

CALL FOR EXPRESSION OF INTEREST FOR ORGANISATIONS TO UNDERTAKE A STUDY ON: CONFLICT IN THE CONTEXT OF LARGE SCALE LAND ACQUISITIONS

Date of publication: 2 February 2017
Deadline for submission: 6 March 2017

CONTENTS OF THE CALL FOR EXPRESSION OF INTEREST:

1. Summary of the Issue
2. Scope of the Collaboration
3. Requirements for submitting organisations
4. How to submit the Expression of Interest
5. *Annex 1: Background information on conflict in the context of large scale land acquisitions*
6. *Annex 2: The Land and Conflict Coalition*

1. SUMMARY OF THE ISSUE

Large-scale Land Based Investments (LSLBIs), also referred to as land grabbing, have gathered momentum across the globe in recent years. The process is characterized by a widespread leasing/concessions or sale of public lands or community lands to large capital, often foreign companies and governments for food production, tourism development, bio-fuel production and for other commercial agricultural uses. Studies¹ have shown that China, India, South Korea and the Gulf States are among the most important global actors leading the process of agricultural expansion, driven by the imperative of producing food overseas for their growing populations. On the other hand, the target of land acquisitions (i.e. the supply side of the equation) has been Africa, especially sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, Central Asia and South East Asia². Hall notes that estimated land deals of 15-20 million ha of farmland in developing countries were under negotiation between 2006 and 2009. In a study of five African countries; Cotula et al (2009) revealed that just fewer than 2.5 million ha of land had been allocated in transnational deals between 2006 and 2009. An even higher scale is advanced by the World Bank study of 2010, estimating that some 45 million ha were under negotiation in 2009 alone, with 70% of this located in Africa.

Alarm has been raised by civil society groups and media organizations in relation to the large scale land acquisitions, with questions being asked on the implications on food security, livelihoods of affected communities, and contestations and conflicts associated with the process. Schutter³ questions the capacity of the countries targeted by these land deals, many of which suffer from problems of governance, to effectively manage these investments in order to ensure that they contribute to rural

¹ Hall, R (2011): Land grabbing in southern Africa: the many faces of the investor rush, *Review of African Political Economy*, 38:128, 193-214.

² Cotula, L et al (2009): Land grab or development opportunity? Agricultural investment and international land deals in Africa; IIED, FAO and IFAD

³ Schutter, O, De 2011: How not to think of land-grabbing: three critiques of large-scale investments in farmland, *The Journal Of Peasant Studies*, Vol 38, No. 2, March 2011, 249-279.

development and poverty alleviation. Foundational weaknesses in the governance structures of countries targeted by LSLBIs seem to be fueling conflict and corruption in the manner in which LSLBIs have been implemented. The DFID Land Policy Bulletin (May 2016: 2) asserts that commercialization and land concentration dynamics reinforce social fragmentation and conflict potential and notes that political will to prevent this is low, while opportunism and greed abound. Several studies⁴ provided some clarity on the escalation of LSLBIs, covering, inter alia, the scale of land acquisitions and type of land targeted, process issues of negotiating land deals and the policy, legal and institutional dimensions of the land acquisition processes. At the same time, new opportunities have evolved that can be used to deal with the situation. Critical instruments in this regard include the SDGs, VGGTs and the LPI Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa.

Annex 1 gives further guidance on LSLBI and on how this Study intends to document this issue and contribute to the debate around it.

2. SCOPE OF THE COLLABORATION

The **primary objective of the Study** is to analyze how land based investments contribute to conflict, violent conflict and social destabilization in selected countries and provide recommendations on how to prevent, mitigate and address such risks in the short, medium and long term.

To achieve its primary objective, the Study intends to:

1. Provide evidence on how large scale land based investments fuel conflict, violent conflict and social destabilisation at the community and national level;
2. Document the causes, dynamics, typologies and scale of conflicts and the efficacy of dispute resolution mechanisms. In addition, the study will develop recommendations on how to make dispute resolution mechanisms more effective.
3. Document the impacts of large scale land acquisitions on vulnerable groups of society, especially women, youths and the marginalized rural communities. Innovative ways will be used to analyse the financial consequences of land disputes.
4. Provide an informed analysis on the extent to which LSLBI based international guidelines and standards have been complied with; and explore new opportunities to address the issues through emerging frameworks such as the VGGTs, LPI Framework & Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa etc.
5. Demonstrate the gaps in national legislations and practices in selected countries;
6. Draw conclusions and recommendations to inform policy and decision makers on the effects of LSLBI and how to prevent, mitigate and address such risks in the short, medium and long term.

The final product - The Study is intended to have: (1) an **introductory part** that provides a general analysis of the problem based on a review of the existing literature and documents; (2) A **detailed analysis of three case studies (countries)** which will constitute the main body of the Study; (3) a concluding part with a collection of the **findings and a set of recommendations** as described above; and (4) a rich **reference section** composed by bibliographical references and available tools and resources on land based investments. The study will be based on field work in selected countries and the review of appropriate secondary sources of data. Bidders are free to propose some countries for field data collection based on their areas of expertise and expertise, but in principle these should be in Africa and Asia.

⁴ World Bank 2011, Rising Global Interest in Farmland, World Bank, Washington. Borras, S M et al (2011): Towards a better understanding of global land grabbing: an editorial introduction; The Journal of Peasant Studies, 38:2; 209-216.

3. REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMITTING ORGANISATIONS

Expressions of interests to carry out this study can be submitted by organisations and institutions only (and not individuals) that fulfill the following requirements:

1. Be registered as non-profit organisation (certificate to be provided);
2. Have published research in comparable fields of expertise (publications' list to be annexed to the submission);
3. Have activities in the relevant thematic areas
4. Be able to produce narrative and financial reports of their activities for the past two years;

4. HOW TO SUBMIT THE EXPRESSION OF INTEREST

The Expression of Interest need to contain the following:

1. A **portfolio of the organisation** that includes a description of the overall experience of the organization in carrying out research in comparable fields (max 4 pages);
2. A **proposal on how to carry out the Study**, including: (1) Proposed structure of the Study (e.g. Annotated Table of Contents; (2) methodology to be used (e.g. desk reviews, consultations, field work, etc.); (3) Work plan, including timeframe, budget and in-kind contributions to be made by the submitting organisation (e.g. contribution in terms of staff time, equipment and logistical support; internal review of the Study; etc.); (4) Any other information considered relevant. *The proposal should not exceed 6-10 pages.*
3. The **CVs of the person(s) to lead the Study**;

If the organisation / institution is shortlisted or selected to carry out the study, additional documents will have to be produced, including:

1. Copies of statement of annual budget and annual reports of the previous 5 years;
2. Copy of the two latest audited reports;
3. Governance and organizational structure and proof of non-profit nature of the organisation.

Expression of Interest must be delivered in electronic format no later than **6 March 2017** to Ombretta Tempra at the following email address: ombretta.tempra@unhabitat.org

Disclaimer: Please note that this notice does not constitute a solicitation and UN-Habitat reserves the right to change or cancel this Study at any time in the process. Submitting a reply to an EOI does not guarantee that the submitting organisation will be selected to carry out the Study.

5. ANNEX 1: BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON CONFLICT IN THE CONTEXT OF LARGE SCALE LAND ACQUISITIONS: Some Guidance for the Study

Land is a driver of conflict and an obstacle to recovery, and increasingly acknowledged as crucial in peace-making, peacebuilding, and addressing protracted crises. To address this problem, in November 2015, the **Land and Conflict Coalition** was established, with Secretariat located within the Global Land Tool Network. A second meeting - the Land and Conflict Coalition Forum – took place on the 11-12 March 2016 in Washington DC, USA, with the **objectives** to further shape the structure of the Land and Conflict Coalition, detailing its main fields of engagement, identifying the key actors and champions of the Coalition and agree on a road map for the way forward. This proposed work is a continuation of the work of the Land and Conflict Coalition, as led by UN Habitat’s Land and GLTN Unit. More information on the Land and Conflict Coalition is in Annex 2.

Examining LSLBIs and their the State of Compliance with Global Frameworks

Numerous frameworks have been put in place by different actors to facilitate responsible farmland investments. GRAIN 2015 lists up to 15 regional and global instruments that seek to facilitate responsible farm investments. Notable among these are, among others, the Africa Union Guiding Principles on Large Scale Land Based Investments in Africa (2014), CFS Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the context of National Food Security, World Bank Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investments (2009), UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the USAID Operational Guidelines for Responsible Investment in Farmland, and the CSO-supported set of principles for responsible agricultural investment (“RAI”) within the Committee on Food Security at the FAO. The global frameworks lay-out the requirements that the negotiation and conclusion of LSLBIs are expected to follow. By and large, implementation of these remains voluntary, with no mechanisms in place to monitor their implementation. Compliance or non-compliance with such global frameworks has implications on how and why LSLBIs may end-up mired in conflict, while at the same violating the human rights of communities through forced evictions.

The RAI principles are meant to go a step further than the Voluntary Guidelines on land tenure and establish agreed norms of behaviour for corporate investment in food and agriculture more broadly. Many civil society groups and networks supported and participated in the negotiation of these principles. The motivation was to assert the importance of small food producers as investors, and clear the way for their needs and interests to take centre stage. Many CSOs who participated in the negotiations denounce the sidelining of the initial vision by other interests, which compromised the final text. An analysis by the Transnational Institute notes that “human rights are subordinated to trade rules; free, prior and informed consent of indigenous people is included, but subject to reservations; the principles envision a weak regulatory role for the state, leaving current power imbalances intact; farmers’ rights are coupled with the interests of seed companies; and while civil society fought hard for the inclusion of agro-ecology, it appears only alongside references to the corporate-friendly term “sustainable intensification.”⁵ Further interrogation of LSLBIs in the context of the human rights framework would be needed, and this Study provides an opportunity to do so.

The UN Basic Principles and Guidelines on Development Based Evictions and Displacement state that forced evictions should not take place. Where states fail to prevent such evictions, effective remedies

⁵ Sylvia Kay, “Political brief on the principles on responsible investment in agriculture and food systems,” TNI, March 2015, <https://www.tni.org/en/briefing/political-brief-principles-responsible-investment-agriculture-and-foodsystems>.

should be provided. This is Study proposes to provide concrete evidence on the extent to which the LSLBIs have complied with this very important guiding principle.

The Africa Union guidelines emphasize on respecting the human rights of communities and that LSLBI should be based on good governance principles and the respect for the rights of women. Thus the AU notes that “rights holders need to be appropriately compensated if their rights are to be affected or lost. It is important for compensation to go beyond compensation for land lost to encompass rights and benefits which would have accrued to rights holders by reason of their landholding or customary use, whether individual or collective” (AU 2015: 8). The AU calls for “robust land administration institutions to ensure effective adjudication of disputes and transparency. Civil society and other groups also have an important role to play in advocating for the inclusion of communities in decision making on LSLBIs which affect them and giving voice to their concerns” (ibid: 15). The expectation is that state agencies and investors should seek the “prior, informed participation of affected communities with respect to all decisions which have consequences for communities.” When adequately complied with, conflicts associated with LSLBIs can be minimized. This Study will shed light on what is the state of compliance with global frameworks, and how has the situation influenced the evolution of LSLBI based conflicts, including violent conflicts. It is also important to interrogate the role of civil society organizations in the implementation of global frameworks on LSLBIs.

National Policy and Legal Dimensions of LSLBI based Conflicts

The discussion on global frameworks sets the context within which national and legal frameworks have to adjust to or accommodate in order to ensure, among others, conflict-free LSLBIs. Cotula et al (2009) observed that: “Many countries do not have in place legal or procedural mechanisms to protect local rights and take account of local interests, livelihoods and welfare. Even in the minority of countries where legal requirements for community consultation are in place, processes to negotiate land access with communities remain unsatisfactory. Lack of transparency and of checks and balances in contract negotiations create a breeding ground for corruption and deals that do not maximise the public interest. Insecure use rights on state-owned land, inaccessible registration procedures, vaguely defined productive use requirements, legislative gaps, and compensation limited to loss of improvements like crops and trees (thus excluding loss of land) all undermine the position of local people”⁶. This Study is particularly keen on generating evidence on how policy and legal gaps have contributed to the development of conflicts in LSLBIs. It is the prerogative of the study to identify the policy and legal practices that are contributing to the development of conflicts and the reasons that explain the situation. Based on a scan of available literature, key policy and legal issues that require attention relate to, management of displacements if any, the payment of compensation following displacement of community population, environmental management requirements, land acquisition procedures and their involvement of communities in the process and land use planning requirements.

Manifestation of Conflicts in LSLBIs

The Study aims at investigating the manifestation of the LSLBI based conflicts will respond to the following questions: what type of land was affected by LSLBI, who owns it and under what tenure rights? How much land has been acquired, what is the size of the population affected and how is it affected? What groups of people are affected by LSLBIs and how are they impacted upon? What are the main

⁶ Cotula, L., Vermeulen, S., Leonard, R. and Keeley, J., 2009, LAND GRAB OR DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY? AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT AND INTERNATIONAL LAND DEALS IN AFRICA, IIED/FAO/IFAD, London/Rome.

conflicts that have erupted and what are their foundational causes? What is the scale and incidence of the identified conflicts, did they remain confined to the communities directly affected or they led to long term destabilization of the broader society? Who are the parties to the conflict and what are their interests? What mechanisms exist to resolve the identified conflicts? What are the social and economic impacts of the conflict?

The contextual issues of the manifestation of LSLBI based conflicts relate to the type of land occupied, the level of transparency and civil society engagement in the negotiation process and capacities to fully implement policy and legal provisions that govern LSLBIs. The study by Cotula et al (2009) showed that most remaining land suitable land for large-scale land investments is land already under use or claim, often by local people. Further to that, the study noted intensifying pressure on high value land. Potentially, large-scale land acquisitions have a high propensity of triggering conflict with the affected communities. At the centre of such conflicts includes the loss of land and livelihoods, displacements and the demands for compensation, among other issues. These represent some of the key issues that the study will investigate.

Existing evidence suggests that there are hurdles in relation to ensuring transparency and civil society engagements in the negotiation of LSLBIs. Pertaining to consultation and consent of communities, Cotula makes some critical observations. “Perhaps the most important area of concern is the extent and depth of engagement with directly affected people in the planning, approval and establishment of large-scale agricultural projects.” In some countries, there are weak provisions in national laws for local people to defend their rights whilst in other situations it is about weak implementation of otherwise good laws. Concerns have also been raised about the commitment to abide by the principle of free, prior informed consent (FPIC) as encapsulated in Article 32 of the 2007 UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. In this context, it is important to investigate the extent to which indigenous people have been able to say “Yes” or “No” to proposed developments on their land. Already, shortcomings have been noted pertaining to how Mozambique’s community consultation has been handled, and so has been the situation in Tanzania. It is therefore in the interest of this Study to provide a comprehensive critique of consultation processes in LSLBI processes.

Documentation of Alternative Approaches to LSLBIs

It is significant to note that there are alternative approaches to LSLBIs that are at different stages of implementation across Africa. A case in point is, for instance, the Vegetable Oil Development Project (VODP) that targets smallholder farmers in Uganda. Elsewhere, there are other examples of community-based investments, as is the case in Mozambique. Under the VODP in Uganda, smallholder farmers are being supported to increase household cash income by revitalizing and increasing domestic vegetable oil production. The model represents an innovative public-private partnership that is supporting the establishment of oil palm plantations and supporting the processing of the oil products. With the direct beneficiaries of the intervention being smallholder farmers and the ultimate goal being to create employment and increase rural incomes in the project area, the model presents a ‘credible’ alternative to the LSLBIs. The Study proposes to develop an inventory of such alternative approaches and document one positive experience of alternative approach to LSLBI, focusing on, among others, process issues, community involvement and the benefits accruing to communities.

Community Voices and Stories on LSLBI based Conflicts

The Study will unpack the groups of people affected by LSLBI. Such groups possibly include women (to be disaggregated further), youths, pastoralists, community leaders, community representatives such as

members of Parliament and various other sections of marginalized populations as identified by the study. The approach proposed intends to capture stories and voices of the identified groups on their experiences with LSLBIs. Where conflicts exist, the study will capture all the specifics of the story, including when it happened, description of the conflict and its causes, how the conflict impacts on the identified group and how the conflicts have been managed and proposed solutions to manage the situation. Community voices will all also be sort on various other aspects of LSBIs, such as the level of transparency and quality of community participation, livelihoods and benefits accruing from LSLBIs, environmental impacts of LSLBIs, role of the state in LSLBIs and issues around compensation for any benefits as a direct result of LSLBIs.

Methodology and Case Study Sites

Submitting organisation will outline the proposed methodology in their submission. Some guidance for consideration is below. It is recommended that a methodology workshop takes place at the beginning of the assignment with the UN-Habitat and Global Land Tool Network team and other key stakeholders. Also, the preliminary results of the Study will be shared with a reference group composed by Global Land Tool Network partners and members of the Land and Conflict Coalition.

Secondary Data Collection

A review of secondary literature can be used to initially locate the extent to which LSLBI have taken place. Published and unpublished data will be search on internet and from other sources. The literature review will provide the context for understanding what is already known about LSLBIs, thereby forming the basis for a further refinement of research issues and the design of the research approach. Any literature available at the national / community level for the case studies should also be identified and reviewed (e.g. the Agreements signed with land investors, minutes of meetings held, other reports that capture the consultation processes with communities, newspaper articles, etc.). The review of secondary literature will be used to identify known conflicts that have occurred following LSLBIs. Where possible, primary data collection should take place with a view to generating an in-depth understanding of the conflicts.

Primary Data Collection

The strength of the study will also be based on the generation of primary data and first-hand information. A combination of key informant interviews, focus group discussions and where applicable, direct observations will be used to generate primary information. The voices of communities and their stories on conflicts associated with LSLBI will be developed using primary data. To this end, interview checklists that target different groups affected by LSLBIs will be developed and implemented. As already discussed elsewhere in this Concept Note, the main target groups that will be targeted by primary data collection (as applicable) are women, youth, community leaders, pastoralists and other marginalized groups. Civil society organizations involved in various aspects of LSLBIs – either from a research or advocacy perspectives will also be targeted for primary data collection. Where applicable, direct observation will be used to gather data. This will include the taking of photographs and short videos. Key government officials involved in LSLBIs will be identified and interviewed. The idea will be to gather the official views and perceptions on the implementation of LSLBIs in their respective countries.

Identification of Study Countries

The Study will be carried out in three / four countries to be proposed by the submitting organisation and then to be further reviewed and agreed upon with the UN-Habitat / Global Land Tool Network team. Some initial discussions held within the Global Land Tool Network rotated around Democratic Republic

of Congo (DRC), Sudan, South Sudan, Mozambique and Liberia in Africa. A review of available literature shows that these countries, among others, have been heavily targeted with LSBIs. For instance, the World Bank (2011) study reported that 1.19 million hectare was transferred in Mozambique between 2004-2009. Whilst data on DRC is scanty, Huggins (2010) reports that multi-national corporations were involved in the expropriation of land from small-holders in Eastern DRC's South Kivu province. However, other countries and specific cases within countries can be proposed.

6. ANNEX 2: The Land and Conflict Coalition

The Land and Conflict Coalition – To address the various articulations of the land and conflict challenges across the conflict cycle – from prevention, to humanitarian response, to development - coordinated efforts from the UN system and non-UN actors is needed. On this basis, the Land and Conflict Coalition was established in November 2015, in Nairobi, with the Secretariat located in the Global Land Tool Network / UN-Habitat and funding from the Swiss Development Cooperation. A second meeting took place in March 2016 to define the mission, objective and develop a first work plan for the Coalition.

Mission: Promote peace and stability by addressing land as root cause of conflict.

Key Objectives:

- Promote alignment, coherence of approaches and coordination among stakeholders;
- Implement joint capacity development, advocacy and knowledge management initiatives;
- Conduct joint strategy development, planning and implementation of tools and projects at country level.

Key Achievements as of December 2016

- A collaboration on land and conflict was established with UN agencies, particularly UNDP, UNEP, UNDPA, DPKO, PBSO, UNHCR, OHCHR, UN-OCHA, UN-Women, FAO, and IFAD. This allowed GLTN to link the land and conflict work with the broader global processes of UN reform, such as the High Level Reviews on Peace Operations and the Peacebuilding Architecture and with key related UN Resolutions.
- The UN Working Group on Transition - composed by 20 UN agencies working across the three UN pillars of peace and security, human rights and development - acknowledged the work being done by GLTN and the Coalition on land and conflict, and incorporated some aspects of this work in the work plan of the Group for 2016 and UN-Habitat/GLTN as leading agency on the topic.
- Contributions were made to the UNDAF framework revisions in New York, with the integration of the need for root causes analysis of causes of conflicts in fragile state with the support of the UN-Habitat New York office.
- In September 2016, a group of experts from 10 Arab countries and from different land governance-related disciplines and backgrounds met in Amman, Jordan for the Expert Group Meeting on Fostering Good Land Governance in the Arab States. The event was hosted by GLTN Partners UN-Habitat, World Bank, GIZ, FAO, ILC and the Urban Training and Studies Institute and enjoyed the support of the Jordanian Ministry of Municipal Affairs. Land and conflict emerged as one of the key areas where coordinated efforts are needed to tackle land governance effectively. In line with the approach proposed in the Scoping and Status Study and in the Secretary General Guidance Note on Land and Conflict (see below), discussions highlighted how capacity development, advocacy, knowledge creation, and regional cooperation are key avenues to improved land governance and addressing land-

related aspects of the conflicts in the region. From the meeting, a joint vision on land emerged and a set of joint priorities actions were identified.

- The “Scoping and Status Study on Land and Conflict: Towards UN System Wide Engagement at Scale” was published in May 2016. The publication presents a functional analysis of how the United Nations System deals with land and conflict across the UN pillars of peace, security, development and human rights. It reviews areas of engagement across the full conflict cycle and proposes a coherent, comprehensive approach to the land sector.
- The Framework Analysis of Land as a Root Cause of Conflict, which was presented at the Land and Conflict Coalition meeting in March, has been further developed. Presentations were made to member states in March 2016 in the Quaker House in New York, informally to members of Task Team on Conflict prevention hosted by UNDP, New York office and at a high level learning event on land and conflict that took place in Kigali in November. The comments received were incorporated in a second version of the document and a final review is planned for 2017, after which the framework will be circulated widely for a last round of inputs.
- Upon the request of the Rule of Law Unit of the Executive Office of the Secretary General, GLTN is leading the development of a Secretary General Guidance Note on Land and Conflict, in collaboration with a number of humanitarian and development UN agencies. The draft of the Note was presented to the UN Working Group on Transition (UNWGT) in March 2016, to the UN Secretary General Rule of Law Unit, and again to the UNWGT in July. Additional rounds of comments are being incorporated in the text of the note, after which process for the formal approval of the Note by UN Agencies will be initiated.
- A research work on “Fit-For-Purpose Land Administration for Conflict Contexts” has also been initiated and it is at its earlier stages of development.
- GLTN is also collaborating with IOM, NRC, UNDP and UNHCR in the development of the “Guidance Note on Mainstreaming Housing, Land and Property Issues into Humanitarian, Transitional and Development Planning Tools”. GLTN is providing technical support and some funding to the IOM consultant leading the work. A first draft has been reviewed in September 2016 and a meeting will take place in October 2016 to decide how to proceed with the development of the document. This is not considered part of the three pieces of research that GLTN committed to under the SDC-funded project, but rather an additional output result of the good collaborations established in this area of work with other key UN and non-UN players.
- The adaptation of GLTN land tools to conflict contexts has started in Iraq and Sudan/Darfur and Lebanon / Syria is upcoming, in collaboration with UN-Habitat country office and with the Regional Office for the Arab states. The tools to be used are the Social Tenure Domain Model, Participatory Enumerations and Land Use Planning, while the use of the Gender Evaluation Criteria and the Youth Responsive Criteria are being considered as complementary.
- In the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Social Tenure Domain Model and the Land Mediation approach are being used in North Kivu to secure land rights for resettlement communities within the framework of the MoNUSCO peace and stabilization program. The project will document lessons learnt for replication.
- A collaboration between GLTN and the UN Department of Political Affairs was formalised to undertake a study on land conflicts in Kismayo and Jubbaland, Somalia. The study intends to investigate the land conflict situation in Jubbaland to guide the work of the UN system in Somalia in peace building and land conflicts management. The findings will also contribute to policy making in Somalia’s land governance sector.
- An agreement of cooperation is being developed between UN-Habitat and the Norwegian Refugee Council to use GLTN tools Gender Evaluation Criteria and Youth Responsiveness Criteria to assess their

land and tenure security and dispute resolution interventions in Somalia. The project is expected to start in early January.

- The implementation of the Great Lakes Region Strategy is being supported by equipping the UN country teams to deal with land and conflict issues. The Great Lakes Strategy, developed with support from GLTN and UN-Habitat, was approved by the Security Council in March 2016, and UN-Habitat/GLTN is the leading agency on land and conflict.
- A short training event on land and conflict was carried out by GLTN and the UN Department of Political Affairs in New York in March 2016, targeting 15 DPA desk Country officers.
- The capacity of Six Peace and Development Advisors was developed in June 2016 through an interactive session on the key concepts and approaches related to land and conflict.
- A two-day high level learning event on Land, Conflict and Natural resources for senior UN officials in the Great Lakes Region took place in Kigali, Rwanda on the 15th and 16th November. The event was hosted by GLTN and the Rwanda Resident Coordinator office, and supported by UNDP, UNEP and UNDP. Over 35 participants from the region took part in the event, including UN resident coordinators, heads of agencies, representative from the missions, and donors. The event was very well received and replication at country level is planned for 2017 in two countries.
- Support was provided for the training on Housing, Land and Property Rights for East and Horn of Africa for the Durable Solutions organised by ReDSS in June 2016.

Who is part of the Land and Conflict Coalition- Forty six UN and non-UN organisations and a number of government representatives took part in the Land and Conflict Coalition gatherings, including: FAO, UN-Habitat, UNDP, OHCHR, UNPD, UN-Women, IOM, UNEP, UNHCR, UNODC, Office of the Special Envoy of the SG for the Great Lakes Region, UNAMA, Huairou Commission, Habitat for Humanity, Brac USA, EEAS-EU / EC Service for Foreign Policy Instruments, GIZ, ICGLR, Interaction, Legal Action Worldwide, Les Afriques Dans Le Monde, Norwegian Refugee Council, Landesa, Land Alliance, FIDA Kenya, Urban Training and Studies Institute, Union of Arab Surveyors, USAID, Interpeace DRC, University of East London, Danish Refugee Council, Technical University of Munich, Rights and Resources International RRI, Durable Solutions Initiative, TNW Nepal, Wilfrid Laurier University, Uganda Land Alliance, DSDI, Slum Dwellers International, HIC-HLRN, Darfur Land Commission, Max Plank Institute, Oxfam, Mc Gill University, SWID Uganda, and the World Bank Group. Government representatives: DRC, Senegal, Switzerland, DFID/UK, and Uganda.