



Project Completion Report

PCR

Project Name: **Land Use Policy and Administration Project —Lupap**

Country: Commonwealth of the Bahamas

Sector/Subsector: Agriculture

Original Project Team: Cesar Falconí (RE3/EN3), Leader; Fernando Bretas (RE3/EN3); Sergio Campos (RE3/EN3); Diego Buchara (LEG/OPR); Trevor Boothe (COF/CBH); Kevin Barthel (Consultant). Giovanna Mahfouz (RE3/EN3) was in charge of document production.

Project Number: BH-L1001

Loan Number: 1589/OC-BH

QRR Date: April 8, 2010

Final PCR Approval Date: May 14, 2010

PCR Team: Edwin Mateo Molina (RND/CJA), Michele Lemay (INE/RND), Maria Silvia Vera (INE/RND) . Reviewers: Camille Davis-Thompson (CCB/CBH), Sharon Miller (CCB/CBH) and Colin Forsythe (TSP/CBH).





Acronyms and Abbreviations

BEST Bahamas Environment, Science and Technology
BNGIS Bahamas National Geographic Information Systems (centre)
BSDI Bahamas Spatial Data Infrastructure
DOLS: Department of Lands and Surveys
EMS Estate Management System
ESRI Environmental Systems Research Institute
GOBH: Government of The Bahamas
GBPA: Grand Bahama Port Authority, Limited.
LIR Land Issues Report
LUPAP: Land Use, Policy and Administration Project
MOE Ministry of the Environment
MOF Ministry of Finance
MOW Ministry of (Public) Works
NP New Providence
OPM: Office of the Prime Minister
PAC Project Advisory Committee
PCU Project Coordinating Unit
PPD Physical Planning Department
PIMS Parcel Information Management System
PS: Permanent Secretary
RPT Real Property Tax
RGD: Registrar General's Department
SG Surveyor General





Table of Contents

I.	Basic Information	1
II.	The Project	2
	A. PROJECT CONTEXT	2
	B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	4
	1. <i>Development Objective(s)</i>	4
	2. <i>Components</i>	4
	C. QUALITY -AT- ENTRY REVIEW (IF APPLICABLE).....	6
III.	Results	6
	A. OUTCOMES	6
	B. EXTERNALITIES	8
	C. OUTPUTS.....	9
	D. PROJECT COSTS	13
IV.	Project Implementation.....	13
	A. ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL FACTORS	13
	B. BORROWER/EXECUTING AGENCY PERFORMANCE	15
	C. BANK PERFORMANCE	15
V.	Sustainability.....	15
	A. ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL FACTORS	15
	B. INSTITUCIONAL CAPACITY	16
VI.	Monitoring and Evaluation.....	17
	A. FUTURE MONITORING AND EX-POST EVALUATION.....	17
VII.	Lessons Learned.....	17

Annexes





I. BASIC INFORMATION

BASIC DATA (in US\$)

PROJECT NO: BH-L1001

TITLE: Land Use and Policy Administration (LUPAP)

Borrower: Commonwealth of The Bahamas
Executing Agency (EA): Office of the Prime Minister.

Date of Board Approval: Nov-17-2004
Date of Loan Contract Effectiveness: March-16-2005

Date of Eligibility for First Disbursement: June-21-2005

Loan(s):
Sector: Agriculture and Rural Development

Months in Execution:
* from Approval: 61
* from Contract Effectiveness: 57

Lending Instrument: Investment

Disbursement Periods
Original Date of Final Disbursement: March-16-2008
Current Date of Final Disbursement: December-16-2009
Cumulative Extension (Months): 21

Loan Amount(s)
* Original Amount: 3,500,000
* Current Amount: 3,500,000
* Pari Passu (if applicable): 30%
Were funds redirected away from [] or to [] this Project?
[X] N/A (Please check one)

Amount US\$: N/A

Project and/or sub loan number(s) to which funds were redirected:
N/A

Project and/or sub loan number (s) from which funds were redirected: N/A

Poverty Targeted Investment (PTI): No
Social Equity (SEQ): No
Environmental Classification: A, B, or C

Disbursements
* Amount to date: 3,484,866.52 (%) 100%

Total Project Cost (Original Estimate): **5,000,000**

On Alert Status
Is project currently designated "on alert" by PAIS: No
If yes then why is the project on alert (DO , IP Ratings and/or relevant PAIS indicators):

Comments on relevance of "on alert" status for this project (if applicable):



Summary Performance Ratings				
DO	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Probable (HP)	[XXX] Probable (P)	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Probability (LP)	<input type="checkbox"/> Improbable (I)
IP	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Satisfactory (VS)	[XXX] Satisfactory (S)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory (US)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unsatisfactory (VU)
SU	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Probable (HP)	[XXX] Probable (P)	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Probability (LP)	<input type="checkbox"/> Improbable (I)

II. THE PROJECT

A. PROJECT CONTEXT

Land tenure security in The Bahamas at the time of preparation of the Land Use, Policy and Administration Project (LUPAP) showed that the property rights were made less secure influenced by at least six key factors:

- (i) Overlapping of claims and rights to land as a result of property disputes and the lack of parcel based cadastral maps. This implies that over 15% of the parcels in the country are in dispute.
- (ii) Uncertainty regarding ownership of land resulting from the person based and non-mandatory requirements for the registration of deeds system and the questionable reliability of the description of the real property available within the deeds in the Registry.
- (iii) Outdated policies for Crown Land divestment and administration which do not promote efficient and equitable use of these lands. It is estimated that 70% of the land is administered by the GOBH as crown land.
- (iv) The existence of commonage and generational land tenure. Commonage land was historically granted to a group of individuals and is still held in common by the heirs of the original community. Commonage land is limited to less than ten locations throughout the islands. Generational land results when families neglect to probate estates generation after generation and the rights to the land become vested in an increasingly large group of descendents who are tenants in common of an undivided property.
- (v) High transaction costs in the formal sale of land.
- (vi) That over 15% of the parcels in the country is in dispute

On the institutional side, land administration was fragmented with no real integration between the agencies involved (The Registrar General Department-RGD, Department of Lands and Surveys-DOLSs; The Real Property Tax Office-RPT), resulting in high transaction costs and lost revenues. Land administration is understood as the various processes for collecting, recording, using and disseminating information about the physical location and extent, the ownership, and



the value of land. To achieve efficiency and effectiveness in administering land and to improve and expand land administration services to the public and private sector, these processes needed to be streamlined and an integrated parcel-based system for land information management developed.

In addition, an integrated land policy was lacking, an important barrier towards addressing the challenges for planning and development in The Bahamas, and a necessary condition for ensuring that they are compatible with sustainable development of the Archipelago. Decision making is done without a clear understanding of the carrying capacity of the infrastructure, the natural resources and the society of the affected area. This was aggravated by the fact that the Government agencies responsible to plan for and make decisions regarding land development, lack the necessary up-to-date geographic information to make informed decisions on specific and immediate projects, let alone to plan for long-term sustainable development.

The request to the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) from the Government of the Bahamas (GOBH) was to create an integrated land management system by integrating cadastral information, deed recording and property value. The system should provide the basis for more secure land transactions and to increase the revenue stream from the expansion of registered parcels.

How did this context change and how was the project execution and its ability to achieve its development results effected?

As mentioned, the cadastral, registry and property taxation processes were outdated; the responsibility for carrying them out is divided among various agencies which are not coordinated; and the systems for managing and disseminating land information are not integrated.

Deficiencies in coordination among the agencies involved in the implementation of the Parcel Information Management System (PIMS) were a factor that affected the timely implementation of the project. While MOU's were intended to provide a coordination mechanism with the participating institutions involved in the implementation of the PIMS, effective coordination was always a constant challenge during the execution of the project. To overcome the deficiencies encountered in terms of institutional coordination, the GOBH took the decision to create a PIMS Unit within DOLS, staffed and with resources to consolidate the PIMS and expand it to other Islands. By taking this action, the GOBH has recognized the importance of the Project. It has also approached and informed the Bank of its decision with the possibility of eventually receiving further technical support and showing interest in the creation of a National Land Agency similar to those already functioning in other Caribbean Countries (e.g. Jamaica).

As per integrated land policy, the project was able to deliver a comprehensive Crown Land Policy Study that has formed the basis for reform of land management in The Bahamas. It is worth saying that the Speech From the Throne (April 2010), recognized that marketable title to land is essential to economic empowerment, and that a land and Adjudication Bill to permit the certification of fee simple title to generation and commonage lands and also legislation will be put in place for a Law of Property Act and for a Registered Land Act.

The Political Administration change in 2007 resulted in a review of all major projects and in the case of LUPAP, among other changes, caused the PCU Project Coordinator and Project Assistant to be relocated to DOLS and have to carry their substantive functions while continuing with their



project coordinating roles. This limited their subsequent ability to wholly focus on management of project outputs.

The financial administration of the project was separate from the PCU. The person responsible for budget execution had to assume the incremental duties imposed by the project in addition to normal duties, thus creating a heavy burden that delayed the processing of payments and disbursements. On occasion, the PCU lacked updated information of commitments and payments and processing of reimbursements. The lack of timely information on availability of financial resources, contract management, and budget matters usually hampered decision making on the use of resources and consequently delayed project implementation. During the period March 2008-June 2009, only one reimbursement was processed.

Another factor included the resignation of the Director of DOLS and Project Coordinator, leaving practically at a standstill the execution during the last semester before the project ended. A temporary Director was appointed, but with reduced authority in decision making.

The firm in charge of the implementation of the PIMS had qualified personnel on the ground dealing with the day to day tasks that alleviated the above-mentioned difficulties, to some extent. The Bank, on the other side, kept constant dialogue with the Executing Agency advising on the need to adopt decisions on project implementation, tackle sustainability issues and document its results. Also, at the PCU level, an international expert on land management served in the capacity of advisor to the DOLS Director on project execution matters assuring the delivery of high quality products. This arrangement proved to be very effective.

The Project introduced the PIMS, which proved to be effective in dealing with land management issues.

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. Development Objective(s)

As stated in Annex A of the Loan Contract, the Project Objective was defined as: *“to improve the efficiency of land administration and land information management while preparing modern land legislation and policy guidelines; and thereby contribute to the improved use of land resources”*. This objective is consistent with the objective stated in the Loan proposal.

2. Three major components were identified:

a. Land Administration Modernization

This component will improve systems, procedures and data sharing to expand the provision of GOBH land administration services at the DOLS, the RGD, Valuations Unit and the GBPA by designing, developing and installing a computerized Parcel Information Management System (PIMS) containing all properties on the islands of New Providence and Grand Bahama. The PIMS will permit the collection, integration and use of data regarding the physical location and extent, ownership and value of individual land parcels. The component also includes additional activities to improve land administration and the management of Crown Land in particular.



b. Land Information Management

This component will improve the collection and management of land information to support land use planning and sustainable development of land resources. It will provide the technical assistance needed to integrate existing land and geographic data from various government sources, as well as collect new data (including environmental and socio-economic data) to develop GIS-based geographical profiles of the islands of Andros, Abaco, and Great Inagua. These islands were selected to serve as models for the replication of geographic profiles on other Family Islands by the government in the future. Their socio-economic and environmental characteristics represent a meaningful and representative sample for developing the models of the geographic profiles.

c. National Land Issues and Policy Guidelines

This component will begin the development of a comprehensive national land policy by completing an analysis of the following five overriding land policy issues: (i) improving land tenure security; (ii) reform and modernization of land legislation; (iii) rationalization of institutions for land administration; (iv) development of an integrated land use planning process; and (v) improving real property valuation and taxation. These issues will be analyzed considering legal, technical, institutional, economic, social and environmental aspects and a set of policy options will be prepared from the recommendations. A series of focused and general consultations with civil society, principally at the local and Family Island level, will provide feedback on the results of the analysis and policy options. Following consultations with civil society final guidelines will be generated and used as the foundation for the country's land policy.

As a result of the study related to improving land tenure security, the cost and benefits and professional and civil society acceptance of migrating from the deeds recording system to a registration of land title will be analyzed. Included in the study to reform and modernize land legislation, draft legislation to modernize the Land Surveyors Act and to reflect the management of real property records on a parcel-basis, as well as regulations for the Town Planning Act will be prepared. In addition, as part of the rationalization of institutions for land administration study, an analysis of the potential benefits of consolidating the cadastral surveying, Crown Land Management, property rights registration, real property assessment and taxation and GIS agencies into a National Land Agency will be completed.

The land use planning process study seeks to rationalize and improve the land use planning and development control process used in the country, specifically in relation to improving responsiveness in relationship to desired development and enforcement of regulations to avoid unwanted and unsustainable development. In addition the study will provide recommendations for streamlining administrative procedures related to the planning, inspection and permitting process, develop a framework for integrated planning and development that incorporates land use planning and coastal zone management while increasing public participation in the planning process. The property taxation study will provide government with institutional, technical and process reform options needed to continue the implementation of a real property taxation system that is both equitable to property owners and effective in generating revenues.



C. QUALITY –AT- ENTRY REVIEW

A “2” rating was given during the Quality at Entry review..

Quality-At-Entry Review			
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory (HS)	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory (S)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory (U)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unsatisfactory (VU)

III. RESULTS

A. OUTCOMES

ACHIEVEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES (DO)				
Development Objective (s) (Purpose)	Key Outcome Indicators			
	Planned Outcomes			
	Baseline	Intermediate	End of Project	Outcomes Achieved
1.1 Document recording time reduced at Deeds registry (Months)	9	0	2	2 (16/11/09)
1.2. Time required for DOLS to make recommendations on Crown Land applications will be reduced (Months).	3	0	3	3 (16/11/09)
1.3. 20% Increase in number of properties on tax rolls (Properties).	70,000	0	84,000	83,933 (16/11/09)
1.4. 40% Increase in revenues generated from Crown lands (Dollars).	1,100,000	0	1,540,000	1,521,576 (16/11/09)



1.5. Information regarding value, ownership and location linked for 75% of all parcels in Grand Bahamas and New Providence (Parcels).	0	0	70,000	56,000 (16/11/09)
1.6. Modern land legislation and policy guidelines formulated and presented to Government (Document)	0	0	1	1 (16/11/09)

Reformulation.

N/A

PPMR Retrofitting. Indicate if and when the PPMR was retrofitted and explain any changes resulting from this exercise.

N/A

Summary Development Objective(s) Classification (DO):

Highly Probable (HP) Probable (P) Low Probability (LP) Improbable (I)

Briefly justify DO classification, based on degree to which planned targets were met, explaining the differences between planned and achieved outcomes as well as any other relevant factors. Include references to evidence that can support these results.

With respect to Outcome 1.2. It was expected that the time needed for DOLS to make recommendations for Crown Land applications was to be reduced from 3 to 1 month. This actually depended on the installation and full use of the Estate Management System (EMS), which only started at the end of the project. As of December 2009, the Bank was informed that the system was in place and fully operational.

With respect to Outcome 1.6. Five Land Issues Reports (LIR) were to be analyzed but at the end of the project, only three additional land issues were studied in detail. The LIRs delivered are: Title Registration System (based on PIMS), Rationalization of Land Institutions, Framework for Land Use Planning, Review of Town Planning Legislation, Harmonizing the Legal Framework, Improving Effectiveness of the Property Appraisal System, Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment. These LIRs constitute a major technical contribution towards comprehensive land management in The Bahamas. These LIRs, contributed to organize an Executive Report to the Office of the Prime Minister with specific recommendations to undertake reforms in four complementary areas: 1) Legislation Agenda; 2) Land Administration Agenda; and 3) Institutional Management Agenda; 4) National Concerns Agenda. As of December 2009, several recommendations and or transitory measures were adopted in the way of: 1) creating a specific PIMS Unit in order to consolidate the results of these first efforts; by integrating the three participating institutions; and 2) the Town Planning Act was reformed.



Country Strategy. Given the results described above, briefly discuss how the project contributed to the Bank's strategy in the country.

The Country Strategy (2003-2007), recognized the weaknesses in land policy and administration, its importance for private sector development, and the need to improve revenue collection. To cope with these limitations, it stated that the Bank will look to assist the government in the development of a rational land policy that: (i) encourages a pattern of growth that supports long-term sustainability; (ii) fosters a decision-making process that is more comprehensive, encourages growth and addresses the needs and circumstances of each community; (iii) allows government to take environmental concerns into consideration directly; (iv) facilitates revenue collection; and (v) facilitates equity in the allocation of land. This implies the development of a comprehensive land use policy, the development of a systematic process to clarify land tenure, the development of a digital title database, the updating of valuation criteria and the assessment list, and the establishment of a systematic mechanism for billing and collection.

The Government views issues of land policy and land tenure as longer-term priorities. Given this, the operation addressed the Government's short-term needs in land administration and land use planning for sustainable development, and laid the technical and legal foundations for addressing longer-term issues in land policy and the transition to a more reliable and cost effective system for registering land titles

The project substantially contributed to the Country Strategy, and was effective in streamlining land registration processes, the backlog of pending crown land surveys has been reduced, a modern geodetic infrastructure has been established and clearly has reduced transaction costs not only for the private sector but for the government as well and also improved revenues. The Parcel Information Management System (PIMS) is fully being implemented and will contribute to the efficient functioning of the local land markets in support of private sector development, including facilitation of foreign investment, thereby contributing directly to the objectives of the Bank's strategy for The Bahamas. Geographic profiles for Abaco, Inagua and Andros represent a good point of departure for land use and natural resources management. It is expected that the results of this project will enhance the dialogue between the authorities and the Bank to engage in a more in-depth modernization process which could eventually lead to a new National Land Agency.

B. EXTERNALITIES

No externalities positive or negative have been identified. Whereas, the implementation of the PIMS a more transparent land transaction system is in place reducing transaction costs and corrupt practices having an overall social impact within The Bahamas society at large, this was an intended effect of the project as it is, laying the foundations for a proper land use management, improving the decision making process with regard to land use, through the organization of geographical information systems.



C. OUTPUTS

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)				
Components (Outputs):	Key Output Indicators:			
Component	Baseline*	Planned Outputs	Outputs Achieved	
1. Land Administration Modernization		Intermediate	End of Project	
1.1. Land Parcels incorporated into Parcel Information management System (Parcels)	0		70,000	139,000 (16/11/09)
1.2. 339,000 acres mapped for the Grand Bahamas Port Authority (Acres)	0		339,000	339,000 (16/11/09)
1.3. Deeds and documents archived in the deed registry in digital format by year 3 of Project (Deeds).	0		1,500,000	2,100,000 (16/11/09)
1.4. Study regarding Crown Land allocation, management and pricing completed (One Study).	0		1	1 (16/11/09)
1.5. Backlog of Crown Land surveys eliminated by Year 3 of Project (Surveys)	750		0	425 (16/11/09)
1.6. Geodetic Infrastructure for New Providence, Grand Bahamas, Andros and Great Inagua re-established (Geodetic Unit).	0		4	4 (16/11/09)
1.7. Surveyors from the public and private sector trained in the use of modern surveying technologies (Number of Surveyors trained).	0		25	25 (16/11/09)
Total cost of Component 1: US\$ 3,864,184 Counterpart: US\$ 938,639 IDB: US\$ 2,924,534.67 IDB Disbursement: 100 % Classification: S				
* (if applicable) HS				



Briefly explain differences between planned and actual outputs (if applicable).
 As per output 1.3, the access to RGD's database speeded the process of transferring the deeds registry from paper to digital format.
 As per output 1.5 it was envisioned to eliminate the backlog in terms of land survey of crown land, but only 60% was achieved. One of the reason of not achieving this output is the scarcity of land surveyors in The Bahamas, as the few existing land surveyors were fully employed hired by private land developers. At the end of the Project, DOLS hired land surveyors from other Caribbean countries to carry out the remaining crown land surveys, financed with local resources. It is expected this backlog will be eliminated, in short order.

[] N/A

Restructuring. Indicate if this component was restructured (date of approval by Manager). Briefly discuss the consequences of these changes.

[XX] N/A

Component 2. <i>Land Information Management</i>	Planned Outputs			Outputs Achieved End of Project
	Baseline*	Annual/Intermediate	End of Project	
2.1. National GIS Policy report prepared (One Report).	0		1	1 (16/11/09)
2.2. Geographic Profiles for 3 islands - Andros, Abaco and Inagua - completed.	0		3	3 (16/11/09)
2.3. Technicians trained in the use of geographic information systems.	0		25	181 (16/11/09)
Total cost of Component 2: US\$ 516,990 Counterpart: US\$ 136,365 IDB: US\$ 380,625.69 IDB Disbursement: 100 %	* (if applicable)			
Classification: HS				

Briefly explain differences between planned and actual outputs (if applicable).
 With respect to Output 2.1, the project delivered outputs additional to what was originally planned as for instance: a draft legislation for the establishment of "The Bahamas National Geographic Information Systems Centre". This proposed legislation defines an expanded and formal role for the BNGIS, and establish the concept of the BSDI. With respect to Output 2.3, the Project surpassed by 700% the planned outputs training 181 technicians in areas related to fundamentals of GIS, ArcGIS 1, ArcGIS 2, Data Quality, GPS, ArcSDE, Spatial Analysis and various Executive Seminars. The beneficiary agencies included technicians from: Local Governments, of Abaco, Andros and Great Inagua, BEC, BEST, BNGIS, BNT, DOLS, GBPA, Health Services, Police, RGD, RPT and many others.
 Eventhough a small number of trainees (25) were identified initially during project preparation the number achieved is consistent with projects that are innovative and deals with introduction of new systems as is the case of LUPAP. In this particular case, 22 agencies benefitted from training



activities sponsored by the Project resulting in 8 trainees per agency. Notwithstanding, to have a full benefit from these efforts, the challenge is to retain the technicians by providing a proper personnel management system with attractive salary and non-salary incentives.
 [] N/A

Component 3. <i>National Land Issues and Policy Guidelines</i>	Planned Outputs		Outputs Achieved End of Project
	Baseline*	Annual/Intermediate End of Project	
3.1. Studies in 5 key land issues completed	0	8	8 (16/11/09)
3.2. Land Policy Guidelines report completed and delivered	0	1	1 (16/11/09)
Total cost of Component 2: US\$ Counterpart: US\$ IDB: Transferred to Component 1. IDB Disbursement: 100% Classification: S	* (if applicable)		



Briefly explain differences between planned and actual outputs (if applicable).

The project resulted in eight (8) separate 'Land Issue Reports' (LIR) instead of five as originally planned. Subsequently, a report integrating the analysis of the eight (8) LIR and entitled "Final Land Policy Options Study" was prepared and issued in May 2008. Based on these specialized reports a special Committee was integrated to make recommendations to the OPM, which integrated the recommendations into three areas (summarized as follows):

Legislative agenda: The Commonage Act of 1896 be amended in an effort to clearly and legally define what comprises a Commonage so as to reduce societal confusion and to ensure that those communities currently occupying and using land in a collective manner are not disenfranchised from the economic use and enjoyment of these land resources. Enactment of a new Physical Planning Act which clarifies the roles and responsibilities of governmental agencies and to reduce duplication of efforts, specifically in the case of the power to list trees and woodland of ecological importance and issuance of licenses for mining and quarrying. The establishment of a governmental entity to coordinate and regulate environmental protection in the Islands. Amendment of the Land Surveyors Act and regulations to conform to the recent fundamental changes in surveying technologies and the geodetic infrastructure modernization efforts currently being undertaken by the Department of Lands and Survey.

Land Administration Agenda: To take actions to establish a real property system that will ensure that property rights and boundaries are clear, the possibility of future disputes among property owners is minimized and that subsequent transactions are completed in a timely manner and at a reduced cost. As a first step in this process, and to establish the foundation for an efficient migration from the current recording of deeds to a full title registration system, the Committee recommends the continued development of the Parcel Information Management System (PIMS) for New Providence and Grand Bahamas and its expansion on an ongoing and systematic basis to other Family Islands. To populate the tax roll with all properties on the Islands as is currently in process on New Providence and Grand Bahamas through the implementation of the PIMS

Institutional Management Agenda: Recommends the use of private sector surveyors, as well as to shift the work of the Surveying and Mapping Unit of DOLS. Government should seek to recoup the significant amount of real property tax arrears (currently estimated \$300 million). To improve the real property tax system. To expand the use of the Parcel Information Management System as a tool to identify missing properties and bring them onto the tax roll, as well as to undertake a general reassessment of all properties on the Islands to establish an equitable valuation reference base.

To reduce duplication of effort, achieve internal productivity and efficiency gains, improve customer service and as a catalyst for public sector reform, the Committee strongly supports the creation of a National Land Agency to perform the core land administration functions of mapping and surveying, management of real property records, management of Crown Land, land valuation and assessment of property values for taxation purposes.

The process in designing the Land Policy Issues and Land Policy Guidelines, consisted in a participatory process including 12 'town hall meetings' most of which were held in the Family Islands and a national stakeholder consultation forum. With respect to the budget, it can be noted that this component shows no disbursement. This was the result of a decision made to transfer the resources from Component 3 to Component 1, justified by the fact that the same firm ILS in charge of Component 1, was also the prime contractor of Component 3, in association with Terra Institute a consulting firm associated with the highly respected Land Tenure Center of the University of Wisconsin. The total value of the Contract was US\$ 287,000.

[] N/A



Restructuring. Indicate if this component was restructured (date of approval by Manager). Briefly discuss the consequences of these changes.

[XX] N/A

(In case of more components, create new row and complete.)

Summary Implementation Progress Classification:

[XX] Highly Satisfactory (HS) [] Satisfactory (S) [] Unsatisfactory (U) [] Very Unsatisfactory (VU)

D. PROJECT COSTS (SEE ANNEX I)

IV. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

A. ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL FACTORS

Assumptions

At the outcome level, the following assumptions were made:

1. Government maintains its priority for land administration and management
2. Government takes into consideration the findings of real property valuation and taxation study in order to generate revenue from increases of properties on tax roll
3. Government takes into consideration the findings of the Crown Land Policy study
4. Government takes into consideration the findings of the Land Use Policy
5. Modern land legislation and policy guidelines approved at high level of the Government.

In general it can be ascertained that GOBH maintained its priority for land administration and management. Nonetheless, since the inception of the project, difficulties were encountered in terms of availability of technical personnel with knowledge of information technology (IT). During the final evaluation, this matter was raised as a reminder that in The Bahamas, IT personnel is scarce.

The GOBH through the OPM ordered the preparation of an Executive Summary of the eight (8) LIRs, which to some extent showed that the findings of the different studies were going to be taken in consideration. This resulted in a Land Policy Option report with 26 key options and recommendations contained within 3 Agendas with the following structure: Legislative Agenda, Land Administration, Institutional Management Agenda, as explained before.

At the Component level, the assumptions were: “the Government maintains the current policy and budget to sustain the Parcel Information System”, and the second assumption stated that “Coordination among the four key land agencies (DOLS, RGD, VU, GBPA) is maintained”.

As per mitigating the risks for the coordination among the four key land agencies, MOU’s and a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) with the participating agencies were implemented. The PAC was chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the OPM and include Director-level representatives from the beneficiary and project partner agencies:

DOLS, BNGIS, RGD, DPP, Valuations Unit, Attorney General’s Office, GBPA



and the Ministry of Finance. The PAC was charged to: (i) review monthly or other progress reports on Project implementation; (ii) review Annual Work Plans and budgets; (iii) review results of studies of Component #3 and recommend land policy guidelines to the OPM; and (iv) promote inter-organizational cooperation and resolve inter-agency conflicts that may arise during execution

Nonetheless, difficulties in coordinating the agendas of the participating institutions persisted until the end of the project, aggravated by the resignation of the Director of DOLS leaving the project in standby for six months. One example of lack of cooperation among agencies is the registry database that was not available until early 2008, which delayed the conversion of the pages of the deeds registry in digital format in a timely manner. At the end, this difficulty was overcome but at the expense of extending the execution period.

After receiving the results of the final evaluation, the GOBH took the decision of creating a specialized Unit integrated by representatives of the four agencies with the purpose of consolidating key results delivered by the Project and expanding the PIMS to other geographical areas. The Bank was informed that such Unit has been staffed, was operating in a new building and that specialized software to manage the EMS had been procured.

The assumption in Component 2 stated that “Government approves and adopts new GIS Policy”.

A National GIS Policy was prepared with the participation of 26 agencies. The Policy statements and standards were developed in the following areas:

Standard Software, Data Naming Policy, Metadata Policy, Library Publishing Policy, Library Performance Measures, Data Maintenance Plans, Change Management, Copyright, Fees for maps and geographic information.

A concept for a Bahamas Spatial Data Infrastructure was developed, with BNGIS as the Lead agency managing the central data base and in charge of distribution of all non-confidential geographic information. The concept and the related policy statements and standards were described in a report, “Data Management Policy and Procedures Manual, for the Operation of The Bahamas Spatial Data Infrastructure.”

Draft legislation was prepared for the establishment of “The Bahamas National Geographic Information Systems Centre”. This proposed legislation defines an expanded and formal role for the BNGIS, and establishes the concept of the BSDI.

The assumptions for Component 3 were the followings:

1. Stakeholder’s participation and consultation meetings are ensured.
2. Government takes into consideration the proposed policy guidelines

In terms of participation, the Project had continuous public consultation events during the execution period. During the drafting of new policies and the implementation of geographical profiles, the stakeholders of the main islands were consulted.

In summary, it is thought that the majority of the assumptions made during the preparation of the Project were adequately identified and held true.



B. BORROWER/EXECUTING AGENCY PERFORMANCE

In an overall context, the performance of the Executing Agency was “satisfactory “in terms of delivering the outputs of the project. The PCU was inserted into DOLS which is a specialized land management agency under the Office of the Prime Minister. Apparently, this arrangement could have facilitated the implementation of the project by achieving a proper coordination of the four agencies involved. One of the critical issues was the integration of the remaining agencies, specifically RGD and RPT. The GBPA was a good executing partner. The Director of DOLS also served as the Project Director.

Fiduciary risks were adequately managed. With respect to disbursements, during the project lifetime only 10 transactions were executed. It is worth noting that the GOBH operates with no revolving funds. They make payments and seek IDB reimbursements.

With respect to Procurement, the fact that one contract represented 80% of the resources of the project greatly facilitated this aspect of project administration. The Bank also provided timely advice which facilitated the management of procurement matters.

Borrower/Executing Agency			
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory (HS)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory (S)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory (U)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unsatisfactory (VU)

C. BANK PERFORMANCE

See Annex III

Bank Performance			
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory (HS)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory (S)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory (U)	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unsatisfactory (VU)

V. SUSTAINABILITY

A. ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL FACTORS

Fiscal benefits accrued from increasing the effectiveness of collection of rents for leases and licenses of Crown Land.

The target was for a 40% increase in revenues generated from Crown Lands by Year 3 of the Project, from a 2005 baseline of US\$1.1 million. According to the Project Management Reports revenues actually increased to US\$1,521,576 up to November 2008. This represents a 38% increase. It is worth noting that the EMS was still at a production stage at the end of the project. This figure should be constantly monitored to better understand the fiscal gains derived from an improved parcel information management system. Additionally measures to eliminate the



backlog and speed up the time taken to execute crown land surveys are required to sustain the current increase in revenue and to achieve the overall objective.

New Institutional Arrangements. PIMS is a computer system, and database. It needs to be turned into program under an ongoing institutional framework. Even though a PIMS Unit has been formed, in the longer term this responsibility should be housed within a new National Land Agency. Under this context, it is relevant to consider a new project with a long term view towards consolidating the land management system in The Bahamas, staged over a 5-10 year time frame, doing one or more of the Family Islands at a time. Also, the expansion of the geodetic infrastructure should only be considered once the proper institutional arrangements are in place.

Budget allocation to the PIMS Unit. Based on the presentation to the IDB by the GOBH officials, a budget and staff has been allocated to the Unit which will guarantee the continuation and consolidation of PIMS.

Future Operation Plan:

During the presentation of the Final Evaluation in September 2009, a series of recommendations/actions were discussed with the authorities emphasizing those actions needed to be taken in the short, medium and long term. The authorities valued these recommendations and many of them have already been implemented and others are in the process of implementation. Apart from the recommendations provided in the final report, it is clear that LUPAP delivered important results that must be consolidated along with a realistic land and institutional reform agenda.

Future actions should be concentrated on:

Consolidating the PIMS to make sure it is sustainable (PIMS Unit created within DOLS)

Passage of basic legislation regarding land issues in keeping with the announcement made in the Speech from the Throne (April, 2010)

Creation of a Land Management Agency. It is recognized that this decision will require political will.

B. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

The basic operational structures for LUPAP's execution, including the mechanisms for coordination, communication and decision making included:

The Executing Agency/The Project Coordination Unit (PCU)

The Project Advisory Committee (PAC)

The mechanisms for operating the project including MOU

To sustain the PIMS, specifically to overcome the deficiencies encountered during the implementation of the Project, the GOBH created a PIMS Unit with delegates of the participating institutions that will follow the recommendations expressed in this PCR.



As per the Bank, consideration should be given to provide the facilities of a CT-INTRA, in such a way that decision makers could visit the National Land Agency in Jamaica to draw from the experiences developed in this country within the framework of an integrated land management under one sole agency. In the longer term a National Land Agency will need to be created to deal with the land management challenges of The Bahamas.

Sustainability Classification SU:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Probable (HP)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Probable (P)	<input type="checkbox"/> Low Probability (LP)	<input type="checkbox"/> Improbable (I)

VI. MONITORING EVALUATION

The PCU in agreement with the Bank devised a Logical Framework Monitoring and Evaluation Form, with the purpose of collecting the data to report the progress of each indicator. This form was included in each of the semestral reports. In that manner, it was easy to monitor the progress of the project and to engage the PCU when actions were needed.

A. FUTURE MONITORING AND EX-POST EVALUATION

Not required.

VII. LESSONS LEARNED

The key lessons learned from the LUPAP project are:

PCU role in Project Implementation: While in general a PCU is very useful for procurement, disbursement, accounting monitoring and reporting, the PCU should not execute vital functions that are the mandate and daily operations of a department or agency. When the PCU Project Director resigned in May 2009 three components were left without leadership, which proved the vulnerability created by the absence of an effective coordinating body at the highest level of the Project. This calls for a more in depth review of the role of PCU in project implementation vis á vis the internalization of each component within each agency with responsibilities in delivering project outputs.

Project Advisory Committee (PAC): A PAC was deemed necessary as an advisory body during project implementation. But it lacked powers and decision making to review and approve the budgets and work plans, and to make major project decisions specifically in coordinating the agencies agendas involved with the project. The lesson learned is that for future operations a PAC must be given more delegation of authority to effectively resolve interagencies problems whenever they arise.

Project Time Frame: The project timeframe was too short at three years (and in fact it was extended twice ending up at 4 years 4 months.) A five year time frame would be more suitable for a land administration improvement project of this scope as with most similar land administration



projects worldwide. This should have included a one-year running in (implementation) phase with external support.

Human Resources: Challenges not originally accounted for were related to human resources issues beyond the scope of the project. For example, lack of existing incentives for staff to undertake second jobs, the existing lack of promotion opportunities, the existing lack of educational and training opportunities. The limited availability of IT personnel was a negative factor to implement areas of the project requiring this type of personnel.

MOU as a coordinating mechanism with non-government institutions. The institutional risks were correctly identified as a major challenge. To reduce these risks, the project proposed to have in place MOU and Administration Agreements with non-government participating agencies (Bahamas Associations of Land Surveyors' Board and the GBPA). This proved insufficient to influence the departments and private sector partners to significantly change their ways and effectively cooperate, in order to improve land administration in The Bahamas. The project design should have explicitly addressed organizational, regulatory and legal changes and provided technical assistance to achieve those changes.

Publication of Project Results. It is worth saying that the Bahamian staff under this project achieved many valuable goals and produced useful products – especially, but not only, the data sets compiled under the PIMS sub-component of Component 1 and the papers written for the land policy studies under Component 3; these positive accomplishments were helped greatly by a professional and committed group of consultants and contractors. These results, documentation and project achievements should be easily accessible to decision makers and to the public at large.



ANNEXES

Annex I	Project Cost Table by Component and by Funding Source
Annex II	Minute of the Exit Workshop
Annex III	Borrower's Evaluation
Annex IV	Final Evaluation Report
Annex V	Presentation at the Exit Workshop
Annex VI	Quality at Entry: Rating Summary



ANNEX I

Project Cost Table by Component and by Funding Source (Planned and Actual)

Annex A. Cost and Financing

(in Thousands of US\$ equiv.)

Categories	Bank	Borrower	Total	(%)
1. Administration and Supervision (PCU)	111	250	361	7.2
2. Direct Costs	3,154	954	4,108	82.2
a) Land Administration Modernization	2,363	954	3,317	66.4
b) Land Information Management	504	0	504	10.1
c) National Land Issues and Policy Guidelines	287	0	287	5.7
3. Concurrent Costs (evaluation)	70	0	70	1.4
4. Contingencies	165	0	165	3.3
5. Financial Costs	0	296	296	5.9
a) Interest	0	284	284	
b) Credit Fee	0	12	12	
c) Supervision Fee	0	0	0	
Total	3,500	1,500	5,000	
Percentage (%)	70	30	100	100

Final Table Costs (LMS)

(US\$ equiv.)

Categories	Bank	Borrower	Total	(%)
1. Administration and Supervision (PCU)	109,715	164,365	274,080	6
2. Direct Costs	3,305,171	1,075,004	4,380,175	91
a) Land Administration Modernization	2,925,545	938,639	3,864,184	
b) Land Information Management	380,625	136,365	516,990	
c) National Land Issues and Policy Guidelines	0	0	0	
3. Concurrent Costs (evaluation)	69,980	0	69,980	1
4. Contingencies	0	0	0	
5. Financial Costs	0	71,832	71,832	2
a) Interest	0	61,231	61,231	
b) Credit Fee	0	10,601	10,601	
c) Supervision Fee	0	0	0	
Total	3,484,866	1,311,201	4,796,067	
Percentage (%)	73	27	100	100



ANNEX II

Minutes of the Exit Workshop

Bahamas

**Land Use Planning and Policy Project 2005-2009
IDB Number BH L1001 and Loan Number 1589/OC-BH**

LUPAP Project Evaluation - Interim Report Presentation Meeting

Location: **The Bahamas Police HQ Conference Centre
East Street, Nassau, Bahamas**

Date: **September 4, 2009 9:30 am to 12:30 pm**

Participants:

OMP – Office of the Prime Minister

The Hon Mr. Byran Woodside - Minister of State for Lands and Local Government
Mr. David Davis - Permanent Secretary, OPM
Ms. Rena Glinton - Under Secretary, Ministry of Land and Local Government

DOLS – The Department of Lands and Survey

Mr. Richard Hardy - Acting Director (Meeting Chairman)
Mr. Brian Bynoe - Surveyor General
Mr. Alan Rolle - Senior Draftsman
Mr. Dwayne Stevens - IT Officer
Mr. Vanbert Pratt - Former Administration Officer, PCU, LUPAP
Ms. Morris – Map Scanning Officer, LUPAP
Ms. Azure Rolle – Data Officer, LUPAP

RGD – The Registrar General's Department, Attorney Generals Department

Ms. Jacinda Butler - Acting Registry General
Ms. Jennie Henderson - Data Officer
Mr. Wellington Smith - IT Officer

BNGIS – The Bahamas National Geographic Information Systems, Ministry of Environment

Ms. Carolann Albury - Director, BNGIS

RPT – The Real Property Taxation Division, Ministry of Finance

Mr. Joseph Whyllly, Senior Field Supervisor

IDB – The Inter-American Development Bank



Mr. Colin Forsythe, Sector Specialist, Nassau

GBPA – The Grand Bahama Port Authority

Mr. Randy Taylor – GIS Supervisor

BALS – The Bahamas Association of Land Surveyors

Mr. Dave Turner, Secretary, Target Surveying and Engineering

ILS – International Land Systems

Mr. Nicholay Gnidenko, Cadastral System Analyst

ESRI Canada Ltd.

Mr. Lynn Holstein – Land Administration Consultant (Team Lead)

Mr. Sydney Nestel – IT/Technical Consultant

Also invited (most with regrets and delegations)

Mr. Kemp - Director, RPT

Mr. Michael Major - Director, PPD

Mr. Cartwright – GIS Officer, PPD

Mr. Dillion Knowles - Vice President Development, GBPA

Mr. Simon Wilson - Director, Economic Planning, MOF

Ms. Christine Thompson - Financial Officer, MOF



The Meeting

The meeting started at 9:40 am Friday September 4, 2009 with about 20 persons in attendance (see list above). Mr. Hardy of DOLS made the introduction and explained that this meeting was to be considered the interim report of GOBH's evaluation consultant team – ESRI Canada Ltd. The evaluation project on-site work was started on August 10, 2009 and ended on September 4. The draft final evaluation report scheduled to be available for review by all stakeholders in the latter half of September 2009. Mr. Hardy mentioned that the LUPAP project loan was due to close on October 16, 2009.

Presentation by the Evaluation Consultants

Mr. Sydney Nestel (IT/Technical Consultant) and Mr. Lynn Holstein (Land Administration/Lead Consultant) presented the preliminary evaluation of the LUPAP Project made by a 4 person team over the 4 weeks period. The 40 page slide presentation was accompanied by a matching handout. The content of the presentation covered the following components:

Component 1: Land Administration Modernization

- PIMS (Parcel Information Management System)
- EMS (Estate Management System)
- Geodetic Infrastructure Improvement

Component 2: Land Information Management

- Geographic Profiles for Andros, Abaco, & Great Inagua
- National GIS Policy

Component 3: National Land Issues and Policy Guidelines

- 8 Issues Reports
- 2 Summary Land Policy Reports

Component 4: Project Management Supervision and Administration, Crown Land Policy Study, Crown Land Survey and GPS.

Major Findings

The LUPAP produced a great set of assets for The Bahamas with public money spent and value obtained. However, the project achievements are not well known to Government or the public, with valuable data and other assets created but not easily available. Education and training was done but it was insufficient, with some of it being lost through lack of use. Infrastructure problems were severe (e.g. the Government IT Network); project IT systems (i.e. PIMS and EMS) had not been put into operation and the collected data deteriorating from lack of maintenance. The Human Resource challenges and institutional complexities hamper effective use of the valuable assets produced by the project.



Recommendations Made

- The successes and failures of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) and the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) were presented along with recommendations for what happens after the end of the project;
- The need for a PIMS steering board to be established;
- The PAC should re-established and become a project steering board or similar;
- Getting the line agencies into ownership of the project products;

Discussions at the Meeting

1. The Hon Minister, Mr. Byran Woodside asked a question about packaged software licenses. The team stated that this would be added to the report.
2. Permanent Secretary (PS), Mr. David Davis stated that he had only just received the 8 land policy issues paper on September 3 as a result of his inquiries to DOLS. He further stated that he was unsure as to when these papers were submitted to OPM, or when many of the meetings were held. (Note: the land policy studies were all completed and submitted by mid 2008).

Mr. Davis also stated that LUPAP principles must go on after the project closing date. And that decisions must be taken and implemented to achieve this. Also that the HR and management must be found; though there were budget constraints at present.

Having said the above, the PS asked, had the project institutions in GOBH been ready for the project when it started back in 2005? Also was the GOBH ready today?

The PS also stated that the LUPAP especially the property information management system (PIMS) institutions must overcome the issue that it was not a primary function of any of the directors involved and that all had other major tasks to perform. There was a lack of dedicated HR available for PIMS.

3. Mr. Randy Taylor of GBPA stated that the Authority had the PIMS package installed in Freeport but at present it was not in operation lacking the formed parcel module.
4. Mr. Allen Rolle of DOLS stated that he was pleased to have worked with the LUPAP team saying that all had benefited from the training and experience. He was pleased to hear that they had created valuable products. He said that he and the other involved DOLS staff had often felt that DOLS did not appreciate their LUPAP work and he was keen to hear what the OPM had to say about this. Mr. Rolle also stated that the GOBH infrastructure especially the network was slow and often failed.
5. Ms. Carolann Albury of BNGIS noted that some recommendations appeared in the main body for BNGIS but not in the final recommendations. She was assured that it would be covered in the final report. Ms. Albury also asked that the recommendations be "more definitive" about the role of BNGIS. She said that the team should emphasis the value of the BNGIS data. She asked that the team give an opinion on whether PIMS data should be given to BNGIS for distribution and sharing. (Apparently there had been an understanding about this at the start of LUPAP.) She asked that the team specifically comment on the draft 'geographic information system' (GIS) legislation and recommend



that it be brought forward to cabinet. The PS stated that OPM was not aware of the existence of the GIS draft legislation.

6. Mr. Colin Forsythe, Sector Officer, IDB, Nassau, stated that the preliminary report was thorough, balanced and frank. He mentioned that the IDB Quality at Entry study in 2005 as having identified the 'risk' of institution non-cooperation and that this risk had not been heeded. He was pleased to hear of the significant assets that had been created under LUPAP. He noted that IDB stands ready to support/ fund further LUPAP activities, perhaps even a 2nd project though there would have to be pre-conditions.
7. Mr. Dave Turner, Target Surveys and Secretary of the BALS, stated that the Team had incorrectly typified Bahamian surveyors as being uncooperative, secretive and old fashioned. He said that this was not the case though there were a few members like this. He added that there were about 20 active land surveyors in The Bahamas of which about 40 % used GPS. He noted that GPS was not recognized by survey laws and regulations. Mr. Turner said the majority of surveyors wanted to modernize, and to cooperate with the Surveyor General (SG) and the agenda that was laid out during the present meeting. And this included mandatory registration of surveys and mandatory reference of a recent survey in any land transaction registered at the Registry General Department.

He also mentioned that it was not compulsory for a legal survey to tie into the national grid, unfortunately. He also said that many survey marks had been destroyed making tying into the national grid more expensive than it should be.

Mr. Turner continued saying that survey data and plans should be available on the Internet as it was a lot of trouble and too expensive to come into the SG's office each time you need data - especially if the task was on another island. He said most surveyors would gladly pay a \$500 or \$1000 annual fee for such a service.

Conclusions

Mr. Hardy stated that the meeting had been successful and that he looked forward to the draft final report due to be delivered September 15, 2009. He closed the meeting at 12:30pm.



ANNEX III

Borrower's Evaluation

Inter-American Development Bank
Project Completion Report –2006 PCR
Borrower Evaluation

Project Name: Land Use Policy and Administration Project (LUPAP)	
Executing Agency(ies): Office of the Prime Minister	
Borrower: The Government of the Commonwealth of The Bahamas	
Date of Project Approval: 17th November 2004	Date of Contract Effectiveness: 16th March 2005
Date of Borrower Evaluation: 3rd February 2010	Expected Date of Exit Workshop: 4th September 2009

Borrower Project Performance Ratings

Probability on Achieving its Development Objective(s):

[] Highly Probable (HP) [**P**] Probable (P) [] Low Probability (LP) []
Improbable (I)

Project Implementation:

[] Highly Satisfactory (HS) [**S**] Satisfactory (S) [] Unsatisfactory (US) [] Very
Unsatisfactory (VU)

Sustainability of Project Results:

[] Highly Probable (HP) [**P**] Probable(P) [] Low Probability (LP) []
Improbable (I)

1.1.1.1 Comments:

Sustainability of the Project (now the PIMS Unit of the Department of Lands and Surveys) will require appropriate staffing along with continued participation between the three key Government agencies (DOLS, RPT and RGD) and sustained financial support.



Bank Performance

Please rate the Bank's overall performance during project preparation and execution. Factors to be considered include the extent to which the Bank facilitated a participatory project design, proposed adequate technical solutions to the problems identified, and responded to the needs of the Borrower (timeliness, selection of instrument type) as well as technical assistance (including informal and formal training) to Executing Agency, timeliness of Bank response and the Bank's flexibility to respond to emergency situations during project implementation. Your comments will be incorporated unedited into the PCR.

HS] Highly Satisfactory (HS) Satisfactory(S) Unsatisfactory (US) Very Unsatisfactory (VU)

Comments:

None at this time.

Borrower Performance

Please rate your own overall performance during project preparation and execution.

Highly Satisfactory (HS) **S**] Satisfactory(S) Unsatisfactory (US) Very Unsatisfactory (VU)

Comments:

Execution of the project presented its challenges for the Project Coordinating (PCU) specific to the key Government agencies adhering to the agreed obligations of Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) and the resignation of the Project Coordinator (PC) from the Public Service on the 11th May 2009.

Additional Suggestions for Improving Bank Performance

Additional comments/suggestions for improving Bank performance in the future.

None at this time.



ANNEX IV

[Final Evaluation Report](#)

ANNEX V

[Presentation at the Exit Workshop.](#)

ANNEX VI

Quality At Entry: Rating Summary

A. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE AND APPROACH		Rating <i>Ratings 1-4 correspond to qualifications pre-defined for each standard in: "Standards, rating guidelines, approach and methodology for the 2003 review of project quality-at-entry", Annex I.</i>
1.	Consistency Between the Project and the Country Strategy <i>Comments:</i> The expected outcome of the project reflects the Country Strategy objectives of sustained economic growth and private equity, environmental management, and public sector modernization. The project seeks to directly improve, modernize, and expand those government services that support private sector development. It also aims to streamline government processes and provide policy options to improve environmental management.	1
2.	Consistency Between the Project and the Bank's Strategy for the Sector <i>Comments:</i> The Bank does not have a strategy for the sector. The Bahamas Government sought the Bank's expertise in the area of land use and policy. The project has been designed with the objective of promoting sustainable development and providing social equity with the Family Islands.	2
3.	Sector Analytical Work on Which the Project is Based <i>Comments:</i> The analytical work brought into focus the experiences in the design and execution of similar projects land-related projects in Caribbean countries (particularly Jamaica and Guyana), as well as the results of The Bahamas National Geographic Information Systems Project. However, the project did not take into consideration the experiences in other (non-Region 3) countries.	2



4.	Project Rationale <i>Comments:</i> The project identifies the need to address key land issues by working in a stepwise manner to provide technical assistance and investment in order to meet immediate needs in land administration and land information management. It also completes studies to prepare the policy, legal, and institutional recommendations needed to address broader land policy and land tenure issues in the longer-term.	2
5.	Project Design Elements and Components <i>Comments:</i> On a technical level, the project design elements and components are adequate. The project focuses on the modernization and expansion of the land administration services provided by government agencies, provision of geographic information for land use planning and monitoring, strengthening of technical capacities in the sector, and preparation of policy options and guidelines for national land issues, including stakeholder feedback.	2
6.	Choice of Lending Instrument <i>Comments:</i> The project is a technical assistance operation that lays out the groundwork for improving land administration and coordination, land use, and the design of land policies. A multiphase project was initially proposed (as in Jamaica and Guyana), but was not adopted because of the much longer time span that it took to complete in other countries (eight years in Jamaica).	2
7.	Identification and Utilization of Lessons Learned from Bank Experience <i>Comments:</i> Within the program documentation itself, there is only one Bank country experience and not much was elaborated beyond the workshop that was undertaken. The Government of Japan TA results were not sustained upon completion of that operation.	3
8.	Contractual Conditions in Support of the Project <i>Comments:</i> There is consistency between the loan contract and the loan proposal, and the contractual conditions reflect essential actions needed to ensure that the project will meet its objectives.	2
9.	Project “Ownership” by the Borrower and/or Executing Agency <i>Comments:</i> The government has powerful incentives to carry out the project given that this project represented the continuation of an existing program. The boundaries of the project were set out from the outset. All important players in the government fully support the project. In this regard, the government provided strong and credible evidence that it supports the project and contributed \$700,000 from its own resources to the project.	1



10.	Stakeholder Consultation During Project Design <i>Comments:</i> All relevant stakeholders were identified and consulted during the project design phase, and their views were taken into account. The project document does not discuss who the potential “losers” would be in this process.	2
11.	Partnership Arrangements With Other Co-financiers <i>Comments:</i> There are no partnership arrangements with other co-financiers.	NA

B. TECHNICAL, ECONOMIC, FINANCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, INSTITUTIONAL AND OTHER ASPECTS		Rating <i>Ratings 1-4 correspond to qualifications pre-defined for each standard in: “Standards, rating guidelines, approach and methodology for the 2003 review of project quality-at-entry”, Annex I.</i>
12.	Technical Aspects of the Project <i>Comments:</i> The solution proposed by the project is well designed. The technical rationale is sound and based on appropriate approaches for the sector.	2
13.	Economic Analysis <i>Comments:</i> The economic analysis is based on the savings in time to be generated by the project’s implementation, the increase in revenue collections that would take place from a proper and orderly registration of land parcels, and the collection of rents on leases and licenses of Crown Lands. A benefit/cost ratio was estimated for the project as well as a rate of return.	1
14.	Financial Analysis <i>Comments:</i> The financial analysis provided estimates of the incremental benefits to revenues and to the collection of rents on leases and licenses of Crown Lands, which led to a revenue increase of \$13 million (paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 of the Loan Proposal).	2
15.	Environmental Analysis <i>Comments:</i> Potential environmental and social impacts of the proposed land policy guidelines will be assessed by means of a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) exercise that will start early on the process of the land policy guidelines definition.	2
16.	Institutional Aspects of the Project <i>Comments:</i> A satisfactory analysis of the three Executing Agencies has been undertaken, which identifies areas in need of strengthening. The project helps address some of these shortcomings.	2



17.	Other Applicable Bank Policies <i>Comments:</i> The project does not have gender or indigenous population implications.	NA
------------	---	----

C. FIDUCIARY ASPECTS	Rating <i>Ratings 1-4 correspond to qualifications pre-defined for each standard in: "Standards, rating guidelines, approach and methodology for the 2003 review of project quality-at-entry", Annex I.</i>
-----------------------------	---

18.	Financial Management <i>Comments:</i> An institutional analysis was conducted during the preparation of the operation using SECI framework, which includes an analysis of the financial management of the Executing Agencies and other units involved in project implementation. This institutional analysis was done for the OPM (executing agency) and DOLS and BNGIS (unit involved in project execution). The analysis included a review of their capacity on the following points: (i) preparation of Annual Operative Plan; (ii) technical programming; (iii) financial programming; (iv) availability and sources of local counterpart; (v) budgetary control system; (vi) agility of procedures for accessing both IDB and counterpart financing in a timely manner; (vii) procurement and payments; (viii) accounting and internal control; and (ix) preparation of financial reports and audit and technical reports. This analysis was considered in the design of the operation, and there is a technical report of the analysis. However, the analysis of the financial management capacity of the Borrower and Executing Agencies included in the Loan Proposal does not provide a clear picture of the flows of funds to the different Executing Agencies.	2
------------	---	---

19.	Procurement Aspects <i>Comments:</i> The analysis of the procurement management capacity of the Borrower and Executing Agencies included in Section H of the project document is not sufficiently specific on key areas that need to be addressed.	3
------------	--	---

D. EVALUABILITY	Rating <i>Ratings 1-4 correspond to qualifications pre-defined for each standard in: "Standards, rating guidelines, approach and methodology for the 2003 review of project quality-at-entry", Annex I.</i>
------------------------	---



20.	Results Framework (Outputs and Outcomes) Associated With the Project <i>Comments:</i> Key project outputs have been clearly defined in quantitative terms, with measurable indicators, including a baseline, intermediate indicators to monitor some outputs, and final targets. Some key project outcomes are described in qualitative terms, including a baseline, intermediate indicators, and final targets.	2
21.	Data Collection and Processing for Monitoring and Evaluation <i>Comments:</i> Acceptable arrangements have been made for data collection, processing, and utilization during the project's implementation period and limited steps are in place for strengthening capacity of the relevant Executing Agencies.	2

E. IMPLEMENTABILITY		Rating <i>Ratings 1-4 correspond to qualifications pre-defined for each standard in: "Standards, rating guidelines, approach and methodology for the 2003 review of project quality-at-entry", Annex I.</i>
22.	Roles of Agencies and Units Involved In Project Implementation <i>Comments:</i> The coordinating mechanism is very clear.	2
23.	Project Implementation Plan <i>Comments:</i> A satisfactory Project Implementation Plan has been prepared with a timetable sequencing the key decisions to be made during project implementation. It also spells out some of the skills required in the Country Office for project implementation.	2
24.	Readiness for Starting Project Implementation <i>Comments:</i> The project has made a satisfactory attempt to address the main factors that have a bearing on readiness for project start-up.	2

F. SUSTAINABILITY		Rating <i>Ratings 1-4 correspond to qualifications pre-defined for each standard in: "Standards, rating guidelines, approach and methodology for the 2003 review of project quality-at-entry", Annex I.</i>
--------------------------	--	---



25.	Provisions to Help Ensure Sustainability of Benefits After Project Completion <i>Comments:</i> From the sustainability perspective, the project will have adequate systems in place; however, from the institutional, technical, and financial perspectives more provisions should have been put in place to ensure its sustainability.	3
-----	---	---

G. RISK IDENTIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT		Rating <i>Ratings 1-4 correspond to qualifications pre-defined for each standard in: "Standards, rating guidelines, approach and methodology for the 2003 review of project quality-at-entry", Annex I.</i>
26.	Identification of Relevant Risks <i>Comments:</i> The identification of relevant risks is not sufficiently candid. It does not include the risk of losing trained staff. Also, there are insufficient indications of the risks' relative importance.	3
27.	Risk Management <i>Comments:</i> The project provides acceptable measures to mitigate most identified risks that can be mitigated.	2