



**LAND MANAGEMENT, ENVIRONMENT & SOLID-WASTE:  
INSIDE EDUCATION AND BUSINESS IN CENTRAL ASIA  
ERASMUS-EDU-2023-CBHE Project Number: 101129032**

**MICRO-CREDENTIAL**

**LAND MANAGEMENT IN CENTRAL ASIA**

**8.- State Role in Land Resource Management**

***Activity***

***Analyze state land policy tools***



Co-funded by  
the European Union

*Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.*

# Activity Workbook

---

## Analyze State Land Policy Tools

### Purpose

This activity package helps students identify, classify, and evaluate state land policy tools. It is designed for classroom discussion, guided group work, and short policy writing. The structure follows the logic of the course sequence on state land policy, regulation of land relations, government management mechanisms, land legislation, land users, institutional responsibilities, and state review.

**Source anchor:** Course textbook: Q. Rahmonov, Sh.K. Narbayev, Z.M. Muqimov, Yer resurslarini boshqarish (2018); FAO, Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT); World Bank, Land Governance Assessment Framework (LGAF); ADB, Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management (CACILM); UNCCD, land degradation neutrality and tenure guidance; Land Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan

### Recommended classroom use

- Individual preparation: 15–20 minutes
- Small-group analysis: 25–35 minutes
- Whole-class synthesis: 20–30 minutes
- Short policy memo or reflection: 15–20 minutes

Instructor may adapt the case prompts to Uzbekistan, Central Asia, or another national context.

# 1. Learning Objectives

By the end of this activity, students should be able to:

- Define what a state land policy tool is and explain why governments use different tool combinations instead of relying on one instrument only.
- Distinguish among legal, administrative, economic, planning, information, and participatory tools in land governance.
- Assess the strengths, limits, trade-offs, and implementation risks of different policy tools.
- Relate land policy tools to land users, institutions, public interests, environmental protection, and long-term sustainability.
- Prepare a concise policy recommendation using evidence, stakeholder analysis, and clear reasoning.

## 2. Core Idea

State land policy is implemented through tools. A tool may be a law, a tax, a land-use plan, a cadastre, a permit, an inspection system, a subsidy, a public consultation procedure, a restoration requirement, or a dispute-resolution mechanism. The quality of land governance depends not only on having tools, but on choosing the right mix, sequencing them well, and applying them fairly and transparently.

**Source anchor:** VGGT: secure tenure, equitable access, accountability, transparency; LGAF: land governance can be assessed through rights, institutions, use planning, public land, valuation, taxation, dispute resolution

## 3. How to Work with the Activity

| Step | Task                                                                                                                       |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A    | Read the short conceptual notes and identify the category of each policy tool.                                             |
| B    | Use the worksheets to compare tools by purpose, legal basis, institutional lead, expected effect, and implementation risk. |
| C    | Apply the tools to one of the mini-cases in this workbook or to a real local example.                                      |
| D    | Discuss which mix of tools is most suitable and why.                                                                       |
| E    | Write a short policy memo or present a group conclusion.                                                                   |

### Tip for students

Avoid treating land policy tools as isolated items. A cadastral update without legal clarity, or a subsidy without monitoring, often produces weak outcomes. Ask how tools reinforce each other.

## 4. What Counts as a State Land Policy Tool?

A land policy tool is any state instrument used to guide land relations, allocate rights, influence behavior, protect resources, resolve disputes, or improve public welfare through land management. In practice, tools are used for at least six purposes:

| Tool family                                   | Typical examples and main purpose                                                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Legal and regulatory tools</b>             | Land laws, secondary regulations, zoning rules, restrictions, standards, environmental requirements, registration rules. |
| <b>Administrative tools</b>                   | Permits, approvals, inspections, compliance orders, land allocation procedures, enforcement actions.                     |
| <b>Planning and spatial tools</b>             | Master plans, land-use plans, protected area plans, irrigation plans, land consolidation design.                         |
| <b>Information tools</b>                      | Cadastral, land records, maps, monitoring systems, valuation data, digital platforms, public disclosure systems.         |
| <b>Economic tools</b>                         | Taxes, rent, fees, compensation rules, subsidies, penalties, incentives for conservation or restoration.                 |
| <b>Participatory and accountability tools</b> | Public hearings, grievance channels, mediation, stakeholder councils, open data, social audits.                          |

No single family is sufficient by itself. Effective land governance usually combines legal clarity, institutional capacity, reliable information, economic incentives, and some form of accountability.

**Source anchor:** Course textbook chapters on land management mechanisms and state regulation; FAO governance and policy support resources; World Bank LGAF overview

## 5. Analytical Framework for Comparing Tools

Use the following six questions whenever you analyze a land policy tool. They transform a descriptive discussion into a policy analysis.

| Question                                                  | What to examine                                                                                                                                       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>1. What problem is the tool trying to solve?</b>       | For example: insecure rights, inefficient allocation, overuse, land degradation, weak records, unfair access, poor compliance.                        |
| <b>2. What is the legal and institutional basis?</b>      | Identify the law, regulation, mandate, and responsible institution. Ask whether authority is clear or fragmented.                                     |
| <b>3. Who gains, who bears costs, and who may resist?</b> | Assess land users, local government, private actors, farmers, vulnerable groups, and environmental interests.                                         |
| <b>4. What behavior does the tool try to change?</b>      | Is it prohibiting, requiring, encouraging, informing, coordinating, or compensating?                                                                  |
| <b>5. How will performance be monitored?</b>              | Look for measurable indicators, inspections, reporting, grievance channels, or digital records.                                                       |
| <b>6. What are the likely trade-offs?</b>                 | Efficiency versus equity, protection versus flexibility, short-term revenue versus long-term sustainability, central control versus local adaptation. |

### Good practice reminder

A tool should not be judged only by its intention. It should also be judged by implementation capacity, transaction costs, distributional effects, and the likelihood of compliance.

## 6. Activity 1 — Tool Identification and Classification

Below is a list of common state land policy tools. Classify each one, identify its main objective, and explain one strength and one limitation.

| Policy tool                                   | Tool family | Main objective | One strength | One limitation |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Land registration and cadastral update        |             |                |              |                |
| Agricultural land-use zoning restriction      |             |                |              |                |
| Land tax or land rent adjustment              |             |                |              |                |
| Permit requirement for land conversion        |             |                |              |                |
| Subsidy for soil and water conservation       |             |                |              |                |
| Public hearing before large land reallocation |             |                |              |                |
| Monitoring system for degradation hotspots    |             |                |              |                |

### Suggested method

Students should first classify the tools individually, then compare answers in pairs. The group should discuss why the same tool can sometimes serve more than one policy purpose.

# 7. Activity 2 — Match Tools to Policy Problems

For each policy problem below, propose a package of at least three tools. Then explain why a single-tool approach would be insufficient.

| Policy problem                                          | Recommended tool package | Why this combination fits | Key risk |
|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------|
| Weak protection of irrigated agricultural land          |                          |                           |          |
| Unclear boundaries and disputes among neighboring users |                          |                           |          |
| Rapid peri-urban conversion of productive land          |                          |                           |          |
| Degradation of pastures and common land                 |                          |                           |          |
| Low public trust in land allocation decisions           |                          |                           |          |

**Source anchor:** ADB CACILM: land degradation and rural livelihoods in Central Asia; UNCCD: tenure and good governance matter for land degradation neutrality

## 8. Activity 3 — Stakeholder and Responsibility Mapping

Select one land policy tool from the previous activities. Map who designs it, who implements it, who is affected by it, and who checks whether it is working.

| Actor / stakeholder                 | Formal role | Interest or concern | Influence on outcome |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Central government                  |             |                     |                      |
| Regional or district authority      |             |                     |                      |
| Cadastre / land administration body |             |                     |                      |
| Land users                          |             |                     |                      |
| Environmental body                  |             |                     |                      |
| Civil society / public              |             |                     |                      |

### Extension question

Where do responsibilities overlap? If several institutions hold partial authority, identify where coordination failure may occur and what mechanism could reduce it.

# 9. Activity 4 — Trade-off Analysis

A tool that improves one objective may weaken another. Use the matrix below to evaluate trade-offs. Mark each criterion as strong positive, moderate positive, neutral, moderate negative, or strong negative.

| Criterion                     | Tool A | Tool B | Tool C | Most balanced? | Reason |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|----------------|--------|
| Administrative feasibility    |        |        |        |                |        |
| Equity for land users         |        |        |        |                |        |
| Environmental protection      |        |        |        |                |        |
| Economic efficiency           |        |        |        |                |        |
| Transparency / accountability |        |        |        |                |        |
| Long-term sustainability      |        |        |        |                |        |

Use this matrix to compare, for example, a strict prohibition, a tax instrument, and a mixed package with monitoring and incentives.

## 10. Mini-Case A — Protecting Productive Irrigated Land

A district government faces rising pressure to convert irrigated agricultural land to non-agricultural uses. Investors argue that conversion will increase local revenue and employment. Farmers argue that the area has strategic food-production value and irrigation infrastructure that cannot be easily replaced.

- Identify the main policy problem in one sentence.
- Choose four policy tools that the state could use.
- Separate immediate controls from long-term management tools.
- Explain how the state should balance public interest, private investment, and land users' rights.
- State what information would be needed before making a final decision.

### Case hint

A strong answer may combine legal protection of especially valuable land, conversion procedures, planning controls, compensation rules, and transparent decision making.

**Source anchor:** Land Code of Uzbekistan: rational and special-purpose use, state protection of land; LGAF: public land management, land-use planning, transparency, dispute management

## 11. Mini-Case B — Degraded Pasture and Common Land

A dryland area shows clear signs of overgrazing, vegetation loss, and seasonal conflict among users. Local households need access to the land, but unmanaged use is reducing productivity and increasing ecological risk.

- Identify whether the main failure is legal, institutional, economic, informational, environmental, or mixed.
- Propose a tool package that includes at least one regulatory tool, one information tool, and one participatory or incentive-based tool.
- Explain how tenure security and community participation affect the success of restoration measures.
- List two indicators that could be used to monitor improvement over time.

### **Link to regional context**

Central Asian land management discussions often show that technical restoration measures work better when rights, responsibilities, and monitoring are clear.

**Source anchor:** ADB CACILM regional materials; UNCCD guidance on governance, tenure, and land degradation neutrality

# 12. Mini-Case C — Weak Trust in Land Allocation Decisions

Citizens complain that land allocation decisions are difficult to understand and may favor well-connected applicants. The responsible office insists that procedures exist, but data are scattered, records are incomplete, and the reasons for final decisions are not publicly explained.

- Name three accountability weaknesses in this case.
- Recommend a tool package centered on transparency and procedural fairness.
- Explain the difference between having a formal rule and having a credible, trusted process.
- Describe one digital tool and one institutional reform that could improve confidence.

| Prompt                        | Space for short response |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Most urgent reform            | .....                    |
| Best transparency tool        | .....                    |
| Best monitoring indicator     | .....                    |
| Likely implementation barrier | .....                    |

# 13. Writing Task — One-Page Policy Memo

Write a short policy memo of 350–500 words based on one case or a real local example. The memo should recommend a feasible mix of state land policy tools.

| Memo element        | What to include                                                                                   |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Problem statement   | A concise statement of the land governance problem and why it matters.                            |
| Evidence            | Relevant facts, observed risks, stakeholder concerns, or available land information.              |
| Recommended tools   | A package of 3–5 tools with a clear justification for each.                                       |
| Implementation note | Who leads, who coordinates, how monitoring will work, and what risks must be managed.             |
| Conclusion          | A short statement on why the package is balanced, realistic, and consistent with public interest. |

## Writing quality rule

Do not list tools without explanation. Show the link between the problem, the chosen tools, the responsible institutions, and the expected effect on land users and land quality.

## 14. Assessment Rubric

| Criterion                    | Excellent                                                | Good                                       | Developing                       | Needs revision                              |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <b>Conceptual accuracy</b>   | Correctly identifies tool families and policy logic.     | Mostly correct with minor gaps.            | Some confusion among tool types. | Major conceptual errors.                    |
| <b>Analytical depth</b>      | Shows trade-offs, incentives, and implementation issues. | Includes some analysis beyond description. | Mainly descriptive.              | Very limited analysis.                      |
| <b>Use of evidence</b>       | Uses course concepts and source anchors appropriately.   | Uses some relevant evidence.               | Limited supporting evidence.     | Unsupported claims.                         |
| <b>Practical feasibility</b> | Recommendations are realistic and well sequenced.        | Generally feasible.                        | Feasibility partly addressed.    | Recommendations are unclear or unrealistic. |
| <b>Clarity and structure</b> | Clear, concise, professional.                            | Mostly clear.                              | Some structural issues.          | Difficult to follow.                        |

## 15. Short Glossary

**Cadastral:** A systematic public record of land parcels and their attributes such as location, boundaries, and sometimes value or use.

**Compliance:** The extent to which land users and institutions follow legal and administrative requirements.

**Incentive:** A policy mechanism designed to encourage desired behavior, often through financial or procedural benefits.

**Land governance:** The rules, institutions, processes, and actors through which decisions about land are made and implemented.

**Land policy tool:** A practical instrument used by the state to regulate land relations, guide land use, or protect land resources.

**Monitoring:** The regular collection and review of information to check whether a land policy tool is producing intended results.

**Tenure security:** The degree to which people can rely on their land rights being recognized and protected.

### Reflection prompt

Which land policy tools are easiest to adopt politically, and which are most difficult to implement effectively? Explain your answer with one example.

## 16. Facilitator Notes and Sample Discussion Path

This page is intended for the instructor or seminar leader. It offers a sample way to guide the conversation without giving students a fixed answer.

- Begin by asking students to name tools they already know from previous lectures: law, cadastre, land tax, zoning, permit, inspection, subsidy, monitoring.
- Move from listing tools to comparing purposes. Ask: Which tools prohibit? Which tools inform? Which tools encourage? Which tools coordinate?
- Push students to discuss sequencing. For instance, why is accurate land information often needed before tax reform, planning reform, or tighter monitoring?
- Use the mini-cases to surface trade-offs. A strong class discussion should not produce a single universal answer; it should compare context-appropriate tool packages.
- End by asking students whether a tool is still useful when implementation capacity is weak. This helps connect legal design to institutional reality.

### **Sample conclusion**

Students should leave the activity with the understanding that state land policy is implemented through tool mixes rather than isolated instruments, and that good governance depends on law, institutions, information, incentives, and accountability working together.

## 17. Selected References for Further Study

Rahmonov, Q., Narbayev, Sh.K., & Muqimov, Z.M. Yer resurslarini boshqarish. Tashkent, 2018.

FAO. Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security.

FAO. Governing land for women and men: A technical guide to support the achievement of responsible gender-equitable governance of land tenure.

World Bank. Land Governance Assessment Framework (overview and manual).

ADB. Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management (CACILM) project materials.

UNCCD. Land Degradation Neutrality principles related to good governance.

UNCCD and FAO. Technical Guide on the Integration of the Voluntary Guidelines on Tenure in the Implementation of the UNCCD.

Republic of Uzbekistan. Land Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan (official legislation resources).