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Overview

• Overview of PRIndex
• Stage of development
• Current thinking and outstanding questions:
  – How to use/not use indices and scoreboards?
  – How to communicate to the wider public?
The problem

• Lack of comparative information about no. of insecure people
• Pilots in eight countries: 25% feel insecure
• How to make decisions on:
  – Policy?
  – Resources?
• How to track progress... and
• Create pressure for progress?

PERCEIVED TENURE INSECURITY: PRELIMINARY COUNTRY-LEVEL RESULTS

Results from our initial research in eight countries show that an average of 25% of people interviewed felt insecure about their property.

1 IN 4 PEOPLE ARE WORRIED ABOUT LOSING THEIR HOME
The problem confirmed

4.6 Worry about losing right to live in property/dwelling in the next 5 years

This question has the lowest proportion of DK/Refused (particularly noticeable in TZ). Similar to 4.2, CO and TZ trail IN in perceived security, though they are closer. Most of the worried express only doubt (somewhat worried), while a relatively low proportion feel very worried/worried.

![Bar chart showing worry levels and security status for different countries with numeric values.]
What is PRIndex?

- A global and national-level **baseline of peoples’ perceptions of their land tenure/property rights security**
- Success with PRIndex will:
  - **give voice** to billions without property rights
  - **create an evidence base** for policy-making around property rights
  - act as a **transparent and public means** for countries to see how they are faring
  - systematically **track progress** towards improving tenure security
  - provide **justification for more funding** to flow into this space
PRIndex: A critical moment in time

There is a unique opportunity to influence the SDGs by providing data needed to elevate Indicator 1.4.2 to Tier 2 by November 2017 and to Tier 1 by 2020.

Evolving survey and sampling methods enable rapid, cost-effective collection of precise data at an unprecedented scale.

A piloted methodology

2015
- Conducted a pretest in India with 14,000 respondents across 14 states in collaboration with Gallup via a face-to-face methodology.

2016
- Conducted an 8-country pilot in collaboration with Gallup, including both in-depth cognitive interviews and a quantitative survey.
- Conducted a test of three rapid cycle research methodologies (web-intercept, IVR, and SMS) for purposes of assessing the efficacy of potentially faster, more cost-effective data collection platforms.

Funding to implement global scale-up

Now

2018
- Roll out PRIndex to between 35 and 70 countries in 2018.

Anticipated next steps

2019
- Roll out PRIndex to between 70 and 140 countries by the end of 2019.
- Build a research and advocacy movement around the results.
Methodology

Implementation

- Face-to-face interviews conducted from August to September in India and from September to October in Tanzania and Colombia
  - Cluster sampling
  - Random walk and Kish Grid selection
  - Data weighted by age, gender, rural/urban, state population. In India, also weighted by SEC.
- Data collection coordinated by Karvy Insights in India and by Cross-tab in Tanzania and Colombia
- Data collection vendors managed by Land Alliance and FactWorks GmbH
- Analysis conducted by FactWorks GmbH in collaboration with Land Alliance
- Measure perceptions of individual people not households

Analysis Approach

- Four core tenure security questions were tested
- A composite security score variable was constructed based on responses to multiple questions in the survey including the four core security questions and each respondent was assigned a score
- Each core tenure security question was evaluated separately for each country in terms of:
  - How well it predicted the composite security score (using security/insecurity classification and multiple regression)
  - It’s consistency of relationships with other variables
  - Proportion of DK/Refused responses

Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Tanzania</th>
<th>India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>3,942</td>
<td>3,904</td>
<td>16,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Sampling Units</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indices & scoreboards: how to use/not to use?
## Three approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Defining Features</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperative</strong></td>
<td>Proponent of indicator actively collaborates with stakeholders that wish to implement the author’s indicator framework</td>
<td>• Possible to maintain independence that maximises potential ‘market’&lt;br&gt;• Breaks down obstacles to uptake</td>
<td>• Resource efficiency if have to deal with multiple individuals/organisations?&lt;br&gt;• Visibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td>Author compiles and packages an index and leaves others to use the data as they wish</td>
<td>• Objectivity ensured</td>
<td>• Requires visibility&lt;br&gt;• Works best when used by actors that are already command attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy</strong></td>
<td>Author uses the data produced in the index to explicitly advance a campaign of advocacy</td>
<td>• Highly visible</td>
<td>• Risks alienating potential users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some conclusions & recommendations

• Relevance, credibility & legitimacy are key:
  – Relies on (perceived) objectivity of institution(s), approach & messaging

• Could be important to build coalitions with those that national governments & other users view as allies

• Could need to adopt a combination of the three approaches:
  – Depends on timing & context
  – Need to be conscious of risks/drawbacks of each approach
  – Operating within parameters of ODI’s mission and rules of engagement
Three CRI objectives

- Establish PRIndex as a go-to, credible source of data to inform key debates in development
Three CRI objectives

- Help to set the land and property rights agenda at a global level by building on the SDGs
Three CRI objectives

- Influence action at national level
Strategies, channels and partnerships

- Digital engagement
- Blogs, Op-eds and media engagement
- Publications and data visualisation – digital first
- Events and meetings
- Launches and announcements
- Relationships with key organisations and champions in priority countries
Some outstanding questions

• How best to present data?
  – Composite security score?
  – Ranking?

• Level of value to add to data?

• Best platforms to make data accessible?
References, links, etc.

- **Websites:**
  - [http://www.prindex.net/](http://www.prindex.net/)

- **Contacts:**
  - a.locke@odi.org
  - mchildress1@landallianceinc.org