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In November 1995, over 1,000 representatives of civil society, governments, and multilateral institutions came together in Brussels, Belgium for the Conference on Hunger and Poverty. The participants at this conference, recognising the importance of equitable access to land for rural development, resolved to create an alliance of civil society and intergovernmental agencies – the Popular Coalition to Eradicate Hunger and Poverty. The conference called for urgent action to empower the rural poor by increasing their access to productive assets, especially land, water, and common property resources, and by strengthening their participation in decision-making processes at local, national, regional, and international levels.

In 2003, the Popular Coalition to Eradicate Hunger and Poverty was renamed the International Land Coalition (ILC), in recognition of its strategic focus on land access issues. Since 2003, ILC has grown to a coalition of 152 organisations representing 56 countries, working together to promote secure and equitable access to land for rural people, mainly through capacity building, knowledge sharing, and advocacy.

---
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Our theory of change

ILC’s theory of change is built around the interconnections and complementarities between four pillars, which provide the basis for the Coalition’s strategic objectives.

We believe that, to be effective, efforts to influence the formulation and effective implementation of pro-poor land governance policies at the national level (Strategic Objective 1) need to be complemented by regional and global commitments (Strategic Objective 2). International frameworks and benchmarks such as the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests (VGGT) and the Africa Land Policy Framework and Guidelines (ALPFG) give an entry point and legitimise efforts by ILC members and partners to open the debate at national level and to advocate for moving forward the land reform agenda. Conversely, ILC’s engagement in global and regional policy processes gains credibility when it is based on needs expressed on the ground and is informed by experiences and lessons learned at country level. We have also observed time and again that, although land-related issues often give rise to confrontation and conflict, where essential knowledge is shared amongst all key actors, the potential for constructive dialogue is much higher. We also recognise that knowledge is not neutral. Even when it is of high quality, it tends to emphasise some issues and concerns at the expense of others, reflecting power asymmetries. This is why, while investing in advancing the understanding of land issues globally, we also support ILC members (especially Southern-based civil society organisation members) in their knowledge generation efforts, which allows them to better articulate their perspectives and engage with other stakeholders with confidence and credibility (Strategic Objective 3). We aim to build a large, multi-actor, globally representative coalition whose voice resonates with realities and experiences on the ground, whose diverse membership respects and welcomes divergent views, and which values knowledge and is committed to learning. When such a coalition is built (Strategic Objective 4), it will enable the achievement of our objectives under the first three pillars mentioned above. More importantly this coalition, or multi-stakeholder and multi-perspective platform, will also be an important asset, a global public good, for improving land governance at all levels.
SO1 Influence the formulation and implementation of national land policy.

SO2 Influence global and regional land-related processes/systems.

SO3 Leading knowledge network on land governance and monitoring, sharing, and uptake of land-related knowledge.

SO4 Become vibrant, solid, and highly influential global actor on land-related issues.

GOAL Secure and equitable access and control over land.

Decreased vulnerability and increased food security.
Foreword from the ILC Council co-chairs

In 2013, the International Land Coalition (ILC) marked a historic expansion in its membership, reaching 152 member organisations in 56 countries. Representing diverse interests and entities from national civil society organisations (CSOs) and grassroots movements to international non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and United Nations agencies, all with a common agenda to work together on behalf of the world’s most vulnerable people to make tangible progress in achieving secure and equitable access to land.

As a result of our strategic actions and the unified voice with which we speak on land issues, ILC is becoming increasingly influential and is gaining recognition as one of the leading actors in land governance debates globally. Notably, at the Global Land Forum and Assembly of Members (AoM) held in April 2013 in Antigua, Guatemala, ILC members unanimously approved the Antigua Declaration, in which they agreed to a series of commitments on people-centred land governance, expanding our common agenda to promote meaningful change.

In 2013, ILC scaled up its efforts (which began in 2011) to support the creation of consultative platforms in 20 focus countries to develop and implement National Engagement Strategies (NES), bringing together our members and other stakeholders at a national level to create a force for political change.

At a global level, ILC ensured that land issues were considered in important platforms, such as the G8 Land Transparency Initiative and the Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), and also raised the profile of members’ work at the World Bank Annual Conference on Land and Poverty and the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.

ILC has also become a leading advocate for transparency and open knowledge on land governance issues. The Coalition and its partners have launched a new and improved version of the Land Matrix Global Observatory, an online database of large-scale land acquisitions, which has gained critical acclaim and received widespread coverage in the world’s media.

In 2013, the International Land Coalition (ILC) marked a historic expansion in its membership, reaching 152 member organisations in 56 countries, representing diverse interests and entities from national civil society organisations (CSOs) and grassroots movements to international non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and United Nations agencies, all with a common agenda to work together on behalf of the world’s most vulnerable people to make tangible progress in achieving secure and equitable access to land.

As a result of our strategic actions and the unified voice with which we speak on land issues, ILC is becoming increasingly influential and is gaining recognition as one of the leading actors in land governance debates globally. Notably, at the Global Land Forum and Assembly of Members (AoM) held in April 2013 in Antigua, Guatemala, ILC members unanimously approved the Antigua Declaration, in which they agreed to a series of commitments on people-centred land governance, expanding our common agenda to promote meaningful change.

In 2013, ILC scaled up its efforts (which began in 2011) to support the creation of consultative platforms in 20 focus countries to develop and implement National Engagement Strategies (NES), bringing together our members and other stakeholders at a national level to create a force for political change.

At a global level, ILC ensured that land issues were considered in important platforms, such as the G8 Land Transparency Initiative and the Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), and also raised the profile of members’ work at the World Bank Annual Conference on Land and Poverty and the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.

ILC has also become a leading advocate for transparency and open knowledge on land governance issues. The Coalition and its partners have launched a new and improved version of the Land Matrix Global Observatory, an online database of large-scale land acquisitions, which has gained critical acclaim and received widespread coverage in the world’s media.
We believe that we have found the right combination of supporting national initiatives while marshalling our influence to support them. We will build upon and replicate these efforts to overcome longstanding inequity in land rights.

Sincerely,

Rowshan Jahan Moni
Co-Chair, Civil Society Organisations

Jean-Philippe Audinet
Co-Chair, Intergovernmental Organisations
ILC’s achievements in 2013

Clear signs that we are on the path towards our 2015 targets.

Madiodio Niasse
ILC Secretariat Director

While 2012 was essentially devoted to putting in place foundations for the execution of the 2011–2015 Strategic Framework, in 2013 the implementation stage entered into full swing. We are now in a better position to visualise the strategy’s strengths and weaknesses and to reassess the validity of the key assumptions upon which it was based. Analysing the challenges faced during the 2008–2010 period, we concluded that the time was ripe to shift our strategic approach to promoting pro-poor, people-centred land governance from why to how. We built our strategy on the assumption that, as a result of our own decade-long awareness-raising campaigns and also due to external factors such as the food, energy, climate, and financial crises that led to the global rush for land, the world had awakened – albeit rather brutally – to the strategic importance of land and the urgent need to improve its governance.

As a consequence, we felt the need to increase our emphasis not only on demonstrating how land governance can be practised in terms of policy and framework formulation, but also crucially in terms of actual implementation on the ground. Our strategy was therefore built around four intertwined and complementary pillars: (1) engagement at national level in support of ILC members and partners to encourage and steer land policy formulation and implementation towards greater consideration of the perspectives of poor rural men and women; (2) engagement with and influencing of global and regional land-related policy processes and forums, with the aim of setting internal norms and frameworks that legitimate and facilitate civil society demands for land governance reforms at national level; (3) generating and sharing knowledge and experiences relating to land governance, not with an overly intellectual or technical approach to the issue of land – which, as we all know, is inherently political – but rather with the objective of creating the conditions for informed multi-perspective and solution-oriented dialogues; and (4) upgrading the Coalition network and positioning it as a key global platform that contributes to pushing forward land governance agendas at all levels.
Today, if we ask ourselves whether we are geared towards fulfilling our 2010 dreams, we see many reasons for being confident.

We have identified and substantively engaged in about 30 countries, 20 of which are considered focus countries. In the 8–10 countries in which ILC members have completed or are about to complete a full-year implementation of the National Engagement Strategies (NES) that they have collectively developed, significant achievements have been observed in terms of engaging with other key actors and influencing the formulation of land policy, its effective implementation, or field piloting of progressive provisions in existing land laws. Notable examples include Nepal, Togo, Madagascar, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Colombia, Peru, and Tanzania. Women’s land rights and land monitoring activities have proved to be essential components of ILC’s engagement at country level.

While we have mainstreamed, promoted, and fully integrated the Africa Land Policy Framework and Guidelines (ALPFG) and the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT) in ILC’s work, especially at national level, we have also continued to work closely with the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and relevant partners to help operationalise these key frameworks.

ILC has also contributed to raising the profile of pro-poor land governance perspectives in many globally relevant forums and international policy processes, including the Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), the UN Inter-Agency Support Group for Indigenous Issues and preparatory consultations for the 2014 World Conference on Indigenous Peoples, World Water Week, Global Soils Week, the International Year of Family Farming (IYFF) 2014, and the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals.
ILC has continued to invest substantially in knowledge generation and sharing, essentially with the aim of filling gaps in key policy areas and levelling the playing field in terms of access to basic knowledge about land governance. Our efforts to monitor the enactment and implementation of land laws through observatories (observatorios de la tierra) in Latin America, to track selected land indicators and processes in Asia through the Land Watch initiative, and to quantify large-scale land acquisitions through the Land Matrix Global Observatory and by piloting national observatories have markedly diminished these gaps. In addition, ILC has established and strengthened platforms for sharing information, experience, and knowledge, notably through the Land Portal, the biennial Global Land Forum in Antigua, Guatemala, and regional land forums in South Africa, Mongolia, and El Salvador. We pursue these efforts in the belief that when essential knowledge is shared with and assimilated by key land-concerned actors, it empowers multi-stakeholder dialogue.

In addition to serving members in their evidence-based advocacy efforts, the investments we have made in joint learning initiatives through Learning Routes and exchanges have played a key role in widening consensus amongst members on what pro-poor land governance means and implies. It is in this context that, at the ILC Assembly of Members (AoM) in Antigua, Guatemala, Coalition members reached consensus on a definition of "people-centred land governance" and endorsed a series of policy commitments that help operationalise this concept in the context of the ALPFG and VGGT.

We recognise, however, that there are areas in which we can improve. These include the need to better integrate our interventions within and between countries and to coordinate activities at the national, regional, and global levels. Moreover, the potential for jointly learning with members on the ground while supporting their work is currently not being realised to its full extent.

In spite of these challenges, when I look at what we have achieved in 2013 and earlier, I am reassured that we are on the path to realising our common dream of making ILC a change-maker at national level, and that we are becoming an essential global actor on land issues. The likelihood of this dream materialising by 2015 is high – but it will require sustained commitment from all members and also the courage to take the necessary corrective measures, building on the findings and recommendations of the independent mid-term review of the Strategic Framework, which is currently being finalised.
Influence the formulation and implementation of national land policy

S01
In nine of the focus countries, governments, international and national CSOs, as well as intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) are working closely together through National Engagement Strategies.

ILC makes the majority of its efforts at national level, because this is where we expect to have the greatest impact. Although policy changes at global level are important, we as a coalition will never achieve our mission unless progressive land policies are formulated and implemented at national level that strengthen the rights and access to land of poor women and men.

In the past few years, however, we have observed that policy positions around land have become more entrenched as the numbers of disputes over land as a productive resource have increased, both within nations and between them. Therefore, the challenges that we face in furthering our mission at national level are greater than ever before.

In response to these challenges, we as a coalition are principally relying on our members to make the difference at national level, because they are more likely to identify windows of opportunity to initiate change and influence policies at national level.

Therefore, we have adopted a two-pronged approach to support members in their country-level work. We work principally in selected focus countries to foster active multi-stakeholder platforms for dialogue and negotiation to promote people-centred land policy formulation and implementation; we call the strategies that underpin these platforms “National Engagement Strategies” (NES). We also support ILC members and stakeholders in non-focus countries through the Facility in Support of Innovative and High Impact Targeted Interventions on the ground (FTI).

Our work at country level, which links both short- and longer-term efforts, is producing effective results in about 30 countries. Members and non-members in ten countries benefited from the FTI in 2013. NES have been formulated in 20 focus countries, and eight have entered the implementation phase.
NES processes have given members opportunities to join forces and to organise themselves into national platforms. In most countries, these platforms have been broadened to involve other relevant stakeholders, and have ultimately guided the formulation of the NES. These NES processes have catalysed the joint work of ILC members and partners at national level, and have brought together no fewer than 70 national CSO members of ILC in the 20 focus countries. Moreover, the processes have proved instrumental in reaching out to at least 100 additional CSOs that are now engaged in the NES platforms. In nine of these countries, governments, international and national CSOs, and intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) are working together as an integral part of the process.

The results of the NES processes are as diverse as the political contexts of the 20 countries involved. Nonetheless, after this first full year of NES formulation and implementation, evidence is accumulating that NES platforms are triggering and influencing changes in land policy, especially in those countries that were first to launch the NES process. In Nepal, the NES has helped to create a platform for joint engagement between ILC members and policy-makers, which has contributed to the implementation of progressive land policy provisions and to some extent to advances in the formulation of a framework national land policy (see case study below). In Togo, the NES has contributed to opening up the National Land Committee, which initially was an exclusively inter-ministerial body, to civil society. In addition, representatives from several ministries that participate in the Togo NES platform are now receiving training on the Gender Evaluation Criteria (GEC), land governance, and advocacy. In Peru, as a result of a joint advocacy campaign by NES members, the ministries of agriculture and culture have committed to review policy to identify solutions for the advancement of community land titling, with an ad hoc working group being established within the National Congress.

Even in countries that were late to start or complete their NES formulation activities, the shared vision exercises that are key features of all NES processes have generated significant results. NES processes have proved to be opportunities for ILC members and partners to promote and extensively use the VGGT and the ALPFG.
The International Year of Family Farming (IYFF) 2014 is being promoted in many NES-facilitated dialogues. NES formulated by members and partners typically address, and give prominence to, women’s land rights as one of their priority areas for intervention. As a result, NES documents have been complemented by specific interventions to improve women’s access to secure tenure rights. In Cambodia, consultations provided the basis for a shadow report that was presented at the 56th session of the CEDAW Committee. According to ILC member STAR Kampuchea, this had a positive impact on its own relationships with CSOs at the national level, while the CEDAW Committee took up issues raised by STAR in its questioning of the Cambodian government delegation on compliance with the convention. Finally, a number of NES processes have prioritised land monitoring in order to generate evidence in support of dialogue and advocacy efforts. In five countries where national land monitoring activities already existed (Land Watch and Land Observatories), these experiences have been followed up and integrated into the NES (in the Philippines, Cambodia, Nepal, Bangladesh, and Peru). Moreover, in three non-focus countries of special interest – Niger, Ethiopia, and Tanzania – progress has been made, albeit unevenly. In Niger, the ILC Secretariat has focused on setting up an innovative partnership that brings together the Permanent Secretariat of the Rural Code and CSOs so that they can, in 2014, start jointly implementing Phase 3 of the Project on Collaborative Action on Land Issues (CALI). In Ethiopia, ILC member Oxfam has been working with the Land

In Togo, the NES has contributed to opening up the National Land Committee, which was initially exclusively an inter-ministerial body, to civil society

Directorate in the Ministry of Agriculture to support the development of guidelines for participatory land use planning for rangelands. In Tanzania, where ILC does not have local CSO members, the Coalition has maintained its longstanding support to a pilot project aimed at securing the rights of pastoral communities over rangelands, which has significant potential for raising the profile of rangeland governance in Tanzania, and for lessons to be learned in other countries where ILC members are engaged on pastoral issues, such as Ethiopia, Niger, India, and Mongolia.

---

2 Niger and Ethiopia were not considered to be “focus countries” in which NES had to be prepared in 2012-2013, as ILC does not have local CSO members in either country. However, with work planned and under way – via a global CSO member (Oxfam) in Ethiopia and a longstanding partner (Code Rural) in Niger – significant progress will be made by 2015 on influencing land policy processes, while laying the ground for a more substantive, member-based engagement in the medium term and for the next strategic framework period. Similarly, in Tanzania ILC’s longstanding support for pastoral communities as part of the Sustainable Rangeland Management Project (SRMP) means that we continue to consider it as a country of special interest, although we do not have a local member there.

3 The Rural Code (Code Rural) is a key element of Niger’s policy on rural land tenure and the management of natural resources, comprising legal and institutional systems that apply from local up to national levels.
National Engagement Strategies

Under implementation in 2013

WLR = Special attention to Women's land rights; IP = Indigenous peoples; Reference to global frameworks: VGGT, IYFF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>WLR</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>VGGT</th>
<th>IYFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main priorities: promoting the reframing of the 2005 land policy; implementing land reform and supporting the decentralisation process; promoting women's access to land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Togo      | ✔   | ✔ |      |      |
| Main priorities: implementing the 1974 land reform; formulating land policy and harmonising land-related legislation; promoting women's access to land |

| DRC       |    | ✔ | ✔    | ✔    |
| Main priorities: influencing current land reform processes; recognising and securing local communities’ land rights; promoting participatory processes; benefit sharing in large-scale land acquisitions; conflict resolution mechanisms |

| Nepal     | ✔   | ✔ |      |      |
| Main priorities: promoting evidence-based policy dialogue on land governance; producing land statistics; promoting joint ownership for women; promoting decentralised land governance |

<p>| Bangladesh| ✔   | ✔ | ✔    | ✔    |
| Main priorities: regulating commercialisation of land through the formulation of land use policies; implementing the Vested Property Return Act 2011; formulating policy for recognition of indigenous peoples’ land rights; monitoring land-related corruption; climate change mitigation |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Main Priorities</th>
<th>WLR</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>VGGT</th>
<th>IYFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Influencing a comprehensive land reform process; implementing the Forest Rights Act 2006; implementing a pro-commons policy; monitoring and dialogue on large-scale land acquisition and violation of the principle of free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Enhancing government compliance on social and economic land concession laws; supporting the development of community land use plans; linking national advocacy for women’s land rights to the CEDAW process</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Implementation of Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program Extension with reforms (CARPER); implementation of the Indigenous Peoples’ Rights Act of 1997; formulation of new Mining Act; implementation of the Fisheries Code; approval of the National Land Use Act</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Promoting people-centred land policies by strengthening farmers’ movements as political actors; formulating gender-sensitive land policies and monitoring the national programme and law on rural women; formulating strategies for the protection of “land defenders”; implementing the land restitution process</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Formulating land policies aimed at securing rural land rights; promoting the role of small-scale agriculture; improving and strengthening land institutions</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Implementing the Rural Development Policy; approving the Rural Development Act and promoting public investment in agriculture; strengthening land users’ groups, including those of farmers, indigenous peoples, and women, as influential political actors; setting up mechanisms and institutions in support of human rights defenders</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Fostering policy dialogue and monitoring around land conflicts in indigenous territories; providing inputs to the national debate on agrarian policies with a specific focus on the persistence of minifundios, land market, and land taxation; engaging in the national agrarian reform process through research and advocacy</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guatemala - Field visit to the village La Lupita, in the community La Bolivia in the municipality of Santo Domingo Suchtepéquez
NEPAL
Building a platform to raise land concerns for rural men and women

**FACT FILE: NEPAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILC Nepal NES members</th>
<th>Six organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National coverage (only by NLRF)</td>
<td>53 districts out of 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign for joint land ownership</td>
<td>917 households have received joint land ownership certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,451 families have received landless identity cards via Village Land Rights Forums (VLRFs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution in process of 22,048 landless identity cards via VLRFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Covenant on Economic, Cultural and Social Rights (ICESCR)</td>
<td>Strong partnership built with CSOs at national and global levels. Community concerns gathered through extensive consultations (i.e. awareness also raised on ESCR at that level) and brought into a global advocacy space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nepal has recently emerged from a decade-long civil war (1996–2006), but has yet to achieve consensus on how to address one of the root causes of the conflict – highly unequal access to land and tenure rights. In an agrarian economy in which 74% of the population are dependent on subsistence farming for survival, widespread landlessness is a major constraint to alleviating poverty and creating a more just society. The 2007 Interim Constitution recognised the urgent need for corrective measures to the skewed distribution of land in the country. It tasked the State with providing land rights to landless people, bonded labourers, disadvantaged communities, and victims of the armed conflict. At national level, there are still disagreements over how to compensate expropriated landowners, and consequently uncertainty as to how the new Constitution, due for approval in 2015, will deal with land issues. In addition, the formulation of the new Land Policy has been delayed significantly. Despite these challenges, significant operational progress has been achieved through the NES, including the implementation of measures that encourage women’s access to land through tax exemptions for land registered individually or jointly titled to women and their spouses, the transfer of public land to people recognised as landless and the transfer of 50% of land held by absentee landlords to long-term tenants, and the devolution of custodianship and management of forests to local communities.

The coordinated response of ILC’s Nepalese members to these challenges and opportunities, articulated in the NES formulated at the end of 2012, actively engaged the government, political parties, and other relevant actors to ensure that equitable access to land remains a high priority in both the new constitution and the new land policy. The NES also supported communities, tenants, landless people, and women to take advantage of the progressive land governance measures implemented in recent years.

As part of the NES, ILC’s six Nepalese members – one community-based people organisation (National Land Rights Forum (NLRF)), two grassroots NGOs (Abhyan and MODE), two think-tank CSOs (COLARP and CDS), and a national-level CSO devoted to land rights activism (CSRC) – have engaged in a shared vision on the land challenges facing the country, capitalising on their complementarities to address these.
After one year of NES implementation, there have been many advances. Building on pre-NES experiences such as the hosting of ILC’s 2009 Assembly of Members (AoM) and the organisation of an exchange visit by a high-level delegation to the Philippines, the profile of ILC members in Nepal has increased significantly. This has enabled them to position themselves as credible actors whose views count in land debates.

On the ground, the NLRF received support to organise 2,741 Village Land Rights Forums (VLRFs), which were attended by a total of 92,335 members in 53 of the 75 districts nationwide. Hundreds of landless farmers received support to gain secure land rights: 447 households received land ownership certificates and 1,394 households obtained access and use rights to public land. In addition, 917 families were supported in their efforts to acquire joint land ownership certificates, which has translated into greater gender equity in access to land and has contributed to more secure land ownership rights for households. Field-based research is currently being carried out to generate a better understanding of the impact of these joint titles on women and intra-household decision-making. As part of the NES process, thousands of landless rural families have received “landless identity cards”, which marks a step towards them benefiting from possible land redistribution measures; of the 38,399 landlessness claims filed, 15,451 cases have so far been settled. No fewer than six communities have been supported to gain access to forest land through community forest user groups or to improve the management of forest land they have acquired. In 2014, the NES process is aiming to scale up these achievements, while continuing to facilitate national-level discussions and consensus building for a new constitution and a new land policy that will both promote equity and social justice.

1 The delegation included the Minister of Land Reform and Management, the chairperson of the NLRF, and a number of CSO representatives.
MADAGASCAR
A pledge for the highest-level political commitment to land reform

Since the adoption of the Land Policy Orientation Document (Lettre de Politique Foncière) in 2005, land tenure and land governance have undergone significant changes in Madagascar. These changes have occurred both at the institutional level and in fundamental legal terms, and include the recognition of private property without title and abandonment of the presumption of state ownership. However, implementing these reforms has proved challenging due to a lack of political will and application of the laws.

The formulation of the NES process in Madagascar, coordinated by the Platform for Land-Concerned Actors (Solidarité des Intervenants sur le Foncier – SIF), offered an opportunity to amplify the concerns voiced by many stakeholders, some of which had not been taken into account when land reforms were conceived, such as access to land for the poorest people. Food security, access to land for vulnerable groups, and the protection of women’s land rights were identified as essential elements of the land reform agenda.

The implementation of the NES action plan contributed substantially to an increased focus on land tenure. Land issues have long been considered a sensitive and even dangerous topic, and the NES has emboldened civil society groups to publicly defend their rights. SIF and its members have issued press releases and have published articles on topics ranging from the implementation of land reform to the problems caused by large-scale land acquisitions, putting land concerns at the heart of the national debate.
During the presidential election campaign at the end of 2013, members of SIF delved back into Malagasy history to produce a velirano, a form of oath practised in pre-colonial kingdoms, to foster respect for citizens’ land rights. They asked presidential candidates to support a seven-point pledge to raise awareness of the importance of land and to create a just and equitable national land policy. Only two of the 33 candidates actually signed this velirano, but all incorporated land issues into their manifestos, taking into account some or all of the seven points outlined in the velirano. As a result, the first decision taken by the newly elected President of the Republic concerned the land sector, namely the suspension until further notice of the sale of land owned by the Malagasy state.
Case example

TOGO
Influential civil society land platform ensures a role for citizens in land governance

Despite an abundance of agricultural land relative to its size, Togo has experienced various pressures on both rural and urban land due to a growing population and changes in land use. In 2013, the Government of Togo initiated the drafting of a new land law to replace outdated statutes dating back to 1905.

When ILC’s Togolese members initiated the NES process in 2012, there were few organisations working on land reform in the country. The NES programme pioneered the establishment of a civil society platform on land, environment, governance, and citizenship. In addition, the NES programme prioritised capacity building for CSOs, advocacy and awareness raising, and collaboration with other actors.

The NES has led to positive results that are laying the foundation for further civil society activity on land rights. The SOFT platform (Synergie des Organisations de la Société Civile sur le Foncier au Togo – Synergy of CSOs Involved in Land Issues in Togo) has been established as a national land alliance comprising 15 organisations, of which six are women’s rights organisations. The platform has identified and mobilised expertise on key land-related areas by hosting four capacity-building workshops on the Gender Evaluation Criteria (GEC), advocacy training, land governance, and conflict management. Thirty participants attended each workshop; subsequently, three SOFT member organisations submitted concept notes to the EU, and have been invited to submit
proposals to develop the activities envisaged in the NES programme. These proposals aim to cover women’s access to land (led by PAFED), advocacy on the land bill (ADHD), and local mobilisation and awareness raising (REFED). In addition to interventions on the land bill, a gender evaluation of family law in Togo will soon be published. Finally, the NES programme has opened a dialogue with five government ministries, as well as local and traditional authorities, who have welcomed civil society inputs into the process of developing the new land law.
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO
Effective participation of civil society in the land reform process

The current law regulating all land matters in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) dates back to the 1970s. Since then, this law has shown many weaknesses in terms of access to land, its use, and territorial management. Although it recognises land rights deriving from existing customary systems, it has never been fully implemented, and instead has contributed to the dualism between statutory and customary tenure regimes. In this context, the land rights of the most vulnerable citizens are under threat from external pressures and commercial interests. As a result, over the past 15 years the DRC has witnessed an unprecedented and uncontrolled expansion in the area of land occupied and used for agriculture and mining, or set aside for environmental protection. It is in this context that the DRC government embarked on a land reform process as a top priority for the period 2012–2016.

Taking advantage of this window of opportunity, ILC members in the DRC began developing an NES in 2013 to influence the formulation of the new land policy and law in order to promote people-centred land governance. Through multi-stakeholder consultations led by members CODELT, UEFA, and AAP, ILC’s participatory approach brought together national and international civil society actors as well as IGOs and representatives of the most relevant ministries to develop a multi-year action plan that will add value to existing efforts to make the most of this historical opportunity for the Congolese people.
ILC members in the DRC managed to bring together national and international civil society actors, IGOs, and the most relevant ministries

As in many other countries where a land reform process is under way, the challenge for the Coalition’s DRC members lies in ensuring that the process moves in a direction that will improve and secure land and human rights for the land-dependent poor. This requires participatory processes and technical expertise, which the NES is achieving through partnerships and collaboration with other key initiatives and actors, such as the USAID Central Africa Regional Programme for the Environment and the Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI).

In May 2013, the DRC government established the National Commission for Land Reform (CONAREF). In line with a ministerial decision of July 2013, this body stipulates the inclusion of two civil society delegates and one representing customary authorities. In addition, its permanent technical secretariat has been tasked with liaising with ILC member CODELT. These developments – to which the preliminary NES consultations contributed by providing policy dialogue opportunities and strengthening collaboration between CSOs and government – are helping to create high-potential channels that enable CONAREF to consider ad hoc technical inputs on tenure options, land administration, and conflict resolution mechanisms, which are the priority areas of the NES. The NES action plan is operating in a participatory manner at the provincial level, enabling consultation and discussion among local civil society actors and concerned communities.
COLOMBIA
Bottom-up advocacy for peace from the perspectives of land rights defenders and gender justice

In Colombia, official records indicate that 6,043,473 people have fallen victim to dispossession of 8.3 million hectares of land as a result of the social and armed conflict that began in 1964 and continues to this day. Consequently, access to land and rural development are among the primary areas of contention, and it is widely agreed that lasting peace cannot be achieved if these issues are not addressed. Unfortunately, the Government of Colombia has not succeeded in effectively involving the rural poor, who account for around a quarter of the country’s population, in efforts to build solutions on land issues.

In this context, ILC members in Colombia – CINEP, Universidad Javeriana, and Corporación Desarrollo Solidario – initiated the NES process, bringing together academic institutions, NGOs, and farmers’ organisations to strengthen the political capacity and representation of peasants (campesinos) and to reinforce political dialogue between the various actors.

Given the huge scale of land disposessions, NES activities began by monitoring land restitution decisions and formulating recommendations for the implementation of land access and reparation policies. As land-related conflicts in Colombia are widespread and levels of violence against land rights defenders are high, ILC members and partners are working together to protect human rights defenders at risk and to denounce human rights violations that occur.
This has taken the form of emergency support, security trainings (including for ILC members from Guatemala), investigations, and nationwide advocacy work. The NES is also helping to strengthen the capacities of farmers’ organisations in terms of security and protection; on six occasions emergency protection has been provided through the “defensor la tierra” (“protect the land”) initiative, led by ILC member CINEP. An exchange on non-violence with another ILC member, Ekta Parishad from India, helped Coalition members in Colombia to learn from people experiencing similar challenges in other regions. Special attention was given to women’s leaders campaigning against violations related to mining, whose situation was brought to the notice of the CEDAW Committee.

As part of the NES aim to strengthen farmers’ political representation, activities have focused on the Montes de Maria region, with support for dialogue and capacity building for farmers’ organisations. The centrepiece of these efforts was the production of an audiovisual piece, “¿Y si dejáramos de cultivar?” (“What if we stopped farming?”), which describes the role of farmers in food production in this region and showcases an alternative, integrated rural development and land reform project. The video is being distributed widely by farmers’ organisations and the Mesa de Interlocución (round-table dialogue) as an advocacy tool to influence land and agrarian policies, in the context of upcoming presidential and congressional elections and ongoing peace dialogues.

The promotion of women’s land rights and gender justice is an integral part of the NES process in Colombia, both in terms of encouraging the participation of women and providing space to debate the topic.
Women represented 33% of the participants in the NES formulation workshop, and women’s land rights are at the heart of the strategy. CINEP, the ILC member leading the NES process, has strengthened linkages with women’s rights organisations engaged in shadow reporting on CEDAW, based on a participatory study on the impact of mining on collective land rights, and has ensured the involvement of rural women’s organisations in the formulation process.

The CEDAW shadow report was presented at the 56th Expert Committee Session meeting of CEDAW in Geneva, and inspired the Committee to raise concrete concerns with the Government of Colombia delegation when it presented its official report. This is particularly important in Colombia, as rural women’s organisations have limited channels for participation in the formulation and application of public policy on land. Involving such organisations in the NES and providing support to them strengthens their representation and political capacity.

**Human Rights Defenders**

There is no inclusive and sustainable land governance without freedom from fear. ILC, through its Secretariat and regional coordination units, has received requests for action related to human rights violations from countries such as Colombia, Guatemala, Cameroon, DRC, Bangladesh, the Philippines, and Indonesia. The role of human rights defenders working on land issues is recognised by human rights treaties and is strongly affirmed in the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT, 4.8). ILC has raised the profile of this issue on the global agenda and has set up a regional mechanism to provide emergency support, either directly or through partners, to defenders at risk because of their peaceful actions. However, the most effective support to defenders is provided by Coalition members who work every day on the ground to promote a culture of non-violence and to protect defenders who speak out. This work is increasingly central in some NES action plans.
Case example

GUATEMALA
Creating synergies in people-centred land governance

Guatemala experienced an internal armed conflict that lasted for more than 36 years; one of the main reasons for this protracted conflict was the unfair distribution of land. Consequently, the peace agreement of 1996 included a number of government commitments and measures to address land inequalities – but these are yet to be implemented. In this context, the NES process in Guatemala is considered to be an instrument for coordinating immediate, medium, and long-term actions to contribute to creating an enabling environment for structural changes in the agrarian sector. Due to persisting political tensions and the polarisation of land debates, it seems particularly challenging to establish a single inclusive multi-stakeholder platform in order to build a strategy for people-centred land governance in Guatemala. In response, the NES approach consisted of convening four separate round-tables for each type of stakeholder group: (1) one involving public institutions and international organisations; (2) one targeting farmers, women, and indigenous, social, and environmental organisations; (3) one for universities, research centres, and experts; and (4) one for the private sector, small and medium producers, rural entrepreneurs, and financial institutions focusing on rural development. Subsequently, these groups came together to contribute to a collective strategy, and the Guatemala NES has created an expanding platform to monitor and implement government commitments related to rural development and agrarian issues.
The 2013 Global Land Forum (GLF) and Assembly of Members (AoM), held in Guatemala, took place at the time of the NES formulation and enriched the process through the exchange of experiences with other members and global organisations. As in Nepal and Albania, the GLF and AoM proved to be an important means of opening up opportunities for inclusive dialogues in countries where the handling of land issues is polarised and confrontational. The President of Guatemala, Otto Pérez Molina, and many senior-level government officials met with the ILC Secretariat and members to exchange views on the land challenges facing the country. The opening of the GLF by the President can be interpreted as an important step towards formalised communication channels between government and non-state actors.

"The work done by ILC in Guatemala, and the fact that we are part of (this) broader global network, changed how the government and the private sector perceive us - we are no (longer seen as) terrorists because we claim our land rights." CODECA, ILC member, Guatemala
TANZANIA
Supporting government and civil society to work together to develop and scale up inclusive approaches to securing community rights

“The land use planning process was good for us as a community as we worked together, including all members – farmers and pastoralists – to identify our common land and natural resources and who should have rights to what. Through this, we were also able to manage a conflict that had been brewing between our community and the next one over our boundaries.”
– Ramadhani Hemedi Jilee, chairperson, LAHAKI joint grazing area

“This is a model for addressing conflict over land and natural resources. We would like to see this approach replicated in other parts of Tanzania.”
– Hon. Titus Kamani, Minister of Livestock and Fisheries Development

The Village Land Act of Tanzania stands as an exemplary piece of legislation; it allows for ownership and governance of land to be fully decentralised to the community level. However, even good laws can lead to dispossession and disempowerment of the people they are supposed to serve if they are badly implemented. Implementing the Village Land Act in an inclusive and equitable manner is a particular challenge in rangelands, where the land use practices of semi-nomadic pastoralists extend over large areas and often overlap with other resource users, and conflict between different users competing for the same resources has become a matter of national concern.
The LAHAKI joint village land use plan developed in Chemba District through the Sustainable Rangeland Management Project (SRMP), incorporates the three villages of Lahoda, Handa, and Kisande. The light green area shown on the map is the shared grazing area, which has been the main component of the joint land use agreement.

ILC has supported local and national governments to work together with the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), a wide range of CSOs in Tanzania, and pastoralist communities in the Dodoma region to develop and pilot approaches to using the Village Land Act to secure community land rights in pastoralist areas.

Of particular importance has been the piloting of joint village land use planning where three villages have shared a grazing area (the LAHAKI project – see box). This is the first time that a joint village land use agreement and common grazing area are being gazetted and formally recognised. The process has involved the demarcation of shared resources and building inclusive community-based institutions to govern them. An estimated 6,000 pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, farmers, and hunter-gatherers have secured their land and natural resources through the piloting exercise. However, the pilot has a much wider significance: this precedent will now be replicated in other parts of Tanzania, with the procedures that have been developed integrated into the national Village Land Use Planning manual used by the National Land Use Planning Commission.
Case example

MONGOLIA
Pastoral communities adopt innovative land management practices

Around 90% of all agricultural land in Mongolia is pastoral land, which is used by 120,000 herder households (a total of about 500,000 people). However, according to recent estimates, more than 76% of the nation’s pastureland is increasingly subject to overgrazing and desertification. How can an innovative system of land management be put in place legally, which addresses the use of pastoral lands and seasonal migration, while at the same time preserving the land for future use?

Mongolian member JASIL (Environment and Development Association), in partnership with Canadian government agency the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), has been promoting an innovative form of co-management of land by local government and herders in 54 communities in four different regions and climate types, with the involvement of 1,326 herder households. Herding families enter into contracts with each other and with the local government for seasonal use of lands, following a scientific assessment of the carrying capacity that particular plots of pastoral land can support.

ILC member JASIL has promoted an innovative form of co-management of pastoral land, which has been replicated by the government in ten other communities.
Results from this research have been crucial in the formulation and implementation of laws managing common property resources. Since the approval of a new Forest Law in 2012, ten forest communities have entered into co-management contracts with local governors.

However, continued advocacy is needed to ensure that rights are given to pastoral communities that are currently awaiting approval of the draft Land Law (which has been under discussion in Parliament since 2013). The law should create a legal base for the allocation of pastureland to herder communities through co-management contracts between them and local governors.

Read the policy brief on the co-management of pastoral land in Mongolia here: [http://ilcasia.wordpress.com/2014/02/03/understanding-co-management-of-pastureland-use-in-mongolia/](http://ilcasia.wordpress.com/2014/02/03/understanding-co-management-of-pastureland-use-in-mongolia/)

JASIL uses tools such as information and communications technology (ICT) to deliver locality-specific weather forecasts to herders to help improve their livelihoods and the co-management of pasturelands and natural resources.
Case example

FTI
Facility in Support of Innovative and High Impact Targeted Interventions on the ground

FACT FILE: FTI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>9: Nigeria, Cameroon, Peru, Guatemala, Colombia, Bolivia, Argentina, Belize, India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisations</td>
<td>9: Rainforest Resource and Development Centre, Community Aid, Centro de Investigación y Promoción del Campesinado, Comités de Desarrollo Campesino, Fundación para la Educación y el Desarrollo, Fundación Tierra, Fundación Para el Desarrollo en Justicia y Paz, Sarstoon Temash Institute for Indigenous Management, Krishi Avam Paristhitiki Vikas Sansthan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people reached</td>
<td>Around 500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all of ILC’s work at national level is covered by inclusive and long-term NES processes. Sometimes swift, timely support is more effective in securing the land rights of specific groups. Therefore, the Coalition has created a facility to provide targeted support to land-dependent rural communities through interventions aimed at helping them defend and strengthen their land rights.
The FTI promotes innovative approaches to securing land rights for the poor. It also helps ILC members and partners to provide time-bound and geographically focused support to communities to protect their land tenure (e.g. in contexts where they are threatened by unlawful evictions) or to take measures aimed at better securing these rights (e.g. through formalisation, titling, etc.). The Facility is therefore an instrument for piloting or testing new approaches but also for scaling up successful examples in efforts to promote pro-poor land governance.

In response to these emerging and urgent demands, especially from smallholder farmers, pastoralists, forest dwellers, and indigenous communities, in 2013 ILC provided support to nine FTI interventions. Many of these sought to provide legal assistance to communities facing the threat of national or international commercial interests acquiring large tracts of their ancestral and community lands. This was, for example, the case for interventions in support of the indigenous Ibiae and Biase communities of Nigeria, Maya groups in Belize, Mbororo people in Cameroon, and Afro-descendant communities in the department of Cesar in northern Colombia. In addition, a number of interventions have implemented participatory, inter-community approaches to the resolution of land conflict through dialogue and innovative territorial management plans, land titling, and land restitution processes, reaching out to thousands of people.

All FTI projects are accompanied by ad hoc capacity-building activities and the strong and continuous involvement of communities benefiting from the intervention.

FTI: in a specific case supported through the FTI, a private company and the government were luring community members with gifts, with the aim of breaking their support for legal action being undertaken to protect their indigenous land rights. They told ILC: “To address this directly, the project leaders have to constantly engage all sectors of the community, bringing legal experts to meet with the communities and to constantly disseminate the results of the documentation of (the company’s) drilling activities to the communities so that they maintain their position.”
Influence global and regional land-related processes and systems

SO2
The Coalition has worked to ensure a more systematic use of human rights treaties and mechanisms (CEDAW and ESCR) to promote the land rights of rural women and men living in poverty.
When ILC acts at global and regional levels, our ultimate goal is to create a more enabling environment for coalition members to achieve positive change at national and local levels. To be truly transformative, policy dialogue at the international level should be meaningfully informed by the perspectives and knowledge of actors who are often excluded from international forums.

A significant achievement in 2013 was the definition and adoption of the concept of “people-centred land governance”, in the context of ILC’s commitment to contribute to the realisation of the Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa (ALPFG) and the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT). ILC members have taken this commitment very seriously, and are working to mainstream these international benchmarks within their own institutions, and at national level, by using them in their NES processes. Similarly, the Coalition has worked to ensure a more systematic use of human rights treaties and mechanisms (CEDAW and ESCR) to promote the land rights of rural women and men living in poverty.

More broadly, ILC has provided opportunities for its members, especially women, to participate and be heard at events and in policy processes and dialogues. Working together to shift paradigms towards a greater openness to people-centred land governance may well prove challenging. However, in 2013 ILC joined forces with partners to focus the CEDAW Committee’s attention on women’s land rights in its development of a General Recommendation on the Rights of Rural Women and catalysed a global call to action, by organisations and individual experts, to secure the land rights of communities worldwide.

We have also learned a lot. One key lesson is the value of effective partnerships in tackling the massive task of influencing land-related processes. This in itself presents challenges for ILC, including how we can create space for dialogue with other players outside our constituency, such as the private sector, in ways that do not compromise the Coalition’s identity and autonomy.

We look forward in 2014 to further raising the profile of our message. We expect the strengthened ILC regional platforms to provide a big push for our work at regional level. To better leverage the extensive knowledge of ILC members, and to provide more substance to our concept of “people-centred land governance”, we will launch a Database of Best Practices. Another strong focus in 2014 will be building partnerships to communicate common messages on the post-2015 development agenda; this will be a significant opportunity to put a central focus on secure and equitable access to land and natural resources in global efforts to meet the wider challenges facing humanity.
Water and land: exploring new frontiers
For smallholder farmers, secure access to land is a necessary condition for sustainable livelihoods. Access to water is equally important: land and water are inevitably linked as production factors, but often also in terms of tenure. In the governance domain, however, their interconnection is commonly disregarded. This is why ILC has begun investigating the common ground between land governance and water governance; in 2013 it organised a workshop at the World Water Week event in Stockholm, Sweden to put land on the water agenda.

Land governance that enables family farmers to overcome poverty
ILC is proudly supporting the 2014 International Year of Family Farming (IYFF). Land rights are a fundamental part of family farming and small-scale food production, but to sustain change at national level, awareness is not enough – action is also needed. This is why ILC has facilitated linkages between NES processes and the IYFF National Committees in nine countries to create policy space on this issue. In addition, it has initiated a global research project covering seven regions of the world to better understand what land governance mechanisms contribute to empowering family farmers.
Investing in international benchmarks to create space for change at country level

The benchmarks provided for good land governance by the ALPFG and the VGGT are fundamental to the work undertaken by ILC. In support of members’ commitments to operationalise these frameworks at country level, in 2013 the Coalition prepared an easy-reference guide to using the VGGT and ALPFG in Africa, which draws on messages common to both frameworks, as well as references to other internationally agreed human rights standards. Following a peer review of the guide, in 2014 support will be focused on supporting members, especially when implementing NES, to follow its recommendations.

In addition, the ILC Secretariat and members have provided support and inputs to the FAO-led preparation of supplementary documents, including “Governing Land for Women and Men: A Technical Guide”, and the e-learning module for the VGGT. The ILC Secretariat and members have also played an active role in the strategic review and planning of the Land Policy Initiative (LPI), a joint programme of the African Union Commission (AUC), the African Development Bank (AfDB), and the UN Economic Commission for Africa (ECA).

With stronger links between ILC members and the ALPFG and VGGT processes, and with a growing number of tools being made available to members, at the end of 2013 ILC was poised to make a significant contribution to the operationalisation of these international benchmarks.
Building partnerships to catalyse global action on community land rights

The lack of clarity on and recognition of community land and resource rights across the developing world has become a global crisis undermining progress on social and economic development, human rights, peace, food security, environmental conservation, and our ability to confront and adapt to climate change.

Ownership of roughly half of all rural, forest, and dryland areas in the developing world is contested, which directly affects the lives and livelihoods of over two billion people. These lands, which contain the soil, water, carbon, and mineral resources upon which the future of all humanity depends, are also the primary targets of rapidly expanding investments by overseas governments and private companies.

The Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Oxfam, and ILC came together in early 2012 to consider possibilities for expanding partnerships with a view to urgently scaling up recognition of community land rights at a global level. To launch the process, these four co-convenors brought together a small group of key activists, academics, and government officials from across the world to brainstorm ideas on ways to do this. Five promising areas of action were identified: legal empowerment, community mapping, engagement with the private sector, engagement with conservation organisations, and global policy processes. These became the basis for a large conference attended by over 200 stakeholders,
Activists, experts, and practitioners who brainstormed ideas on global strategy for scaling up community land rights.

Baseline and feasibility studies are being undertaken by the co-convenors with a view to launching a call to action in 2014. The overwhelming response to the process that has been started by the convenors suggests that momentum will continue to grow throughout the year.
CEDAW and ICESCR
Holding national governments accountable to their human rights commitments

An overwhelming majority of countries have signed up to and ratified international human rights treaties such as the Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). However, formal commitments to a global culture of human rights often fail to change practices locally. How can governments be persuaded to comply with the obligations that their states have entered into?

In 2013, ILC supported member organisations from Cambodia, Colombia, and Nepal to develop shadow reports on their governments’ record of compliance with international human rights treaties. In all three countries, this reporting exercise was carried out as part of the NES process.

In Cambodia, STAR Kampuchea organised consultations at the community level to produce a report looking at whether the CEDAW articles on rural women’s rights were being respected. In Colombia, CINEP carried out research on women’s human rights and mining activities to feed into its shadow report and liaised with other organisations both before and during the 56th session of the CEDAW Committee. In both cases, a positive outcome was the building of relationships with national women’s rights organisations; in the case of Colombia, two organisations are now also involved in the NES process. In addition, the CEDAW Committee took up issues raised in both shadow reports in its questioning of the respective government delegations, illustrating a direct impact.
In Nepal, member CSRC prepared a shadow report on the government’s compliance with the ICESCR on behalf of the Human Rights Treaty Monitoring Coordination Center (HRTMCC), a local alliance of human rights NGOs. In addition to using the report for domestic advocacy, CSRC prepared a lobby note, attended the sessions of the ESCR Committee in Geneva, and built relationships with like-minded international NGOs.

All three ILC members involved in this initiative shared their experiences through the ILC blog for other members to obtain a better idea of what such shadow reporting entails. Through shadow reporting, ILC members made the lack of land rights for women in their countries visible as a human rights issue. They joined forces with other national and international actors promoting respect for human rights, contributing a land rights perspective. Most importantly, they explored and took advantage of a further space for direct advocacy with their governments.

Building on the experience of its members thus far, ILC will continue to encourage shadow reporting as an advocacy strategy to influence national land policy and will also support members to take advantage of (and create) opportunities to learn from others on how to use global spaces for advocacy most effectively.
Building a member-driven strategy on the territorial rights of indigenous peoples

Indigenous peoples (IPs) depend on their lands, territories, and resources for their survival. Despite the great gains made by IPs in mobilising globally and gaining recognition, the rate at which they are being dispossessed of their lands remains alarming.

ILC has always placed priority on supporting the territorial rights of IPs, but in 2013 the Coalition Council mandated a consultative process to define how work in support of IPs could be widened to become a more strategic engagement. This effort was strongly endorsed by ILC members in the Antigua Declaration, which reads: “We commit ourselves to work together to more effectively support Indigenous Peoples in their struggle for territorial rights and the protection of their environments.”

Through a dedicated seminar held during the first global meeting of the Indigenous Peoples’ Forum at IFAD in Rome in February 2013, together with a technical workshop and a survey, ILC members, as well as indigenous leaders and experts from outside the Coalition network, provided input into the development of a strategy. Initial findings were presented at the ILC Global Land Forum and at a side event at the 12th session of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII).

The findings are captured in an issue paper, “Indigenous Peoples’ Rights to Lands, Territories, and Resources”, and in “ILC’s Approach to Indigenous Peoples’ Issues”, which was validated online by
members. Working through the Inter-Agency Support Group on Indigenous Issues, these documents have been used as a basis for ILC’s ongoing contribution to the 2014 World Conference on Indigenous Peoples and the debate on the post-2015 development agenda. They will also provide the basis for dedicated efforts by ILC from 2014 onwards in support of IPs’ rights to land, territories, and resources.
Build the world’s leading knowledge network on land governance

SO3
ILC will continue to seek innovative ways to enable the tremendous amount of knowledge and experience available within its network.

The knowledge and learning cycle

While the Secretariat limits its role to that of facilitator, ILC as a network embraces the entire knowledge cycle.
At the start of the current strategic framework period, ILC declared that it wanted to build the world’s leading knowledge network on land governance – a network that would contribute to the monitoring, sharing, and uptake of land-related knowledge.

Since we made this bold resolution, we have been working hard to realise it. We monitor large-scale land acquisitions worldwide through the global Land Matrix initiative, whose updated dataset was launched in June 2013, and through the national and thematic Land Observatories, piloted in 2013 in six countries and three regions. We monitor land rights and policies through Land Watch Asia and the Latin American network of Observatorios. We generate authoritative knowledge in the form of research reports, opinion papers, and manuals. We facilitate the steady growth of the Land Portal, the web’s premier online repository of knowledge on land, which in 2013 had 1,200 registered users and carried over 30,000 items of data. We create space for the exchange of knowledge, experiences, and skills amongst members; in 2013 this happened at the Global Land Forum and via three regional land forums, two transnational South–South exchanges, and 17 conventional trainings and workshops. Some of these initiatives are explicitly geared towards the effective use of knowledge for advocacy purposes.

In 2013 this was the case for subjects as diverse as using the Gender Evaluation Criteria to evaluate land laws and policies, rangeland security, access to land in semi-arid areas, and monitoring of land rights and land policies.

Over the past few years, however, we have realised that our knowledge network can only be effective when it conscientiously embraces every phase of the knowledge cycle: from the identification of knowledge needs, through the generation and sharing of knowledge that addresses these needs, to the effective use of this knowledge to advocate for pro-poor land processes.

We have also learned that different actors within ILC’s constituency have complementary roles in this cycle. The Secretariat plays a facilitating role in enabling the Coalition to function as a breeding ground for new ideas, building partnerships and developing members’ capacities, while the actual work on the ground is done by members and partners themselves.

ILC will continue to seek innovative ways to enable the tremendous amount of knowledge and experience available within its network – at village, national, regional, and international levels – to inspire land professionals and improve land policies throughout the world. In 2014, we will develop an overarching knowledge management strategy that makes explicit how we embrace the overall knowledge cycle, from the identification of needs, through the generation and sharing of knowledge, to its effective use. This should make the detection of actual knowledge needs and the effective application of knowledge much more effective.
The Global Land Forum
a major gathering for knowledge exchange

identify knowledge needs, share knowledge

Surveys conducted amongst ILC members repeatedly show that organisations join the Coalition expecting to find a space for the exchange of experiences and opportunities in order to improve their own capacities. This is precisely why we convene the biennial Global Land Forum (GLF) – to create a space for exchange.

The ILC GLF and sixth Assembly of Members (AoM) took place in Antigua, Guatemala, on 23–27 April 2013. In total, 273 people from 47 different countries came together to reflect on land issues, not only in conventional sessions and discussions, but also through field visits, a “marketplace of ideas”, and training sessions. The GLF saw the participation of CSOs, IGOs, and research organisations, as well as representatives of the Guatemalan government and the Guatemalan President, Otto Pérez Molina.

A key feature of the GLF was the marketplace of ideas – a real market where 19 ILC member organisations showcased innovative practices, tools, and approaches that had a high degree of replicability. This was evaluated as one of the most fruitful activities of the GLF.

The event also had a strong capacity-building component, with two specific training sessions. One was on “Promoting gender justice: tools for monitoring – and advocating for – women’s land rights in land policies and programmes”; the focus here was on introducing the Gender Evaluation Criteria (GEC), developed by the Global Land Tool
Network (GLTN) and its partners. The second session was on “Achieving results through open knowledge and communications advocacy tools”, which introduced ILC members to the open knowledge and open development movements. The session provided examples of ICT tools for open data sharing, info-activism, and evidence-based advocacy that could be readily used in national campaigns for land rights, and challenged participants to think about ways to integrate these tools into their work.

The next GLF will be organised in 2015 in Senegal – the first time it will be held in francophone Africa. One challenge will be to retain the potency of the conventional sessions and discussions, while at the same time increasing the space for non-traditional activities geared towards the exchange of implicit knowledge and skills.

109 CSOs
47 Countries represented
66 Media mentions
273 Participants
18 International organisations
The global increase in commercial interest in land and natural resources is a phenomenon that is reported by many of ILC’s members as one of the most significant trends affecting the land rights of women, men, and communities with whom they work. Also referred to as “land grabbing”, this phenomenon has attracted widespread interest, including in the media.

One of ILC’s responses to serving the interests of its members has been to monitor the extent and characteristics of large-scale land deals. In June 2013, the Global Observatory of the Land Matrix was relaunched, with an overhauled database and new features for its online interface, based on feedback received from the beta version, which had been available for a year. The Land Matrix has become the global reference source for quantitative information on large-scale land deals. The Global Observatory has received very positive feedback from practitioners and open data specialists, and in the first six months after its relaunch was covered by over 100 media mentions, including in The Economist, The Guardian, the BBC, the Financial Times, Bloomberg, Die Zeit, El País, Inter Press Services (IPS), Al Jazeera and The EastAfrican.

The Land Matrix Partnership, in which ILC works together with GIGA, CDE, CIRAD and GIZ, has contributed to building catalysing collaborations between the land sector and the growing open data movement, and has gained a reputation as a leading initiative to promote transparency in the land sector.
The Land Matrix is above all a tool to promote more evidence-based and inclusive decision-making on questions concerning land and investment. In order to better support this aim, great strides have been made towards applying experiences gained at global level to supporting national and thematic land observatories. National observatories have been supported in Madagascar, Sierra Leone, Laos, Cambodia, Peru, and Tanzania, as well as rangeland observatories in the Sahel, the drylands of India, and the Gran Chaco region of Latin America.

At the end of 2013, the Land Matrix partners reached an agreement to focus their role on supporting efforts by partner organisations to set up observatories, while at the same time promoting linkages and coherence through the Global Observatory. This will involve strengthening the initiative’s long-term sustainability by expanding the partnership to include regional coordination organisations and setting up a dedicated support unit, which will be hosted by the University of Pretoria in South Africa.
The Land Portal taking advantage of momentum on open data
identify knowledge, share knowledge

The ILC network consists of 152 members, ranging from international organisations through research institutes to grassroots NGOs. Each and every one of them produces huge amounts of information and large numbers of documents. The Land Portal is a unique online space where land-related information and documents from these and other organisations are aggregated – already in 2013 these amounted to 30,000 items – and where land experts with very diverse backgrounds and affiliations can exchange information and points of view. The portal had more than 1,200 registered users in 2013.

The Land Portal applies principles of openness in its governance, technology, and outputs, by embracing the principles of open source, open content, open data, open culture, and collaboration. Rather than requiring content to be posted online, the portal pulls much of its content directly from other open data sources. New datasets and documents were integrated into the portal in 2013 from, amongst others, the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), the World Bank, the OECD, FAO, and the Land Matrix.

The Land Portal community also recognises that not all insights exist in the form of readily available reports or datasets, and that dialogue around data and key issues remains essential. Supported by the multilingual portal and newsletters (in English, Spanish, and
French), the community regularly holds online debates on essential land topics. In 2013 debates on gender and open data attracted wide interest and resonated further in other online platforms.

The Land Portal is also a principal promoter of open knowledge and open development in the land community, in particular by promoting the open licensing of data and knowledge. The new Land Portal strategy, agreed in 2013, explicitly places open data and open development values at the core of its activities. Together with the portal’s redesigned back-end and front-end, which make extensive use of innovative technologies for the semantic linking of data, this new strategy will reinforce the Land Portal as a global hub for open land-related data and will place it at the forefront of the open development movement.
South-South exchange visits

Collecting and sharing relevant knowledge across the entire ILC network is a hard task – and it is even harder when we try to exchange undocumented knowledge and experiences. It is very difficult to transfer this form of knowledge via conventional trainings or workshops. To address this challenge, ILC has been facilitating direct member-to-member contacts through Learning Routes, exchange visits, etc.

At the end of 2012, a high-level delegation of key land actors from Nepal visited members and partners in the Philippines. Another example, of exchange visits organised between ILC members in Argentina and Brazil in 2013, illustrates how important this approach to knowledge sharing can be. Argentinian member FUNDAPAZ facilitated a transnational exchange of experiences between farmers in semi-arid regions of Argentina (Región Chaqueña) and Brazil (Semiárido Brasiliero). The focus of the exchange was on access to land and farm productivity in the context of semi-arid ecosystems. Key individuals from leading CSOs exchanged their experiences, first in Brazil and then in Argentina, through knowledge-sharing workshops, thematic panels, field visits, and a marketplace of innovations.

The Argentinian delegation, when visiting Brazil, was very impressed by the negotiating power of civil society actors in the semi-arid region, through the network organisation Articulação no Semiárido Brasileiro (ASA), which brings together around 1,000 CSOs. The network has achieved successes in steering central government development programmes, such as the well-known “One Million Cisterns” programme.
The Argentinian delegation visits Semiárido Brasileiro

Besides this lesson on scaling up advocacy, the Argentinian participants took home lessons on how women play a stabilising role in intergenerational conflicts and in halting the migration of young people to urban areas. The Brazilian delegation, when visiting Argentina in its turn, was struck positively by the constructive dialogue between indigenous and criollo farmers in negotiating access to millions of hectares of land in the Salta region. They learned that participatory mapping had helped to facilitate this dialogue.

“Although they (the Argentinians) live in conditions that are less favourable than ours, they live well with what they have. This makes us think about how we (the Brazilians) produce and take care of our resources.” Impression of a Brazilian farmer after visiting the Argentinian semi-arid area

Besides these political experiences, on a practical level the delegations also exchanged seeds, farming techniques, and water conservation technologies. Both delegations expressed the will to make further exchanges of technical, political, and organisational experience in the future.
The monitoring of land rights and land policies is a core activity for most of the CSOs in our coalition. We have taken steps to harmonise the different monitoring practices of CSOs at regional level in Asia and Latin America, and to reinforce their monitoring capacities. Land Watch Asia (LWA), the regional monitoring platform for this region, includes 20 NGOs in seven countries, while the platform in Latin America, covering five countries, is known as the Red de Observatorios de la Tierra.

In 2013, the regional platforms made tangible progress on the harmonisation of land monitoring efforts. In January 2013 LWA published the first regional status report on land reform in Asia, based on data collected by grassroots organisations in the seven countries. It also produced an easy-to-use monitoring framework, to be shared by CSOs at regional level, to track land disputes and access to land at the national level.

Responding to CSOs’ needs to assimilate the new monitoring framework and to develop their data collection and reporting capacities, ANGOC, the lead organisation for LWA, organised a training session on land monitoring in Bangkok in May 2013. Although this training was focused on the new monitoring framework, it also took advantage of data management expertise available elsewhere in ILC, for example in the Land Matrix and Land Portal partnerships. The workshop was attended by key individuals from 18 grassroots organisations active in the seven LWA countries.
“We (at CDA) have our (existing) monitoring system with the general framework, but with my learning from the training, new indicators and tools will be developed and included in our work plan for a very specific, transparent, and systemised monitoring.” Ms. Shirin Masuda (Community Development Association, Bangladesh), participant in the Bangkok training.

Both in Asia and Latin America, the regional platforms are still facing significant challenges in harmonising their monitoring capacities and in the systematic publication of a regional status report on land; however, the basic building blocks are in place.
Gender Evaluation Criteria training for effective use of knowledge

Since 2012, ILC has been promoting the use of the Gender Evaluation Criteria (GEC), which were developed by the Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) and its partners, including through five trainings in Africa and Asia and one at the Global Land Forum. Several members adopted the tool at the national level in 2012–2013.

The work of ILC member ADHD in Togo provides a good example of using the GEC not only as an assessment framework but also as a means of raising awareness about gender issues throughout discussions on land policy. In a context where achieving gender balance is challenging, as farmers’ organisations, traditional authorities, and professional organisations are represented almost exclusively by men, ADHD’s efforts to organise trainings on the GEC, as well as to include women in other NES-related trainings, have led to stronger relationships with women’s organisations and relevant ministries. Women’s access to land now has a central place in the NES process in Togo, and women’s organisations are represented in the national NES committee and CSO network.

In addition to using the GEC at the national level, ADHD has become a champion of the tool within the wider ILC network, training francophone African members on the basis of its own experience. This is part of an encouraging trend of horizontal knowledge sharing between ILC members.
Countries of origin of the participants in the five GEC trainings (excluding the GLF)
Framing the Debate disseminating knowledge with a vision
generate knowledge, share knowledge

The “Framing the Debate” series of publications was launched in 2010 to help improve understanding of central issues in increasingly complex land debates. A first paper, “Land Governance in Africa”, was followed by similar publications on Brazil and Asia. A paper on China is due to be published in 2014. The Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP) – one of Brazil’s leading universities – has decided to reprint and widely disseminate the Portuguese version of the Framing the Debate paper on land governance in Brazil, which is an indication that these reports are of relevance not only to general readers seeking to understand the essence of current land governance debates in foreign contexts, but also to land experts and land-concerned actors in the countries of focus themselves. In their authorship, format, and content, the papers in the Framing the Debate series are conceived to reflect ILC’s unique position as a knowledge broker between CSOs, IGOs, research organisations, and even national policy-makers. The papers are written by leading land experts from the continents and countries of focus in order to provide a broad backdrop for informed discussions of land governance in specific countries or thematic areas.
Strengthen ILC as a vibrant, solid, and influential global actor on land-related issues

SO4
We have completed the decentralisation of the Coalition’s structure. Besides the global Secretariat in Rome, three self-governing regional platforms are now fully operational in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean.

We would not have been able to bring about the many changes at global and national levels described in this report if our coalition were not as strong and vibrant as it is today. Indeed, in order to be effective at national and global levels and in knowledge sharing, it needs to be solid, vibrant, diverse, and reputable.

However, the landscape of global and national land debates is constantly evolving, so ILC also needs to adapt its institutional form accordingly. To start with, the Coalition has grown steadily – welcoming 36 new members in 2013 – and with every expansion the diversity of its membership increases. This diversity is necessary if we want to remain a vibrant coalition and maintain our position as an influential global actor on land-related issues.

Second, the constant growth of our membership also requires organisational development. This year we have completed the decentralisation of the Coalition’s structure. Besides the global Secretariat in Rome, three self-governing regional platforms are now fully operational in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean. This regionalisation was necessary to maintain an effective connection between the Coalition’s global- and national-level activities. The Secretariat in Rome has maintained its role as a facilitator for the whole coalition, and has been reorganised into a “cluster” structure (see below) in order to carry out this role more efficiently.

Our growing, increasingly diverse, and decentralised coalition has lost none of its convening power, however. In April 2013 we organised the biennial Global Land Forum and AoM – our most visible and most inclusive event – in Guatemala, where many members and invited guests came together to reflect on land issues.

As a way to solidify the common ground between the diverse members of the Coalition, all participants in the GLF endorsed the Antigua Declaration, which agreed upon a shared definition of “people-centred land governance” and set out a series of commitments and action points to help realise that aim.
The Global Land Forum and Assembly of Members

The convening power of our Coalition

The Global Land Forum (GLF) took place on 23–27 April 2013 in Antigua, Guatemala, back-to-back with our sixth Assembly of Members (AoM). It was co-hosted by Guatemalan members and non-members, including the Asociacion Comité de Desarrollo Campesino (CODECA), Comité Campesino del Altiplano (CCDA), Coordinación de ONG y Cooperativas (CONGCOOP), Unión Verapacense de Organizaciones Campesinas (UVOC), and Oxfam-Guatemala.

| Individual participants | 273 |
| CSOs represented | 109 |
| International organisations represented | 18 |
| Countries represented | 47 |
| Thematic sessions | 6 |
| Media mentions | 66 |
The Forum brought together 273 people from 47 countries – including the President of Guatemala – and provided participants with an opportunity to debate and develop a common understanding of the complex and dynamic political, economic, environmental, and societal linkages between land governance, food security, poverty, and democracy. The GLF highlighted the critical role of land rights in meeting challenges such as territorial development, environmental stewardship, climate change, food security, responsible investment, peace building, and indigenous peoples’ self-determination.

From an institutional point of view, the AoM provided an opportunity to debate and approve ILC governance issues and strategic directions, and to admit new members. The AoM also approved the Antigua Declaration, which notably expresses solidarity with the people of Guatemala and includes a series of eight commitments to support responsible land governance and ten action points on people-centred land governance. The Declaration recognises the need for land to be looked at not just as a productive asset but to be valued for the various functions that it performs, including cultural, spiritual, and ecological functions; it highlights the fact that land is a means of establishing people’s dignity and inclusiveness.

The Forum also provided space for co-learning and the sharing of experiences through field visits, a “marketplace of ideas”, and a learning day. The marketplace of ideas created a public space where members were able to showcase innovative practices, tools, and approaches that had a high potential for scaling up. The learning day offered in-depth learning sessions designed to exploit the knowledge that exists within the ILC network. One training session was on “Promoting gender justice: tools for monitoring – and advocating for – women’s land rights in land policies and programmes”, while the second was on “Achieving results through open knowledge and communications advocacy tools”.

President Otto Pérez Molina underlined that a holistic vision is needed to overcome the poverty, exclusion, and inequality that exist in Guatemala and to achieve sustainable peace.
Our big event epitomises our institutional response to global evolutions

The 2013 GLF and AoM reflected evolutions in the land debate worldwide and epitomised the long-term achievements of the Coalition in particular.

1. **Land is politically more visible than ever before.** This reality provides a unique opportunity for change at national level, but it requires strategic and coordinated engagement. Therefore, ILC has begun to more systematically create spaces for land debates at a national level. The National Engagement Strategies (NES), first conceived in 2012, have become the Coalition’s principal tool to support or create multi-stakeholder platforms on land governance at national level. At the gathering in Guatemala, members and partners shared their NES experiences along with their achievements and the challenges ahead.

2. **It is not just about land, it is about sustainable livelihoods.** Equitable access to land (including through redistribution or restitution) and security of tenure are not goals per se – they are vital conditions for small-scale producers and family farmers to ensure their food security. However, the claims of our membership, made during the Forum, go beyond these first necessary conditions. Members point out the need for good land governance in conjunction with rural development, in order to provide a sustainable livelihood to smallholder farmers. These multiple dimensions of the land question were captured by the Antigua Declaration and the commitments and action points that member organisations agreed upon in Antigua.

3. **More than ever, advocacy work needs to be evidence-based.** Thanks to data collected by the Land Matrix partnership in 2011–2012, the extent of global commercial pressures on land became clear. In 2013 ILC geared up its monitoring efforts at regional and national levels, gathering qualitative as well as quantitative data and information not only on land deals but also on land rights, land policies, and policy implementation. During the GLF members were trained in data-based advocacy, as data management will be a fundamental part of empowerment processes in the future.

4. **Addressing the potential of the most vulnerable citizens, from intentions to action.** ILC has reinforced its focus on women and indigenous peoples, and a new initiative to help support land and environmental rights defenders was launched in 2013.
2013 was a remarkable year in terms of strengthening the Coalition’s voice. The AoM adopted the Antigua Declaration, in which members committed themselves to contribute to the realisation of the Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa (ALPFG) and the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT).

This general statement was reinforced by ten specific commitments that, taken together, constitute the first widely agreed definition of “people-centred land governance”. This concept will drive our work in the future and, we hope, will be a reference point for all those working on land governance with a focus on meeting the needs of women and men living in poverty.

Achieving consensus within the Coalition gives momentum to our ongoing activities, creates new space for collaboration, enhances members’ ability to influence policy processes, and helps to convey the bigger picture beyond any single activity. We have learned that there is a strong connection between a common vision and the potential for impact.

Reaching such a consensus was not an easy task – it took years of dialogue and joint learning. But 2013 showed that it is possible to find areas of common ground, building on international benchmarks. Where disagreements remain and can be acknowledged and respected, it is a sign of the Coalition’s healthy diversity of membership and its vibrancy.

We think that this vibrancy makes ILC even more relevant to the wider land and development community and that it strengthens the basis for more sustainable debate in the future. It also means that we need to equip ourselves with tools to conduct more systematic dialogues, both within our network and with other players, to further identify areas of consensus that enable collective action.

Recent expansion makes the Coalition more representative of the diversity of land actors.
The 2013 AoM admitted 36 new member organisations to the coalition, expanding it to 152 organisations in total. This latest round of expansion reinforced the membership base mainly with research and grassroots organisations, and 16 of the 36 new members were from countries or regions that were not previously represented in the network. In other words, this latest expansion has allowed us to better cover the diversity of actors in the land sector, both in geographical and organisational terms.

Many global organisations are following the Coalition closely and joined its ranks in 2013, with more expressing an interest to join in the next round of admissions (2014–2015). Some have land issues as their primary focus while others have recognised the centrality of land issues only recently, but all appreciate the need to link global work coherently to country-level actions.

The top five motivations for becoming an ILC member

1. Information sharing and learning: sharing ideas and experiences with like-minded organisations, as well as learning from others.

2. Benefiting from expertise both of ILC Secretariat and within the ILC network: in the form of technical support, as well as opportunities for training, etc.

3. Network and relationship building: alliance building, opportunities to find ways of working with others who share a common goal and vision.

4. Platform to raise issues at international level: membership means increased ability to put pressure on governments and international figures.

5. Broaden audience for the organization: reaching a wider audience, with technical support in the area of communications and public relations.
As members of ILC, we welcome and reaffirm the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure, and the Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa, as much-needed global and regional norms and benchmarks. We call on States to take the appropriate legal and institutional policies to operationalise these Guidelines, and we commit ourselves to working with them and other partners towards extending these Guidelines to practice and policy, both as member organisations and as a coalition.

We, in particular, recognise that the implementation of these Guidelines at the country level requires intensive engagement by multiple stakeholders at local, national and regional levels, and that implementing these Guidelines and other international standards involves trade-offs between competing interests and priorities. We also know that transforming international norms into reality on the ground is an enormous challenge that requires the collaboration of all.

As ILC members, we commit ourselves to contribute to their operationalisation, with a particular focus on those who live in poverty and consistent with our vision that ‘Secure and equitable access to and control over land reduces poverty and contributes to identity, dignity, and inclusion.’

Drawing on our fifteen years of experience as a coalition, we emphasise the following ten actions as essential to achieving people-centred land governance. We will work together as a coalition, and with all concerned state and non-state actors, to see that these actions are put into practice.

1. **Respect, protect and strengthen the land rights of women and men living in poverty**, ensuring that no one is deprived of the use and control of the land on which their well-being and human dignity depend, including through eviction, expulsion or exclusion, and with compulsory changes to tenure undertaken only in line with international law and standards on human rights.

2. **Ensure equitable land distribution and public investment that supports small-scale farming systems**, including through redistributive agrarian reforms that counter excessive land concentration, provide for secure and equitable use and control of land, and allocate appropriate land to landless rural producers and urban residents, whilst supporting smallholders as investors and producers, such as through cooperative and partnership business models.

3. **Recognise and protect the diverse tenure and production systems upon which people’s livelihoods depend**, including the communal and customary tenure systems of smallholders, indigenous peoples, pastoralists, fisher folks, and holders of overlapping, shifting and periodic rights to land and other natural resources, even when these are not recognised by law, and whilst also acknowledging that the well-being of resource-users may be affected by changes beyond the boundaries of the land to which they have tenure rights.
4. **Ensure gender justice in relation to land**, taking all necessary measures to pursue both de jure and de facto equality, enhancing the ability of women to defend their land rights and take equal part in decision-making, and ensuring that control over land and the benefits that are derived thereof are equal between women and men, including the right to inherit and bequeath tenure rights.

5. **Respect and protect the inherent land and territorial rights of indigenous peoples**, as set out in ILO Convention 169 and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, including by recognising that respect for indigenous knowledge and cultures contributes to sustainable and equitable development and proper management of the environment.

6. **Enable the role of local land users in territorial and ecosystem management**, recognising that sustainable development and the stewardship of ecosystems are best achieved through participatory decision-making and management at the territorial-level, empowering local land users and their communities with the authority, means and incentives to carry out this responsibility.

7. **Ensure that processes of decision-making over land are inclusive**, so that policies, laws, procedures and decisions concerning land adequately reflect the rights, needs and aspirations of individuals and communities who will be affected by them. This requires the empowerment of those who otherwise would face limitations in representing their interests, particularly through support to land users’ and other civil society organisations that are best able to inform, mobilise and legitimately represent marginalised land users, and their participation in multi-stakeholder platforms for policy dialogue.

8. **Ensure transparency and accountability**, through unhindered and timely public access to all information that may contribute to informed public debate and decision-making on land issues at all stages, and through decentralisation to the lowest effective level, to facilitate participation, accountability and the identification of locally appropriate solutions.

9. **Prevent and remedy land grabbing**, respecting traditional land use rights and local livelihoods, and ensuring that all large-scale initiatives that involve the use of land, water and other natural resources comply with human rights and environmental obligations and are based on:
   - the free, prior and informed consent of existing land users;
   - a thorough assessment of economic, social, cultural and environmental impacts with respect to both women and men;
   - democratic planning and independent oversight; and
   - transparent contracts that respect labour rights, comply with social and fiscal obligations and are specific and binding on the sharing of responsibilities and benefits.

   » Where adverse impacts on human rights and legitimate tenure rights have occurred, concerned actors should provide for, and cooperate in, impartial and competent mechanisms to provide remedy, including through land restitution and compensation.

10. **Respect and protect the civil and political rights of human rights defenders working on land issues**, combating the stigmatisation and criminalisation of peaceful protest and land rights activism, and ending impunity for human rights violations, including harassment, threats, violence and political imprisonment.
In 2013, ILC invested significantly in strengthening its regional platforms in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). All three platforms now have their own Regional Coordination Units hosted by a member organisation. Each unit is headed by a regional coordinator, supported by a regional communications officer. All of these individuals have been recruited through an open and transparent process by the regions themselves.

The Regional Coordination Units report to Regional Steering Committees, in which the global Secretariat participates in order to ensure institutional coherence and linkages between the global and regional dimensions of ILC’s work.

The process of restructuring the ILC Global Secretariat was completed in 2013. Under the new structure, in addition to the core administration and management of the coalition, the Secretariat is organised into three clusters: (1) global network coordination and land monitoring; (2) global policy and technical support; and (3) corporate administration and finances. This reorganisation will help support the regions by bringing global technical and policy support more coherently to their work as they implement regional and national programmes. The cluster structure will also improve the coherence of technical, policy, and advisory support services to ILC’s membership. Finally, this new structure should increase opportunities for non-regional organisations to have their interests reflected in the Coalition’s work, despite not being part of the regional platforms.
Main outcomes of the regional forums

Improving connections between global- and national-level activities.

Africa
At the forum’s meeting in South Africa, regional integration and dialogue with the AU/ECA/AfDB Land Policy Initiative emerged as new priorities, given the need to ensure implementation of the ALPFG at the national level to promote better land governance in relation to communal land tenure, women’s rights, indigenous people’s rights, and small-scale farmers.

Asia
The meeting in Mongolia highlighted the new laws drafted by the government of the host country, which ILC member has actively participated in formulating (see case study on Mongolia). Different country experiences of land law development were exchanged, with government representatives acknowledging important points such as the need to make consultations on the formulation of the draft laws participatory if their implementation is to be successful, as well the need for laws to be gender-sensitive and of benefit to vulnerable populations.

Latin America and the Caribbean
The meeting of the regional forum in El Salvador provided a major opportunity for an exchange of views between government representatives, IGOs, social movements, and CSOs on the challenges faced by family farming in the region. A panel of experts discussion was held with the participation of grassroots organisations, highlighting key elements of work in the region supported by ILC in the context of the IYFF. The Technical Secretary of the Presidency of the Government of El Salvador, recognising the strategic importance of family farming, reinforced his government’s commitment to meeting the needs of rural people in light of continuing changes in rural areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hosting Organisation in the Region</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
<th>Regional Steering Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>LWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBOSCUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAFIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ULA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>KPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SARRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ANGOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAFID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IFAD Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICRAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>CEPES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CINEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NITLAPAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Financial highlights

The ILC Secretariat had confirmed contributions totalling USD 22 million, with prospects for further contributions in 2014.

The full five-year implementation of ILC’s 2011–2015 Strategic Framework was budgeted as requiring a total of USD 37 million. The Secretariat was to take responsibility for raising the bulk of this – up to USD 27 million – over the lifetime of the Strategic Framework, with the remainder to come from the regions as they grew stronger over time. The regions were supposed to raise up to USD 10 million, in a progression that would see them contribute up to 40% of the ILC budget in 2015.

As of December 2013, the ILC Secretariat had confirmed contributions totalling USD 22 million, with prospects for further contributions in 2014 – a sum that represents 81% of the total budget to be mobilised by the Secretariat to implement the Strategic Framework objectives. This is an encouraging achievement. The 22nd Coalition Council, however, stressed the importance of the Secretariat addressing the funding gap, which is in the order of USD 5 million for the remainder of the current Strategic Framework period, while starting to mobilise funding beyond December 2015.

The Coalition Council also emphasised the need to strengthen efforts to mobilise resources at regional and country levels in order to sustain ILC’s increasingly decentralised organisational structure. In parallel, a call was made to more systematically track resources that are already being mobilised by ILC members and partners against the objectives and work plan set out in the 2011–2015 Strategic Framework. A systematic assessment of these funds was done for the first time in 2013, and showed an amount equivalent to USD 589,500 (and USD 866,600 cumulatively over the period 2011–2013). While this figure does not monetise in-kind contributions made by members and partners at regional level nor capture financial efforts by non-regional members to contribute to commonly designed global initiatives, it shows positive signs of support by members and partner organisations to the current Strategic Framework, representing 17.7% of ILC’s total granting leverage in 2013.

By the end of 2013, the executed budget amounted to USD 7.1 million, against an adjusted final budget of USD 8.7 million for the year – this is equivalent to 81.7% implementation capacity. If compared with the executed budget in 2012 (USD 4.5 million, against an adjusted final budget of USD 5.5 million, equivalent to 82%), it can be seen that ILC had a good absorption capacity to implement additional resources made available in 2013.

ILC members contributed 60% of membership dues in 2013, less than in the previous year (73%). The Membership Fund, based on total membership dues collected, amounted to USD 90,000 at the end of 2013.

The ILC Secretariat had confirmed contributions totalling USD 22 million, with prospects for further contributions in 2014.
Financial summary

Independent auditor’s report.

To the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) as administrators for the International Land Coalition

Report on the financial statements
We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the International Land Coalition, which comprise the balance sheet as at 31 December 2013, the statement of comprehensive income, the statement of changes in retained earnings, the cash-flow statement for the year ended, and a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information.

Management’s responsibility for the financial statements
Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these consolidated financial statements in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB), and for such internal control as Management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditor’s responsibility
Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with International Standards on Auditing. Those standards require that we comply with ethical requirements and plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor’s judgement, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity’s preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity’s internal control. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

Opinion
In our opinion, the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the International Land Coalition as at December 31, 2013, and its financial performance and its cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board.

DELOITTE & TOUCHE S.p.A.
Rome, 8 April 2014

DELOITTE & TOUCHE S.p.A.
Rome, 8 April 2014
**Balance Sheet**

As at 31 December 2013 and 2012 (expressed in United States Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>8,162,177</td>
<td>5,417,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions receivable</td>
<td>10,231,316</td>
<td>8,444,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other receivables</td>
<td>61,316</td>
<td>56,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>18,454,809</td>
<td>13,919,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities and equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payables and liabilities</td>
<td>1,635,964</td>
<td>1,310,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisbursed grants</td>
<td>2,333,440</td>
<td>1,293,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund payables</td>
<td>1,429,896</td>
<td>526,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contribution revenues</td>
<td>13,126,373</td>
<td>10,794,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained earnings</td>
<td>(70,864)</td>
<td>(5,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities and equity</strong></td>
<td>18,454,809</td>
<td>13,919,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statement of Comprehensive Income

For the years ended 31 December 2013 and 2012 (expressed in United States Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions revenues</td>
<td>6 072 239</td>
<td>4 493 885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest income</td>
<td>3 929</td>
<td>3 679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td>6 076 168</td>
<td>4 497 564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff salaries and benefits</td>
<td>(1 292 229)</td>
<td>(999 264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants and other non-staff costs</td>
<td>(677 986)</td>
<td>(598 813)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and general expenses</td>
<td>(1 156 407)</td>
<td>(863 841)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges</td>
<td>(3 453)</td>
<td>(2 780)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant expenses</td>
<td>(2 946 093)</td>
<td>(2 032 866)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td>(6 076 168)</td>
<td>(4 497 564)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustment for changes in fair value</strong></td>
<td>2 876</td>
<td>(235 826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact of foreign exchange rate movements</strong></td>
<td>(171 032)</td>
<td>(59 124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess/(deficit) revenue over expenses</strong></td>
<td>(168 156)</td>
<td>(294 950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other comprehensive income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for after-service medical scheme benefits</td>
<td>102 892</td>
<td>(189 044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total other comprehensive income</strong></td>
<td>102 892</td>
<td>(189 044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total comprehensive income/(loss)</strong></td>
<td>(65 264)</td>
<td>(483 994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
annex
ILC’s progress in 2013

ILC considers its yearly work as part of a wider effort to achieve the objectives set by the Strategic Framework.

2013 was the second full year of implementation of the ILC Strategic Framework 2011-2015 and this report assesses the contribution of this year’s results toward achieving ILC’s strategic targets.

The table on the following pages represents progress made in the course of 2013 and helps assess whether ILC is on track to achieve its goals.

It references expected results per Strategic Objective together with their respective indicators and 2013 results.

Indicators and results reveal the challenges encountered.

As you may see from the legend, green indicates areas in which ILC has made considerable progress towards achieving the intended result. A green goal is very likely to be achieved by 2015, at the end of the Strategic Framework period.

Yellow indicates areas in which some activity has been undertaken, but more needs to be done in order to reach the target set by the indicator.

Red refers to areas in which ILC is not on track and will therefore have to work harder in order to deliver the expected result.
### Strategic objective 1
Influence the formulation and implementation of national policy for the benefit of rural people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Expected result 1.1**  
Collaborative partnerships on land governance issues are strengthened in ILC focus countries. | 10 country-level collaborative partnerships established, involving ILC members and relevant governmental and non-governmental partners.  
Land Watch/Observatory established and functional in each of the focus countries.  
Comprehensive country profiles for each of ILC’s focus countries. | 22\(^1\) national partnerships ongoing  
11 observatories established  
18 country profiles |
| **Expected result 1.2**  
Mechanisms for the implementation of pro-poor land policies are pilot-tested, documented, shared, and adopted. | 100 ILC-supported direct interventions on the ground.  
Events organised at national level to share results of pilots and other initiatives on the ground and the number and type of participants.  
Advocacy tools developed to promote adoption of good practice examples. | 4 (in 2012) /14\(^1\) in 2013  
63 events, with approximately 6,000 participants\(^3\)  
2 manuals under the SRMP |

### Strategic objective 2
Influence global and regional land-related processes and systems in favour of pro-poor land policies and governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Expected result 2.1**  
CSOs, international organisations, governments, and other concerned actors have a better understanding of land issues. | Global advocacy events organised and attended (panel discussions, side events, etc.).  
Dialogue events held with key actors on issues such as foreign investment in land, implementation of the principle of free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC), land and climate change, etc.  
ILC consultations and joint advocacy initiatives organised for members and partners. | 68 events\(^4\)  
26, of which 21 attended by members and 5 by Secretariat staff\(^5\)  
9 events |
| **Expected result 2.2**  
Global/regional processes benefit from/are informed by, perspectives, knowledge, expertise of actors traditionally excluded from such forums. | Number of members and partners attending international events (80% of members participating in at least two ILC-facilitated consultations/joint actions).  
Policy briefs, declarations, and policy papers resulting from ILC consultations. | 33 participants sponsored to participate in 29 events\(^6\)  
1 declaration, 4 policy briefs |

---

1. 20 NES countries (at varying stage of implementation) plus Tanzania (SRMP project) and CAU Niger.
2. Not including interventions which as integral parts of NES. Figure refers to 9 FTI projects and 5 other country-level initiatives in Mongolia, Pakistan, Tanzania, Ethiopia and Kenya.
3. Considering Marches, public meetings, exchange of experience events, roundtables, focus group discussions most of them in the frame of NES (source: monthly updates of 2013 and inputs to report on the Programme of Work 2013).
4. Excluding events for which ILC is among the main conveners.
5. Dialogue event: event organised by ILC, by ILC members, or other organisations or institutions, to which ILC members or Secretariat participated.
7. This only considers workshops, seminars and trainings with learning component and does NOT count for conferences and other similar public events.
### Strategic objective 3
**Build the world’s leading knowledge network on land governance, contributing to substantive improvements in the monitoring, sharing, and uptake of land-related knowledge.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Expected result 3.1**  
A world-leading, easy-access, easy-to-use online platform is established for sharing land-related information. | At least 100 baseline country profiles completed for the Land Portal. | 180 country pages |
| | Global land indicators finalised and partnership established to measure them (2012). | In draft (under discussion) |
| | Global report on status and trends in pro-poor land governance published by 2015. | In progress (4 “Framing the Debate” papers published) |
| **Expected result 3.2**  
The gap is bridged between grassroots activism and academic research on land issues. | Number of collaborative research projects on the ground on priority themes. | 33 (12 desk-based/17 empirical/3 case studies/1 documentary) |
| | Workshops and other knowledge-sharing events. | 17 events’ |
| | 50% increase in number of members and partners attending collective learning initiatives (Learning Routes, Training of Trainers, etc.). | Capacity building events, seminars, and trainings: 107 (2011); 161 (2012); 268 (2013)* |
| | Number of beneficiaries of Internship Programmes (50 by 2015). | 5 in 2013 (2 in 2012) |

### Strategic objective 4
**Strengthen ILC as a vibrant, solid, and influential global actor on land-related issues.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Expected result 4.1**  
ILC is strategically expanded and diversified. | 100% increase in membership against 2010 baseline. | 90% (80 in 2010, 152 in 2013) |
| | One-third of leading regional networks of farmers’ organisations are members of ILC. | 3: AFA, ROPPA, EAFF |
| | 50% increase in number of academic institutions in ILC membership. | 150%, from 8 in 2010 to 20 in 2013 |
| | Expansion in number of Strategic Partners to about ten (compared with three in 2010). | 5: EC, SDC, MFA of the Netherlands, Sida, LPI |
| **Expected result 4.2**  
ILC’s financial situation is improved. | ILC’s average annual budget level doubles during the 2011–2015 period, compared with 2007–2011. | 68.56% increase |
| | At least 40% of financial resources are mobilised from regional platforms. | USD 389,500 (cumulative 2011-2013 USD 866,600), 17% |
| | At least 80% of membership dues are collected every year. | Average 72.92% |
| **Expected result 4.3**  
ILC’s governance is strengthened. | By December 2013 a new hosting arrangement is found for the Secretariat. | New MoU drafted |
| | ILC council and other governance sessions take place regularly. | 1AoM: 3 regional assemblies; 2 Coalition Councils |
| | At least 40% of participants in ILC governance structures are women. | Average 25% in 2013 |
Thanks to our donors, ILC wishes to thank the following donors for their contributions in 2013:

- Belgian Fund for Food Security (BFFS)
- European Commission (EC)
- Ford Foundation
- Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
- Irish Aid
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
- Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)
- Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
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Our Mission
A global alliance of civil society and intergovernmental organisations working together to promote secure and equitable access to and control over land for poor women and men.

Our Vision
Secure and equitable access to and control over land reduces poverty and contributes to identity, dignity, and inclusion.