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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Just over four years ago, ILC set out to build a tool that would democratise land monitoring and put people at the centre of data collection so they could hold their governments accountable. Considering the wealth of existing initiatives within the Coalition, the tool would not replace ongoing monitoring efforts but would instead attempt to reduce fragmentation and amplify common indicators. Since 2018, the Global Land Governance Index, better known as LANDex, has been implemented in 31 countries.

A first-ever global analysis of the data underlines long-standing concerns: weak support for family farming, lagging implementation of laws that recognize Indigenous Peoples rights, and few effective protections for those who defend their land, territories and natural resources. The data also raises new questions, such as how to close important implementation gaps and how people’s data can better inform official and policy-building processes?

At the same time, the process of building and implementing LANDex has affirmed the value of people’s data as a response to persistent data gaps and the promise to “leave no one behind” in the Agenda 2030, now at its half-way point. The data generated and identified through LANDex has been used by ILC members and strategic partners in countless ways: leveraged in local press conferences, presented to national statistical commissions, taken to the CEDAW commission in Geneva and presented before governments at the High Level Political Forum, among others. By committing to facilitating the use of data as a tool for accountability, ILC has also positioned itself as a mediator between the numerous data collectors and initiatives behind the LANDex tool and the needs of our members on the ground. In the next four years, we hope the experience of LANDex – and the revamped platform – will inform better, more agile and even more inclusive data collection across the Coalition.

This report will review the precedents of LANDex, how it was built and what it hopes to achieve. For the first time, it will review major findings and provide global and regional analysis of the data. Finally, it will look at how the tool is evolving and how the context for citizen data is shifting.
THE ROAD TO PEOPLE’S DATA

In 2015, the year that the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) were ratified by UN Member States, ILC approved a five-year strategy that called for development of a tool that would capture the evolving status of land governance. This tool would need to work in line with ILC’s 10 Commitments to People-Centred Land Governance (PCLG), which – ratified in Antigua, in 2013 – continue to act as a compass for the Coalition’s work. Rather than building a new monitoring framework, this tool would need to build upon existing land monitoring efforts across the membership with the goal of reducing fragmentation among initiatives.

The first iteration of this tool was referred to as the ILC Dashboard. The beta version of what would later become LANDex was broadly committed to collecting and visualising people-centred data, which described not only the kind of data to generate and make visible, but also the process by which the tool itself had been constructed and was intended to be used. People – the communities they lived in, the stakeholders they represented – were at the centre of this process, and with that the intention to democratise land monitoring and, in turn, land governance data.

In 2018, when LANDex was piloted in Colombia, Nepal and Senegal, the challenges in collecting, analysing and successfully employing people-centred data were numerous, despite a growing body of literature extolling the benefits of public participation in data collection and citizen science, more broadly.

Common in environmental science, citizen science (CS) relies on citizens participating in the collection of scientific information across habitats and locations, contributing observations, perspectives, and interpretations to feed into scientific knowledge. CS includes community-based monitoring (CBM), participatory action research, citizen-generated data, crowdsourcing and volunteered geographic information. CS is increasingly a channel for Indigenous and local knowledge of ecosystems, biodiversity, land and natural resource management, knowledge systems and practices “as diverse as the locations and groups from which they emanate.”

The benefits are well-documented: CS empowers people to contribute data that reflect their reality, thereby giving them a voice. Citizen science can foster collaborations, partnerships and participation, enhancing citizens’ knowledge.
confidence in data and understanding of a scientific process that, in the case of land, involves them and is also about them.

Most recently, the term citizen-generated data (CGD) has been mainstreamed in discussions of global development and the need for complementary data to monitor major international frameworks. The CIVICUS Data Shift Program defines this type of data as “data that people or their organisations produce to directly monitor, demand or drive change on issues that affect them.” In this sense, it is data that can provide citizens’ perspectives and reveal gaps while complementing shortcomings in official data.

Early concepts of LANDex called for a tool that would “empower the collection and use of participatory data that is not generally found in mainstream, official data collection processes.”

In its most recent strategy, 2022-2030, ILC adopted the term **people’s data** as part of its internal power shift to put people’s organisations at the forefront of ILC initiatives across our member-led platforms.

An evolution of people-centred data, people’s data refers to all land-related information collected and used by individuals, communities and their organisations to promote people-centred land governance. It seeks to highlight and disaggregate how our members experience land governance, perspectives often missing in official numbers.

Building a tool to generate and centralise data centred on people, implied increasingly working with members, especially people’s organisations, to use this data and information to hold key actors, namely governments and corporations, accountable.

Whether people-centred data, citizen science, community-based monitoring, citizen-generated data or people’s data, these terms share a common goal: to facilitate the generation and use of data by people, as well as the groups, communities and organisations they belong to, in order to build more inclusive, representative datasets with and for those most affected by the issues we are monitoring.

As ILC enters the third year of its new strategy, this report serves to document the LANDex experience and its contribution in the space of citizen science, providing an analysis of the data collected over the last four years, and sharing data, information and experiences gathered through the initiative. Finally, we will share lessons learned and aspirations as we look ahead to 2030.

---

**LANDex: THE GLOBAL LAND GOVERNANCE INDEX**

**ORIGINS**

The Global Land Governance Index LANDex was conceptualised in 2016, when the ILC strategy called for a tool that would allow Coalition members to monitor the shifting nature of land governance.

At the time, demand for such a tool considered various relevant elements. **There were a number of emerging land governance and rights-oriented frameworks** for which ILC had declared its support, including the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGTs) and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). More recently, the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KM-GBF) and the Escazú Agreement, were added to this list.

An initial scoping exercise identified a large number of indicators used for land monitoring within the Coalition. In order to reduce fragmentation and amplify ongoing efforts, a common tool should reflect existing indicators, methodologies and monitoring initiatives and streamline data collection across a diverse membership by elevating good practices and making them replicable. By building a land governance monitoring tool around ILC’s 10 Commitments to People-Centred Land Governance (PCLG) as a guide, members could focus on aspects of land governance central to their work. Land monitoring facilitated by the tool could be tailored to member needs and priorities.

Furthermore, the tool could be used by members in response to a growing need to collect and use participatory data on land, a type of data seldom included in official data processes. Such data would improve the visibility of people’s organisations, communities, groups and individuals at the core of ILC’s work, engaging them in monitoring the implementation of major land governance and rights-oriented frameworks that impact their environment, livelihoods and wellbeing.

Finally, it was envisioned that such a tool should be visually appealing and accessible, available online and in downloadable formats for anyone who wanted to use it or contribute data. The results, likewise, would be made available to the general public and used by ILC members for evidence-based advocacy and to tell their own stories.
BUILDING THE TOOL

With the primary objective of reducing fragmentation among existing land monitoring initiatives, the development of LANDex began with a scoping exercise to determine which indicators in use by ILC members. This first mapping identified more than 250 indicators, which were organised according to ILC’s 10 Commitments to People-Centred Land Governance, common themes and indicator level and types, what they measured and with which methodology. A shortlist of indicators was presented for consultation at regional and global levels in 2017 and 2018, during which members and strategic partners were asked to identify priority indicators in their regions. In addition, for each indicator, they were asked to identify methodologies and data source per indicator, as well as the ideal scale for data collection and possible routes for implementation.

The result of this process was the final list of 33 LANDex INDICATORS.

A HUMAN RIGHTS BASED APPROACH

Indicators and questions included in LANDex have been developed based on human rights principles and norms to emphasise the promotion and protection of human rights as fundamental to the realisation of people-centred land governance.

As such, indicators that were clustered around the 10 thematic commitments of ILC were further organised according to the three-level structure proposed by human rights indicators: structural, process and outcome indicators.

As a conceptual framework, this anchors indicators in human rights and conventions. Even where a human right has not been explicitly established – a right to land, for example – the first level indicator would establish to what extent laws, policies and an institutional framework at the national level provide for the realisation of one of the ILC’s 10 Commitments. Wherever relevant, commitments to international human rights treaties were also evaluated at this first level. For LANDex, these were considered A-level or legal indicators.

At the second level, structural indicators measure commitment to make legal standards a reality. LANDex considers these B-level or implementation indicators. While not uniform, they were identified by ILC members and partners as being key measures of legal frameworks being translated into practice. In some cases, these indicators measure available budget, the extent to which target groups are covered by dedicated programs, levels of awareness or capacity building, as well as more subjective measurements, such as the perception of political will or institutional support to implement a legal framework.

The third level are outcome indicators, which LANDex considers C-level or results and perception indicators. These indicators capture individual and collective results, reflecting the enjoyment of those rights established at the legal indicator level in practice. As with the implementation indicators, the outcome indicators are not uniform, but commonly reflect the impact of the processes determined by the first two levels of indicators. They can include overall perceptions of tenure security, de facto control of land by Indigenous Peoples (IPs), reported attacks on land rights defenders or the presence of corruption in the land sector.

METHODOLOGIES

The methodologies employed by LANDex are determined by the selected indicators and the information needed. The methodologies describe how information or data should be collected, indicating where to source data for each indicator.

After the short list of LANDex indicators was defined with members and partners, we identified methodologies already in use, as well as methodologies that could be adapted or modified to measure the indicators. Where no viable methodology was identified, it was developed by ILC with relevant partners.

The choice of methodology and data sources was largely driven by the nature of the indicator and whether we expected this data was available through secondary sources – Prindex, LandMark or Transparency International, for example – or if we would need to collect it firsthand, relying on ILC members and their networks at the national level to provide perspectives or information not otherwise available. All LANDex indicators are set on a 0-100 scale – where 100 is the most desirable outcome – which makes it possible to aggregate scores at the indicator, commitment, country and global level.

All LANDex indicators use one of four types of methodologies.

- People-based indicators: guided assessments in the form of structured questionnaires on a specific theme. More than half – 17 of 33 – indicators in LANDex rely fully or partially on people-based assessments, proven to be a fundamental means of gathering perceptions and lived experiences of land governance from target groups. This kind of data collection is effective for collecting qualitative data such as opinions, attitudes, political and social beliefs, as well as rates of satisfaction or perceptions of inclusion.

- Numerical or calculation indicators, which are indicators based on existing, quantitative data. For these indicators, members identify specific data points to calculate the indicator score, for example, the number of hectares claimed by Indigenous Peoples in a country and how many of those have been recognized. These indicators use secondary data, both from official sources and third-party data collectors. While many of the calculation indicators list likely sources of data – national census or survey data, for example – there is no specific data source required, so long as the data provided is compatible.
Global survey indicators, where the source of data has been predetermined, either because there is no other viable source of data or because the source is a known data collector with good coverage on an issue that is of central importance to the index, such as the indicators on perception of tenure security among rural populations based on Prindex data, as well as the indicator for corruption in the land sector based on data collected by Transparency International through its Afrobarometer Initiative.

A unique crowd-sourced indicator or joint integrated database 10C – led by the ALLIED data working group – counts the total number of verified attacks against Indigenous, land and environmental defenders attacked in a country over the previous 12 months. This indicator, with information pooled from multiple sources, has not been integrated into LANDex index calculations to avoid giving the false impression that any amount of documented violence against these defenders is acceptable.

DATA PARTNERS

As many of the indicators and methodologies behind it are coming from existing monitoring initiatives and other data collection tools, LANDex has presented an opportunity for collaboration, to reduce fragmentation across land data initiatives by offering a consolidated set of tools.

Of the 33 LANDex indicators, five are based on PRINDEX data on rates of documentation and perceived tenure security among rural populations, disaggregated for sex and type of tenure, where possible. Another two indicators use LAND MATRIX INITIATIVE (LMI) data, including the presence of conflict in large-scale land acquisitions (LSLA) and the extent to which benefits promised in these deals have been effectively delivered. Data from LANDMARK is used for another indicator of the proportion of land held or claimed by Indigenous Peoples that is recognized, while Land Mark’s legal and implementation indicators were adopted for use in other parts of LANDex. The methodology used to document attacks on Indigenous, Land and Environmental defenders (ILEDs) was developed by members of the ALLIED Data Working Group, which has been leading data collection for that indicator. In the new version of LANDex, updated indicators under Commitment 8 – transparency and accessible information – will reflect corruption data collected by TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL and the State of Land Information (SOLI) index by LAND PORTAL.

Beyond those indicators that rely on data collected by others, a number of indicators employ methodologies developed by strategic partners, members and other monitoring initiatives. For Commitment 5 – Secure Territorial Rights for Indigenous Peoples – LANDex relies on a national questionnaire developed by the Indigenous Navigator, which assesses recognition and implementation of UNDRIP.
Diverse methods were used to analyse the data, recognizing the complexity of LANDex. The combination of qualitative, statistical and broad data analysis undertaken here is not by any means exhaustive, nor does it attempt to give an authoritative interpretation of what LANDex data tells us or how it describes ILC members’ relationships with land governance in their respective countries.

In the four years since LANDex was launched, ILC members have collected data in 31 countries, largely where National Land Coalitions (NLCs) have been established as multi-stakeholder spaces for inclusive land governance. In 26 countries, full datasets were collected, with partial datasets collected in five countries. LANDex data was collected in seven African countries, four Asian countries, three in the Eastern Europe, Middle East and North Africa (EMENA) region and in 13 countries across Latin America and the Caribbean.

In a first-ever analysis of LANDex data, big trends, correlations and implementation gaps are unpacked on a global and regional level. While data availability is not uniform across the indicators, regions and thematics, LANDex data collected across 31 countries points to concerning results for small-scale farmers, Indigenous Peoples and defenders, while underlining the lack of data on women’s land rights. The data points to potential for more research and the opportunity for people’s data to contribute to our understanding of how land governance is impacting those living closest on and from the land.

In most countries with LANDex data, we observe small to moderate gaps in data availability.

In some countries, Commitment 5 – Secure Territorial Rights for Indigenous Peoples – was determined not to be relevant, as there are no groups that identify or could be described as Indigenous. We do not count this as a data gap, but it explains why fewer countries were considered in an analysis of that commitment. In other cases, the secondary data required for the indicator was not available or could not be identified, while in yet other cases members prioritised indicators according to interests and resources, which meant deprioritizing data collection for others.
Across the 26 countries where members undertook implementation of all LANDex indicators, the data is 81% complete, indicating that there were some indicators where data either could not be identified or was not collected.

Some omissions reflect data gaps of concern beyond the scope of LANDex analysis. Data on the proportion of women that control or own agricultural land at the national level – SDG 5.a.1, LANDex indicator 4A – was only available for 62 percent of countries, while the proportion of land that is held or claimed by Indigenous Peoples that is recognized – LANDex indicator SC.2 – was available in only 56% of the countries where data was collected. Likewise, members could only determine the proportion of rural administrative units with inclusive sustainable land use plans – indicator 6B – in 50% of countries.

The largest single indicator data gap exists for indicator 10C, representing non-lethal attacks against Indigenous, Land and Environmental Defenders, where data is available in five countries.8

CHALLENGES IN THE ANALYSIS

There are inherent challenges to analysing data from an aggregate index. LANDex uses composite indicators that are set on a common scale (0-100), averaged and then combined in order to create an aggregate index. While this kind of index provides a summary measurement and easy-to-access set of comparable scores across indicators, commitments and countries, it poses numerous challenges.

Among them is the fact that LANDex indicators – often built with ILC members and with the hopes of capturing important aspects of their experiences with land governance – are not uniform. The indicators vary widely in terms of the number of sub-indicators and variables contained within them and, as such, some of the indicators represent relatively “easy wins” for some countries – i.e. requirements for achieving a high score are not demanding – while others represent an ideal scenario, framework or outcome that is far from the reality of most countries.

METHODS OF ANALYSIS

In carrying out a qualitative and descriptive statistical analysis of LANDex scores, we give equal weight to the contribution of indicators to the overall commitment, country, regional and global scores. In reality, a more nuanced method of evaluation would be required to account for imbalances across the index.

In carrying out a correlation analysis of individual indicators, we tested the assumption that a stronger legal framework would lead to better implementation, resulting in more positive outcomes. In some cases, this assumption holds, while in others – outcomes appear to be positive despite weak legal frameworks.

We used the Pearson method in order to identify positive and negative correlations between LANDex indicators. With one exception, we limited our analysis of correlations to indicators belonging to the same commitment and to correlations that were considered strong, with a score greater than or equal to 0.5. Narrowing this scope, we were able to focus on the degree to which a strong legal framework on one thematic topic – women’s land rights, for example – was strongly linked with better de facto ownership of land by women or higher rates of perceived tenure security.

Moreover, the regional correlation analysis did not take into account all 33 indicators, but those where each region had a sufficient number of entries to allow meaningful analysis. In Africa, Asia and LAC, the analysis included all indicators with data available for more than five countries. Data from the Caribbean was included where available. The EMENA region included all countries where data was available.

BALANCING ACCESSIBILITY AND RIGOUR

LANDex is an evolving and ever-improving tool. As ILC set out to build a tool that would measure progress towards people-centred land governance, it was important to identify and amplify existing indicators and initiatives, adopting their methodologies and practices wherever possible. It was equally important to build a data tool that was robust and sound in terms of its methodology and process and to create a tool that was accessible and easy-to-use for a membership with diverse experiences and capacities.

The data included in LANDex has been identified, cultivated and in many cases generated by ILC members themselves. While the global data team reviews submissions for general data coherence, the validity of the perceptions and experiences that the data represents is not monitored by the global team. Instead, ILC members are asked to carry out a platform-wide review and validation of the data collected and identified through LANDex. The validation event provides a space for data to be questioned, debated, and even discarded. In this process, ILC has respected the decisions of national land coalitions while striving to improve the quality of data centralised through the tool.

---

8 Currently, ILEED is evaluating the viability of a global dataset that would rely on a subset of data sources, including protection and accompaniment organisations, that would run in parallel to the deep-dive methodology used at the national level.

9 Indicator 1A contains four blocks that assess the strength of 1) private land rights, 2) women’s land rights, 3) community land rights and 4) the land, territorial and natural resource rights of Indigenous Peoples, contributing scores to indicators 3A, 4A and 5A. This represents the only cross-commitment analysis undertaken.
This section gives a global overview of LANDex results and an analysis of regional findings, focusing on participation and diversity among LANDex respondents as well as overall trends – positive and negative – before taking a closer look at target populations or commitments in line with ILC’s strategy.

**GLOBAL COMMITMENT SCORES**

**ILC’s 10 COMMITMENTS TO PEOPLE-CENTRED LAND GOVERNANCE**

1. **SECURE TENURE RIGHTS**
2. **STRONG SMALL-SCALE FARMING SYSTEMS**
3. **DIVERSE TENURE SYSTEMS**
4. **EQUAL LAND RIGHTS FOR WOMEN**
5. **SECURE TERRITORIAL RIGHTS FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES**
6. **LOCALLY MANAGED ECOSYSTEMS**
7. **INCLUSIVE DECISION-MAKING**
8. **TRANSPARENT AND ACCOUNTABLE INFORMATION**
9. **EFFECTIVE ACTIONS AGAINST LAND GRABBING**
10. **PROTECTED LAND RIGHTS DEFENDERS**

**PARTICIPATION IN LANDex**

Over the past four years, LANDex data was collected in 31 countries, soliciting responses from at least 719 respondents, 38% of which were women.

*Gender of Respondents, Global*
The respondents, who provided data for all LANDex people-based indicators, represented 498 organisations: 38% of respondents were from civil-society organisations (CSOs) and non-governmental organisations (NGOs), while government – if surprisingly absent in some countries and regions – contributed 33% of all people-based responses. Research and academic institutions represented an additional 12% of respondents while private sector, notably difficult to engage in most countries where LANDex was implemented, accounted for only 5% of all responses. An additional 11% of respondents did not identify with the categories provided here.

Globally, a mere 2% of all LANDex respondents represented people’s organisations, a figure that speaks to possible biases in the way that data is being collected but also to a shifting focus to people’s organisations within ILC that began only towards the end of the first phase of LANDex data collection.

**GLOBAL TRENDS**

Across all countries where LANDex data was collected, scores on **Commitment 2 – strong small-scale farming systems – were consistently low**. The global average, 44 out of 100, reflects consistently mediocre results across the four regions where data was collected. The LAC region had the lowest overall score for family farming (35), drawn down by the high levels of land concentration as measured through indicator 2C.1, a Gini coefficient on land distribution where 0 represents perfect equality and 1 represents perfect inequality. The best available Gini land data gives Argentina a score of 0.83, Guatemala a score of 0.84 and Nicaragua and Peru each scores of 0.86.

Likewise, in Peru, Ecuador and Guatemala, little funding was dedicated to support family farming, with little to no technical or financial assistance. Similar to land concentration was detected in Liberia, Kenya and Kyrgyzstan, while Indonesia and India received low scores on budgets for family farming and direct assistance to small-scale producers.

Overall, the highest score across all countries was on **Commitment 1 – secure tenure rights – indicating that the legal frameworks for securing tenure rights are reasonably strong overall**, with rates of documentation and perceptions of tenure security relatively strong as well. But at the global level, as with regional results, the high scores presented by Commitment 1 invite caution, as the commitment – aiming to measure the strength of all types of tenure security – lumps together an assessment of private land rights with measurements of the strength of laws providing for women’s land rights, the rights of communities and other diverse tenure categories, as well as the land and territorial rights of Indigenous Peoples.

While the overall 1A score was 64, a further disaggregation of that score reveals weaker legal frameworks in place for other tenure types and populations: for women and local communities the score drops to 52 out of 100, while the average global strength of the legal framework supporting Indigenous Peoples is 58.

Additionally, two of the three indicators used by LANDex in Commitment 1 are using global survey data collected by PRINDEX, based on nationally-representative sampling to estimate rates of documentation and perceived tenure security. These global survey methods, while robust, result in rates that can be considered elevated when compared to the opinion and lived experience of target groups central to ILC’s work – Indigenous Peoples (IPs) and local communities (LCs). Due to limitations in sample sizes and coverage, smaller and more remote populations can be underrepresented in typical nationally representative surveys. Across the 25 datasets that were analysed globally, Prindex data indicates that 73% of rural respondents possessed either informal or formal documentation of their property rights, while nearly 70% of those same respondents perceived their tenure security to be secure. Between the two indicators, we find a relatively strong correlation (0.64) indicating that documentation rates (informal and formal) are associated with increased tenure security. Globally, the strength of this correlation can vary regionally.

**IMPLEMENTATION GAPS**

**Globally, we observe an implementation gap across all thematic commitments**, indicating a significant disparity between laws, policies and programs to address certain aspects of land governance and their implementation, execution or application in practice. While LANDex uses several different measures of implementation – allocated budget, extension programs, political will, institutional support and de facto ownership – the implementation gap is present regardless, with legal indicators measuring on average 80% higher than implementation or outcome indicators.

---

10 For indicator 4A – derived from 1A – LANDex uses a people-based assessment using the Tool for gender-equitable land tenure (LAT), developed by FAO. The long LAT questionnaire includes questions that derive the proxies of SDG 5.a.2.

11 For indicator 3A – derived from 1A – LANDex uses a people-based assessment adapted from legal indicators developed by LandMark.

12 For indicator 5A – derived from 1A – LANDex uses a people-based assessment that relies on questions from the Indigenous Navigator national survey.

13 For indicator 1B, LANDex considers the proportion of the rural population that present either an informal or formal document proving rights to land, an inclusive approach recognising the importance of non-official documents in claims to property and land, but one that has also elevated apparent rates of documentation.

14 For indicator 1C, LANDex considers the proportion of the rural population that considered themselves secure, according to the four-point system used by Prindex. A more detailed discussion on the methodological challenges of capturing perceived tenure security are available here.

15 Prindex and ILC are currently working to develop alternative methods of data collection that could be used in these settings to improve how the experiences of these target groups are captured, for instance through focus groups and other community forums.
FINDINGS FOR KEY GROUPS AND POPULATIONS

In ILC’s strategy, there is strong focus on shifting power within our network and beyond, putting people’s organisations at the forefront of ILC initiatives, while doubling-down on early gains to improve gender justice across the membership. The following section will focus on the populations, communities and groups at the core of ILC’s work, especially rural women, Indigenous Peoples and local communities and our members on the frontlines, those who have put themselves, their organisations and communities at risk to defend their land, territories and natural resources.

WOMEN’S LAND RIGHTS

In LANDex, three indicators measure progress towards equal land rights for women and globally: an assessment of the extent to which the legal framework providing for land rights is gender sensitive, the proportion of agricultural land that is held or owned by women, and the reported rate of perceived tenure security among rural women.

On average, across the 31 countries where data was collected, only half (53) of the ideal parameters for gender-equitable land tenure were met in the national legal frameworks reviewed.

This is according to member-led assessments using the FAO Legal Assessment Tool (LAT) employed by LANDex indicator 4A and in line with SDG 5.a.2. Ecuador achieved the highest rating – at 76 – while Indonesia presented the lowest score, at 16.

Between indicators 4A and 4B, measuring the legal framework for women’s land rights and the de facto proportion of agricultural land controlled by women, we see a 28-point implementation gap.

Commitment 10 – protected land rights defenders – represents the biggest global implementation gap. The legal indicator (10A), measuring the strength of the national legal framework to protect human rights defenders who protect land, territories and the environment, received a score of 63 out of a possible 100, while the presence of effective protection mechanisms received a score of 27, indicating an important gap between the aspiration of the legal framework and the de facto situation for defenders.

WOMEN’S LAND RIGHTS

In LANDex, three indicators measure progress towards equal land rights for women and globally: an assessment of the extent to which the legal framework providing for land rights is gender sensitive, the proportion of agricultural land that is held or owned by women, and the reported rate of perceived tenure security among rural women.

On average, across the 31 countries where data was collected, only half (53) of the ideal parameters for gender-equitable land tenure were met in the national legal frameworks reviewed.

This is according to member-led assessments using the FAO Legal Assessment Tool (LAT) employed by LANDex indicator 4A and in line with SDG 5.a.2. Ecuador achieved the highest rating – at 76 – while Indonesia presented the lowest score, at 16.

Between indicators 4A and 4B, measuring the legal framework for women’s land rights and the de facto proportion of agricultural land controlled by women, we see a 28-point implementation gap.
Members found data on women's control over agricultural land in 16 out of the 26 countries where they looked. In the countries where data was identified, women held and owned an average of 31% of all agricultural land, ranging from women controlling a reported 60% of land in Cambodia to a reported 1% in Kenya, 2% in Nepal and 3% in Ecuador. There was also a lack of data: in at least five countries, no available data could determine how many women were among those controlling or owning agricultural land.

Finally, when it came to perceived tenure security, rural women across the 31 countries where data was collected felt on average 3% less secure than men.

Argentina received the highest overall score, with the legal framework receiving a relatively positive assessment (62) and Prindex data estimating rates of tenure security among rural women at 83%. However, this figure was debated by the NLC, which felt it did not reflect the reality in rural territories. They organised focus groups to reflect on the findings and gather qualitative data on risks threatening rural women's tenure security.

Nepal, instead, received the lowest overall score for women's land rights: Although a score of 67 puts the legal framework among the best performing, globally, the proportion of women in control of agricultural land (2%) brought the overall average down.

**INDIGENOUS PEOPLES**

Indigenous Peoples worldwide struggle to have their rights over land, territory and natural resources recognized. Globally, it is estimated that four-fifths of the land claimed by Indigenous Peoples and local communities is not recognized legally as theirs, while Indigenous Peoples continue to be disproportionately targeted in attacks against human rights defenders.

The indicators used for **Commitment 5 – secure territorial rights for Indigenous Peoples** confirm these concerns. Globally, progress towards this commitment among the lowest-performing, receiving an overall score of 47 out of 100. Overall, Nepal received the lowest score (24), with a moderately weak legal framework, low levels of perceived political will, funding and institutional support to implement the legal framework and, most concerning, that none of the land held or claimed by IPs in the country has been recognized.

Across the 23 countries that considered Indigenous Peoples in their assessment, the legal framework
despite providing for their tenure rights received a moderate score of 58 out of 100. The average 5A score – as compared to 3A – indicates that **Indigenous Peoples enjoy slightly stronger legal protection than local communities, though the implementation gap for IPs is also larger**, underlining the fact that many laws and policies remain aspirational or, worse yet, largely symbolic.

On average we see a nearly 30-point implementation gap between legal commitments to advance the tenure rights of Indigenous Peoples and an assessment of the political will, funding and institutional support to realise these.

In Bolivia, for example, while the legal framework for IPs was assessed as relatively strong (62 out of 100), an assessment of the implementation of these laws saw a substantial drop (19).

At the outcome level, LANDex considers the proportion of land held and claimed by Indigenous Peoples that has been recognized. In many cases, this data is from LandMark, but in some countries, partners identified other data sources to contribute to the indicator.

In the 10 countries with available data, on average, only 53% of the land that was held or claimed by Indigenous Peoples had been recognized.

Also for this indicator, the availability of accurate data remained a challenge.

**INDIGENOUS, LAND AND ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENDERS**

ILC members on the frontlines play a crucial role in protecting, defending and securing rights to land, territories and natural resources. While many individuals and communities may not recognize themselves as defenders, their role puts them at risk.

Globally, data on **Commitment 10 – protected land rights defenders** – gives cause for concern: across 31 countries where data was collected, this commitment gets the second-lowest score (45 out of 100), only slightly higher than small-scale farming (44). As for other commitments, the commitment to protect defenders is measured with the legal, implementation and outcome indicators, but given the nature of the outcome-level indicator and limited data availability (discussed below), the global averages reflect only the legal and implementation indicators, measuring measuring the strength of the legal framework to protect Indigenous, land and environmental defenders, and the presence of effective protection mechanisms.

Latin America continues to be one of the most dangerous places for land and environmental defenders, including Indigenous Peoples, as reflected in the LANDex data. The region has the lowest overall score for Commitment 10 (39 out of 100); with notably low scores at the implementation level (18 on average), indicating lacking or ineffective protection mechanisms in place. In terms of effective protection, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Guatemala and Nicaragua fulfill only 10% – scores of less than 10 out of 100 – of the established criteria for effective protection mechanisms.

Notes:

16 Based on questions from the Indigenous Navigator that measure the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

17 For indicator 5C.2, LANDex looks at the proportion of land claimed and held by Indigenous Peoples that is recognized. Commonly, this data comes from the LandMark platform.
The outcome indicator for Commitment 10 has been developed and implemented with ALLIED, where ILC and the Business and Human Rights Resource Centre (BHRRC) have co-led the Data Working Group (DWG). Since 2018, the DWG has been working to build an integrated database of non-lethal attacks on Indigenous, land and environmental defenders (ILEDs) using data collected by multiple organisations. In 2020, the methodology was piloted in five countries: Colombia, Guatemala, Kenya, Mexico and the Philippines. The FIRST FINDINGS were published in 2022, with data collectors documenting 355 non-lethal attacks against 536 distinct individuals, communities, organisations and unaffiliated groups. According to Global Witness data, in these five countries, 137 defenders were killed.

In the four countries where ILC supports national land coalitions (NLCs) – Colombia, Guatemala, Kenya and the Philippines – 107 killings and 332 non-lethal attacks were documented.

These numbers have not been converted into a score that could contribute to the global land governance index, as it is impossible to assign a score to any level of violence against these defenders.

We can, nonetheless, interpret these indicators. In Colombia, for example, despite a relatively high assessment of the laws and policies in place to protect defenders, as well as the mechanisms that would provide protection, levels of violence against Indigenous, land and environmental defenders remain high. In this case, it may be that the legal framework and protection mechanisms have improved in response to persistent violence against these defenders, or that the historical context of conflict and dispossession, a weak rule of law and widespread impunity, have rendered the legal framework and protection mechanisms ineffective.

Global Implementation Gap on Land Rights Defenders

In the four countries where ILC supports national land coalitions (NLCs) – Colombia, Guatemala, Kenya and the Philippines – 107 killings and 332 non-lethal attacks were documented.

These numbers have not been converted into a score that could contribute to the global land governance index, as it is impossible to assign a score to any level of violence against these defenders.

We can, nonetheless, interpret these indicators. In Colombia, for example, despite a relatively high assessment of the laws and policies in place to protect defenders, as well as the mechanisms that would provide protection, levels of violence against Indigenous, land and environmental defenders remain high. In this case, it may be that the legal framework and protection mechanisms have improved in response to persistent violence against these defenders, or that the historical context of conflict and dispossession, a weak rule of law and widespread impunity, have rendered the legal framework and protection mechanisms ineffective.
Across Africa, LANDex data was collected in Cameroon, Kenya, Liberia, Senegal, South Africa, Togo and Uganda. In total, people-based indicators implemented in the region received responses from 112 individuals, 35% of which are women. Respondents represented 87 organisations, nearly half (46%) of which from civil society. NGOs represented another 15% while the private sector accounted for 5%. Among all respondents in Africa, only three – representing 3% of the total – represented people’s organisations.

In contrast to other regions, the highest thematic score in Africa came from Commitment 6 – locally controlled ecosystems – rather than Commitment 1 on secure tenure for all. However, the high regional score on Commitment 6 in Africa is largely due to high scores for indicator 6A, indicating a high-level political commitment to achieve Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN), and a number of missing datasets for other indicators in the commitment. Only three of the seven countries were able to discern the presence of rural administrative districts with sustainable land use plans that account for the rights and interests of local land users and owners.

In Senegal, Liberia and Kenya, the average proportion of rural administrative units that had such plans in place was 56%, just over half. Data reflecting the strength of community-based tenure regimes and the proportion of land designated for or owned by Indigenous People or local communities was only available in Cameroon and Senegal, which received scores of 30 and 0, respectively.\(^\text{19}\)

FINDINGS IN AFRICA

\(^{19}\) For indicator 6C, LANDex uses data and an assessment from the Rights and Resources Initiative, which indicates the strength of community-based tenure regimes in the country, in addition to the de facto proportion of land designated for or owned by communities. In Senegal XXX, in Cameroon XXX.

Commitment 10 – protection of land rights defenders – returned the lowest regional score (41 out of 100) in Africa, raising concerns about the laws, policies and mechanisms in place to ensure an enabling environment for Indigenous, land and environmental defenders. While the legal framework to protect human rights defenders received positive evaluations in some countries – Liberia and Senegal both received scores over 80 – big drops were observed between the legal framework and implementation indicators measuring the existence of effective protection mechanisms. Four of the seven countries analysed received implementation scores that were less than 10 out of 100, indicating minimal institutional infrastructure supporting these defenders. Across the region, implementation of the legal framework to protect defenders received an average score of 21.

In addition to Commitment 10, we see a strong negative correlation (0.77) in Commitment 8 – transparent and accessible information – between the implementation and outcome level. Where assessments of the effective availability of land information\(^\text{21}\) were low, we saw higher levels of land-related corruption, as reported in 8C\(^\text{22}\) (inverted for inclusion in the index). Likewise, we see a strong negative correlation (0.89) between 3B and 3C, indicating that in countries where funding, political will and institutional support for implementation of land rights in diverse tenure systems was weak, we would expect to see lower rates of perceived tenure security among respondents in local communities.

In Kenya, despite relatively strong laws (78) calling for public input on decisions related to land\(^\text{23}\) and the presence of state-funded multi-stakeholder platforms dedicated to land (50),\(^\text{24}\) respondents raised concerns about the extent to which such platforms are inclusive and whether decisions made in these spaces are acted upon and upheld (2 out of 100).\(^\text{25}\)

Across African countries, a moderately strong correlation (0.62) was identified between the presence of robust laws providing for women’s access to land (4A) and the perceived security of land tenure among rural women (4C).

\(^{20}\) Cameroon, Kenya, Senegal and South Africa

\(^{21}\) For indicator 8B, LANDex reviews the de facto availability of different kinds of land data

\(^{22}\) For indicator 8C, LANDex has used data from the Afrobarometer, which is only available in Africa. In the revised indicator, LANDex will use a global measurement of corruption in the public sector.

\(^{23}\) For indicator 7A, LANDex determines whether or not laws call for participatory decision making

\(^{24}\) For indicator 7B, LANDex assesses the presence of multi-stakeholder spaces and support for these platforms

\(^{25}\) For indicator 7C, LANDex assesses to what extent these multistakeholder platforms are inclusive, and to what degree decisions made their are upheld and acted upon.
The lowest score in Asia came from **Commitment 5** – *secure territorial rights for Indigenous Peoples* – with an average of moderately strong legal frameworks (60 out of 100) but low levels of implementation (38). Across two countries with available data, an average of 33% of land held and claimed by IPs was recognized.

The second lowest score came from **Commitment 3** – *diverse tenure systems*, with a relatively weak institutional framework regionwide (43 on average) and lacklustre support for its implementation (49). The perceived tenure security of those living on community lands was on average 22% lower than the average rural resident.

In Mongolia, those living on community land were nearly 50% less secure than the overall rural population (85 vs. 36), while in the Philippines, only 11% of those living on community land reported feeling secure.

Across the region, the laws in place to provide for women’s equal access to land were neither exceptionally bad nor good – 48 out of 100 – while there was a notable drop when we looked at the amount of agricultural land that was effectively held by women.

While in Mongolia and Bangladesh, this data was not available, in Nepal, India and Kyrgyzstan, data indicated that women held minimal shares of total land (2%, 11% and 6%, respectively). In every country except Cambodia – where rates were nearly equal – rural women felt less secure in their tenure than rural men, according to Prindex data.

The data in Asia showed a strong positive correlation (0.77) between the presence of robust laws supporting family farmers at the national level (2A) and the availability of national budget and support programs dedicated to family farming (2B). A slightly weaker but nevertheless significant correlation (0.72) was found between a strong legal framework to support the land and territorial rights of Indigenous Peoples (5A) across Asian countries and the levels of political will, financial and institutional support available for programs and policies that would advance those rights (5B).

**FINDINGS IN ASIA**

In Asia, LANDEex data collection included the countries of Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal and the Philippines. In total, 226 people across the region responded to people-based indicators and 19% of these were women. Respondents represented 92 distinct organisations or offices, with 50% of respondents in Asia representing government offices, the highest proportion of any region and a figure that largely reflects substantial government engagement in Mongolia. Among all respondents in Asia, only two individuals – representing 1% of the total – belonged to people’s organisations.

In Asia, as in other regions, the overall score for **Commitment 1** – *secure tenure rights for all* – was the highest among all commitments, indicating a relatively strong (72 out of 100) overall legal framework to provide for secure tenure rights. But as in other regions, we see that the inclusion of private land rights in the indicator drives up the average, while the framework protecting the rights of local communities (44), women (48) and Indigenous Peoples (60) are considerably lower.

Additionally, reflecting the global findings, two of the three indicators used by LANDEex in Commitment 1 are calculated using global survey data collected by Prindex, which uses nationally-representative sampling to estimate rates of documentation and tenure security.

---

26. For indicator 1B, LANDEex considers the proportion of the rural population that present either an informal or formal document proving rights to land, an inclusive approach recognising the importance of non-official documents in claims to property and land, but one that has also elevated apparent rates of documentation.

27. For indicator 1C, LANDEex considers the proportion of the rural population that considered themselves secure, according to the four-point system used by Prindex. A more detailed discussion on the methodological challenges of capturing perceived tenure security are **AVAILABLE HERE**.
Women’s land rights continue to represent a challenge in the EMENA region.

The strength of the legal framework to support women’s access to and control over land shows room for improvement in all countries, with Albania, Jordan, and Kosovo scoring 57, 31, and 64, respectively. As a consequence, effective rates of women’s land ownership are low: in Kosovo, only 4.9 percent of agricultural land is estimated to be in the hands of women. In Albania, 27 percent of land is in the hands of women, while in Jordan there is no data that allows for such an estimation.

Other notable lows in Jordan, in particular, point to weak protections for human rights defenders (10A, 10B) and the need for more inclusive and representative decision-making spaces on land (7C).

An analysis of the relationships between indicator scores in the EMENA region confirmed some suspicions, while highlighting potential for further analysis and research. In the EMENA region, we saw a moderate positive correlation (0.59) between the legal framework and outcomes for inclusive decision making. When 7A scores were high – indicating the presence of laws calling for public participation in decision-making and representation by women – the outcomes (7C) were positive as well: states were more likely to have established a multi-stakeholder platform and that platform was more likely to be inclusive and the decisions made are more likely to be acted upon and respected.

Likewise, the presence of strong laws in support of small-scale farmers at national level (2A) was highly correlated (0.77) with the de facto availability of national budget and support programs dedicated to family farming (2B).

In the EMENA region, LANDex was implemented in three countries – Albania, Jordan and Kosovo – where ILC supports National Land Coalitions (NLCs). Of the 63 total respondents across the EMENA region, 40% were women. In total, individuals responding to LANDex questionnaires belonged to 57 distinct organisations, with civil society organisations (CSOs) and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) representing 43% of respondents, combined. Only two respondents – representing 3% of the regional total – belonged to people’s organisations, highlighting a challenge and area where improved representation is needed.

The relatively small amount of data in the region makes it difficult to discern meaningful regional trends, but across the three countries with LANDex data, we can make some observations. The regional score for Commitment 6 – locally controlled ecosystems – was the highest (85 out of 100) across the three countries, largely reflecting a high 6A score in each country, indicating the presence of high-level political commitments to land degradation neutrality (LDN), commitments that are further supported by relatively high levels of inclusive rural land use planning (6B) in each country. In EMENA, as in other regions, Commitment 2 – strong small-scale farming systems – was evaluated as being the weakest (44 out of 100), reflecting an especially weak legal framework to support family farming in Jordan, particularly, and little financial and technical assistance available to family farming in Albania or Jordan. In both of these countries, likewise, the most updated available land Gini data showed high levels of land concentration.
In the LAC region, full datasets were collected in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Peru. Additional, partial datasets were collected in Belize, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, as well as Trinidad and Tobago. A total of 318 individuals responded to LANDex questionnaires in the region, the majority of which (53%) were women. Again in LAC, the majority of respondents came from CSOs and NGOs, which represented 34 percent of all respondents. Government representatives accounted for 29 percent of respondents across the region while researchers represented an additional 14 percent. Respondents representing people’s organisations accounted for a mere 2% of the regional total.

Across the LAC region, **Commitment 1 – secure tenure rights** – consistently scored the highest (71 out of 100). As a foundational commitment containing umbrella indicators – legal framework for secure tenure rights; rates of documentation and rates of perceived tenure security – that arguably inform and influence all other indicators in LANDex, such a result is welcome. But it also calls for some caution.

The rich socio-political history of Latin America and the Caribbean, including significant legal reforms and strong inter-regional cooperation, may have contributed to a stronger overall legal framework for land governance in the region (63 out of 100). However, if we look more closely at these results, we can see that strong private land rights continue to outweigh those enjoyed by other tenure categories, such as local communities living on collective or customary land (49), and that the land rights afforded by women (54) as well as the land and territorial rights of Indigenous Peoples (60) are in some cases much weaker.

Likewise, as described in the global analysis, two of the three indicators under Commitment 1 are calculated using Prindex data, which is collected uses nationally-based estimates to estimate rates of documentation and tenure security. Challenges with these methods have been noted.

The most concerning findings in LAC surround **Commitment 9 – effective actions against land grabbing** – highlighting the persistent threats of land concentration, extractivism and foreign investment in commodities throughout the region, often culminating in conflict. The low regional average (33 out of 100) finds its lowest extents in Nicaragua and Peru (both 24), which both present concerns around the implementation of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) and an absence of legal regulations providing protections and redress mechanisms in contexts of large-scale land acquisitions and transfers.

Underlying concerns about the safety of Indigenous, land and environmental defenders in the LAC region, low scores across **Commitment 10 – protected land rights defenders** – reflects uneven laws to protect human rights defenders across the region and, of greater concern, that protection mechanisms across the region were consistently evaluated as being absent or ineffective. Guatemala, Chile and Nicaragua returned the lowest average scores across legal and implementation indicators (16, 17 and 27 out of 100, respectively), while the most recent allied data highlights concerning trends in violence against these defenders in Colombia, where nearly 1,300 non-lethal attacks were documented in 2021 alone.

For indicator 1B, LANDex considers the proportion of the rural population that present either an informal or formal document proving rights to land, an inclusive approach recognizing the importance of non-official documents in claims to property and land, but one that has also elevated apparent rates of documentation. Challenges with these methods have been noted.

For indicator 1C, LANDex considers the proportion of the rural population that considered themselves secure, according to the four-point system used by Prindex. A more detailed discussion on the methodological challenges of capturing perceived tenure security are available here.

Due to limitations in sample sizes and coverage, smaller and more remote populations can be underrepresented in typical nationally representative surveys.

For indicator 10A, LANDex built an assessment of the legal framework protecting human rights defenders against the international Service for Human Rights (ISHR) and the International Service for Human Rights (ISHR). This indicator is adapted to include questions specific to land and environmental defenders.

For indicator 10B, LANDex built an assessment of the existence and effectiveness of protection measures together with ISHR and members CINEP. In the revised LANDex tool, this indicator will be further adapted and regionalized to better capture the reality of members in different contexts.
While the data generated through LANDex provides important insights into trends in land governance across countries and regions, the process of identifying and collecting data at the country level led to a number of unexpected, innovative and welcome results. It was ILC members, together with other networks, platforms and partners on the ground, that gave life to the tool and made sense of the process. Often, LANDex implementation became a conduit for existing agendas – priorities, but also aspirations, frustrations and bottlenecks – and lent new momentum to pending projects and relationships.

As with many processes within ILC, it was members who shaped the data cycle, gave it meaning and made it of service to their own work.

Among the strongest relationships identified in the LAC region was the strong correlation (0.82) between the rates of rural men and women with documentation proving their rights to land (1B) and the perceived tenure security of these individuals (1C), confirming a long-held assumption that individuals and their communities enjoy higher rates of security – and a host of positive collateral impacts – when they possess some form of documentation linking them to the land.

Likewise, but distinct from what the global trends show, in LAC we see a strong correlation (0.70) between the strength of the legal framework to protect land rights defenders (10A) and the presence of mechanisms to effectively protect these defenders (10B).

As mentioned before, the LAC region enjoys relatively high overall scores for legal indicators measuring the strength of legal frameworks as applied to different thematic areas. As such, we see a positive and relatively strong correlation between the rights to support diverse tenure systems and those to support the territorial rights of Indigenous Peoples (0.84) and, likewise, a positive, strong correlation between laws supporting women’s land rights and those of Indigenous Peoples (0.82).

An analysis of correlations between LANDex indicators in the LAC region did not take into account the five Caribbean countries where data was partial and insufficient to establish such linkages.
IN ALBANIA
Data collected through LANDex was used by the NLC to identify major problems and generate a set of concrete recommendations that were sent to the Minister of the Environment and Tourism in a formal statement. Likewise, the data specific to the status of women’s land rights was used by members in Albania to draft an alternative report that will be submitted to the CEDAW Committee.

IN ARGENTINA
The NLC recognized that the complex LANDex tool was not readily understood by many members. They organised informational sessions, workshops and data sharing moments where platform members could informally engage with the tool, data and findings. In addition, the platform organised focus groups to solicit the perspectives of specific populations and held a broadly attended validation event that drew representatives from nearly 40 organisations. Data collected via LANDex was submitted for the government to consider in its state-led Voluntary National Review (VNR). In addition, the NLC organised an in-person workshop targeting rural youth to reflect on existing data and gather additional qualitative information. Finally, the platform developed a first-ever template by which LANDex and other land data could be used to monitor the country’s progress towards commitments under the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR).

IN GUATEMALA
Guatemala has to date the lowest overall LANDex score. It’s NLC members took the results into public spaces and called for an official reaction. They convened two rounds of validation – one with all members of the platform and another with strategic partners, including Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) – where they discussed data, agreed on interpretations and identified common, relevant messages for advocacy. Data gathered via LANDex in Guatemala was presented during a press conference at CONGOOP’s 30th anniversary celebration, calling on the state to improve policies supporting family farmers and to increase protections for defenders. Additionally, data was presented in a side event at the High-Level Political Forum and, most recently, introduced as part of recommendations to the state made during a Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) session in Geneva.

IN LIBERIA
The newly-formed NLC – the Liberia Land Platform – implemented LANDex with key actors, including the Liberia Land Authority (LLA), the Ministry of Agriculture and the CSO Working Group on Land Reform. In contrast to the LANDex experience in other countries, Liberia was the first to use LANDex as the basis for its Country Assessment that would guide and orient the development of a national strategy. The validation event, where results were presented to key actors in the country, succeeded in creating a “sense of national ownership.” The LLA expressed an interest in using LANDex as a national baseline to be used to assess progress towards better land governance, while the data has been fed into a national platform for land data led by LLA, the Swedish group Lantmatariet and Cadasta.

IN THE PHILIPPINES
Members leveraged LANDex results with several key stakeholders. While the LANDex initiative helped members to identify available land data at the country level, it also helped them identify the limits of this data, such as the invisibility of diverse tenure types. As members had already been working to define basic elements of tenure security in the country – a tenure instrument or legal document, de facto control of the land, adequate support services, the absence of perceived threats and equal recognition of women’s rights – findings from LANDex reinforced this work. In partnership with IFAD, ILC members identified common target groups to jointly reflect on the extent to which this data was capturing the reality of key populations, among them rural women. An overall analysis of available land tenure data in the Philippines, including IFAD’s data, was combined with concrete policy recommendations in the LANDMONITOR REPORT. IFAD included land tenure in the most recent country strategy, an important achievement on the heels of the LandMonitor work, while the findings of the study – including recommendations for improved data collection – were presented to the Philippines Statistical Authority (PSA). As a result, ILC members were invited to join an inter-agency working group on SDG data.

“It has created partnerships for collaboration and allowed us to generate collective consensus around the situation of the country and form new alliances.”

“We are confident that LANDex can form a good basis for the establishment of a national land monitoring system in Liberia.”

“Findings from studies undertaken by local CSOs and scores from LANDex reinforce one another, for example when LANDex highlights a notable lack of SDG data, and CSOs highlight observations by the rural poor, pointing to a lack of key elements for measuring tenure security.”

36 CONGOOP violence, underline here and add link.
PEOPLE’S DATA FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

Moving beyond data as part of a monitoring exercise, ILC’s strategy calls for data to be used as a tool for accountability. Data should raise awareness of structural inequalities in land governance systems and empower collective action to hold governments, corporations and other key actors accountable. While accountability mechanisms differ based on context, there are some major, common frameworks that present opportunities for members to use data to monitor land-related commitments made by governments.

LANDex MONITORS THE SDGs

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), endorsed by UN member states in 2015, include 231 quantifiable indicators that measure progress towards its targets and goals. Half-way through Agenda 2030, however, data reported against these indicators remains limited.

Over the past three years, the SDG Land Momentum Group convened by ILC has tracked state reporting on major land indicators in the SDGs and consistently found that Parties are not only not reporting data against key land indicators, but they make no meaningful mention of land in their Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs). In its MOST RECENT PUBLICATION, the group concluded that in the last three years, “the majority [of states] had not prioritised land rights in their development agendas or undertaken significant action,” a finding that casts doubts on their ability to achieve commitments made in Agenda 2030.

In this context, we see an opportunity for people’s data to fill gaps and shed light on progress towards the SDGs from the perspective of priority groups and populations. LANDex has been mapped against the SDGs and can monitor its indicators and targets in three ways.

- A number of LANDex indicators use methodologies directly aligned with SDG indicators and are able to generate measurements that are comparable with official reporting or able to complement them.
- Other LANDex indicators measure something closely related to an SDG indicator with a slightly different methodology or objective.
- A broader set of LANDex indicators shine light on linkages between land governance and SDG targets and goals where considerations of land are not explicit.

IN SENEGAL

Senegal is one of the LANDex pilot countries and its ILC member IPAR struggled to explain the exercise to partners and to encourage responses to the questionnaires. While the objective of LANDex became clear to the NLC, the government took longer to convince, but all agreed on land data being key to the development of public policies. Ultimately, collecting data in Senegal via LANDex created an important space for dialogue between various stakeholders. When data was presented, for example, it highlighted that the government budget allocated to family farming was considered insufficient. Similarly, the scores related to the protection of land rights defenders, caused concern. Members in Senegal shared hopes that LANDex could be used as a decision-making tool and that the scores would ideally provide an accessible entry point for further understanding and recommendations.

©ILC/CHÉRIF S BODIAN, IPAR
Senegal: women’s control over land remains limited, as does their effective enjoyment of the laws that provide for their equal rights.
For the SDG indicators where LANDex provides a direct measurement – on rates of documentation, the strength of the legal framework for women’s land rights, as well as violence against Indigenous, land and environmental defenders – the data identified and generated through the tool is able to complement or stand in in the absence of official land data. Beyond providing a comparable measurement for key land indicators, LANDex data provides perspective from groups and individuals often absent in government datasets.

ILC members in Cameroon, Guatemala, Nepal, Nicaragua, the Philippines and Senegal – in collaboration with the TIERRA Y ODS platform in Latin America – have used LANDex data to develop SDG shadow reports that monitor government commitments to the SDGs against progress towards its implementation and data reflecting the same. Currently, Argentina and Togo are in the process of developing SDG shadow reports. Where official data isn’t available, members review LANDex and other complementary sources that give an idea of progress towards the SDGs. The reports give more detail about the methodology used. For the past four years, ILC members have presented SDG shadow reports at the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) and in other national and regional spaces for accountability on the SDGs.

In Nepal and the Philippines, ILC members were asked to join state-led working groups on land data and SDGs as a result of these engagements. Likewise, LANDex data has been submitted for consideration as part of official SDG data processes in Argentina – on women’s land rights – and in Kenya, where ALLIED data may provide insight into attacks on Indigenous, land and environmental defenders.

OTHER FRAMEWORKS FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

While the SDGs have been the most prominent framework for accountability, members have also used LANDex data to monitor implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGTs) as well as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). ILC members in Guatemala, Albania and the Philippines have leveraged LANDex data on women’s land rights in CEDAW shadow reports to hold their governments accountable for commitments made under the convention.

Most recently, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) has become another framework where members are using LANDex and other land data to hold officials accountable, the first example being in Argentina. Likewise, the development of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, the monitoring framework for the Convention for Biological Diversity (CBD) has presented an exciting opportunity for renewed commitments around the land, territorial and natural resource rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

Other regional and thematic frameworks, including the Escazú Agreement – the Regional Agreement on Access to Information, Public Participation and Justice in Environmental Matters in Latin America and the Caribbean – the Aarhus Convention, and the EU’s Directive on Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence (CSDD), present new and developing accountability mechanisms that will be more relevant in coming years.

WHERE LANDex IS GOING

In the four years since LANDex was launched, ILC members have given meaning to the tool and taken its data into countless policy, accountability and learning spaces. LANDex has made people’s data on land more relevant and legitimate, highlighting gaps in official data and the need for complementary data that better captures groups and populations often absent or invisible in official datasets. This data can fill gaps in official datasets but can also be a tool for empowerment, generated by ILC members and used to advance their objectives. This data can also be used to monitor the implementation of development frameworks and used to hold governments and corporations accountable.

LESSONS LEARNED

At the end of the first round of data collection, ILC organised regional consultations to solicit feedback from members involved to identify areas of improvement, ongoing needs and evolving priorities, while the ILC data team undertook a full revision of the tool, identifying opportunities to streamline data collection.

Members appreciated the comprehensive nature of the indicators but struggled with the complexity of the tool, either as respondents or implementing LANDex surveys in their entirety. Members suggested instead to prioritise commitments and indicators aligned with regional priorities, in addition to core ILC monitoring indicators related to the SDGs. Furthermore, considering the numerous data initiatives contained by LANDex, members expressed a desire to be able to engage more deeply with the initiatives most relevant to their work. In response, ILC has built regional data packages and is working to develop an integrated data cycle that can be implemented with other data partners at the national level.

There is also an ongoing need to improve data quality and better match the data being collected with the people, groups and communities best placed to provide it. In the next round of data collection, a legal working group will respond to legal indicators to improve data quality. Likewise, there is a growing demand for focus group discussions and their ability to capture important community-level data, especially for hard-to-reach or underrepresented populations such as rural women, Indigenous People and rural youth.
In addition, new important themes are emerging. The 2022 Global Land Forum Youth highlighted existing gaps in LANDex and its ability to capture land governance data from a youth perspective. In a series of consultations throughout 2023, the ILC data team engaged global youth members and partners and built a new series of questions that will form the LANDex youth index. The new questions and indicators will be implemented by youth in the forthcoming round of data collection.

People's organisations – directly representing women, youth, family and peasant farmers, indigenous peoples, pastoralists, forest dwellers, fisher folk, afro-descendants and local communities – must have a bigger role in the data cycle, as respondents but also as data users. As ILC supports people's organisations to take the lead in NLCs so their voices define the strategic vision and focus, so too should they be centred in questions of how data can be used to advance their objectives on the national level.

The climate crisis, and with it biodiversity loss and degradation of lands, is of growing relevance and concern to members as the role of land tenure in mitigating the worst climate outcomes is increasingly recognized. In addition to reframing existing indicators in terms of their relevance to climate, as part of its Climate and Nature flagship, ILC will develop additional indicators to help members monitor national commitments to the Rio Conventions: the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

Data partnerships also play an important role in LANDex and our ability to scale land data for accountability and impact. At the national level, a more integrated data cycle will allow multiple data actors to support bottom-up processes and connect them with regional and global data collection, while at global level, alignment between data initiatives can lead to a more efficient use of resources and more streamlined in-country support.

At the same time, the global environment for citizen data is shifting. The CBD has endorsed a preliminary monitoring framework that explicitly invites States to use community-based monitoring initiatives and citizen science as a source for their reporting. The UN Statistical Commission has endorsed the Collaborative for Citizen Data, which will facilitate the recognition and use of citizen-generated data in official data processes.

DATA FOR IMPACT

As we continue to collect LANDex data over time, it will be important to better document and understand how data is being used for concrete impact: Are policies and practices changing? Are people becoming more secure in their tenure rights as a result? In limited cases, the answer is already yes, but as we look towards Agenda 2030 and beyond, the opportunity is clear. People’s data – citizen data, citizen science and community-based monitoring initiatives, among others – are best placed to provide land data that is inclusive, responsive and contributing to our understanding of how land governance can better support people’s organisations and those living on and from the land.
### ANNEX I
LANDex GLOBAL AND REGIONAL COMMITMENT SCORES

#### Global average scores per commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Africa average scores per commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Cameroon</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>Togo</th>
<th>Senegal</th>
<th>Liberia</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Asia average scores per commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Mongolia</th>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Cambodia</th>
<th>Kyrgyzstan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Eastern Europe, Middle East and North Africa (EMENA) average scores per commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Jordan</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) average scores per commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Argentina</th>
<th>Bolivia</th>
<th>Chile</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Ecuador</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Nicaragua</th>
<th>Peru</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ILC seeks to make land monitoring more inclusive, accessible, and to overcome single-source data dependence while capturing the complexity of land governance in various contexts.

HTTPS://WWW.LANDEGLOBAL.ORG