



Global Donor Platform
for Rural Development

Global Donor Working Group on Land
14th Physical Meeting, Sofitel Hotel, Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire
25 November 2019, 14:00 – 18:00h GMT

Member Participants:

- **SDC** – Peter Sidler (Chair)
- **BMZ** – Nora Boehm
- **DFID** – Chris Buckley (DFID)
- **FAO** –Jean Maurice Durand (dialed in), Francesca Romano
- **GIZ** – Anita Hernig
- **IFAD** – Giulia Barbanente, Jimmy Gaudin, Harold Liversage
- **MCC** – Jennifer Lisher (dialed In)
- **MFA Sweden** – Senait Regassa
- **Omidyar Network** – Amy Regas (dialed in)
- **RVO** – Gemma Betsema & Rik Wouters
- **UNHabitat/GLTN** – Oumar Sylla
- **UNHabitat/GLTN-GLII** – Everlyne Nairesiae
- **USAID** – Caleb Stevens (dialed in)
- **World Bank** – Victoria Stanley, Andre Teyssier, Linus Potts, Michael O’Sullivan

Invited Strategic Partners on Agenda Item 5:

- **ILC** – Ward Anseeuw, Mike Taylor
- **LEGEND** – Julian Quan

Platform Secretariat: Manuel Urrutia, Octavio de Araujo

Agenda:

1. [Welcome](#)
2. [Member update round table](#)
3. [Into the dragons' den](#)
4. [GDWGL planning during the Platform's Transition to IFAD](#)
5. [GLGR concept and the Land Summit](#)
6. [Discussion - Strategic partner presentations](#)
7. [AOB & closing remarks](#)

Summary of decisions/agreements on Agenda Item:

3) Into the dragons' den

- WB and RVO presentations will be circulated with the minutes
- USAID will present their Dragon's Den at the next telco

4) GDWGL planning during the Platform's Transition to IFAD

- GDWGL members are encouraged to begin to direct contributions to IFAD
- All GDWGL members are encouraged to pay the minimum contribution to the Platform to maintain Secretariat services

5) GLGR concept and the Land Summit

- General go ahead and process - The Group should go ahead with the plan to publish a GLGR, next steps discussed at next telco. DFID to come up with a first proposal for a strategic document guiding the concept note group (FAO, GLTN, ILC) on the next steps.
- Report organizational institutional setting – The Group has had some feedback and will come up with more inputs and guidance in this regard. The next GDWGL telco in January will have the GLGR as an agenda item in addition to discussion on the WB Conference public GDWGL session dedicated to seek inputs from a broader public on the GLGR.
- Timeline for first report – The Group is still reviewing the timeline and will clarify as soon as possible.
- Report focus – There are some feedbacks on the content and there are different target groups within the government domain.
- Financial/Resource commitment – There are resource commitments from the three lead institutions (UN-Habitat/GLTN/GLII, FAO, ILC), as well as DFID, but a more concrete discussion on financial commitment should take place when everything else has more clarity.

6) Discussion - Strategic partner presentations

- Secretariat will draft criteria by which partner organizations can be involved in meetings. Criteria to be presented and discussed on at the next telco was approved

7) AOB & closing remarks

- Revisit topic of structured CSO engagement at a later date, potentially at the next telco

1. Welcome

Chair (DFID) welcomed the members to the meeting and highlighted the importance and effectiveness of the GDWGL to the Global Donor Platform. The biannual physical meetings contribute to Group's effectiveness and are key to its success. The chair encouraged members to use the Group as a platform to formulate a more ambitious agenda. DFID announced the end of their year term as Chair of the group and passed on the position to SDC, with FAO assuming the vice chair position.

Chair (SDC): Accepted the Chair position and expressed their pleasure to take over the position.

FAO: Accepted the vice Chair position.

Chair: with FAO as the new co-chair. Reiterated DFID's points that the GDWGL can advance the land agenda together and can help each member make the case for land in their own constituencies. Highlighted that the Global Land Governance Report (GLGR) and Land Summit are options to advance the land agenda. Reviewed the agenda for the day, it was approved by the members with no comments.

2. Member updates round table

UN-Habitat/GLTN:

- Intervention in South Sudan (UN-Habitat/FAO: UN Peacebuilding Funds) to enhance women's access to land to consolidate peace. Capacity building for traditional authorities and changes agents; community leaders for gender responsive land disputes resolution. Improve land management and administrative system to enhance access to land for women and vulnerable groups (IDPS and so) (process and access to land information). Awareness building for policy makers for gender responsive land policies
- Intervention in DR Congo under the Central Africa Forest Initiative (REDD+) Framework. Draft land policy through consultation within the 26 provinces. Integrated land administration model to respond to community needs in terms of land tenure security (customs and practices) in 4 provinces. Mutli-Stakeholder's Regional workshops on land and conflict (UN-Habitat and NL in June in Bakavu).
- In Uganda, land tenure security interventions in customary lands and implementation of the National Land Policy. Issuance of certificate of customary occupancy in 3 districts (joint titling including women; engagement of national governments). 3552 CCO issues and 6296 more expected before the end of the year (40% issued to women). Discussion for scaling up with NL embassy in Uganda (to reach 30,000 certificates in the coming 3 years. Implementation of the FFP land administration model; strategy already developed. Development of an overarching program for the MoLand Affairs
- NORAD agreement: supports local land taxation system in fragile states (Afghanistan and Somalia) to leverage land based financing to support basic infrastructures and citizen participation. Scales up good practices on land tenure regularization and securing as the basis for local revenue. Strengthens capacity for local government to enhance land based local revenue for reconstruction and peace building
- Joint research on Syria refugees outside of Syria (in Lebanon) in collaboration with GIZ on Housing, Land and Property (HLP). Objectives are to identify bottlenecks, collect data to inform regulatory reform, design interventions, awareness and platform on HLP. EU funded projects: to review HLP current context, review policy and regulatory framework related to land administration, informal settlements; data infrastructures and capacity assessment; develop a language for the peace agreement if any.
- Land nexus peace and development in the Horn of Africa: Regional Prevention Strategy in the Horn of Africa (land and conflict-UN-Habitat/FAO). Common analysis in the horn of Africa: land, migration, transhumance, climate change. Support to the UN Special Envoy in the Horn of Africa.
- UN-Habitat also informed that they might have one slot on land at the World Urban Forum in Abu-Dhabi from 8-13 February 2020. Potential theme: land and sustainable urbanization in terms of access to data and financing. UN-Habitat will share the concept note with the Group later.

BMZ: New BMZ focal point, took over for Fritz. S2RI (strengthening responsible agricultural investment) project has from Christian Graefen's team at GIZ to Klaus Ackermann's team, who is head of the global land projects, along with Anita Hering. They are also keen to continue the project's work, not only in Ethiopia, but also in Laos and Uganda and are looking for some co-financing. While Senegal will not become a part of this global programme, Germany and BMZ have set up recon partnerships with a couple of African countries, Senegal among them. Senegal is keen to work on land governance within the framework of the partnership. This is something that will move forward and is in the making.

DFID:

- Will be sharing more information by January 2020 the new Africa Land Facility programme.
- Funding a new initiative by the Earthworm Foundation (formerly the Tropical Forest Trust). The Foundation supports the Center for Excellence, a school based in Africa, that trains a new generation of environmental social risk managers every year with a focus on social aspects of environmental impact assessments (EIA). If anyone knows anyone who would like to send someone to the school or host an intern, please reach out to DFID.

- The last update is on a note recently published by Lorenzo Cotula and the LEGEND programme that looks at the VGGT and the ILC Performance Standards, building on earlier work by BMZ and GIZ had done on that, and trying to break down what are some of the differences and where some of the limitations. Particularly relevant around the issue of land rights and human rights.
- There is a process underway linked to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) to look at land in that context. The process will use a general comment to position land rights more centrally as a human right, depending on the outcome of the process. DFID will circulate the note so that the Group can feed a joint comment into the process.

FAO:

- A point from Delhi Declaration formulated at UNCCD COP14 was the request for FAO to look into the linkages between tenure, in particular the use of the VGGTs, and the Convention. The resolution requests FAO to provide technical guide on the topic. FAO stated that they have the timeframe to do the task, adding that they would like to accompany the development of the technical guide with more inclusive process of consultation on the issue. FAO is currently working on the development of the work plan and funding.
- Announced the date for a forum at the end of March 2020 in Ghana, in collaboration with the Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment, The forum is dedicated to investment promotion agencies and institutions dealing with investment approval processes. FAO has identified six countries – Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Ghana, Liberia and Sierra Leone – and has also received confirmations and nominations from all the 6 countries. GIZ also showed some interests to support two participants from Ethiopia.

World Bank:

Highlights on their Africa Gender Innovation Lab. It generates rigorous evidence from impact evaluations of what currently works to promote women's property rights. Second, they use the evidence to inform and shape policy. In the first piece, they are currently looking for implementing partners interested in testing innovative new ways to strengthen property right and tenure security. Current project support comes from the Gate Foundation, DFID, and other but they are happy to speak with any Group members who are interested in funding projects. The Lab is interested in getting their evidence used by others. Please contact Michael O'Sullivan (mosullivan@worldbank.org) if you would like to get in touch about using their evidence.

3. Intro the dragon's den

Action Points/Recommendations:

- WB and RVO presentations will be circulated with the minutes
- USAID will present their Dragon's Den at the next telco

[MFA Sweden presentation on African interventions](#)

MFA Sweden: Presented an overview of the Swedish government's general contributions in the area of land governance which consist of three different levels: global, regional and country. At the global level, they are contributing to ILC, which started in 2014 and will run until 2021. The contribution focuses on enabling poor women to gain secure access to land. Sweden also contributes to the Rights and Resources Initiative, starting in 2018 and the agreement will last until 2021. The overall purposes of the institute is to increase forest area under community ownership and to prevent laws that weaken customary and statutory land rights of indigenous people. Their third global level contribution goes to the Tenure Facility which started in 2018 and will continue until 2020. The purpose of this contribution is for local communities to have sustainable management of their forests and land access.

At the regional level, Sweden contributes to Sub-Saharan Africa development cooperation strategies to promote cooperation between countries and the regional economic communities. Recently, Sweden joined SDC in providing the land governance support that assist member states to harmonize policy framework and improve land administration. The specific objectives of the project are:

- to enhance further the capacities of IGAD and its member states to effectively implement their respective land administration system with application of innovative tools;
- to strengthen gender mainstream land administration in the IGAD member states;
- to facilitate land monitoring for improved land policy processes and implementation in the IGAD region;
- and to enhance IGAD capacities to oversee the implementation of the regional land programme. SIDA elaborated that this is a most recent contribution that that will run for 2 years.

At the country level, Sweden's contributions focus on five countries:

1. Liberia (Capacity development in land administration, 2019- 2023);
2. Rwanda (Capacity development in land administration with collaboration with Swedish agency of land mapping, cadastral and registration, 2017 – 2021);
3. Tanzania (Land tenure regularization, policy and institutional development, 2017-2019), Gambella region. The support for Tanzania also has a parallel project with the support of CSOs.
4. Ethiopia (Land development plan with The Horn of African Regional Environment Center, 2016-2021)
5. Zambia (Sustainable integrated land management solution, 2015-2019).

Chair: Thanked the SIDA representative for being at the meeting and presenting their big portfolio. The Chair also underlined the fact that only when members can better understand what each of them do that they can work closely together and align their support.

[WB presentation on UN-GGIM IGIF and Stand4HerLand Campaign](#)

WB:

WB clarified that they also now have gender innovation labs for South Asia, Africa, East Asia and Pacific, and Latin America.

Presented on two global initiatives focused on the operations of the Land Unit, the United Nations Global Geospatial Information Management's (UN-GGIM) Integrated Geospatial Information Framework (IGIF) and the Stand4HerLand Campaign.

1. The WB has been working with the (UN-GGIM) to develop the (IGIF) with the vision to generate the efficient use of geospatial information by all to effectively measure, monitor, and achieve sustainable social, economic, and environmental development. The objectives are to provide the reference for country-level action plans, including investment plans and socio-economic justification, to operationalize and ensure the sustainability of national geospatial information systems. It is aimed specifically at low and medium income countries, but with broader relevance.
2. The global advocacy Stand4HerLand campaign for women's land right was launched in March 2019 at the WB Land & Poverty Conference with Landesa acting as the Secretariat of the campaign. The global steering committee at the moment is comprised of GLTN, Habitat for Humanity, the Huairou Commission, and Landesa. They are hoping to expand the steering committee and are simultaneously looking for global partners. They have also been scaling up the programme in Africa. The campaign will run until 2030 and is linked to the SDGs.

Within Africa, the WB is scaling up operations more than a dozen countries and growing. In implementing their interventions, the WB recognizes customary and communal tenure rights and supports women's land rights. They are also trying to ramp up their donor coordination and are supporting governments to do a better job on donor coordination and improving land governance at all levels, including local and

customary. This means a scaling of from thousands of parcels to millions. To expand the scope of its work, some of the WB's country program portfolio, such as the one in Tanzania, include urban land. The Tanzania project will issue 1,000 certificates of the right of occupancy in urban areas. In term of capacity building component, the Bank is hoping to partner better with NELGA going forward.

Raised questions within the group regarding the public-private partnership (PPP) space, and the need to include private investment for land issues, keeping in mind that there are inherent risks. The complicated nature of land administration may not be clear to private investors. In this regards, they are finalizing Analytical and Operational Frameworks for PPP in Land Administration.

Reactions/comments to World Bank's update:

FAO: Raised the issue of confusion at the country level due to uncoordinated donor programmes and asked what role the GDWGL can play to mediate the issue. How can the Group make a better use of this forum? Should the Group work as channel for information?

Chair: Agreed that this is an important point that can be an added value for the GDWGL. The GDWGL Code of Conduct could be resent to the Group and touched upon at the next telco.

WB: Provided an example of Liberia where there are at least 10 different donors involved working on land issue but there is not donor coordination mechanism.

DFID: Asked whether the Bank, in its country programmes, see some openness from the Government to develop a more mixed approach. How does the Bank begin to assess and what tools the Bank could use to focus on the country?

- **WB:** Responded that there is no straightforward answer to the question. The Bank provided an example of Liberia which passed the land right act that allows for communal land right for the first time in the country's history. The Bank is working with Liberia Land Authority (LLA) to pilot how that would be done on the ground. In Tanzania, the Bank had preliminary discussion with the government on how do we recognize land right for pastoralist, which has to be done on communal basis. The Bank also provided an example in some Francophone countries where government does not support consultation with CSOs. Overall, the case varies from countries to countries.

UN Habitat: Wanted to know the Bank's update on its current work in Senegal.

- **WB:** Responded that they are at an early stage of preparation for a project in Senegal.

RVO: Wanted to know the budget for the Bank's programme and the responsible entity to coordinate the donor's activities at the country level.

- **WB:** Responded that there is no budget since it depends on the country's envelopes which vary greatly from country to country. Regarding the coordination responsibility, the Bank stated that it should be under the government supervision. However, this is not often the case.

Chair: Proposed that in the absence of government's leading coordination role, the most effective way to handle the situation is that development partners coordinate among themselves. The chair emphasized that the coordination responsibility is a shared one for every donors.

WB: Added that the initiative to take coordination responsibility should be started by any donors, regardless of the size of their contributions. WB also agreed that it should be a shared responsibility in rotational form.

ILC: In regards to this process and donor coordination, why not use Multi-Stakeholder Platforms?

WB: Shared recent experiences in Francophone countries on the importance of institutional arrangement in enhancing the coordination among the donor agencies.

[RVO presentation on LAND-at-scale programme](#)

RVO:

Shared presentation on their LAND-at-scale programme, which addresses land, climate, and gender issues. Funding comes from different departments from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In principal, the programme, which aims to make successful pilots and find new innovations for upscaling, is open to all countries.

Some important features of the programme:

- Knowledge management;
- Interventions should be linked to the SDGs;
- Embassies play an important role in the application process;
- NGOs are engaged with the embassies to present their ideas;
- The programme goes from identification stage to selection, formulation, and implementation;
- Flexibility in allocating the money for implementation;
- The progress to date includes 58 submitted proposals from 22 countries and 13 awarded project ideas have;
- 4 countries were selected for further exploration to reformulate project ideas: Ethiopia, Burkina Faso, Egypt, Mali;
- Deadline for next round of application is 10 March 2020;
- Most projects awarded in in African countries;
- Interventions focusing on socio economic of land right, gender, women land right, and youth;
- More interventions are on technical side of land governance rather than on land administration and registration.
- After the selection stage and during the formulation stage, their programme advisors are involved in the provision of technical assistance to submitted the ideas.

Reaction/Comment on RVO's update:

FAO: Suspected that the lack of land administration component in the intervention projects submitted to RVO might be stemmed from CSOs' limited capacity to formulate land administration component in their proposed ideas and the scale/amount of the funding.

GLTN: Wanted to know if RVO is interested to consider capacity development in monitoring and evaluation in their programme and link that to SDGs.

RVO: Responded that capacity development is considered in the knowledge management element of the programme.

WB: Asked if it is the case for all countries that after projects have been designed, they will be tendered out for NGOs and companies to bid on them?

RVO: Responded that it depends on the discussion with their legal department.

Chair: Informed the group that USAID will present their Dragon's Den in the next conference call.

4. GDWGL planning during the Platform's transition to IFAD

Action Points/Recommendations:

- GDWGL members are encouraged to begin to direct contributions to IFAD
- All GDWGL members are encouraged to pay the minimum contribution to the Platform to maintain Secretariat services

The Platform Secretariat at GIZ will enter a cost-neutral transition period starting on 1 January 2020 when the Secretariat begins to move to IFAD. It will take until June 2020 to complete the transition. The Secretariat will continue to support GDWGL activities during this transition and so there should be no interruption of staff service from now until June.

Prior to the Secretariat's move to IFAD, the member Transition Task Force will submit their final recommendations on how to shape the Platform and Secretariat to the Board the first week of December, in time for the virtual Board meeting on 10 December. The Board will make final decisions on the Task Force recommendations and their implementation at its meeting beginning of February.

Transition Task Force findings:

- While the GDWGL is frequently cited as the exemplar thematic working group, 13 out of 24 (54%) members are non-paying Platform members.

Preliminary Transition Task Force recommendations:

- A leaner Secretariat staff with one Senior Policy Advisor to coordinate one working group
- Increase the number of paying members (keep contribution rate at €50,000 a year) to offset reduced volume of contributions from the EC and BMZ (together they previously funded around 72% of the Platform)
- Working groups should be guided by the Board's decisions, and outcomes should be better communicated with the Board. Working Groups should receive Board approval before engaging in any projects that involve core Platform funding. For example, working groups will be required to submit their work plans to the Board on a bi-annual basis.

In face of the expected reduced Secretariat budget, GDWGL members, who are not currently paying Platform a membership contribution, may want to consider becoming paying members or make supplemental GDWGL contributions to provide for sufficient funding for the Secretariat's support of Platform activities.

Funding for first half of 2020

USAID will provide US\$50,000 in supplementary funding for the GDWGL in 2020; as it applies to 2020, the funding will be channelled through IFAD, but will not be available until May/June. Thus, the status of available Platform funding for GDWGL activities for the first half of next year (e.g., a side event and the next physical meeting at the WB Land and Poverty Conference) must be discussed with IFAD.

Therefore, the Secretariat recommends that GDWGL members assess possible alternative paths to funding activities until June. For example, IFAD could possibly pay the cost for a side event/meeting and then recoup the costs from USAID's funding once it arrives. Other options would be that USAID pays for the side event/meeting in March and then reduces their contribution in May/June or another Land Group member(s) cover the expenses of the side event/meeting.

The Secretariat recommends that GDWGL members begin channelling funding to IFAD, who has agreed to begin accept contributions from members sometime within the first quarter of 2020.

Chair: Encouraged members to pay the minimum contribution in order to maintain the Secretariat functions and activities.

5. GLGR concept and Land Summit

Action Points on GLGR:

- General go ahead and process - The Group should go ahead with the plan to publish a GLGR, next steps discussed at next telco. DFID to come up with a first proposal for a strategic document guiding the concept note group (FAO, GLTN, ILC) on the next steps.
- Report organizational institutional setting – The Group has had some feedback and will come up with more inputs and guidance in this regard. The next GDWGL telco in January will have the GLGR as an agenda item in addition to discussion on the WB Conference public GDWGL session dedicated to seek inputs from a broader public on the GLGR.
- Timeline for first report – The Group is still reviewing the timeline and will clarify as soon as possible.
- Report focus – There are some feedbacks on the content and there are different target groups within the government domain.
- Financial/Resource commitment – There are resource commitments from the three lead institutions (UN-Habitat/GLTN/GLII, FAO, ILC), as well as DFID, but a more concrete discussion on financial commitment should take place when everything else has more clarity.

The Group invited ILC and LEGEND, as key collaborators on the GLGR, to participate in the discussion of the GLGR

DFID: Reminded everyone about its one pager that was circulated (please reach out to the Secretariat if you require a copy) which gives a bigger picture of the idea of the GLGR and uses the Global Nutrition Report as a point of reference. Reiterated that land is losing a bit of momentum and that a GLGR could potentially position the topic higher in the global agenda and advance it. In proposing for a report that will have such strong effect, they drew lessons from the success of the Global Nutrition Report, which can engineer a transformative phase and mobilize global movement and commitment. Mentioned how the Nutrition group used their summit to obtain governments' policy and fund commitments before they launched their report, which tracked these commitments.

Chair: Agreed that the land report could be an important contribution towards building up that momentum which they need in order to advance the agenda. Put forward 5 points for the Group to continue discussing on: 1) General go ahead and process; 2) Organizational institutional setting; 3) Timeline for first report; 4) Focus; and 5) Financial commitment.

The Chair asked UN-Habitat/GLTN to present their concept note (please reach out to the Secretariat if you require a copy of the concept note).

UN-Habitat/GLTN:

The core objective of the GLGR is to make available a single global evidence-based report on the status of land tenure and governance issues as a reference point for policy makers, linking global with country commitments in the frameworks of the VGGTs, SDGs, UNCCD, New Urban Agenda, AU-F&G, etc., and other related State obligations. It will be a tool for advocacy and policy engagement, targeting strategic spaces, including: the UN High Level Political Forum, where National Voluntary Reviews are presented and discussed annually against the SDG frameworks, the World and Regional Economic Forums, the CFS, UNCCD COP, Africa Land Policy Conference, as well as national policy processes for effective implementation of the above frameworks among others.

Additional objects are to be evidence based so as to inform and document the state of land governance and tenure in the world; elevate the discourse and build awareness at the highest political level on the importance of land in combatting poverty and addressing other global challenges; scale up policy engagement; strengthen the coordination of initiatives and actors and foster a community of practice; broadening the scope of data sources; and help mobilize support/resources for the land sector. In terms of content, the Group should discuss if the report should provide a deeper focus on specific topics or broader engagement and analysis of the land sector.

Based on informal consultations from CFS, the GLGR's main target would be policy makers, such as Ministries of Finance, Land, and Environment. The private sector, development agencies, organisations, and networks who are not the usual audience/participants in the common land sectors spaces would also be targeted. Additional audiences would be the UN HLPF, CFS, CSOs, and academia.

On the specific governance framework, the GLGR embraces a participatory approach and proposes a three tier set up composed of a Secretariat (GLTN/UN-Habitat, FAO, and ILC), a technical working group (TWG) (lead organizations, authors/experts, data providers/analysts, etc.), and a steering/advisory group (SAG) (representation from broader land community, from donors to civil society, private sector, etc.).

It was proposed that the Group should start the process soon of initiating the GLGR and see how they can refine these elements so as to not to delay the process. It would be ideal to make the GLGR a series of thematic papers that will cover what will happen over the next ten years' time. The series could start with a comprehensive and integrative baseline and then each individual report could be thematic (e.g., migration, climate change, food systems, etc.). The proposed publication and release date for the first GLGR report would be end of 2021.

FAO: Commented that the target audience definition in the concept note is too broad and could be narrowed down. The first report can focus on a specific topic more in depth or could cover a few topics more broadly, more comprehensively, without going into too much detail. On the other hand, they pointed out the challenge of the latter option in reaching a consensus on which two or three topics to concentrate on. Overall, in stating their readiness to mobilize resources (i.e., staff and budgetary) in the first task, they recognized three main points: the first report will not have the perfect template and outline; the report might evolve in the process, depending on who would like to contribute to it; and it is worth it to start working soon on it.

ILC: Noted different positions between what is currently being discussed and what is on DFID's one pager. They drew two main points based on the discussion. First, it seems like the Group is ready to work on the report with ILC, GLTN, and FAO, indicating their readiness to kick start the process and with availability of funding. Second, on the format and report content, there is discussion on either covering one broad theme or a couple of them. Based on the one-pager, there is also the possibility of using the GLGR as a monitoring tool for where we stand with regard to SDG implementation in land.

UN Habitat/GLTN: Seconded the proposal that maybe the first report could focus on advancing processes and agenda. While endorsing the focus on thematic area, they proposed a hybrid of the two proposed approaches to the report's content. To reduce to cost, GLTN recommended that the Group look into the way UNDP or UNFCC brings expert technical inputs into their reports. In terms of structure, they propose that with the confidence already shown by FAO, ILC and GLTN to work on the report, the discussion should generate some new ideas and thoughts that further strengthen the three entities and may expand the scope of opportunities for partners who can contribute and bring in fresh ideas.

Chair: Expressed the strong view that the report should create momentum for land, attracting the interest of developing countries' governments, civil society, and development partners. Posed some concrete

questions on how to use the report to attract government to invest in land and how to bring CSOs on board? Emphasized that the Group has to think smart when it comes to the focus of the first report. To do so, they should reflect on the question “What do we want the report to help us get to?”

WB: Expressed the concern that the report’s main target group has not been specified. Is it policymakers, national government, donor agencies, CSOs?

FAO: Agreed that the Group needs to work on the identification of a target group.

DFID: Put forward three points. First, there is more work to be done on the communications strategy and they are happy to work with other members on the big picture/strategic thinking. Second, the Group does not need another thematic report because it does not attract the attention of governments too much. Instead, the report needs to track progress, commitment, and spending at the heart of it. Third, if the Group is going to track progress, then it has to be done by independent agencies as it is difficult for a UN report to be able to do that in a credible way. It needs to be multi-stakeholder steering group that has an independent group of experts as well. They also added that they have budget for the GLGR that they might be able to mobilize next year.

GIZ: Appreciates the scope of the report but asks how relevant will the report be in 15 years? What is possible in terms of rural transformation and employment? How does this line of thinking inform our outlook for the GLGR?

IFAD: Stated that the Group has to be realistic in terms of the level of ambition and actual deliverable outputs of the GLGR process.

ILC: Reacted to DFID’s point on linking the report to longer-term monitoring of commitment to SDG, that while they agree with it, pointed out that such a task is not easy, especially at a global level. Also highlighted that such task is different from the exercise that was informally proposed in Rome, which was to work what we the Group already has.

Chair: Repeated the questions on target group and what the Group wants to achieve through this report. To steer the discussion, the Chair encourage member to go ambitious with their plan for the report. Concerning how independent such report should be, the Chair reminded everyone that while the UN has some advantages to produce such a report, they also bring some bureaucracy and more cost. Asked “What do we want to achieve with this report?”

LEGEND: Asked everyone to step back and to review the timetable if the ambition is to try to do publish something as big as we have been discussing with its associated challenges by the end of 2021. Maybe better to think about doing something that is as ambitious but having a structured process, having people who know about, linking it to SDG monitoring process, but not making it a monitoring report, and then coming up with something a bit late. So if the level of ambition is going to be raised in order to have more systematic coverage, stock taking, and progress, not just commitment to the progress and changes in governance and tenure security, then maybe the process for the GLGR should be longer. What is the point of having three reports by a certain date if the audience is not clearly defined, and it is unclear of how to tie the GLGR into wider transformation changes of what we want to achieve.

Chair: Proposed that since the topic of the Land Summit is the next agenda point, it might be better that the Group merge the discussions for these two agenda points here. The Chair put forward the idea that if the Group wants a single, big summit on land, 2022 can possibly be an interesting year. This would also provide more time for the Group to generate a solid report.

BMZ: Emphasized that the Group should make sure they know what they want. Shared insights that the process of approving such a big report, such as SOFI can be lengthy and tricky. It is helpful if the Group makes sure they know what they want to achieve and how to structure the process.

WB: Expressed a concern that there is no certainty that there will be a global appetite for a GLGR, as automatically assumed by the Group. They therefore urged everyone to think about what they, collectively as a group of donors, want to do and how can they keep the issues that they are working on high on the agenda?

UN-Habitat/GLTN-GLII: Stated that there is no perfect time to develop the report than now. As none of the global reports mention anything about land, the Group has the opportunity to align the GLGR with global development agendas, such as the SDGs. They reminded the Group that at the informal consultations in Rome, the Group decided to target government officials that attend land meetings or conferences. Therefore, the Group needs to discuss now the content of the report, how to pack evidence and information for the identified target group. As 2030 is approaching, they urged the Group to put themselves in an ambitious role in order to start the process sooner than later. Assured that this report, with the support of a multi-stakeholder team in the process, will generate a strong document to engage with the target group

WB: Pointed out it is about time to produce a report that should send some short of shockwave through the professional development world after the VGGT, the last momentum. In their view, what the Group wants to achieve is bringing increased funding to the sector and the target group is clearly the highest level of the government.

ILC: Noticed that although the discussion did not generate consensus, the Group made a big step forward. Summarized four main points from the discussion:

1. Rearrange the plan more concretely to have solid targets.
2. There are resource commitments from the three lead institutions (UN-Habitat/GLTN/GLII, FAO, ILC), as well as DFID.
3. There are some major questions on who to target: Governments or CSOs?
4. Centrality of the content, centrality of land in the broader context vs. linking the report into monitoring of concrete data not only on SDGs itself but also on the commitments.

DFID: Agreed with the urgency to work on the report; however, they suggested that it would be good to do a little bit of quick work around the strategy thinking. Therefore, they propose that the Group think about the slightly more ambitious agenda and maybe at the next telco in January, the group can discuss it again. In their view, there are different ways to go about this report. For example, the first report might be an input to the Summit and then a second report might track commitments out of the Summit. They are happy to draft something and welcomes anyone who would like to join them in the process.

RVO: Proposed that maybe the Group should do a bit of reverse engineering to identify who the target groups is and what the Group would like to achieve through the report.

Chair: Noticed that there is a big appetite from the Group to think and to work on the idea of a GLGR. If there is a common agreement that a Land Summit could be an important step and whether to have it late in 2021 or 2022.

WB: Confirmed that they still believe that a Land Summit needs to happen. It is just a matter of when, where, and how it is financed.

Chair: Asked the members if they have reactions to the Land Summit idea. No further reactions on the idea. To wrap up the agenda point, the Chair revisited the points/questions put forward at the beginning the discussion.

1. General go ahead and process - The Group should go ahead with the plan to publish a GLGR, next steps discussed at next telco. DFID to come up with a first proposal for a strategic document guiding the concept note group (FAO, GLTN, ILC) on the next steps.
2. Organizational institutional setting – The Group has had some feedback and will come up with more inputs and guidance in this regard. The next GDWGL telco in January will have the GLGR as an agenda item in addition to discussion on the WB Conference public GDWGL session dedicated to seek inputs from a broader public on the GLGR.
3. Timeline for first report – The Group is still reviewing the timeline and will clarify as soon as possible.
4. Focus – There are some feedbacks on the content and there are different target groups within the government domain.
5. Financial commitment – There will be more discussion on financial commitment when everything else has more clarity

In acknowledging how useful this discussion session was, the Chair announced that the Group would continue this discussion during the next GDWGL telco, tentatively slated for the third week of January 2020.

Any future comments can be directed to the Secretariat, who will then forward them to the Group.

6. Discussion – Strategic partner presentations

Action Points:

- Secretariat will draft criteria by which partner organizations can be involved in meetings. Criteria to be presented and discussed on at the next telco was approved.

Chair: Provided an account that different partners usually approach the Group to be at the GDWGL's meetings. The Chair and Vice Chair normally who decide who, in anyone, can be invited to the meeting. Therefore, the Chair proposes that the Group come up with some criteria to decide who could be invited to meetings. The Secretariat will provide the criteria for discussion at the next conference call. The Chair also asked for the Group's view on whether to extend the invitation to organizations working in land governance and whether to limit the number of invitees to a maximum of two in the physical meeting.

DFID: Flagged that the Group wants to avoid meetings becoming a pitch forum for organizations to come and find funding. Therefore, clear criteria is needed.

The proposal for the drafting of criteria by the Secretariat for partner organizations to be involved in meetings, and for said criteria to be presented and discussed on at the next telco was approved by the Group.

7. AOB & Closing remarks

Action Points:

- Revisit topic of structured CSO engagement at a later date, potentially at the next telco.

The Group welcomed representatives from the African Land Policy Centre (ALPC), who undertook the main function of organizing the 2019 CLPA.

Chair: On behalf of the entire GDWGL, expressed gratitude to the organizers for setting up the CLPA. The Group is happy to be here, and is having their first physical meeting in Africa. The Chair also highlighted that the Group had a rich discussion and that different members of the Group presented their current projects in Africa. Member of the Group are eager to continue advancing the land agenda in the continent.

ALPC: Would like to welcome the Group to the Conference and encourage members to interact with stakeholders and use CLPA as the platform for change.

Secretariat: Thanked ALPC for facilitating the event and in assisting in the set-up of the Group's physical meeting.

On the topic of CSO engagement

Chair: Highlighted that it is important for the Group to engage with CSO representatives, as was done during the March physical meeting and the CFS in Rome. Encouraged the Group to do these informal sessions in the future meetings with more structure focus. They also highlighted a particular initiative by BMZ to be a focal point for a human right defenders group. Potential topic of discussion at next telco.

IFAD: Advised that the Group define CSOs because there is wide variety of forms of them.

Chair: Secretariat will send out Doodle for the date of the next conference call meeting in the 3rd week of January. Added that the Group might have a bit open public consultation with participants at the World Bank physical meeting on GLGR. This point will be discussed further on the next conference call.

The Chair closed the 14th Physical Meeting of the Global Donor Working Group on Land.