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ABSTRACT

This study assessed the challenges and prospects of good urban governance practices in land administration at Shambu town, Horro Guduru Wollega, Oromia National Regional State Government, basing five good governance principles, such as: participation, transparency, accountability, equity, and effectiveness and efficiency. The study design was descriptive case study. Data was collected from primary and secondary sources. Primary data was obtained through questionnaires, interviews, and focus group discussion. Secondary data involved reviewing relevant literature from journals, books, magazines and proceedings. Data collected by survey questionnaires was entered SPSS for statistical analysis, and data collected by focus group discussion and interviews were analyzed using words and statements, and used for the purpose of triangulation. This study found that corruption and rent-seeking behavior and activities, negligence by officials and employees of the municipality, lagging of response, lack of mechanism to ask municipality about its deeds and officials run for getting political loyalty from their bosses to either sustain their power or to upgrade their position rather work to solve residents’ problem, lack of financial, material and human resources, lack of institutional capacity regarding major challenges. Improving the participation of local community, enhancing institutional and organizational capacity, practicing accountability, equity based land service delivery, computerization of records, establishing “one-stop shop” services, separating “front-office” from “back-office”, establishing service standards which include all the elements of the service provided in the land administration and service standards, updating and monitoring the cadastral system consistently are stated as recommendations.
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INTRODUCTION

Land is a fundamental resource for the economic development of any country in the world (Burns and Dalrymple, 2008:3). As Deininger et al (2010:2) discussed, land is an enormously valuable asset, typically accounting for 30-50% of national wealth in developing countries. Globally, land governance is about the policies, processes and institutions by which land, property and natural resources are managed. This includes decisions on access to land, land rights, land use, and land development (Deininger et al., 2010:2). As (World Bank, 2009:6) stated, “land governance is basically about determining and implementing sustainable land policies and establishing a strong relationship between people and land. Sound land governance is fundamental in achieving sustainable development and poverty reduction.”
According to Solomon (2013:25), different literature demonstrates the importance of adopting good land governance in land administration (as cited in Palmer, et al., 2009). Solomon (2001:26) cited in (Palmer, et al., 2009), stated the benefits of good governance in land administration were to reduce corruption, prevent environmental degradation, increase land tenure and give priority for the poor. In contrast, Solomon (2013:26) cited in (Wehrmann, 2012) discussed that weak land governance causes insecurity of tenure, high transaction costs, informal land transactions or an informal property market, reduced private sector investment, illegal transfer of state land, limited local revenues, land conflicts, landlessness and inequitable land distribution, social instability, social exclusion and political instability, erosion of ethics and also standards of unsustainable natural resources management.

In Ethiopia under the FDRE, urban land is governed and administrated by the urban land leasehold law which has been amended three times since its first application in 1993. The first urban land leasehold law, (proclamation 80/1993) by the Transitional Government of Ethiopia (TGE) and second (proclamation 272/2002a) by FDRE were issued without underlying urban land policy. Third urban land leasehold law (Proclamation No. 721/2011) was also issued following the acceptance of the first urban land management policy (FDRE 2011b) (Alemie, 2015:25). However, good urban governance practice in land administration has not improved. Poor urban governance in land administration is still ongoing (Ibid). This is true at local level at Shambu town, according to my observation, where this study was regarding the challenges and prospects of good urban governance practice in land administration conducted.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In Ethiopia, urban land administration is often perceived as one of the most corrupt sectors in public administration (Yiadom, et al., 2014:5). Under the FDRE, urban land is governed and administrated by the urban land leasehold law which has been amended three times since its first enactment in 1993 (No. 80/1993, 272/2002 and 721/2011) without any assessment ((FIG, 2015:3). Even though proclamations made, urban land mal-governance has persisted (Ashenafi, 2015:19). As Alemie (2015, 19) cited in (Bjorn 2008 existing understandings and assessments of land governance are usually confined to national, city and sub national level (Alemie, 2015:1). The land governance assessment framework (LGAF) is good in this regard; it has, however, only considered the national context until recently.

For instance, Zevenbergen, et al., (2015:18) have conducted studies involving Bahir Dar, Dire Dawa and Hawassa cities and stated that “land administration and land governance was generally weak and surrounded by a growing number of weaknesses and threats”. Berhanu and Fayera(2005), on examining land right registration in the Amhara region, came to a finding that: “the monetary cost of land right registration in urban areas includes informal transactions costs (bribing), for example and official costs, such as surveyors costs, transport and material costs, photo copies and other costs extremely affect the poor” (2005:12). Similarly, Yiadom, et al., (2014) conducted a study at Hawassa and concluded that, “governance in the city is weak which leads to an ill-functioning land delivery system.”

Furthermore, in reviewing and testing against evidence obtained through discussion with the public and officials in land administration research covered four municipalities - Harar, Awash 7-killo, Bonga and Mekelle - across the country by Van Dijk and Fransen concluded that “…administration of public land by municipal authorities has been poor and that, if the present trend continues, it is difficult to expect the increase of urban development without radical change to the system of land administration” ( Van Dijk and Fransen 2008:18).

This literature and related literature on urban land governance mainly focus on the national, sub national and city levels. Nevertheless, urban land governance and development are greatly influenced by local governmental actors in a given jurisdiction. To fill this gap, the researcher was inspired to undertake research on an assessment of the challenges and prospects of good urban governance practice in urban land administration in the case of Shambu town (district), Horro Guduru Wellega, Oromia regional state where there is manifestation of poor urban land governance and where no research has been conducted on the topic yet.
OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main objective of the study was to assess the challenges and prospects of good urban governance practice in land administration of Shambu town. However, the specific objectives of the study are:

• To identify the extent of involvement of community members in urban land delivery process
• To identify the extent of transparency and accountability of municipality related to urban land administration
• To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of urban land administrative officials to perform their duties
• To identify the municipality’s accountability and impartiality in urban land administration
• To assess the main challenges of municipality to practice good urban governance in land administration.
• To identify the perceptions of experts and officials to practice good governance in urban land administration in the future

BASIC RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. To what extent the municipal has ensured involvement of community members in the urban land delivery process?
2. To what extent the municipal government ensured transparency and accountability in urban land administration system?
3. Does the urban land administration office official perform their responsibilities in an efficient and effective manner?
4. Does the municipal government provide equal opportunity and response to the needs and demands of residents and other stakeholders in managing, registration and transferring urban land?
5. What are the major challenges in ensuring good urban governance in land administration in Shambu town?
6. What are the perception of experts and employees of urban land administrative office to practice good governance in urban land administration in the future?

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

As Deininger et al (nd: 3) cited in Kaufmann and Kray (2008) governance indicators can be categorized into rule-based and outcome-based. Deininger also asserted that Rule-based indicators assess whether institutions generally presumed to be associated with good governance such as anti-corruption commissions are in place. This clearly linked to positive outcomes and easily observed by outsiders. On other hand, outcome-based indicators, by contrast, focus on either broad citizen perceptions, the extent to which (potential) users find public services to be easily accessed and responsive to their needs, or expert opinion about the de facto implementation of rules. In practice, output- and rule-based indicators can complement each other (Deininger et al nd: 4).

URBAN LAND GOVERNANCE

Urbanization increases the demand for land: more land user and land interests are involved urban land than rural areas. These new interests put enormous stress and challenges on urban land which need well organized decision to harmonize these diverse interests (Alemie, 2015; 105). (Burn and Darlymple, 2008:3) commented “that weak institution and the high land values lead corruption actions and informal settlement”. Related to these, (Yiadom 2005: 17) assert that urban laws are often subject to constant change because actors are misinformed, confused, or untrusting. For instance, in Ethiopia the urban land leasehold proclamation was modified three times since its inception in 1993(Burns and Dalrymple, 2008: 3). These indicates the institutional and organizational functions that are responsible for dealing with the issue of people–to–people relations are weak and fragmented. So, incorporating good governance into policy making and implementation is a central for tackling the challenges above. This is because the applying good governance concept creates platform that encourages different actors to participate, various interests be discussed and argued and collaboration during policy making and implementation to strengthened.
As (Alemie, 2015:107), applying good governance in urban land administration has at least three advantages: First, it pinpoints the exact causes of the urban people to urban land problem such as urban land access and urban land uses at local level. Second, a governance approach provokes discussions among diverse actors including urban people, to scrutinize alternative solutions to the problems identified. Third, it forms a shared platform to follow up proper implementation of the solution is identified. And generalized as these combined lead to the achievement of the desired policy out comes and thereby the goals of sustainable development.

In addition, (Burn and Dalrymple, 2008:5) commented that contemporary urbanization and associated public service such as provision of housing, utilities, infrastructures, waste management are related to urban land and they need notion of urban land governance to improve the lives of urban poor and consequently support the realization of sustainable development in a country or nation more broadly.

GOOD GOVERNANCE IN LAND ADMINISTRATION

Good governance in land administration aims to protect the property rights of individuals and enterprise as well as of the state by introducing principles such as transparency, accountability, rule of law, equity, participation, effective and efficiencies in to land related administration (Burn and Dalrymple, 2008:5). Governance in land administration is becoming an important issue in many countries, as land management, particularly in developing countries, where corruption and rent-seeking grows increasingly. Corruption and rent-seeking are much linked to bad governance in developing countries where control over land rights is used as a means of accumulating and dispensing political and economic power and privilege through patronage, nepotism and corruption (FAO, 2007:16). Poor land governance is also related to growing insecurity in property rights and a high level of bribery and corruption in land administration activities, especially in the developing world.

On other hand, studies conducted by researchers (Antwie, 2000; 78, Burn and Dalrymple, 2008 :8) in developing countries have witnessed that cities of developing countries were unable to provide affordable urban land in sufficient quantities, particularly for the urban poor, because of inefficiency and ineffectiveness of land management. Regarding this, Burnes and Dalrymple (2008:2) pointed out that “Weak governance will affect the poor in particular and may leave them marginalized and outside the law. Good governance in land administration is central to achieving good governance in society”. One of the reasons for the prevalence of inefficiencies in public land management is the lack of good governance (FIG/World Bank, 2009:24). Rajack (2009:3) has argued that “if public authority or the land market fail to provide land for housing and economic activities due to weak land governance, it is inevitable to emerge informal land market.” Therefore, poor governance is the main factor for the in-efficient and in-effective land management in the cities.

Burnes and Dalrymple (2008:4) have argued that overlapping land regulations, weak institutions, limited accountability, and incomplete property registration systems create a fertile environment for petty corruption and grand misuse of public scarce resources. They further argued that weak land governance provides the political elites and government officials with a means to seek illegal gratification (bribes) in return for their services such as land leasing to investors. Again, Burnes and Dalrymple (2008:1) have noted that “Land administration is often perceived as one of the most corrupt sectors in public administration. Land itself, considered a primary source of wealth, often becomes the trading medium and motivation for political issues, economic and power gains, and self-fulfilling interests.” High profile corruption cases are, for example, found in the land sector in Kenya, Indonesia, India, China, Tanzania and Cambodia (Massum, 2009). “The Transparency International (TI) survey of 2002 in South Asia revealed that land has become the 2nd corruption-prone sector in Pakistan; 3rd in India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka; and 4th in Thailand” (Ibid). McAuslan (2002:27) has also pointed out that: “senior politicians and public servants in cities all over the world manipulate or ignore the law and administration relating to land allocation and development so as to line their own pockets and those of their families, friends and political allies”.

Another constraint to increasing land access for poor and attracting the private sector to participate in land development is the lengthy administrative procedures. Research in many developing countries (Bolivia, India, Lesotho, South Africa and Tanzania) found that administrative procedures imposed constraints to the urban poor to obtain land through formal procedure (Payne, 2002: 12). It is because of this factor that most people, including
middle and high income groups, have looked to informal means to obtain land. There are many consequences of poor governance in land management that have direct and indirect impacts on cities, such as unplanned urbanization, land speculation, inequitable land distribution, and bribery in land allocation and development. Generally, most literature reflects as urban good governance practice in land administration is vital to solve urban problem and bring urban development.

OVERVIEW OF LAND ADMINISTRATION IN ETHIOPIA

Land administration is the processes of determining, recording and disseminating information about tenure, value and use of land when implementing land management policies (Solomon and Rinfied, 2003: 2-3). Land tenure in Ethiopia has undergone dramatic shifts from feudalistic systems under the monarchy of Emperor Haile Selassie (1930-1974) to socialist land policies under the Dergue military government (1974-1991), to the current system under the Ethiopian People’s Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) who took control in 1991. This has left peoples under uncertain about their rights (Tetra Tech 2013: 6). In Ethiopia; all land is under public/state ownership. While land is not subject to sale or other means of exchange, the government does recognize use rights and holdings. On other hand, Ethiopia’s federal structure gives its regions a lot of autonomy, which, in turn, has led to a coexistence of different laws and institutions with unclear responsibilities at different levels (World Bank 2012: 79).

As international transparency (2014:5) found out, urban land administration is delegated under the federal constitution to city governments and municipalities. However, there is no common system to administer land in urban areas. Urban land is provided through a lease system, a perpetual permit system and separate legislation for condominiums. According to this, urban land lease holding proclamation stipulates that the leasing system will apply to all urban areas irrespective of how they were acquired, relevant authorities have yet to adopt the leasing system. This also asserted, there is no real system to record rights and restrictions and the registry faces capacity issues.

THE HISTORY OF LAND LEASE IN ETHIOPIA

Then after the down fall of the Dergue regime, the government led by EPRDF that took power in 1991, even if did not change the public ownership of land in general, has made important changes on policies of urban land. Lease became the over-riding urban land holding system through proclamation No.80/1993. This proclamation enabled the government to transfer urban land administration from the permit system to leasehold system. This lease holding proclamation was replaced by urban lands lease holding proclamation No. 272/2002. Of course, these former urban land lease holding proclamations were not practically applicable to all urban centers throughout the country and it is the new proclamation No.721/2011 which has expressly provided that every urban center in Ethiopia will be administered by the lease proclamation even if there is a transitional period of five years depending on the decision of the concerned regional cabinets for some towns found in the various regions (Araya, 2013:24-25).

According to Araya (2013:26),the purpose of the new urban lease holding proclamation were: providing an appropriate urban land administration which is efficient and responsive to demand created due to the sustainable rapid economic growth registered across all economic sectors and regions in the country, ensuring the prevalence of good governance, and robust free market economy.

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Good governance in land administration cannot strictly be differentiated from other sectors. However, while there are many institutions and scholars promoting good land governance in their works, there are three distinctive frameworks specifically developed for good governance in land administration. The frameworks include the UN-Habitat, World Bank and FAO good governance principles on land administration.
THE UN-HABITAT GOOD LAND GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

The first framework was developed by UN-Habitat in 1999 and compiled later in 2004. Based on Amartya Sen’s concept of development as freedom, the UN-Habitat developed five good governance principles in land administration. The principles are effectiveness, equity, accountability, participation and security (UN-Habitat 2004:14). UN-Habitat developed the Urban Governance Index (UGI), to lay down key principles geared towards promoting good urban governance around the world (Ibid).

WORLD BANK GOOD LAND GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

The second framework found was from the World Bank. The World Bank developed a Conceptual Framework for good land governance with eight (8) principles in 2008 (Burns and Dalrymple 2008:7). The principles include fairness and equity, market justified land management control, transparency, good land information, clear procedure in land disposition, recognition of social land rights, and market based valuation of land and good land disputes settlement system (Ibid).

FAO GOOD LAND ADMINISTRATION FRAMEWORK

The third framework was devised by the FAO in 2007. The FAO developed twelve (12) good governance principles including efficiency, responsiveness, competence, transparency, consistency, accountability, equality, sustainability, participation, security, integrity of land officials, and locally responsive land administration system (FAO 2007:9). Researcher assessed the challenges and prospects of good urban governance practice in land administration on basis of five good urban governance principles: participation, transparency, accountability, equity, effectiveness and efficiency.

These principles were selected for the following critical reasons: local applicability, the day to day face of local administrative agencies and clients who are serviced by the urban land administrative office and the dimensions selected were found to be common in urban land administration at most local levels in that they involve issues of land delivery in urban areas.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The practice of good governance in separate agencies and programs no longer satisfies citizens, politicians, economists, developmental planner and even researchers. This is true in urban land administration which ranks highly regarding corruption. Proper practice of good governance enhances effective urban land administration and leads to sustainable urban development.
These principles of good governance affect both negatively or positively the practice of good governance in urban land administration. The practice of these principles in urban land administration give effective urban land administration which leads to urban development in contrast to ineffective urban land administration and its negative consequences that deters urban development.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK USED TO ANALYZE DATA

Data were analyzed using the following concepts taken from the review literature part of this paper and the researchers developed the following framework based on FAO (2007), UN-habitat (2014), Burns and Dalrymple (2008), Tuladhar, Zevenbergen etal. (2010), UND (2006), Bell, (2007) and Arko, (2011), to collect and analyze data.

**Participation**- is the act of engagement of stakeholders at various levels in decision making processes regarding land issues that affect their interest. The indicators of participation include: the extent of involvement of community members in the land delivery processes, plan preparation, policy decision, and the implementation of laws and regulations.

**Transparency**- means that information is freely available and accessible so that land management decisions and their enforcement are made honestly and fairly by institutions mandated for the same. The indicators of transparency include: clarity of land delivery processes, clarity and accessibility of the laws and rules regulating land delivery, as well as free flow of and accessible land market information to all.

**Accountability**- is the answerability of institutions or/and servants for their actions and resulting consequences in implementing land policies. The indicators of accountability include: the mechanism of reporting, mechanisms of declaration of financial statements, mechanisms for questioning and appeal mechanisms for conflict resolution.

**Equity**- is a way of providing equal opportunity for all to access land and land information without legal impediment or procedural difficulties. The indicators of equity include: equitable access to land and land information as well as fair compensation.

**Efficiency and Effectiveness**- regard the quality of processes for managing land while making the best use of it to meet user needs (service levels and costs) without wastage. Some indicators of efficiency and effectiveness, include customer satisfaction; risk of bribery, competency, land conflict resolution mechanisms, land registration systems;
and time, cost and clarity of procedures to access land, availability of a single agency and “one stop shop offices”, plus the separation of front and back office.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study employed descriptive case study with mixed research approach methods which included a survey questionnaire (close ended and open ended questions), interview (semi structured interview) and focus group discussions. Accordingly, the study cross-checked data in order to answer study objectives.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The study focused on assessing the challenges and prospects of good urban governance practice in land administration in the case of Shambu town. The researchers elected Shambu town after critical observation and aimed to fill a gap referring to urban land governance focused on national, sub-national and city level. Based on the time required to accomplish the research, the researchers employed a cross sectional research design because this would enable them to collect data from many people at one particular point in time. Moreover, descriptive case study design was employed to describe the challenges and prospects of urban good governance practice in land administration and to discover the challenges involved.

DATA TYPE AND MEASUREMENT SCALE

This research utilizes quantitative data generated by a cross-sectional survey questionnaire and qualitative data collected via key informant interview, focus-group discussion, and open-ended questions. In this study, quantitative data was measured on a measurement scale. The Likert scale was employed for closed-ended questions. In this research respondents were asked to rate each item on a Likert-type scale by assigning a value of 1= (strongly disagree) to 5= (strongly agree), as suggested by Bahia and Nantel (2000).

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE INSTRUMENT

To assure the validity of instruments for data collection, expertise opinion was solicited from different scholars regarding developing of the questionnaires. The pilot study was conducted on ten participants who were believed to be in a position to provide relevant inputs regarding the improvement and revision of the data collection instrument. Researchers used triangulation to cross-check different data collected via questionnaires, interviews, and document review.

Respondents were persuaded to take part as the research was used only for academic purposes to avoid any bias. Efforts were exerted to avoid ambiguity in the setting and asking of the questions and researchers employed instruments of data collection that were relevant to the research objectives. The researchers have ensured of the reliability of their research by repeatedly listening to voice records of the versions interviews.

SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

Non-probability and probability sampling techniques were employed to select samples from the population. The researchers purposely selected the key informants: mayor, technical staff of municipality, head of urban land development and management office for interviews and each kebele’s administrators, members of zonal urban land development and management, head of urban investment offices considering them all as valuable providers of information.

From probability sampling, the researchers used systematic random sampling to identify respondents from two kebeles (01 and 02) of Shambu town. If the population contains N ordered element, and the sample size of n is required or desired for selection we found the ratio of these two numbers, i.e., N/n to obtain the sampling interval.
POPULATION

The population is the universe of residents or peoples which the sample is drawn from. The study population for this research consisted of the heads of households in the town. According to the data obtained from the municipality, the number of households in the town in 2007 E.C totally 3532 of which 1640 in kebele 01 and 1892 in kebele 02. The sample was drawn from these households. Additionally, the head urban land development and management office, mayor, municipal technical staff, zonal urban land development and management staff, kebele administrators and heads of urban investment administration office were selected.

SAMPLE SIZE

Shambu town has only two kebeles and the study consists of these two kebeles to make a representative sample. Firstly, the total sample size was determined from heads of households by using a formula. Secondly, after the total sample size was determined, the sample size for each kebele was determined from the total sample size based on the heads of the household size of each kebele to ensure a proportional representation of each.

To calculate the sample size, different authors have chosen different formulas. For the purpose of this study, the researcher used the formula by Kothari (1995), calculated as follows considering a level of acceptable margin of error at 7%. Therefore, the sample size of household respondents was determined by using the following formula. If N is between 1,000 and 10,000, the sample size was calculated as the follows:-

\[ n = \frac{z^2pq}{d^2} \]

where:
- \( N \) = target population
- \( n \) = desired sample size
- \( z \) = confidence level (93% = standard value is 1.96)
- \( p \) = estimated characteristics of study population (0.5)
- \( q \) = 1−p
- \( d \) = level of statistical significance set or margin of error (standard value is 0.05)

\[ n = \frac{(1.96)(0.5)(0.5)}{(0.07)^2} = 196. \]

So, since total population is 3532, a number lying between 1,000 and 10,000, the sample size was calculated as

\[ \frac{196}{1+196/3532} = 186 \]

Thus, the sample was arrived at by first selecting a random starting point and then picking every K on element in the population for both households of independent kebeles for the sampling frame. To compute \( K \), we used the formula

\[ K = \frac{N}{n} \]

Kebele 01 \( K = \frac{3532}{1640} = 2 \) and
Kebele 02 \( K = \frac{3532}{1892} = 2 \)

Hence, every 2\(^{nd}\) head of households in kebele 01, kebele02 was selected by using the kebeles respective registers. The sample size for each kebele was determined from the total sample size based on the heads of household size of each kebele by stratified sampling formula.

- \( n_1 = \frac{(n/N)N_1}{1+1/n/N} \)
- \( N_1 = \)population size in stratum
- \( n = \)total sample size required for study
- \( N = \)the total number of elements in the population all strata taken together
- \( n_1 = \)the sample size in stratum 1

Based on this kebele 01=(186/3532)1640=86.Kebele02=(186/3532)1892= 100.
METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

The qualitative and quantitative data collected from respondents by employing survey, interview and focus group discussion methods: tools of data collections. Percentage used to analyze the quantitative data. In the process of mixed data analysis, qualitative dominant data analysis was employed. In order to complement the information, data was collected by different instruments of data collection. Appropriate tools and sampling size were selected to keep validity.

One hundred and eighty-six (186) questionnaires were distributed to head of households. Out of these, 180 questionnaires were returned and entered to SPSS version 16 for the statistical analysis. The result of statistical analysis is presented using percentage, tables and graphs as they are simple to work with and easy to understand while data that was collected through interviews as designed involving five (5) people and focus group discussion involving nine (9) people were analyzed by description and triangulation methods.

MAJOR FINDINGS

The research identified several challenges of good urban governance practice in land administration in Shambu town. With regard to participation in land management activities in the town, 80.6% of the respondents confirmed that the level of residents’ participation in decision making is very low. Similarly, residents’ involvement in the urban land delivery and planning process has also been rated as very low. This shows that The door of municipal is closed to involvement and the policy of land itself is not good for participation. It is top down, not bottom up, and the municipality not considers what residents say only what proclamations, directives and charter say.

Concerning transparency, there is no transparency of municipal officials and urban land development and development management officials in the town. 77.8 % of survey participants responded that the level of transparency was very low. The study found that the extent of clarity and accessibility regarding newly enacted land laws, proclamations and directives and the extent of transparency of land delivery of the municipality were very low as perceived by the respondent residents and participants in the focus group discussion.

Furthermore, the study also showed that information provided by the municipality was very poor. There are no computerized records and no registration system.

Absence of system by which residents can held officials accountable is also hindering good land management practices in the town. Accordingly, the study revealed that 92.2% of the respondents are to the view that there are no mechanisms of holding the town officials accountable for the duties and responsibilities assigned to them specifically in relation to managing land. According to interviewed respondents this leads to a high practice of corruption in the town and the abuse of official responsibilities for private gain rather than discharging their officially assigned responsibilities as per the rules and regulations. Nepotism and favoritism by which officials use their influence to favor their families, political associates and friends are especially rife in the town. In this regard, 43.9% of survey respondents confirmed that corruption and rent seeking behavior is a deterrent to good urban land governance.
This study also indicates that there is no declaration of financial statements accrued from land delivery to residents or others stakeholders. The revenue gathered from transferring land to the end users is not usually publicized to the town residents. Obviously, the absence of a mechanism for holding officials accountable, the lack of declaration of financial statement to the public and the absence of meaningful external auditing energizes corruption among officials in the urban land administration office within the municipality.

The study also revealed that there are no mechanisms of ensuring equity in accessing land to all categories of residents in the town. 62.2% of the respondents confirmed the same reinforcing the fact that there is no equal access to land information and access to land for building a house. Even though the municipal officials and the mayor defends that the municipal government adheres to the principle of impartiality, the reality on the ground as testified by focused group discussants, shows that some group of people are receiving special treatment while that majority of others are marginalized from getting access to a plot of land. The absence affirmative treatment and financial subsidies for the poor people to help them to have access to land itself implies absence of ways to ensure equitable distribution of land. The major problem of the town is a distributional problem as identified by the study. The principle that “all people should have the same access to service and receive the same service standards” has not been translated into action.

Furthermore, the study also exhibited the ineffectiveness and inefficiency of municipality officials in delivering services to the public. 67.2 % of survey participants highlighted the low level of efficiency and effectiveness in discharging their official responsibilities. The study also disclosed the low level of service users’ satisfaction with the municipal staff as workers of the municipality do not perform their duties diligently and objectively without expecting bribes from service users.

In a nutshell participants of the study outlined the major challenges of good governance in relation to land administration in the town involving: corruption and rent seeking, lack of commitment of officials and experts and absence of mechanism to make municipal official accountable for their misdeeds. In addition, the fact that they give primacy to show political loyalty to their bosses other than discharging their duties in the most effective manner is also anchoring effective land administration in the town. Moreover, lack of resources, scarcity of qualified or competent staff, weak institutional capacity and a lack of necessary infrastructure are also additional factors that limit effective land management in Shambu town.

Dwelling on the findings discussed above the study underlines the following key points that needs to be taken in to account in order the improve the system of land management in the town:

- Enhancing institutional human resource capacity in terms of qualified and skilled man power,
- Provide adequate training to employees on the concept and principles of good governance,
- Promoting e-governance to enhance service delivery and for better documentation of files
- Encouraging participation of residents and other stakeholders on the decision making process of the municipality,
- Rewarding good performing employees and taking corrective measures against those who utilize their official positions for their own personal gains.
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