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NCAER - Land Records and Services Index

*N-LRSI gauges:*

1. Digitisation of textual/spatial records and registration process
2. Ease of procuring land record copies
3. Quality of land records

*N-LRSI 2020-21 enables comparison with findings of N-LRSI 2019-20 by using the same components and weights in scoring*
# N-LRSI Composition

## TEXTUAL RECORD
- Digitisation of RoRs: 15
- Availability of legally useable copies of RoRs: 5

## SPATIAL RECORD
- Digitisation of CMs: 15
- Availability of legally useable copies of CMs: 5

## REGISTRATION
- Public Entry of Data: 4
- Circle Rates: 4
- Payment of Stamp Duty/Registration Fee: 4
- Verification of Document by SRO: 4
- Delivery of Registered Document: 4

## QUALITY OF LAND RECORDS
- Updating Ownership: 5
- Joint Ownership: 10
- Land Use: 10
- Land Area/Extent: 10
- Encumbrances: 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textual Record</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Record</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Records</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Points: 100
Methodology & Sample Size

Samples checked in N-LRSI 2020-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Sample Plots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROR</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12,258*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land extent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Sample villages

- Table gives number of States/UTs test checked through samples for above parameters (64 points out of 100).

- Balance 36 points was ascertained from KCs and Desk Research

* ROR- Record of Rights; CM- Cadastral Maps; CR- Circle rates
N-LRSI Scores 2020-21

- All India mean score- 45.1 up from 38.7 (GR= 16.6%)
- 28 States/UTs have improved (out of 32); 2 have retained their scores; 2 shows marginal decline
- Top Performers: MP, WB, Odisha, Maharashtra, TN
- Most improved States/UTs: Bihar, Karnataka, Tripura, WB, A.P, HP and Kerala
Digitization of Record of Rights
Top scoring states are Odisha, Tripura, TN, WB, Goa, Bihar

- Bihar, West Bengal and Tripura showed maximum improvement.

- 22 States/UTs improved or retained their position; 5 States/UTs report decline
Availability of Legally Usable Copies of ROR 2020-21

- WB shifted from category to 3 to 1;
- Odisha from category 3 to 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1: Digitally Signed from their website (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 2: Citizen Service Centres (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3: Relevant Departments (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Digitization of Cadastral Maps
Changes in CM Digitisation Scores: 2020-21 over 2019-20
Availability of Legally Usable Copies of CMs 2020-21

- WB shifted from category 3 to 1;
- HP shifted from category 3 to 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1</td>
<td>Digitally Signed from their website</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2</td>
<td>Citizen Service Centres</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3</td>
<td>Relevant Departments</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Digitization of Registration
Registration Process Digitisation Scores: Change: 2020-21 over 2019-20

- All India mean score increased by 17.1%: from mean of 8 points in 2020 to 9.5 in 2020-21.
- 25 States/UTs (out of 30) have improved their position.
- Another 5 States/UTs have retained their position.
Bihar, Punjab, HP and Delhi upgraded to category 1 in 2020-21

Category 1: Online Payment (13)
Category 2: E-stamping facility (14)
Category 3: Paper Stamps (9)
**Registration Software Adoption: 2020-21**

- Bihar and Odisha upgraded to Category 1 in 2020-21

**Data entry Portal for Registration**

**Category 1:** States/UTs with provision of public data entry portal for registration (17)

**Category 2:** States/UTs without provision of public data entry portal for registration (19)
Registration Software Adoption: 2020-21

- West Bengal first state making compulsory provision for document to be digitally signed & delivered
- Bihar have added optional provision of online delivery of registered document

States with the facility of online attestation of registered document (8)

States with the facility of delivering soft copy of registered document (12)
Test checks conducted – 26 States/UTs (Chandigarh, A&NI, DNH & DD added in 2020-21)

Average availability of rates on the websites in 2021- 90%, up from 77.7% in 2019-20

25 States/UTs report have improved or retained their or position
Quality of Land Records
Measured by proxy indicators of:

✓ Updating ownership
✓ Extent of joint ownership
✓ Land use
✓ Land area
✓ Encumbrances
## Updating Ownership: 2020-21 over 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration: Registration and Land Records</th>
<th>No. of States/UTs 2020-21</th>
<th>No. of States/UTs 2019-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States with no linkage between RoR and registration (nil)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States where SROs can only view RoRs online (1.25)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States where SROs send SMS/e-mail to revenue office (2.5)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States where an automatic note is generated in the RoR (3.75)</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States with mutation attested on the same day (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bihar, Odisha and Sikkim added*
Scores for Joint Ownership: 2020-21

- Test checks conducted - 27 States/UTs
- All India mean score 2020-21 (8.7) – marginally improved over 2019-20 (<2%)
- 17 States/UTs improved or retained their position
- 10 States/UTs reported marginal decline
Changes in Scores for Land Use (2021 over 2020)

- Test checks conducted in 15 States (10 in 2019-20)
- Additions in 2020-21: AP, Bihar, Karnataka, Goa, and Tripura.
- The average land use consistency increased to 87.9 per cent in 2020-21 compared to 76 per cent in N-LRSI 2019-20.

Out of 10 scores
### Changes in Scores for Land Extent (2020-21 over 2019-20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>N-LRSI 2020-21</th>
<th>N-LRSI 2019-20</th>
<th>Change in score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakshadweep</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odisha</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil Nadu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himachal Pradesh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of 10 scores

- Test checks conducted in 11 States/UTs in 2020-21 (it was 9 in 2019-20).
- New additions in 2020-21—Maharashtra and Bihar
Encumbrances (2020-21 over 2019-20)

- Sikkim & Tripura—earlier 2 now 1;
- West Bengal—earlier 3 now 1;
- Bihar—earlier 1 now none
Overall Scores for Index Components

- **Component 1:** Extent of Digitisation of Land Records & Registration Process
- **Component 2:** Quality of Land Records & Services
Scores 2020-21: Extent of Digitization (out of 60)

- All India mean score increased by from 24.6 to 29.6 in 2020-21
- 28 States/UTs (out of 31) improved or retained their position
- Top 5 Performers: WB, TN, MP, Odisha, AP
- Most Improved: Bihar, WB, Tripura, Karnataka, AP
All India mean score increased from 15.1 to 16.4 in 2020-21.

24 States/UTs have improved or retained their position (out of 32); 8 States/UTs report decline

Most improved States/UTs: Karnataka, Bihar, Tripura, Goa, MP
Accessibility Index
Accessibility Index - Methodology

Ease of Access

Comprehensive information

Website Design & Navigation

Help/Assistance features

Accessibility Index
Comprehensive Information Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Odisha</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.B</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telangana</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarat</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.N</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripura</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.P</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.P</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.P</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipur</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.P</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerala</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakshadweep</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puducherry</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D &amp; N H &amp; D &amp; D</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttarakhand</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; N</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assam</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J &amp; K</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikkim</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandigarh</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Website Design & Navigation Scores

Score out of 25

W.B 21.9
Lakshadweep 20.8
Odisha 19.8
Bihar 18.8
Haryana 17.7
Rajasthan 16.7
Karnataka 15.6
U.P 15.6
H.P 15.6
T.N 15.6
M.P 15.6
Chhattisgarh 15.6
A.P 15.6
Telangana 15.6
Tripura 15.6
Gujarat 15.6
Jharkhand 14.6
Maharashtra 14.6
Goa 14.6
Punjab 14.6
Delhi 14.6
D & N H & D & D 14.6
Uttarakhand 14.6
Assam 13.5
Manipur 13.5
Kerala 13.5
Puducherry 13.5
A & N I 0
J & K 0
Sikkim 0
Chandigarh 0
Help/Assistance Scores

Score out of 25

- H.P
- Karnataka
- Manipur
- Odisha
- U.P
- W.B
- Bihar
- Kerala
- MP
- Jharkhand
- Chhattisgarh
- Delhi
- Goa
- Haryana
- Maharashtra
- T.N
- Tripura
- A.P
- Assam
- D & N H and D & D
- Puducherry
- A & N I
- Chandigarh
- Gujarat
- J & K
- Lakshadweep
- Punjab
- Rajasthan
- Sikkim
- Telangana
- Uttarakhand

Scores:
- 22.5: MP, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Delhi, Goa
- 16.25: Haryana
- 12.5: Maharashtra, T.N, Tripura
- 10: A.P
- 2.5: Assam, D & N H and D & D, Puducherry
- 0: A & N I, Chandigarh, Gujarat, J & K, Lakshadweep, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Telangana, Uttarakhand
Summing up

1. **N-LRSI index**: Overall mean scores improved by **more than 16%** from 38.7 in 2020 to 45.1 in 2020-21.
   - 28 States/UTs showing positive change.
   - In 2019-20 only one state scored more than 70 points and now there are 5.

2. **Extent of digitisation of land records**: All India mean score has increased by **25%** from 24.6 to 29.6 in 2020-21.
   - 28 States/UTs have improved or retained their position in 2020-21 out of 31.

3. **Quality of land records**: Mean score increased by **10.3%** from 15.1 to 16.4 in 2020-21.
   - 24 states/UTs have either improved or retained their position in 2020-21 out of 32.
   - Decline reported in land extent and recording of encumbrances in present round.

4. **Accessibility**: Progress in digitisation in contrast with poor accessibility is found in some well-performing States/UTs like MP, AP and Rajasthan
5. **NACER India Land Portal: Demo**

6. **Future Directions:**
   - N-LRSI 2020-21 intend to integrate supply side directions with demand side. The client survey will act as a reality check on the value of the digitisation efforts for the public.
   - The improvement has been most visible in the measurement of the extent of digitisation of the records and registration processes - areas which can be achieved relatively swiftly but have finite limits.
   - The N-LRSI 2020-21 highlights the shortcomings in ease of access to and navigability on websites, these can also be addressed expeditiously to benefit users.
   - A progressive reduction in the weight attached to the extent of digitisation while maintaining the emphasis on quality parameters, may also merit consideration.
Thanks!
Questions and Discussion