteriet

GEL1 A 01 Report on workshop strategic plan 1, Lantmäteriet

GEL1 F 09 Report on Cadastral Standards, Lantmäteriet

GEL1 H 53 Strategic Planning, Lantmäteriet

Georgia Human Rights report US Dept

GIS Database environment at NAPR 2010, Lantmäteriet

GIS Database environment at NAPR 2012, Lantmäteriet

GIS Database environment at NAPR 2013, Lantmäteriet

Massvaluation of Agricultural Land,, Kristin Andersson, 2013

Minutes Meeting of SC_13.01.12

No Cost extension to 2011, Sida, 2011-12-05, Lantmäteriet

Project Main Activities 1 June 2008, Lantmäteriet

Project Proposal Capacity building and improved client services at NAPR of Georgia, Lantmäteriet/NAPR, 2008

Project proposal For a no-cost extension of the project Capacity Building for Improved Client Services at NAPR of Georgia, Lantmäteriet/NAPR, October 2011

Public Register Strategic Plan

Results_Strategy_EasternEurope_WesternBalkans_Turkey_2014_2020

Review of the project Capacity Building amp Improved Client Services at the National Agency of Public Registry NAPR in Georgia,Jan Eriksson, Mariam Tkeshelashvili, Bernt H. Andersson, Indevelop, Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2012:11

Review of the Results of Sweden's Development Cooperation Strategy in Georgia, Vera Devine, Jessica Rothman, Indevelop 2013

Specific Agreement Between Sida and NAPR, Sida, 2008

Strategy for development cooperation with Georgia January 2010 – December 2013, MFA, 2010

Strategy for Southern Caucasus 2006-2009

Technical Specifications for Establishment of a New Geodetic Reference System

Terms of Reference - Capacity building and improved client services at NAPR of Georgia, Sida,2008-05-14

Belarus:

Name	Position	Organisation	Date of interview
<i>Alexander Khizhniak</i>	<i>Deputy Director</i>	<i>BelNIIPgradostroitelstva</i>	<i>March 10,2013</i>
<i>Alexander Litreyev</i>	<i>Deputy Chairman</i>	<i>Goskomimushchestvo</i>	<i>March 06, 2014</i>
<i>Anatoly Onisehuk</i>	<i>Director</i>	<i>UE Geozemplan</i>	<i>March 7, 2014</i>
<i>Anders Hedlund</i>	<i>Programme Officer</i>	<i>Sida</i>	<i>February 21, 2014</i>
<i>Andrei Anashenkov</i>	<i>Chief Engineer</i>	<i>Belaerocosmogeodesia</i>	<i>March 06,2014</i>
<i>Andrei Filipenko</i>	<i>General Director</i>	<i>National Cadastral Agency</i>	<i>March 06,2014</i>
<i>Artem Davidovich</i>		<i>Tvoja Stolitsa</i>	<i>March 6, 2014</i>
<i>Carl-Erik Sölscher</i>	<i>Project Advisor</i>	<i>Lantmäteriet</i>	<i>March 4, 2014</i>
<i>Dmitri Semenkevich</i>	<i>Vice Minister</i>	<i>Ministry of Architecture and Construction</i>	<i>March 10,2013</i>
<i>Dmitry Rytvinsky</i>	<i>Head of Department</i>	<i>National Cadastral Agency</i>	<i>March 06,2014</i>
<i>Igor Mikhailovsky</i>	<i>Director</i>	<i>Applied System Institute</i>	<i>March 07, 2014</i>
<i>Ilarij Shevadzutski</i>	<i>Director</i>	<i>UE Kartservis Group</i>	<i>March 7, 2014</i>
<i>Karin Borovic</i>	<i>Programme Officer</i>	<i>Sida</i>	<i>February 21, March 4</i>
<i>Lubov Sayapina</i>	<i>Head of Department</i>	<i>BelNITzem</i>	<i>March 07, 2014</i>
<i>Martin Åberg</i>	<i>Charged'Affaires</i>	<i>Embassy of Sweden</i>	<i>March 6, 2014</i>
<i>Mikalai Ulasiuk</i>	<i>Chief Architect</i>	<i>Minsk Architectural and Town Planning Committee</i>	<i>March 10,2013</i>
<i>Miroslav Kobasa</i>	<i>Chairman</i>	<i>Land Reform Association</i>	<i>March 5, 8, 11</i>
<i>Nadezhda Rudnitskaya</i>	<i>Head of Data Center</i>	<i>Belaerocosmogeodesia</i>	<i>March 06,2014</i>
<i>Nikolai Siniak</i>	<i>Head of Department</i>	<i>Belarusian State Technological University</i>	<i>March 7, 2014</i>
<i>Sergei Shavrov</i>	<i>Senior Researcher</i>	<i>Technological University</i>	<i>March 07, 2014</i>
<i>Sergei Zabagonsky</i>	<i>Director</i>	<i>Belaerocosmogeodesia</i>	<i>March 06,2014</i>
<i>Veronica Solovyova</i>	<i>Head of Department</i>	<i>National Cadastral Agency</i>	<i>March 06,2014</i>
<i>Viktor Ivlichev</i>	<i>Director</i>	<i>BelNIIPgradostroitelstva</i>	<i>March 10,2013</i>
<i>Viktor Veksin</i>	<i>Director</i>	<i>UE Geokart</i>	<i>March 7, 2014</i>
<i>Vladimir Davidovich</i>	<i>Director</i>	<i>Tvoja Stolitsa</i>	<i>March 6, 2014</i>
<i>Workshop</i>	<i>NCA</i>	<i>13 participants (List below)</i>	<i>March 11, 2013</i>

Georgia:

Name	Position	Organisation	Date of interview
<i>Alexander Gvaramia</i>	<i>Legal Analyst</i>	<i>APLR</i>	<i>March 18, 2014</i>
<i>Irakli Chiburdanidze</i>	<i>Technical Manager</i>	<i>APLR</i>	<i>March 18, 2014</i>
<i>Irakli Gvenetadze</i>	<i>Chairman</i>	<i>Data Exchange Agency</i>	<i>March 14, 2014</i>
<i>Johannes Werner</i>	<i>Resident Twinning Advisor</i>	<i>Data Exchange Agency</i>	<i>March 14, 2014</i>
<i>Eva Gibson Smedberg</i>	<i>Counsellor</i>	<i>Embassy of Sweden, Sida</i>	<i>March 13, 19, 2014</i>
<i>Kakha Khimshiashvili</i>	<i>Programme Officer</i>	<i>Embassy of Sweden, Sida</i>	<i>March 13, 19, 2014</i>
<i>Mats Snäll</i>	<i>Project Advisor</i>	<i>Lantmäteriet</i>	<i>March 4, 2014</i>
<i>Malkhaz Khurtsidze</i>	<i>Member of the Board</i>	<i>Geographic & Terragraphic</i>	<i>March 14, 2014</i>
<i>Malin Askhamre</i>	<i>Field Representative</i>	<i>Kvinna till Kvinna</i>	<i>March 19, 2014</i>
<i>Mikheil Panchulidze</i>	<i>Project Manager</i>	<i>Liberty Bank</i>	<i>March 14, 2014</i>
<i>Ekatarine Meskhidze</i>	<i>Head Int'l Relations Division</i>	<i>NAPR</i>	<i>March 13, 18, 2014</i>
<i>GalaktionHahubia</i>	<i>Head of Geodesy and Cartography Division</i>	<i>NAPR</i>	<i>March 14, 2014</i>
<i>Ivane Tsartsiz</i>	<i>Head of</i>	<i>NAPR</i>	<i>March 13, 19</i>
<i>Mari Khardziani</i>	<i>Deputy Head, Int'l Relations Division</i>	<i>NAPR</i>	<i>March 13, 18, 2014</i>
<i>Rusudan Mikautadze</i>	<i>Chief Specialist, Int'l Relations Division</i>	<i>NAPR</i>	<i>March 13, 18,19, 2014</i>
<i>Shota Chachkhunashvili</i>	<i>Deputy Chairmen</i>	<i>NAPR</i>	<i>March 14, 2014</i>
<i>Vladimer (Vova) Chkhaizde</i>	<i>Deputy Head of IT Division</i>	<i>NAPR</i>	<i>March 14, 2014</i>
<i>Nino Gogelashvili</i>	<i>Head of Tbilisi Enforcement Bureau</i>	<i>National Bureau of Enforcement</i>	<i>March 17, 2014</i>
<i>David Okroshidze</i>	<i>Member of the Board</i>	<i>Notary Chamber of Georgia</i>	<i>March 17, 2014</i>
<i>Nikoloz Cheishvili</i>	<i>Director</i>	<i>Tbilisi Group</i>	<i>March 18, 2014</i>
<i>Ekatarine Bokuchava</i>	<i>Senior Lawyer</i>	<i>Transparency International Georgia</i>	<i>March 17, 2014</i>
<i>Gia Gvilava</i>	<i>Projects Manager</i>	<i>Transparency International Georgia</i>	<i>March 17, 2014</i>

Wednesday, 05.03.2014

12.00-13.30 – **Preliminary Meeting at the NGO “Land Reform”**

Mr. Miroslav Kobasa, chairman of the Board NGO “Land Reform”

Thursday, 06.03.2014

10.00-10.45 – **Meeting at the Goskomimushchestvo (Committee on State Property)**

Mr. Alexander Litreyev, deputy chairman of the Goskomimushchestvo

11.00-13.00 – **Meeting at the National Cadastre Agency**

Mr. Andrei Filipenko, general director of the National Cadastre Agency

Mr. Dmitry Rytvinsky, chief of the Department of Evaluation

Mrs. Veronica Solovyova, deputy chief of the Department of Evaluation

15.00-16.30 – **Meeting at the Belaerocosmogeodesia**

Mr. Sergei Zabagonsky, director of the Belaerocosmogeodesia

Mrs. Nadezhda Rudnitskaya, chief of Data Processing Centre

Mr. Andrei Anashenkov, chief engineer of the Belaerocosmogeodesia

17.00-18.00 -- **Meeting at the Group of Companies “Tvoja Stolitsa”**

Mr. Vladimir Davidovich, chief of the Group of Companies “Tvoja Stolitsa”

Mr. Artem Davidovich

Friday, 07.03.2014

09.30-11.00 – **Meeting at the “BelNITzem”**

Mrs. Lubov Sayapina, chief of the Department of Evaluation “BelNITzem”

11.30-13.00 – **Meeting at the Software Applied System Institute (IPPS)**

Mr. Igor Mikhailovsky, director of the IPPS

15.00-16.30 – **Meeting at the of Belarusian State Technological University**

Mr. Sergei Shavrov, Senior Researcher

Mr. Siniak Nikolai, Head of Production Organization and Real Estate Economics Department

17.00-18.00 – **Meeting at the UE “Geokart”**

Mr. Viktor Veksin, director of the UE “Geokart”

Mr. Ilarij Shevadzutski, director of the UE Kartservis Group

Mr. Anatoly Onisehuk, director of the UE Geozemplan

Saturday, 08.03.2014

12.00-17.00 – **Meeting at the NGO “Land Reform”**

Mr. Miroslav Kobasa, chairman of the Board NGO “Land Reform”

Monday, 10.03.2014

09.00-11.00 – **Meeting at the “BelNIIPgradostroitelstva”**

Mr. Viktor Ivlichev, director of the “BelNIIPgradostroitelstva”

Mr. Alexander Khizhniak, deputy director for Management and General Affairs

11.30-13.00 – **Meeting at the Minsk Architectural and Town Planning Committee**

Mr. Mikalai Ulasiuk, Committee chairman, chief architect of Minsk

15.00-16.00 – **Meeting at the Ministry of Architecture and Construction of the Republic of Belarus**

Mr. Dmitri Semenkevich, vice Minister

Tuesday, 11.03.2014

15.00 – 17.00 – **Meeting at National Cadastral Agency for group discussions.**

Participation:

Kobasa Mirosław – NGO “Land Reform”

Rudnitskaya Nagezhda – RUE “Belaerocosmogeodesia”

Laurynovich Ina – Institute for Regional and Urban Planning

Onistchuk Anatoliy – Private Company Geozemplan

Mikhailovskiy Igor – NIRUE “IPPS”

Shavrov Sergey – Belarus State Technological University

Pigal Natalia – State Committee of Property

Krivenchenko Elena – National Cadastral Agency (NCA)

Ritvinskiy Dmitriy - National Cadastral Agency (NCA)

Filipenko Andrey - National Cadastral Agency (NCA)

Davidovich Artem – Tvoja Stolitsa

Zhukov Denis – National Cadastral Agency (NCA)

Levchik Sergey - National Cadastral Agency (NCA)

Wednesday, 12.03.2014

09.30 – 10.30 – **De-briefing at the Swedish Embassy**

Mr. Martin Åberg, Chargé d’Affairs

Thursday, 13.03.2014

- 11:00 Start-up meeting at the Embassy of Sweden
- 14:30 Meeting at NAPR, Tbilisi Public Service Hall
- Introduction to NAPR, International Relations Division
 - Dept. of Geodesy, Cartography, Geospatial information & Cadastre

Friday, 14.03.2014

- 10:00 NAPR GEOCORS Control Center (NAPR Headquarters),
- Geodesy & Cartography
 - NAPR IT Infra structure
- 14:00 Geographic & Terragraphic (Authorized user)
- 16:30 Liberty Bank

Monday, 17.03.2014

- 10:00 Data Exchange Agency
- 11:30 Transparency International Georgia
- 14:30 National Bureau for Enforcement
- 16:00 Visit to a Public Notary

Tuesday, 18.03.2014

- 10:00 Tbilisi Group
- 12:00 APLR (Association for Property and Landowners Rights)⁹⁰
- 14:30 NAPR International Relations Division

Wednesday, 19.03.2014

- 13:00 NAPR
- International Relations Division
 - Dept. of Geodesy, Cartography, Geospatial information & Cadastre
- 14:00 Kvinna till Kvinna
- 15:00 De-briefing at the Swedish Embassy
- 17:00 NAPR - International Relations Division

⁹⁰ Recently changed to "Association for Professionals and Real Property"

Component	Activities
Valuation and compensation	Expert visit 101014-20 (1 person) Expert visit 110425-29 (1) Expert visit 120206-10 (1) Expert visit 121105-09 (1) Expert visit 130408-12 (1) Expert visit 130902-06 (1) Expert visit 140120-24 (1) Expert visit 140310-14 (1)
New Geodetic system	Expert visit 101206-10 (2) Expert visit 110411-15 (2) Expert visit 1111128-1202 (2) Expert visit 120116-20 (2) Expert visit 120424-28 (2) Expert visit 130624-28 (2) Expert visit 140317-21 (1) Expert visit 140422-26 (1)
e-Government	Expert visit 110427-29 (2) Expert visit 110509-13 (2) Expert visit 111205-09 (1) Expert visit 120422-28 (1) Expert visit 130609-10 (1) (NAPR) Expert visit 140217-21 (1)
Methodology for urban planning	Expert visit 110314-18 (2) Expert visit 110606-10 (2) (Minsk & Vitebsk) Expert visit 111031-1204 (2) Expert visit 120220-24 (2) Expert visit 121213-14 (1) (Seminar Gomel) Expert visit 130417-20 (1) (Seminar Grodno) Expert visit 130605-08 (2) Expert visit 140210-14 (4) Seminar Minsk
International seminars	UNECE WPLA Rome 110504-07 UNECE WPLA Amsterdam 111012-15 FIG Rome 120506-120510 UNECE WPLA London 121010-13 UNECE WPLA Uppsala 120529-31 UN Conference on Social Housing 140203-06 FIG (planed for spring 2014) UNECE WPLA (planed for spring 2014) Project Concluding Conference 140410-11
Study visits in Sweden/international	Valuation 130313-20 Valuation 120415-22 Geodesy 111002-09 Geodesy 130210-17 Geodesy 130923-26 (Latvia) e-Government 110522-29 e-Government 121202-09 e-Government 130402-06 (Georgia) Urban planning 120520-27 Urban planning 130617-21 (Denmark)

Component	Activities
Seminars in Belarus	Valuation 130311-15 Valuation 130904-05 Urban planning 110314-18 Urban planning 110606-10 Urban planning 121018-19 Urban planning130417-20 Urban planning140204-14 Geodesy 130210-13 E-Government 130711-13
Publishing	Struve Arc. History and modernity (Russian) April 2013 Struve Arc. History and modernity (English) October 2013 Land Foundation Structure and management of real property, October 2013
Procurement of Equipment	GPS Equipment February 2011 Computers ISSP January- March 2011 Software March 2011 Software BelNITsZem June 2013 Computers for NGO December 2013

Participants in International Conferences, Trainings and Study Tours

Activity	Dates
Study tours to Sweden	
Project Manager and Project Coordinator	24 - 29 August, 2008
NAPR Team in Sweden	19 – 24 April, 2009
NAPR Team in Sweden	22 -29 November, 2009
NAPR Team in Sweden	8 - 12 December, 2009
NAPR Team in Sweden	16 -22 May, 2010
NAPR Team in Sweden	24 May – 3 June, 2010
NAPR Team Sweden	9 – 13 May, 2011
Study visit on training in Photogrammetry	13 -19 November, 2011
NAPR Team (Addressing system development)	18 – 22 March, 2012
Project Manager and Project Coordinator (project planning)	18-22 June, 2012
Study visit - on –job training on Aerial triangulation	5 – 16 November, 2012
NAPR IT officers (on user support)	12 – 16 November, 2012
NAPR IT officers to Sweden (on Data Warehouse)	19 – 23 November, 2012
Study visit on valuation issues	19 – 23 November 2012
Study visit on Organization and Management issues	26 May – 1 June, 2013
Study visit on GIS issues	26 – 31 May, 2013
Study tours to other countries	
NAPR Team in Belgium	7 – 11 July, 2009
NAPR team in Tallinn, Estonia,	6 -9 July, 2010
UNECE WPLA	
UNECE WPLA Workshop, Cavtat, Croatia	2-3 October, 2008
UNECE WPLA Workshop, Sofia, Bulgaria	23-24 April, 2009
UNECE WPLA 6 th Session, Geneva, Switzerland	18 – 19 June, 2009
UNECE WPLA Workshop, Baku, Azerbaijan	3 – 5 March, 2010
UNECE WPLA Workshop, Minsk, Belarus	8 – 9 June, 2010
UNECE WPLA Workshop, Antalya, Turkey	28 – 29 October, 2010
UNECE WPLA Workshop, Rome, Italy	5 -6 May, 2011
UNECE WPLA Seventh Session, Geneva, Switzerland	30 June – 1 July, 2011
UNECE WPLA Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands	12 – 15 October, 2011
UNECE WPLA Bureau Meeting, Zagreb, Croatia	28 -29 May, 2012
UNECE WPLA Conference, London, The Great Britain	10-11 October, 2012
UNECE WPLA InternatioConference, Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic	18 – 20 March, 2013
UNECE WPLA Conference, Uppsala, Sweden	29 – 31May, 2013
Other International Conferences	
Training course “Project Cycle Management & Design”	30 March- 3 April 2009
EUREF Symposium 2010, Gavle, Sweden	3 – 4 June, 2010
EUREF 2011 Symposium, Chisinau, Moldova	25 – 28 May, 2011
EUREF 2012 Symposium, Paris, France	6 – 8 June, 2012
CeBIT 2009 exhibition, Hanover, Germany	4-8 March 2009
VIII International Congress of Appraisers, Tbilisi, Georgia	30 Sep – 1 Oct, 2009
CeBIT 2010 exhibition, Hanover, Germany	2-5 March, 2010
INSPIRE Conference 2010, Krakow, Poland	22 -25 June, 2010
INSPIRE Conference 2011, Edinburgh, Scotland	27 – 28 June, 2011
INSPIRE Conference 2012, Istanbul, Turkey	23 -27 June, 2012
Seminar on Evaluation and Planning, Antalya, Turkey	27 October, 2010

Activity	Dates
EuroSDR Eduserve9 distance e-learning courses for NAPR employees	14 March - 3 June, 2011
Pre-course seminar of Eduserve9 distance e-learning courses, Paris, France	7 -12 March, 2011
ECRF 14 th Annual Conference, Bonn, Germany	20 – 22 June, 2011
25 th Conference of ICA, Paris, France	3 – 8 July, 2011
EuroGeographics General Assembly 2011, Belfast, Northern Ireland	16 – 19 October, 2011
Eurogeographics General Assembly, Helsinki, Finland	2 – 5 September, 2012
Geospatial World Forum 2012, Amsterdam, The Netherlands	23 – 27 April, 2012
15 th Annual ECRF Conference, Ohrid, Macedonia	17 -19 June, 2012

Participants in Professional Workshops and trainings in Georgia

Activity	Dates
A_Organisation and operation	
Training course “ Project Management (MS Project)” IT-knowledge,	1-19 December, 2008
Training course “Strategy and long-term planning”, CTC,	23 – 25 May, 2009
Workshop on “Strategic Planning”	2 -3 June, 2009
Seminar on Management in State Property Registration Agencies,	22-23 Sep 2009
Training course “HR Management”	15 March – 21 May, 2010
Training course “General English language”	22 March – 22 June, 2010
Training course “General English language”	20 September,2010 (3 times per week)
Regional Workshop “Public Service delivery of Future” of Ministry of Justice of Georgia	22 – 24 September, 2011
Training for HR officers on Individual Salary Setting in NAPR	26 September, 2011
Training for managers on Individual Salary Setting in NAPR	27 September, 2011
Workshop on Strategic Planning	7 March, 2012
Workshop on Strategic Planning	14 -15 May, 2012
Workshop on Strategic Planning	17 – 18 January, 2013
Workshop on “Organization and operation – Swedish example”	14 March, 2013
Training on Presentation Skills	3 November, 2010
Workshop on Strategic Planning	3 November, 2010
C_IT system	
Training course “CISCO ACADEMY” (CCNA 1-4 semesters)	27 March – 27 September 2009
Training course “LINUX administration” (1-2 semesters)	27 March – 30 June 2009
Training course “Implementing, Managing and Maintaining a Microsoft Windows Server 2003 network Infrastructure”	30 March – 4 April 2009
Training course “Service +”	16 January – 21 February, 2010
Training course “Service +””	16 January – 21 February, 2010
Workshop on web-based Software developed within NAPR	7 – 8 May, 2010
Training course “CISCO ACADEMY” (CCNA 1-4 semesters)	September, 2010 – March, 2010
Training course “Windows Server 2008 Active Directory”	from 24.01.2011 (6 weeks)
Training course “VMware vSphere: Install, Configure, Manage”	11 – 15 April, 2011
Project WS “What will happen after the project”,	18 January, 2011
E_Data quality and Standards	
Internal workshop on Cadastral Standards in Georgia	24 November, 2008
External workshop on Cadastral Standards in Georgia	25 November, 2008
External workshop on SWEPOS	22 January, 2009
NAPR Workshop on ”GEO-CORS presentation”	9 December, 2011
Workshop on “GeoCORS and Cadastral Standards in Georgia”	14 May, 2013
Workshop on “NSDI Development in Georgia”	22 May, 2013
G_Valuation	
Training course on Mass Valuation,	March-May 2009

Activity	Dates
Workshop on Valuation	22 May, 2012
Regional WS	
NAPR Event “2 nd place in Doing Business”	24 September, 2009
Regional WS for Adjara and Guria region	13-14 February, 2010
Regional WS for Imereti region	13 February, 2010
Regional WS for Samegrelo region	16-17 October, 2010
Regional WS for Kakheti region	6 – 7 November, 2010
Regional WS for Imereti and Racha-Lechkhumi Kvemo Svaneti regions	27 – 28 November, 2010
Project Final Event	4 December, 2012

Visits of Swedish Consultants to Georgia

Project mission	Period in Georgia	
Organization and Operation	1 – 7 June	2009
Organization and Operation	20 – 26 Sep	2009
Organization and Operation	23 Feb – 1 Mar	2009
Organization and Operation	1 – 4 Nov	2010
Organization and Operation	4 -7 October	2010
Organization and Operation	26 -29 April	2010
Organization and Operation	22 -23 June	2010
Organization and Operation	25 – 27 Sep	2011
Organization and Operation	12 – 15 Dec	2011
Organization and Operation	30 Nov – 4 Dec	2012
Organization and Operation	14 -15 May	2012
Organization and Operation	6 -11 March	2012
Organization and Operation	16 – 22 Jan	2013
Organization and Operation	13 – 15 Mar	2013
Organization and Operation	21 – 23 May	2013
Development of IT-system	3-11 February	2009
Development of IT-system	3-11 Nov	2009
Development of IT-system	19 – 26 May	2010
Development of IT-system	4 -10 Nov	2010
Development of IT-system	20 – 29 April	2010
Development of IT-system	24 Nov – 2 Dec	2010
Development of IT-system	4 -7 October	2010
Development of IT-system	6 – 13 October	2011
Development of IT-system	5 – 15 April	2011
Development of IT-system	8 -16 June	2011
Development of IT-system	12 – 20 Dec	2011
Development of IT-system	21 – 24 Nov	2011
Development of IT-system	14 – 21 Nov	2012
Development of IT-system	16 – 24 April	2012
Development of IT-system	3 – 5 Dec	2012
Development of IT-system	21 – 24 May	2012
Development of IT-system	9 – 18 April	2013
Publicity and Awareness	20 -24 Sep	2009
Publicity and Awareness	1-5 March	2010
Publicity and Awareness	4 -7 October	2010
Publicity and Awareness	5 – 8 Dec	2011

Project mission	Period in Georgia	
Publicity and Awareness	3 – 6 Dec	2012
Archiving	23-27 February	2009
Archiving	15 -19 March	2010
Data quality and data capture	2-11 March	2009
Data quality and data capture	2 – 8 Dec	2010
Data quality and data capture	4 -7 April	2011
Data quality	16 – 19 Jan	2012
Data quality	16 – 19 April	2012
Data Quality Pilot Project on Data quality	11 -14 Sep	2012
Efficient procedures for cadastral data	18-27 Nov	2008
Efficient procedures for cadastral data	10-20 March	2009
Efficient procedures for cadastral data	13 – 17 May	2013
Permanent GPS System	19-24 January	2009
Permanent GPS System	22 – 26 Nov	2010
Permanent GPS System	7 – 9 Nov	2011
Permanent GPS System	14 – 17 March	2011
Permanent GPS System	7 – 9 Nov	2011
Permanent GPS System	29 Nov – 4 Dec	2012
Permanent GPS System	13 – 15 May	2013
Efficient procedures for cadastral data (GIS-support	3-11 Nov	2009
Efficient procedures for cadastral data (GIS-support	22 – 27 Feb	2010
Efficient procedures for cadastral data (GIS-support)	23 – 27 May	2011
Geodesy and Mapping	13 – 20 April	2011
Geodesy and Mapping	21 – 24 May	2012
(Addressing system development)	19 – 22 Nov	2012
CORS System and Cadastral Standards	13 – 17 May	2013
Cadastral Standards	26 Nov – 4 Dec	2012
Cadastral Standards (NSDI development)	21 – 23 May	2013
Valuation	30 Sep – 3 Oct	2009
Valuation	13 – 15 June	2011
Valuation	22 – 23 May	2012
Valuation	1 – 4 Dec	2012
Quality Assessment	15 -19 March	2010
Quality Assessment	10 – 13 Jan	2012
Project management and administration	27 – 30 Oct	2008
Project management and administration	25-26 Nov	2008
Project management and administration	30 Oct - 5 Nov	2010
Project management and administration	17 – 21 Jan	2011
Project management and administration	23 – 25 Feb	2011
Project management and administration	20 - 27 Sep	2011
Project management and administration	12 – 17 Jan	2012
Project management and administration	26 – 28 Sep	2012
Project management and administration	3 – 6 Dec	2012



Evaluation of Results of Support to Land Administration Systems in Belarus and Georgia, from 1998 to 2014

This report presents the findings from the evaluation of two projects implemented by Lantmäteriet (The Swedish Mapping, Cadastral and Land Registration Authority): the "Development of Real Property Market in the Republic of Belarus" and "Capacity Building & Improved Client Services at the National Agency of Public Registry (NAPR) in Georgia".

The evaluation is focused on the medium to long range results and impacts of the two projects in their respective country. The evaluation demonstrates that the projects' implementation can be considered satisfactory and in general the main objectives of the projects have been achieved.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

