



On whether data includes peoples’ perceptions

- All countries do not collect perception data on tenure rights.
- It was noted that Cambodia partially reports on people’s perception of tenure security over land because the NIS, the NSO of Cambodia collects specific data on the experience of land conflict in their agricultural plot and migration/displacement as a result of land conflict. This data from the Cambodia Socio-Economic Survey of 2015 is an innovative strategy to measure tenure security over land specifically focusing on the level of threat experienced by households against land conflict. This method can also be used, if ever, for other threats such as armed conflict, natural disasters, and climate change, among others. (<http://www.nis.gov.kh/nis/CSSES/Final%20Report%20CSSES%202017.pdf>).

FINDINGS ON DATA QUALITY FOR SDG 1.4.2

Key features of “data quality” under SDG 1.4.2

The status of *quality* of national data for Indicator 1.4.2 is assessed along two research questions to wit:

SDG 1.4.2

“Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land,

with legally recognized documentation,

and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and type of tenure.”

QUESTIONS on DATA QUALITY

On SCOPE of COVERAGE:

- Includes ***slums & informal settlements***
- Includes ***collective & communal land rights***

On DISAGGREGATION:

- By ***sex*** and ***type of tenure***
- By ***land size*** and ***income group***

Quality of land data at country level

On scope of coverage. Available land data is assessed whether it reports on populations *in slums or under informal tenure* (including those living in public lands and public spaces, pastoralists and indigenous communities) whose tenure rights are not legally-recognized. These poorest sectors are sometimes not visible or are unaccounted for in government surveys, yet they are the focus of SDG Goal 1, and specifically of SDG Target 1.4. The second set of questions relates



to whether the reporting on land data includes tenure under *collective ownership* like the case of collective or cooperative farms, or recognized *communal rights* like for the case of indigenous peoples' lands.

On disaggregation. Available land data on security of tenure rights is assessed whether it is *disaggregated by sex, type of tenure, land size, and by income group*. Disaggregation by sex and by type of tenure are directly mentioned and are thus required for reporting on Indicator 1.4.2.

The country status of *quality* of data on land tenure security are reported in Table 6.

Table 6. Quality of land data

	SCOPE of COVERAGE		DISAGGREGATION			
	Includes Slums & Informal Tenure	Includes Collective/ Communal Tenure	By Sex	By Type of tenure	By Land size	By Income group
Bangladesh	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cambodia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
India	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Indonesia	Yes	No	Partial	Yes	Yes	Partial
Kyrgyzstan	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nepal	Partial	No	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes
Pakistan	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Philippines	Partial	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Observations and findings

On data on slums and informal settlements

- Cambodia collects data on slums and informal settlements because of an active State program on land registration and titling, which involves the land distribution to homeless/ landless populations.
- India and Indonesia collect data on slums and informal settlements as part of their national censuses of population and housing. However, these censuses rely on self-declarations on land tenure, where the extent of landlessness and informal settlers may potentially be under-reported.
- The cases of the Nepal and the Philippines are similar to India and Indonesia. However, the NSOs in both countries admitted that the data on slums and informal settlements are under-reported.



On data on collective and communal tenure

- Most (6 out of 8) countries surveyed did not generate data on collective land ownership or communal land tenure. The exceptions are Cambodia and Philippines, which have policies on communal tenure and collective titling systems for indigenous peoples.
 - Cambodia is a country that provides legal recognition for land rights of indigenous peoples under the 2001 Land Law, and issues *communal titles* under Sub-Decree 83 on Communal Land Titling. Records for these are readily available and are gathered by the NIS.
 - In the Philippines, the PSA has indicated its intention to include lands *collectively transferred* through Certificates of Land Ownership Awards (CLOAs) and Emancipation Patents (EPs) under the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP), as well as *indigenous peoples' communal lands* that are legally-recognized and issued with Certificates of Ancestral Domain Titles (CADTs) under the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA). Data from the DAR on lands distributed under agrarian reform is already being collected by the PSA, while data on ancestral domains from the NCIP are still to be submitted to the PSA.

On disaggregation by sex

- Most countries do not disaggregate land tenure rights by sex. In most household surveys, it is the sex of the “household head” that is recorded. As such, women’s land rights is usually recorded as ownership of land by “female-headed households.”
- In Cambodia, land for housing and farming were reported in terms of sole ownership of wife, husband, or jointly.
- In Kyrgyzstan and the Philippines, land agencies are able to disaggregate land tenure instruments issued and registered by sex of holder.
- In Indonesia, the Inter-Censal Agricultural Survey (ICS) of 2018 was able to gather data on the sex of landowners of farmlands, but joint spousal ownership data were not collected.
- There is partial sex-disaggregated data on land rights in Nepal, because the data collected and reported are on the ownership of each land parcel.

On disaggregation by type of tenure

- All countries are able to disaggregate data by type of tenure. For Nepal, the full complexity of the actual tenure system was not accurately captured by the survey methodology used, and hence is considered only able to “partially” disaggregate data on land tenure security by type of tenure.
- Regarding the disaggregation of data on tenure security by type of tenure, the question is how the data is to be interpreted. It is crucial to nationally determine which categories



of land tenure are considered as secure. For example, the SDG Watch in the Philippines reported that 98 percent of all households have security of tenure, which includes housing that are under rent and lease. It was argued by the Philippine researcher that such definition of security of tenure in the Philippines should be adjusted to not include housing/homelots under rent and lease. Given such proposed revision, the baseline figure reported in the Philippines may be changed from 98 percent to 62 percent of Filipino households with secure tenure over land used for housing.

- In Kyrgyzstan, the types of tenure reported is based on the types of registry documents issued.

On disaggregation by land size

- All countries disaggregate land data by land size for both homelots and agricultural lots.

On disaggregation by income group

- All countries except Pakistan are able to disaggregate data by poverty line or quintile of income groups based on national income thresholds.
- However, for Indonesia, land data are partially disaggregated by income group, as the data are available only for housing, and not for agricultural lots.

Notable initiatives

Finally, some notable initiatives have been found:

- In the Philippines, the Evidence and Data for Gender Equality (EDGE) project was carried out in 2015. It is a multi-country initiative also conducted in Mongolia and Georgia, where a methodology for gathering data on SDG 5.a.1 was pilot-tested. Data on security of tenure of both husband and wife in a household were gathered along with data on whether their tenure was enshrined in a legally recognized document. Data was also gathered on the perceived rights of the husband and wife, whether the land was solely or jointly owned, and what their perceived rights are in terms of decision-making about the use, sale, and bequeathing of their residential, agricultural, and other lands. (<https://unstats.un.org/edge/pilot/philippines/philippines.cshtml>)
- In Kyrgyzstan, a methodology for computing Indicator SDG 1.4.2 was proposed. Instead of using “self-declared” survey methodologies, the NSC proposed a proxy indicator using official records from their register of deeds (Department of Cadastre and Registration of Rights to Immovable Property) and projecting this vis-a-vis the total adult population. The



proposed definition of “adult” is 16 years old and above, which is the existing data collected, since the “labor force” is defined as persons of 16-65 years of age.

$$D = \frac{\text{No. of adults with guaranteed tenure rights (Land Registration data)}}{\text{Total number of adults (Population data)}} \times 100$$

Thus, this proposal from the NSC was developed when Indicator 1.4.2 was still under *Tier III*. It can be a useful approach particularly for countries with an efficient land administration system. It should be noted that private property in Kyrgyzstan was formally reinstated only in the 1990s, as under the previous Soviet regime, all lands were legally under State ownership.

LOOKING FORWARD

Overall assessment

- It must be noted that the NSOs themselves do not deal with land policy issues and in general, have no in-house expertise on matters of land tenure. NSOs are focused on collecting land data, and for policy matters, they coordinate with the relevant land agencies.
- In the eight countries included in this study, most NSOs have no existing engagement with CSOs particularly on land, but most are open to engagement. The following starting points have been identified at the country level:
 - In Cambodia, the NIS gathers inputs from a multi-stakeholder body including CSOs through the Technical Working Group on Population and Poverty Reduction. NGO Forum on Cambodia and the Cooperation Committee for Cambodia is part of this TWG.
 - In Nepal, the NSO is engaged with the academe and research institutes for the production of data. Support is also earned from international donors for the attainment of statistical needs.
 - In the Philippines, the NSO gathers inputs from CSOs on the determination of indicators and design of methodology.
- Defining SDG 1.4.2 is currently seen as a task of the custodian agencies, WB, UN-Habitat, FAO, and NSOs. There is still no clear and official role yet for CSO engagement in defining the data collection methodologies for the SDGs.