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WHAT IS LAND CONSOLIDATION?

- Planned readjustment and rearrangement of land parcels and their *ownership*
- Usually applied to form larger and more rational land holdings

Van Dijk (2007)
WHY AND HOW IS LAND CONSOLIDATED?

- Agriculture transformation and rural development
- Different countries use different approaches
  - Mostly applied in Europe, limited cases in sub Saharan Africa
- Land tenure information *is needed*
- Existing situation, potential changes, recording the new situation
WHAT ABOUT RWANDA?

- Commenced land consolidation activities in 2008
- Crop intensification program (CIP)
- Countrywide land tenure regularization (LTR) from 2009 - 2013
- Limited relationship between RNRA and MINAGRI
- Therefore, land consolidation commenced without land tenure information…
HOW CAN THIS BE?

- How could land consolidation be completed without land tenure information?
- What did the activities it result in?
- Now that land tenure information is available, how is it being used?
- Are the results any different?
WHAT DID WE DO?

- Comparative study
- Two case locations (Pre vs. Post)
- Case study approach
- Legal, policy, social and spatial analyses
WHERE WERE THE STUDY AREAS?

Pre
Kigarama sector
Kinoni Scheme

Post
Mpanga sector
Nasho Scheme
WHAT DATA WAS CREATED?

- Document Review
  - Government laws and policies

- Structured interview
  - Smallholder farmers

- Semi-structured interview
  - Government officials

- Focus group discussion
  - Farmers and cooperative leaders

- Spatial data collection
  - Satellite image from Google earth
  - Orthophoto images from RNRA
  - Cadastral shapefiles from RNRA
WHAT DID THE RESULTS SHOW?

- Consolidation of use not ownership
- 2 methods being used
  - Simple method involved no creation of infrastructure
  - Modern method was linked to irrigation schemes
WHAT HAPPENED IN KINOMI (PRE)?

- Information about tenure was provided by the community
- Created information was not registered (or passed onto RNRA)
- There were no changes to land owners
- There was no change to parcel sizes
- There were no changes to existing rights (or, maybe?)
WHAT HAPPENED IN KINOMI (PRE)?
WHAT HAPPENED IN NASHO (POST)?

- Information about tenure was provided by RNRA
- Only cadastral shapefile used (identifying impacted parcels)
- Parcels changed size - on the ground
- Rights changed - on the ground
- Changes to parcels were not registered with RNRA
WHAT HAPPENED IN NASHO (POST)?

Before

After
WHAT CAN WE CONCLUDE?

- **Homegrown**: Rwanda developed its own form of consolidation

- **Fit-for-purpose**: Less cost and tenure information needed for startup

- **Gains?** Probably smaller and less sustainable longer term – but, how should we be measuring gains?

- **Conflict?** Failure to update land registry creates potential for later G2C conflict and C2C conflict

- **Collaboration**: land tenure and use should go hand-in-hand – at all levels – but, how do we limit costs and regulations?
Many thanks for coming along

Thoughts? Questions?