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The trigger

- e - Title registration system in Denmark
- Representatives from the Danish cadastre and the Danish land book
- Different visions, do not speak the same “language”, technical point of view vs. legal point of view
  → hard to develop new system
A theoretical angle

• Constraints are the term used when referring to the rules that shape human interaction
  Douglas North 1990

• Constraints can both be formal and informal

• Rules are prescriptions that forbid, permit, or require some action or outcome and authorize sanctions if the rules are not followed
  Elinor Ostrom 1994
Formal vs. informal constraints

• Formal constraints are written rules
  – Political (and legal rules), economic rules, and contracts
Informal constraints are the “rest”

- Codes of conduct, norms of behavior and conventions
Informal constraints

- Customs
- Values
- Behavior
- Traditions
- Organizational culture
- Self-understanding
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Focus on formal constraints
Overall research question

• Are informal constraints important to the administrative function of land administration systems? (How and why?)

• How can the structure of informal constraints in land administration systems supplement the existing understanding of the overall land management paradigm?
How do differences in organizational culture in the administrative institutions affect the functions of the system?

(Danish example)
How do we define organizational culture in the land administration systems?

Is this different from organizational culture in other administrative systems?
How can organizational culture be a barrier to the functions of a land administration system?
How do informal constraints fit into the exiting understanding of the functions, components and infrastructures of a land administration system?
Why is this interesting?

- Fiscal/juridical
- Land transfer
- Planning
- Multipurpose
- Land information networks
- E-governance

Advanced cooperation
Abandon the isolated “stovepipes” of data
E-governance fosters large extend of cooperation
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Effective exchange of geo-related information among the actors in land administration systems

Integrated management of the future development of land administration systems
Build cooperation through understanding

- Sustainable Development
- E-government
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- Land Development
- Land information infrastructures

Build cooperation through understanding.
Build cooperation through understanding

In a cooperative system formal rules are important
Build cooperation through understanding

The legislation, regulations and contracts must be efficient, consistent and contribute to cooperation.
Build cooperation through understanding
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My hypothesis is that this is not enough!
Build cooperation through understanding

There must be a cooperative culture in the system, the different institutions must share the same overall vision and “speak the same language”
Focus on informal constraints is a supplement to the existing understanding.

- What informal constraints are important?
- Why are informal constraints important?
- How do we put informal constraints into the existing models and conceptual framework?

- Land Policy Frameworks
- Land Administration Functions
  - Land Tenure, Land Value, Land-Use, Land Development
- Country Context
  - Institutional Arrangements
- Sustainable Development
  - Economic, Social and Environmental
- Land Information Infrastructures
Thank you