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Part 1: 
Follow the data – Overview of existing data sources

Growing and unprecedented number of data sources on land governance and tenure security – What can it tell us?

* This list of data sources is incomplete and purely indicative
Part 1:

The following slides provide a good, but incomplete, overview of existing data on tenure security, land rights and land governance.

Main assumptions and limitations

- Key gaps, some of which will be filled by official SDG data from 2020
- Not much on trends and cross-country comparisons
- Data often not nationally representative
- Data and figures are indicative and do not reflect official opinion of original data providers
Part 1:
Follow the data – Prindex: Perceived tenure insecurity in 33 countries

About 1 in 4 people feel insecure about their land and property

Source: Prindex, 2019 - Comparative Report (March 2019)
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Part 1:
Follow the data – Land and Gender Data (FAO gender and Land rights, DHS, LSMS-ISA…)

Data suggests the existence of a – often very large – gender gap, but the actual size of this gap can vary considerably across countries and depending on specific definitions of ownership.

**Distribution of Agricultural Landowners by Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>% Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FAO Gender & Land Rights Database – Indicator2
Part 1: Follow the data – Lights and shadows in forest tenure trends (RRI’s Forest Tenure Data)

Positive trend in legal recognition of community-based forest ownership: from 374 mha in 2002 to 521 mha in 2017 – 98% of which in LMICs.

Yet, globally, only 15.3% of forests are owned/designated for IP-LC & many LMICs do not adequately respect indigenous and women’s tenure rights.

Gains in Recognition of Community-based Forest Tenure in 33 LMICs

Change in Global Forest Tenure 2002 - 2017

Source: on forest tenure data see RRI, 2018 - At a Crossroads; On indigenous and women's tenure rights see RRI, 2017 - Power and Potential
Datasets such as LGAF and FAO LAT analyse in detail a variety of qualitative aspects of land governance, laws and institutions – but typically include few countries and time periods.

While these type of data relate to the VGGT, there is no direct / official monitoring or assessment of the VGGT implementation status.

**FAO LAT indicator: Property Rights – Gender Equality**
The law recognises gender equality in the right to own or control property regardless of the type of marriage.

**LGAF Scorecards**
The framework (post-2013) assigns ratings for 116 dimensions of land governance, allowing for comparison and identification of good practice across 20 countries.
Part 1:
*Follow the data – Business perspective on land administration quality (WB Doing Business)*

Typically hard to access and compare administrative data, but WB Doing Business includes a *Quality of Land Administration Index* measured for 180+ economies. Most of the 28 reforms related to registering property recorded in 2017/18 took place in Sub-Saharan Africa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DB2019 Quality of Land Admin. Index (0-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan, China</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DB2019 Quality of Land Admin. Index (0-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A.R.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2:
Follow the money – Existing funding information (GDWGL – Land Governance Map)

Currently 21 different donors support 222 active land governance programmes worth US$2.89 bn

![Image of Land Governance Map & Database]

**Total value of active, concluded and unknown programmes**

- **Concluded** (by 31/Dec/2018): 6.18 billion US$/Current
- **Active** (as of 1/Jan/2019): 2.89 billion US$/Current
- **Unknown**: 0.34 billion US$/Current

**Total number of active, concluded and unknown programmes**

- **Concluded**: 563
- **Active**: 222
- **Unknown**: 55
Part 2: Follow the money – Funding distribution by country (GDWGL – Land Governance Map)

With some (strong) assumptions, we can get a preliminary idea of funding distribution by country – More than 100 countries targeted, but 5 countries alone might get as much as 35% of total funding for active programme.

Top 10 Countries

1. Turkey
2. Indonesia
3. Morocco
4. Ethiopia
5. Vietnam
6. Ivory Coast
7. Uganda
8. Madagascar
9. Brazil
10. Serbia

Bottom 10 Countries

96. Angola
97. Myanmar
98. Mongolia
99. Costa Rica
100. Dominican Rep.
101. Honduras
102. Panama
103. El Salvador
104. Gambia
105. Ecuador

~997 mln US$

Estimate of aggregate funding for active programmes in top 5 countries

~0.7 mln US$

Estimate of aggregate funding for active programmes in bottom 5 countries

*Based on 222 active programmes as of 1/Jan/2019
Conclusion
Final remarks & questions

• **A lot of data but....does it tell us what we need to know?**
  - **What are the key trends (e.g. on formal recognition, on perceived tenure security, on funding)?**
  - **Are we on track? To achieve what?**
  - **An ‘ecosystem’ of data is good....but this implies some common design and coordination. Do we have that?**
  - **How much would it cost to achieve ‘X’ and what is the funding gap?**
  - **Do we have or can we agree on a common ‘X’?**