

WPLA Study – The prevention of fraud in land registration systems

Jon Atkey, United Kingdom

Contents

PurposeThe new surveyTimetable



Purpose - background

- -An on-going topic in the WPLA work programme
- –WPLA Fifth Session, 19–20 November 2007, Geneva
 - Initial limited survey of delegates re on-line fraud
 - Results inconclusive
 - More work needed to be done
 - A Pan-European issue
- -The new WPLA survey



Results of the preliminary survey

- -18 member states completed the questionnaire
- A small minority could identify increased fraud due to online access
- -But only half monitored fraud or monitored trends
- -Little evidence of systematic review and improvement of anti-fraud measures
- -Widespread agreement that sharing intelligence with other jurisdictions would be helpful
- -Agreement to further research

Purpose

- Identify best practice in the detection and prevention of fraud
 - Ask how open should public access to data be?
 - Consider whether and how access to data should be restricted
 - Discuss national data protection issues and laws
 - Consider freedom of information



The new survey



How accessible is land information to the general public?

- -What proportion of land registries store their data electronically?
- -Is it available for public inspection?
- –What information is open to public inspection?
- -What limits are there concerning who may inspect the information?
- –Are different groups of customers given different methods of access?

Who accesses what information?

- –What proportion of land registries make their information available to the general public online via the internet?
- -What methods are used to monitor who gets the information?
- –To what extent do anonymous applicants have the same access to information as identifiable applicants?
- –How much is information limited for anonymous applicants?

How much of a problem is land registration fraud?

- -Is it increasing or decreasing?
- –What proportion of land registries monitor fraud trends?
- -What effect do new electronic services have on fraud?

How do land registries combat registration fraud?

- To what extent do land registries have defined practices for detecting and preventing fraud?
- How successful have these practices been?
- What proportion of land registries systematically review, evaluate and improve these practices?
- What proportion of land registries use networks of key contacts in their own jurisdiction to co-ordinate anti-fraud efforts?
- Would sharing intelligence between organisations in different jurisdictions be helpful in combating fraud?

How do national conditions affect fraud?

-Compensation/indemnity

- What proportion of land registries pay compensation for losses due to fraud?
- What records do they keep of compensation paid and the circumstances of fraud?
- How does the practice of paying compensation influence anti-fraud strategy?
- What proportion of land registries are able to pursue fraudsters through the courts and how successful are they?

How do national conditions affect fraud?

–Do notarial systems of conveyancing reduce the likelihood of fraud?

– and if so, how?

What additional steps can we take?

-Should there be a Europe-wide strategy to combat land registration fraud?

–What formal staff training do land registries have to assist in detecting fraud?



Timetable



Timetable

- July 2009 Background note and questionnaire sent by Secretariat to member states for completion
- -30 September 2009 Final deadline for responses
- September/October 2009 collate all responses, analyse/check and summarise the results.
- -November 2009 Verify results with participating states
- Early 2010 Results delivered back to delegates.



Any questions?

