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SUMMARY

Although there is a published lack of accepted frameworks and methodologies for the comparison and evaluation of national land administration systems, several frameworks for assessing the performance of LAS in terms of different aspects of these systems have been proposed. The bulk are biased towards analysis of technical, institutional, or cost/benefit aspects, or focus on economic efficiency and effectiveness. There is a dearth of frameworks for evaluating the external impact of land administration and cadastral developments, i.e. how do these developments affect citizens and communities having rights in land?

This paper constitutes a review of recently published frameworks related to land administration and cadastral development. The underlying theories are explored and frameworks are identified as belonging to two general groups: those providing recommendations or guidelines, and those providing a hierarchical analysis that conforms to the general structure of evaluation frameworks. This latter category is further explored in terms of the motivations for development of the framework and three sub-groups are identified: those that address a gap in knowledge, those that address issues related specifically to developing contexts, and those with a pro-poor and good governance focus.

Finally key lessons are drawn from the reviewed publications. It is proposed that land administration systems should be developed in such a way that they can become successful, sustainable, and significant. To this end good leadership is seen as very important, as are public participation, the (temporary) adoption of fit-for-purpose standards, a focus on providing secure tenure, and good governance. The theoretical underpinning for development should be adaptation or unified theories, not formalisation or replacement theory.