Evaluation of the International Land Coalition (ILC) strategy and the support provided by the EU and Switzerland
Summary of final evaluation report

MDF
EMPOWERING PEOPLE, CREATING IMPACT

Evaluation of the International Land Coalition (ILC) strategy and the support provided by the EU and Switzerland

Summary of final evaluation report

The evaluation was commissioned by SDC, EC, IFAD, ILC Council

and funded by EC and SDC

Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC

INTERNATIONAL LAND COALITION

IFAD
INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

The evaluation was co-implemented by

Advisory Services for Resilient Agri-Food System (ASRAFS)

GFA CONSULTING GROUP

Implemented by a consortium
led by GFA Consulting Group

crea
Consiglio per la ricerca in agricoltura
e l'analisi dell'economia agraria

MDF
EMPOWERING PEOPLE,
CREATING IMPACT

This report was written by:

Lise Paaskesen and Hilde van Dijkhorst (MDF) and

Karen McHugh (ASRAFS)

Contents

List of abbreviations

ALLIED	Alliance for Land, Indigenous and Environmental Defenders
AoM	Assembly of Members
BMZ	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
CAFI	Central African Forest Initiative
CfT	Call for Tenders
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EMENA	Europe, the Middle East and North Africa
EU	European Union
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GLF	Global Land Forum
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development in Eastern Africa
ILC	International Land Coalition
ILEDs	Indigenous, Land, and Environmental Defenders
iNGO	International Non-Governmental Organization
KII	Key Informant Interview
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
LED	Land and Environmental Defender
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NP	Net Promoter
NLC	National Land Coalition
PCLG	People Centred Land Governance
RCU	Regional Coordination Unit
RG	Reference Group
RF	Results Framework
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SO	Strategic Objective
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
VGGT	Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land
WLR	Women's Land Rights

Executive Summary

The main objectives of this evaluation were to provide the European Union (EU), the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the ILC Assembly of Members (AoM) through the ILC Council, the ILC One Team and other interested stakeholders with:

- An overall independent assessment of the performance of the ILC triennial cycle of the strategy (2022 -2024) and the related EU and Swiss actions, paying particular attention to its different levels of results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results.
- Key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations to improve current and future interventions, including, for example, the development of ILC's triennial plan for 2025 – 2027.

The evaluation serves an accountability function vis-a-vis the EU and SDC as well as a learning objective for the ILC Council that relate to the strategic shifts and choices that have been made during this first cycle (2022-2024) of the overall 2022-2030 Strategy, and the role of the data component specifically.

Considering the complexity of the ILC, the evaluation team applied a theory-based approach to capture the results of the new strategy complemented by a mixed methods approach that drew on both quantitative and qualitative data. Based on data collected from an extensive desk review, interviews, focus group discussions and field visits, the evaluation team sought to test the relevance and viability of the underlying Theory of Change (ToC) and strategy taking account of the internal and external (contextual) factors affecting planned results, and to capture suggestions from a broad range of stakeholders on how the network should evolve in the next triennial. The evaluation is framed by the six standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability which were transposed into an evaluation matrix including seven evaluation questions (EQs) and corresponding judgement criteria (JC) to guide the evaluation process.

1 Main Findings

This section provides an overview of main findings and conclusions, clustered into sub-sections according to the six OECD DAC evaluation criteria cited above.

1.1 Relevance and quality of design

The majority of members consulted as part of this evaluation confirm that the work carried out by ILC **responds to their needs** but there are limitations e.g. the limited amount of funding available means that some priority areas do not receive the support members require, while the level of demand for support within some priority areas greatly exceeds resources. Another limitation relates to the fact that certain members are frequently called on to share their expertise with other members but do not receive support themselves e.g., training, so there is a sense that the needs of others are prioritised over theirs.

As regards **added value**, all interviewees confirmed that being part of ILC adds value to their work, and this takes many forms. One of the main added values identified is that the network is **keeping land rights on the agenda.** Many consider that if ILC did not exist, the issue of land rights would have fallen off global, regional and national agendas. The **opportunity provided by ILC members to learn from each other** is also cited as one of its main added values; through the sharing of experiences and expertise. In this regard, the diversity of members' competences (legal, technical, moral), is considered a big plus, providing lots of scope for intra-learning. The **advocacy** role played by the network is also singled out as a major added value; the "strength in numbers" argument is put forward as particularly relevant to smaller organisations as it gives them greater legitimacy and visibility.

Closely linked to this advocacy role is the success achieved by ILC in **raising awareness** and getting public opinion on the side of different aspects of land governance which is also identified as a key added value. The **high level of representation of PO/constituency groups** within the coalition is considered another major added value. Giving voice to POs and engaging them in processes alongside government and international organisations is a key added value of ILC membership. Another area highlighted by representatives of the One Team and ILC members is the so-called **network effect** whereby ILC provides opportunities for both national and regional organisations to get involved with like-minded organisations in other regions (connecting); ILC serves as a window to the world, helping NLCs to think regionally and globally. On the **regional level,** the main added value identified by the evaluation team includes the potential learning between countries. Other examples of added value were identified such as the positioning of land on the regional agenda and the role played by the RCU in supporting members with resource mobilisation.

There are a number of **weaknesses in the planning and management documents supporting the work of the ILC namely the ToC, the Results Framework (RF) and the Workplan**. In the first place, all three should be interconnected i.e. the ToC should be providing the overarching framework for the change process sought by the ILC, which is then reflected in the RF for the ILC 2022-2030 strategy which in turn is captured by the Triennial Workplan. As they currently stand, there are too many inconsistencies between the three. Secondly, there are weaknesses in each of the three documents. The ToC needs to have clearly formulated results statements, e.g. what exactly is meant by PCLG and how does this link to the 10 Commitments. The ToC also lacks reference to the two ILC Pledges, and the link with the four challenges would be more compelling if they appeared on the far right of the ToC. There are no assumptions identified. The RF needs to remove the concept of ERs; there should only be impact, outcome and output levels and these should be the same as those appearing in the ToC. They should be accompanied by relevant indicators, preferably drawn from LANDex. Baseline data should be collected as without it, it is not possible to identify targets. And finally, the workplan should include the same results

(outcomes and outputs) and indicators as the RF and as an operational document should include the clusters of activities what will lead to the delivery of those outputs. That is typically the additional level of detail provided by a workplan.

Highlighting the **link between land rights and the four global challenges** was a good decision, firstly because of its inherent logic (land is a crucial factor in all of these), but also because it opens up other potential sources of funding e.g. climate finance. However, whilst there is broad agreement that the linking of land rights to these key global challenges makes sense, there is less clarity about how it will it be translated into concrete actions. To date, progress has only been made regarding climate change (CC) and ecosystem restoration through the "People, Climate and Nature Programme[1]". What is interesting about this initiative is how it pulls the different strands of the ILC's ToC together by detailing how work under each of its three pillars, will "cut across ILC's areas of engagement" i.e. NLCs, Data and Global and Regional Advocacy as well as Knowledge and Learning. For the sake of completeness, it would have been good to highlight how the two ILC pledges will be addressed. As regards the opening up of **possible alternative funding sources**, this is also confirmed as a positive development by interviewees and in some countries CC and gender related initiatives already constitute a significant proportion of leveraged funding.

The **ILC triennial workplan adequately reflects the longer-term strategy (2022-2030)** and provides detailed information on the work to be carried out under each of the 3 SOs and 2 Pledges as well as activities related to governance of the network, monitoring and evaluation, knowledge management, and learning and communication. As regards the 'indicators for success' and deliverables, these are deemed pertinent and realistic, but not very ambitious given the overall level of ambition the network has set itself through its 10 commitments. The deliverables are basically a series of activities and outputs that are not clearly linked to the achievement of the ILC's higher level goals.

LANDex represents a serious attempt to **overcome the high level of fragmentation in the current, complex data landscape**. A key added value of LANDex is that more than half (18/33) of its indicators rely fully or partially on people-based assessments. However, and notwithstanding the efforts made by the Secretariat to improve the user friendliness of LANDex, criticisms remain and several of the members consulted by the evaluation team were critical of the tool. The general feedback provided was that it is too centralised and not aligned with what is happening on the ground. There are some positive examples of how locally collected data can potentially be a powerful tool for advocating on land rights e.g. the case of the Saamaka people in Suriname. In addition, Land Matrix, Landmark and ALLIED were frequently referred to in positive terms. As regards the links between the data component i.e. SO2 and the other two SO, a number of commentators (in the Secretariat and NLCs) felt that the links between SO2 and SO1 are not being sufficiently exploited. LANDex is creating a huge amount of data, but it is not clear how this data is being used and how it is bringing change. In the case of SO3, there is better integration but again, this link could be strengthened.

1.2 Coherence

The evaluation team assesses that there is progress towards increased coherence, specifically in the areas of workplan development on the national level. The process leads to empowered members and a strong contribution to shifting the power to POs. However, the main challenge remains limited funding. There are major challenges because of the high diversity among NLC members in terms of language and priorities. There are ample examples of partnerships being created on national, regional, and international levels, which aids the efficiency by which outcomes can be reached, like learning, implementation, and accountability. Based on these

---

[1] ILC's draft PROGRAMME ON PEOPLE, CLIMATE AND NATURE for consultation with partners

findings, and despite challenges, progress is being made towards increased coherence and that it is generating positive outcomes, which ILC may leverage on further.

In theory, national workplans feed into the regional workplan, which in turn feeds into the global annual workplan, making it a bottom-up process. The assumption underlying the workplan development process is that the ILC strategy informs the national and regional workplans, but that there is space to contextualize national workplans, based on their specific priorities. Overall, the evaluation team commends the participatory and inclusive approach to developing workplans, as it supports the power shift towards PCLG, though funding provides a serious limitation to what and how much NLCs can do.

A main challenge in developing the workplan is the limited funding received from ILC. NLCs and the Africa and EMENA RCUs mentioned that limited funds **require them to prioritize and choose areas of intervention**, and that it limits them from doing all that they want to do. Another **challenge** is in **coordinating and aligning diverse contexts** and NLCs with diverging priorities and experiences at the regional level. For example, the EMENA region is extremely diverse with European NLCs' priorities focusing more on green energy and conservation, whilst eastern European NLCs focussing more on protecting land tenure and MENA-based NLCs operating in conflict-affected areas. This challenge is exasperated by **differences in language and in capacities**, such as in their understanding of land governance and implementation.

The **participatory and inclusive approach to workplan development is commendable** as it speaks to putting PCLG at the centre for creating change. NLCs in Malawi, Tanzania, and Uganda spoke about how they see **members become more empowered** by being included and by being given the opportunity to decide their own priorities and approaches. The **process of linking SOs to each other in workplans remains in process**, as conversations for understanding between NLC members, the ILC secretariat, and the RCUs are ongoing. The design is driven by the ILC strategy and ToC but is foreseen to be driven more by members in the next triennial. This will allow for even more alignment with the ILC Strategy and in support of the goal PCLG.

The evaluation team determines that the **degree of convergence achieved varies greatly among countries** and that partnerships allow coalitions on all levels to expand on their work, to implement activities, and to reach their goals in a more efficient way. According to members of the One Team, there are three categories of NLCs: those who have fully embraced the concept, like Senegal and Tanzania, and more recently Colombia, which was facilitated by the recent change in government; those who have some degree of convergence, like the Philippines, though not with the government, and those who reject the concept, like Cambodia.

Examples of convergence and synergies on the global level include **partnerships ILC has created with international organisations and institutions for advocacy, knowledge management, and resource mobilization purposes**, like with FAO, CIFOR, the Rainforest Trust, the Tenure Facility, and the World Bank. As regards resource mobilisation, ILC's focus on POs means that they are an ideal partner for many international organizations, like FAO who is keen to work with ILC. Also, IFAD seeks engagement with POs on the national level, which ILC could support them in. There is a challenge, international organizations argued, in determining **how and how much ILC should be involved in creating relationships between institutions and decision-making bodies** on a national level. For example, NLC Togo is not known to the national government, hence, the question is what ILC should do to support relationship building between the NLC and national decision-makers, for example to advance SO3.

Examples of coherence on the regional level include RCU Africa who aims to advance their contributions to SO3 above and beyond their own capacities by partnering with the Intergovernmental Authority on Development ([IGAD) in Eastern Africa](), an institution that aims to contribute to a region where people enjoy a safe environment alleviating poverty through appropriate and effective sustainable development programmes by focusing on land governance and related issues. As a result of the partnership, RCU and NLC members engaged in dialogue with IGAD last year and were able to **play a key role in including civil society** and in **informing**

the ongoing process of developing national land policies in countries where IGAD was supporting national governments in drafting new land policies, like South Sudan. RCU EMENA hopes that a partnership with the Arab Land Initiative can support them to do advocacy on the regional level and in strengthening members' capacities by inviting them to webinars and other trainings

At the national level decision-makers in Malawi and the DRC iterated the benefits and added value of working with civil society, as they can **contribute to national decision makers' understanding of the land governance issues**, allowing them to **make informed decisions**. Also, national decision makers count on the NLC and its members to **reach people in rural areas**, **coordinate and facilitate local and national actors for implementation** of their plans and projects. Maintaining a close relationship with the government allows for an **integrated process of change**, whilst NLCs may **hold governments to account**.

In the Philippines, there are **synergies with World Bank and USAID programmes**, namely support provided in the former's titling programme and in helping the World Bank put in place a safeguards policy. The **links with IFAD and the EU are less evident**. NLC facilitators from Tanzania, Malawi, DRC, and Uganda, and NLC Uganda members said that the added value of the NLC is that they can **learn from their peers**, they can **build on each other's experiences**, and that they are **stronger together**.

1.3 Effectiveness

The evaluation team assesses that overall progress towards outcomes and results based on the indicators of success and deliverables listed in the triennial workplan is mixed. Some targets were exceeded, whereas others were not reached. Extensive contributions have been made towards increasing visibility and in advocating for improved land governance. The evaluation team deems the continuation of these efforts to be necessary, even though outcomes may be difficult to attribute to interventions. This need also relates to gender justice and Defend the Defenders Pledges. There are significant additional wins to be made by strengthening the communications.

There has been **significant progress in supporting members' participation in international events and high-level dialogues** with national and international decision-makers, which are ongoing. **Campaigns likely increased the visibility of land governance** issues and how they affect people, though visibility is difficult to measure as the impact of campaigns and other advocacy events on people's perceptions, opinions, and others are difficult to isolate. Steps are being taken to integrate data into global frameworks.

SO1 includes three indicators of success. The target for the first indicator of success was not reached whereas the second target was exceeded. There are **inconsistencies between the indicators of success listed in the workplan and those in the RF** so here the indicator of success only refers to policies, not practices. The RF does not include an indicator for collaborations between governmental and multilateral agencies collaborate with NLCs.

To support NLCs in their goal of advancing people-centred land governance (SO1), ILC provides both **financial and non-financial support** through structured learning, knowledge exchange, technical assistance, and advocacy. Key support activities carried out in 2022, included consultations with land rights experts and support to members in COP-events where they were able to **showcase their experiences and technical expertise**. The **Land Rights Now (LRN) campaign** was also launched, **and peer-to-peer exchanges** were held, such as the conference in Asia. In 2023, the **learning cycles continued**, ILC supported the **VGGT+10 initiative**, and NLCs continued to engage in **national dialogues**.

There are two indicators of success for SO2, including NLCs with LANDex and data applications and countries that used people's data to develop parallel or SDG reports. Both targets were exceeded in 2023. Based on this, which is not surprising as ILC led on those, hence, steps towards progress can be made more efficiently. Bearing in mind the SO which these indicators measure, the evaluation team consider that the latter **could be a lot more ambitious**, as in 2022 ILC collected LANDex data involving 26 POs and collaborated with key actors to use data for

accountability. In 2023, ILC refined the LANDex tool and developed regional data packages and **integrated data cycles for enhanced evidence** to be used for advocacy. For example, **ILC presented their data at high-profile events**, like CBD and GBF. NLCs continue to receive training and guidance on data collection, and they receive small amounts of funding to collect data and upload it. The ILC Secretariat deems the process a success and confirmed that **data is tested and verified on country and regional level**. However, some questions were raised as regards the **legitimacy of some of the data**.

For SO3, there are two indicators of success, including on NLCs influencing regional and global processes and influencing national processes because of the advocacy strategies at regional and global level. Regional and global advocacy builds on political commitment to people-centred land governance. The objectives, as laid out in in the triennial workplan, are to create an enabling environment and to build political commitment towards PCLG and to influence regional and global processes and build leadership capacities. To this end, ILC released **reports on land and environment defenders** and **launched campaigns**, such as the [Illusion of abundance](#) campaign. In 2023, ILC supported **members' participation at the COP and SDG Summit**. They also launched the **Global Land Agenda** initiative to elevate political commitment to land reform.

In 2017, the ILC Council approved the Gender Action Plan, which has the purpose of informing the ILC strategy and to move away from being gender sensitive to gender transformative. Recommendations made in the ILC Gender Action Plan focus on three aspects, namely (i) learning and trainings, (ii) monitoring, data tracking and sharing, and (iii) reinforcing gender focal points and gender oversight committee's roles and responsibilities. The evaluation team confirms that **efforts were made to take these recommendations on board** in the new strategy, including support to gender focal points across the One Team, gender audits and trainings, and coordination of the network of gender experts. Gender experts on the global level exchange good practices and share knowledge, skills, and resources on gender justice to the NLCs, including through learning labs and Women for Women.

NLCs **try to promote Gender Justice across their actions** in different ways, from trainings to advocacy, from engaging in global campaigns to producing documentation and analysis. The evaluation team confirms that efforts were made to take these recommendations on board in the new strategy. Commitment to promote gender justice also included: mapping, promotion of women's participation at all levels, including governance, as well as women's leadership. ILC provided **technical support** to NLC Albania, Guatemala, and the Philippines to develop and submit alternative report to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. Between 2022-2024, 23 **audits** were carried out and in 2024 ILC is supporting the implementation of nine **Gender Action Plans**. Finally, in line with being gender inclusive, 68% of participants in the **youth leadership programme** are women.

The Defend the Defenders pledge is supported by an emergency fund. RCUs stated that **the fund is modest**, but that it has helped pay defenders' bail, or allowed them to pay for legal costs to help their case. The limited availability of funding results in **great responsibility and ethical considerations**, namely who should receive funding and who should not. A good practice is reported by RCU Asia where they have a set of **guidelines** for deciding who they will support. In Africa, RCU supported 127 people, including 61 women. In Latin America and the Caribbean, the Emergency Fund supported five acute instances of criminalization and human rights abuses, benefiting 165 individuals across Argentina and Guatemala. The Philippines NLC contributed to the submission of LED cases to the Department of Agrarian Reform, established an in-house Response Mechanism for LED (QRM-LED), and coordinated support for 14 LED cases affecting around 3500 people. Similarly, in Cambodia, the NLC's support for the documentation and resolution of land conflict cases by provincial authorities led to the securing of 222 hectares for 112 households. Through members of the ALLIED Data Working Group, over 1,510 attacks were reported in 2023. Based on these findings, the evaluation team assesses that there has been progress related to the Defend the Defenders Pledge, but that it has been modest.

The M&E system is comprised of multiple tools for monitoring progress towards results. These include the RF, contribution stories, and the Keystone Vibrancy Survey. A total of 10 contribution stories have been produced during the first triennial. The **added value of the contribution workshop to the NLC is unclear**: They resemble an exercise in data extraction, rather than an exercise for learning. Contribution stories miss a key dimension, namely an in-depth analysis of how outcomes were brought about (or not). The ILC communications team at the Secretariat uses these contribution stories to identify human interest stories to be shared with the wider public and to show donors what ILC is contributing to in-country. Donors confirmed they **appreciate the human-centred approach** and see it as one of ILC's strengths. Members and partners confirm that ILC is **strong in developing case studies and reports**, which partners can use as examples. Members stated that the communication team develop **convincing stories** of why land issues are important to focus on and to link these issues to larger topics, like climate change. They also state that they **appreciate how the communications team can synthesize vast amounts of information** into bite-size formats, like information cards which are very accessible.

The ILC annual communications plan is developed based on a survey/consultation process with One Team and based on the idea that communications can help make strategic linkages between the different work areas and flag opportunities for visibility. The focus of the materials is on the positive, highlighting the strengths of the network. However, in doing so, the communications team is making a deliberate choice to **forego highlighting challenges and calling to action**. Examples of collaboration between the communications and advocacy teams Land Rights Now Guatemala and #SheShouldMakeTheNews as well as additional examples, including evictions of Maasai in Loliondo in Tanzania. **Collaboration for visibility on the national and regional levels are less evident.**

The 2024 Vibrancy survey systematically provided a comparison of the data for the 2018 and 2024 surveys demonstrating the interest the coalition has in assessing shifts in the perceptions of members regarding their work and engagement in the network. Overall, **the content and quality of these surveys is commendable** as is **the level of interest and effort that ILC puts into accessing feedback**, as it speaks to their commitment of being a member-led coalition.

Notwithstanding the positive aspects of the M&E tools, the evaluation team is of the opinion that they provide only a **limited overview of progress** towards ILC's overall goal and SOs as described in its ToC. Though each tool provides a side of the story, the **tools are not linked in such a way that they tell a coherent story** of progress. the weakness of the RF indicators and the lack of ambition and consistency of the workplan's "indicators of success" described in detail in section 3.1.2 limit meaningful monitoring. The **weak linkages with the indicators** tracked under LANDex is considered a missed opportunity for effective monitoring of progress towards results.

1.4 Efficiency

IFAD is a cofounder of ILC and has hosted it since 1995. Since 2022, the **IFAD-ILC Roadmap 2020-2025**, or "Land Tenure Security for Rural Prosperity and Resilience", has provided a framework for IFAD-ILC collaboration. The roadmap is structured around three operational objectives:

- Sustainable country-level impact at scale, through policy dialogue and technical support throughout the project cycle;
- Global and regional policy engagement, and thematic programme support across countries;
- Knowledge and data generation, innovation and dissemination of good practices.

According to the June 2024 Progress Report to PMC on the ILC-IFAD roadmap 2022 – 2025 "*in-country work is prevailing as the main added value of the partnership". The ILC technical contribution by One team and members in support of the IFAD land desk is reflecting the importance of land tenure in COSOPs (Country Strategic Opportunities Programmes) and solution-led-projects. Building collaborative actions on the ground takes time and often turnover of people and their workloads against competing priorities is discontinuing paths of collaboration. We can estimate it takes around two years to have a success story to share but the preparatory work is*

expected to diminish while experimenting collaborative modalities in several contexts and extracting the good practices". In other words, although some progress has been made, results are slow to emerge.

Some of the more successful stories that give a good indication of the potential of this collaboration include the LandMonitor project in the Philippines and Brazil, which was the winner of IFAD's 2022 Innovation Challenge. Addressing a persistent lack of official data to inform policy and decision making, ILC members and rural communities identify and collect land data that fills gaps in national data sets, including sex-disaggregated data. The data informs IFAD loan projects that have tenure components, providing concrete recommendations not only for IFAD investments but also to governments. Engaging IFAD and decision-makers, ILC members can elevate community generated data for accountability. Another area where notable progress has been made is in WLR. In Bangladesh, Uganda, Kyrgyzstan and Colombia, IFAD has been working with CIFOR and CIAT-Bioversity to pilot Gender Transformative Approaches together with ILC members such as Land Net and UCOBAC in Uganda and Kaflu in Kyrgyzstan with the aim of registering land in the name of women. In Kyrgyzstan, the collaboration is going a step further in bringing these innovations into a co-implemented USD2.5M GAFSP grant that has a large WLR and livelihoods component led by KAFLU and the NLC with IFAD supervision.

In summary, although the visible operational successes of the IFAD/ILC hosting arrangement are slow to emerge and limited in terms of coverage, the potential benefits of this collaboration are clear and are confirmed by a broad range of interviewees. Other benefits of the arrangement cited by stakeholders refer to ILC being able to exploit IFAD's close relations with partner governments to get issues onto the table, and the increased credibility and visibility the IFAD brand brings to ILC. Being able to use IFAD services such as procurement, payments, HR, IT was also identified as a benefit.

However, **challenges** have emerged in recent years due to ILC's lack of legal identity which prevents it accessing funds from potential donors in particular US philanthropic organisations/ foundation, the Rain Forest Trust, whereby funds had to be channelled to a member organisation, and funds for support services from ILC, like training/communication, then being reverted to IFAD. By coincidence this resulted in the situation whereby funds left a New York based bank to be deposited in a bank in the Philippines only to be sent back to IFAD's bank account in New York, destined for the ILC Secretariat, based in Rome. The same happened with the Ford Foundation whereby funds had to be channelled through CEPES. The funding mechanisms, according to ILC Secretariat staff and members, leads to missed opportunities. The reasons put forward for why these funds cannot go directly to IFAD and then to ILC, are, on the one hand, the reluctance of certain organisations such as private foundations to channel funds through a UN agency, and on the other hand, what is referred to as IFAD's stringent rules. From the IFAD perspective, their rules and regulations have not changed since the setting up of the hosting agreement with ILC, so they object to the charge that their rules are stringent. What has changed is the direction that ILC is taking in terms of shifting from being a funder to a facilitator (see Sustainability section) which has resulted in a bigger role for ILC members in identifying other sources of funding (resource mobilisation).

This shift, combined with the power shift to POs means that non-traditional donors are being approached as potential funders of ILC activities, for example, foundations and philanthropic sources. Some of these newer types of funders, for example, Ford Foundation and the Rainforest Trust are indeed encountering difficulties in meeting the financial requirements of an entity such as IFAD, resulting the complex financial flows described above. IFAD points to the fact that there are no issues with funds being channelled from donors such as the EU and SDC.

Though some interviewees raised the question as to whether it makes sense for ILC to remain within IFAD, which is a bank, whilst pursuing its people's organisation identity, both parties say it is a mutually beneficial relationship. However, there is a pressing need to resolve the funding issue as on the one hand, ILC is being pushed to raise more funds, but on the other, too many

obstacles are being put in their way. Options such as increased autonomy for ILC within IFAD or the possibility of entering into a fiscal sponsorship agreement is currently being explored.

As regards **regional hosting arrangements** these are also throwing up issues as the designated host organisations (ICRAF in Nairobi, CEPES in Lima, CIFOR in Jakarta and Germany for EMENA) have their own rules and procedures which differ, so ILC employees in one regional office do not necessarily have the same working conditions (salaries/leave etc) as those in another. However, according to interviewees, there is a move now to standardise working conditions across the regions, but this is proving problematic for some regions, for example, Asia, who consider that some degree of flexibility in working conditions makes the job more appealing. They are concerned that if this flexibility is taken away, they will struggle to find people willing to work in RCUs. In addition, in some cases the financial systems are cumbersome whereas NLCs use small amounts and need to move quickly. According to interviewees, this causes a lot of problems.

According to ILC Secretariat and members, although efforts have been made to decentralise, and provide more power to the RCU and NLCS, it is challenging, especially in terms of decision making. **Decentralisation** is seen more as a long-term goal that will evolve in line with increased capacity to absorb responsibilities. ILC is still perceived as being centralised as evidenced by the distribution of the budget between the ILC Secretariat (55%), and the RCUs. RCUs point out that although they have much more responsibility for resource mobilisation on a regional level, they have little to no say on how those funds are used; some interviewees claimed they were merely regional offices rather than regional teams.

The total **budget** approved for the 2022-24 triennium is USD 29,913,473 including both core and resources leveraged through One Team, with a maximum contribution of EUR 12,000,000 from the EU (estimated at $US 12,040,800) and a maximum of CHF 3,500,000 from SDC. The latter is made up of CHF 2,550,000 (later increased by CHF 500,000) allocated to the core basket fund for the purpose of implementing ILC's triennial work plan 2022 - 2024, and CHF 450,000 which is earmarked for the Land Matrix Initiative (LMI). The EU contribution is not earmarked and goes to the ILC's core basket fund. Spending by the end of 2023 had reached USD 16,813.902.

The distribution of spending in 2023 by SO is presented in table 1 below. From this it can be seen that almost 80% of funds committed in 2023 under SO1 and SO3 went to supporting ILC members' activities or facilitating advocacy and capacity building opportunities for them. It can also be seen that SO2 accounts for the largest spend (USD 3,777.758) most of which is raised through partnerships and targeted support to initiatives including initiatives such as Land Matrix, LandMark, Land Portal and PRIndex.

Table 1: distribution of spending in 2023 by SO

	Support to Members (Funding)	Support to Members (Advocacy and Capacity Building)	Support Team	Partnerships and targeted support to initiatives	Total by SO
SO3	888 068	253 845	284 355	124 763	1 551 031
SO2	36 380	115 540	47 623	3 578 215	3 777 758
SO1	644 500	104 564	73 760	22 899	845 723
Total by Expense Type	1 568 948	473 948	405 737	3 725 878	6 174 511

In terms of **human resources**, the number of staff is deemed adequate by some on in the Secretariat but are not prioritised correctly e.g., there are too many staff in communications and too few in resource mobilisation. But, for others, the One Team is understaffed and over stretched; people don't have time to consult colleagues, and opportunities are being missed. Some staff members argued that lack of staff has created a bottleneck. Climate is the only one of the four global challenges that has a dedicated staff member, but she has no team and no budget and only has an advisory role, meaning there is no requirement for anyone to engage with

her. The three other global challenges do not have a dedicated expert, and the WLR position is currently vacant.

The organigramme, which has been changed numerous times, gives an indication of the workload distribution and range of responsibilities, with one person responsible for External Relations, Visibility and Gender Justice, another one for Impact, Regionalisation and Learning, and another one for Strategy, Network and Knowledge. Furthermore, the separation of learning and knowledge does not make sense.

On the national level, NLC facilitators in particular are overstretched. The key role played by these facilitators in terms of animating NLCs was highlighted by several interviewees but there are issues associated with this role, for example, closely linked to the hosting issue addressed above, it is not always clear who facilitators are answerable to: the host organisation or the Secretariat? And how to deal with non-performing facilitators also lacks clarity.

In terms of **management,** some members of the One Team suggested that ILC needs a more integrated management approach that "joins the dots". For example, through closer integration between the teams managing the three SOs, and between the SOs and thematic experts, like gender justice, youth, climate, food systems etc. According to some interviewees, the organisational structure is not appropriate; there is too much focus on the national level and as reporting is country based, it is not capturing cross cutting and global links.

1.5   Governance

In 2023, following the 2021 AoM, a comprehensive **governance reform** of ILC was initiated, focusing on shifting power to POs[2] both within and beyond the ILC network. This transformative effort, involving 106 ILC members, was facilitated by the Governance Reform Committee and the People's Organisations Committee, and was overseen by the ILC Council with the support of the One Team. A series of consultations were conducted across the regions which culminated in the new ILC Charter (hereafter referred to as the Charter), approved by the AoM in September 2023.

According to this new Charter "*the ILC is based on the potential for diverse organisations working together at different levels to achieve systems change. At the centre of ILC's membership and work are People's Organisations. In support, and solidarity, with their efforts to secure their land rights are other civil society organisations including NGOs, research institutions and inter-governmental organisations*". This power shift towards POs represents a key pivot for the network and is what distinguishes ILC from other actors. But the process is still in its early stages. According to the One Team, elections for the Council and Regional Steering Committees are being held this year (Oct/Nov), with the expectation that POs will be highly represented in the Council (one out of two Council representatives per region will be a people's organisation, and five constituency platforms can elect one representative to the Council, bringing their overall representation in the Council to potentially 47.4%, while they actually represent 36% of members). Actual implementation of the reform is therefore not expected before 2025. All interviewees concur that this pivot is a positive development for the network that aligns with its PCLG and 10 commitments. This is also reflected in the findings of the Keystone Vibrancy Survey whereby in response to members' rating of the value of the relationships that they establish through the ILC with different types of organizations, one of the two most valued relationships by a large margin was with POs. The second one was with organizations working on the same topics as the member but in different countries.

---

[2] ILC uses the term "people's organisations" (POs) for constituency-based organisations that directly represent, and are accountable to, people depending upon land. This includes farmers, peasants, women, youth, Indigenous Peoples, agricultural workers, fisherfolk, landless people, pastoralists, forest users, and other associations of rural peoples, including community-based organisations".

However, the power shift to people-centred land governance comes with challenges in terms of capacity, an emerging divide between NGOs and POs, and access to funding. As regards capacity, although some of the POs present in the network are very strong and have been active in land rights for many years, this is not the case for all. The question therefore arises as to the extent to which (limited) ILC funding should be focussed on increasing the capacities of these POs at the expense of other members. Although several members pointed out that some members of the network, NGOs, think tanks, research organisations, inherently **support POs**, some also questioned the distinction being made between a people's organisation and an NGO: Some members claimed that many organisations classified as a people's organisation are managed by professionals, hence, are not so different from NGOs.

Linked to this discussion is the issue of access to funding. As noted above, more and more donors, both traditional and non-traditional, are keen to work with POs, so this opens a range of funding opportunities. However, there are inconsistencies in terms of this stated desire and the reality. For example, EU Calls for Tender give extra points to offers presented by POs but at the same time include requirements that make this challenging for most POs, for example, three-year audited accounts and high levels of financial thresholds. The same happens with other donors, for example, USAID, which requires POs to become members of the Council for Certification of NGOs as it the case in the Philippines. This means that de facto, it is much easier for NGOs with strong track records and the relevant permits etc. to access donor funds leading to the charge that "NGOs are capturing funds that should be going to POs". Although incipient, this potential fracturing of the network between NGOs and people's organisation presents a serious risk to the network so will need to be addressed.

A good source of data on the **level and quality of engagement of the network with its stakeholders** is the draft 2024 Network Vibrancy Report elaborated by Keystone. This draft report draws on the responses given by 175 of the 295 members of the ILC i.e. a response rate of 59%, with all main stakeholder groups included (National and Regional Civil Society Organizations, Peoples Organizations, Global Civil Society Organizations, and International Governmental Organizations & Multilaterals).

Some of the key findings of this survey related to the level and quality of engagement of the network with its stakeholders to achieve its goals include the following:

Although down somewhat from 2018, table 2 below shows that 80% of members believe that ILC will achieve its goal of PCLG (44% +36%).

Table 2: members that believe ILC will achieve its goals

	Negative	Okay	Positive	NPS	2018	Ave. score
"I have confidence in the capacity of ILC to achieve its goal of people-centred land governance."	21%	36%	44%	23	45	7.74

Also, down from 2018 (table 3), but by a smaller margin, 64% of members feel they belong and contribute meaningfully to the network (which means that 36% do not). According to the report *"a close examination of the qualitative data suggests that lower scores here are associated with members' sense that they can be doing more. Newer members also say they have not yet been able to contribute yet".*

Table 3: members sense of belonging

	Negative	Okay	Positive	NPS	2018	Ave. score
"I feel that my organisation belongs to ILC and that we contribute meaningfully to it."	36%	41%	23%	-14	-5	6.69

In terms of expectations (table 4), almost two-thirds of members say they are being met, at least substantially.

Table 4: fulfilled expectations.

	Negative	Okay	Positive	NPS	Ave. score
Extent of fulfilled expectations	39%	44%	18%	-21	6.59

These three key findings of the Keystone Vibrancy Survey indicate a strong appreciation of ILC's work but show that there is scope for improvement. For example, areas of improvement relate to resource mobilization. This very much fits with the findings of the evaluation team as elaborated on in different sections of this report. In terms of what the network is doing well and what it could do better, the survey results indicate that the three most positively assessed aspects are:

- Quick response to queries (NPS -6)
- Enabling transparent and efficient flow of information (NPS -9)
- Supporting good governance of the network (NPS -9)

While the three lowest scoring areas i.e. where the network could do better, relate to:
- The provision of high quality, relevant technical expertise (including on data) (NPS -32)
- Facilitating contacts and alignment of agendas with influential actors or policymakers (NPS -36)
- Supporting resource mobilisation with donors (NPS -39)

Furthermore, the ILC asked its members about their level of satisfaction (table 5) with member engagement in the network, across global, national, regional, and thematic levels. According to respondents, the engagement of members in the national context is the most positive. ILC members were less satisfied with the level of engagement in the regional, thematic, and global context which also concurs with the evaluation findings. The results are presented in the table below. Of note are the relatively high levels of negative responses for global (62%) and regional (50%) engagement.

Table 5: levels of members' satisfaction

	N/A	Negative	Okay	Positive	N	NPS	2018 NPS	2024 and 2018 difference	Average score
Nationally	3	41%	31%	28%	174	-14	5	-19	6.36
Thematically	2	42%	38%	20%	174	-22	-19	-3	6.33
Regionally	2	50%	32%	18%	175	-31	-19	-13	6.18

Globally	3	62%	27%	10%	175	–52	–55	+3	5.22

Also, interesting for ILC to note are the responses to the question about the value of the relationships that they establish through the ILC with different types of organizations. The very low rating given to relations with funders/grant making organizations on the one hand (76%), and private sector companies/businesses on the other (91%), suggests there is ample scope for improving the work of the network regarding these two stakeholder groups. An example from Malawi was that ILC introduced the NLC to a large iNGO. Though appreciated by the NLC, the support provided by ILC did not extend further. A lesson learnt, the NLC said, is that an introduction does not bear fruit, unless it has a purpose, and the newly formed relationship has something to build on.

1.6   Impact

Overall, the evaluation team deems the targets for impact to be misplaced. ILC's main activities are necessary to contribute to change, even though attribution is not possible, though a clear strategy and direction would strengthen ILC's direction and approach. Learning events and learning opportunities strengthen ILC members and their understanding of the topic and the work. The evaluation team applauds the commitment to strengthen youth participation, though it remains limited to tokenism.

The 2022-2030 Results Framework identifies three indicators to track progress towards the overall goal or impact of ILC:

1. % of people with secure land rights in NLC countries (by age and sex disaggregated)
2. % of NLC countries in which women's land rights are recognised and
3. % of countries that report on land SDGs.

It is not clear why these three were selected as the most appropriate means of measuring PCLG; some of the LANDex **indicators which relate to the 10 commitments would have been more appropriate**, such as: 1B. Women and men with legally recognized documentation or secure rights to land disaggregated by type of tenure; 3C. Those living on community land perceive their rights to land protected against dispossession or eviction, disaggregated by sex, or others. For the second and third indicator, where data is available, the **situation seems to be improving**.

NLCs and partners engaged in multiple opportunities that contributed to the overall goal of PCLG, like national, regional, and international advocacy. For example, in Kyrgyzstan high-level officials said they have been able to reach their goals, namely by bringing about policy change in two areas out of three planned policy changes on land governance, and in DRC and Uganda high-level officials said they rely heavily on the NLC and its members, specifically in monitoring the situation on the ground and in providing relevant information for policy changes. Advocacy is one of the key activities ILC and its members contribute to, though **advocacy is expensive** to engage in and NLC members have relied on financial support from ILC, NLC members, or partners. **Positive outcomes** have been seen in-country, like in Sierra Leone where the member now routinely supports and liaises with a Minister, RCU Africa has created a relationship with the African Union such that the African Union asked the RCU to be the co-convenor for the biannual conference, and RCU LAC stated that they enjoy recognition on the regional level. However, overall, a **clear direction and strategy would strengthen the overall advocacy approach**.

An international learning event, like the one in Uganda (11-14 June 2024) and regional ones, like the ones in Indonesia and Kenya, are an added value in that they provide a **space for members to meet, discuss, learn from each other, and that their motivation is reignited** to tackle challenges. ILC's added value is their **impressive convening power**. Learning happens online during webinars, though a challenge in organizing them is **scarce funding** and **differences in individuals' capacities** in the organizing working group. Online trainings, like on advocacy,

governance, youth and leadership, and private sector engagement, are ongoing, which have fostered **greater understanding of topics and of the process**. However, online trainings are provided in French, English and Spanish, thus excluding Russian-speaking members. Finally, it is **unclear whether knew knowledge trickles** down to all members.

In support of youth inclusion and youth participation, ILC, together with partners, launched a **multi-stakeholder platform on youth land governance** in Africa and developed a **regional agenda with concrete proposals and key messages** that support advocacy processes and contribute to raising awareness on the importance of rights to land. In 2022, the ILC youth network took these messages to the COP27, the World Food Forum, the Regional Youth Climate Summit, and the CBD COP15. While the evaluation team applauds the **commitment to youth inclusion is applauded**, it remains limited to presentations unrelated to youth issues in advocacy spaces, which is a missed opportunity for ILC. The global Youth Leadership programme included non-members, which could indicate a need/demand for **additional focus on building youth leadership** for meaningful youth participation in land governance.

1.7   Sustainability

The evaluation team has identified multiple signs of sustainable outcomes, which is a great finding at the early stages of the ILC strategy. A serious challenge remains limited funds, which has led to risks that may undermine the network. Whilst the evaluation team deems that ILC could do with setting more ambitious targets in terms of funding, there are no signs that institutional sustainability is threatened. Progress towards sustainability in all three areas are assessed as positive:

There are ample signs of sustainable outcomes. The first sign is **raised awareness of women allowing them to stand up for their rights and claim them**. Continuous capacity strengthening through the process of learning by doing meant that **community members increasingly take charge of their own affairs** and that, in some cases, government officials have built a rapport with community leaders, and that NLCs are **learning to secure and mobilize resources** and advocating for their goals and objectives. NLCs show increased resilience through **continued contributions to national dialogues** about land governance reform, despite drops in financial support from ILC. Members iterated that the role of a **standalone facilitator assures consistency** in line with the shared goal of PCLG and continuity in interventions and activities. ILC facilitates the process of shifting the power by encouraging dialogue and by having an RCU coordinator and NLC facilitator who is separate from members and only has this task. **This makes coordination between members easier and faster**. The multi-stakeholder approach is an added value to ILC and NLCs, which has led to **ILC becoming more inclusive**, whilst members are more conscious about including youth and people living with disabilities.

ILC's decision to shift from being a funder to facilitating members' access to funding has **had serious implications for the work of the network**. The shift resulted from various push factors such as the drying up of donor funds and the power shift to POs: several interviewees said **the shift happened too quickly** and should have struck a better balance between capacity development and empowerment. The issue of limited resources was systematically raised with the evaluation team and many interviewees observed that the **limited funding is holding back development of the network**. Other repercussions of this shift from funder to facilitator means that **members are being driven by the opportunities available to them through projects**, rather than a strategic overarching plan. Furthermore**, leveraging funds is becoming a big burden** on both the secretariat and NLCs who are obliged to spend a lot of their time chasing funds/writing proposals. Members who successfully raise **funds may not feel under any obligation to share those funds** with other members of their NLC. Without clear rules and guidelines in place setting out roles and responsibilities regarding resource mobilisation, and as (some) members become more adept at this, there is a strong risk that more and more of them will feel they can "go it alone", thus **undermining the very basis of the network**.

Despite frequent references to limited resources from many sources ILC is very close to hitting its targets (see table 6): For the 2022-24 triennium, ILC's budget target was USD 42 million, evenly split between core/flexible and earmarked funding sourced through ILC platforms and members. Five core donors **renewed their commitment**, and two of them, the EC and SDC, agreed to **increase their contributions**. By December 2023, agreements for core and earmarked funding exceeding USD 19 million had been finalised, with a top-up of EUR 2 million to the existing core contribution proposed for early 2024 leaving a small gap of USD175 039. In the case of leveraged funding (global level), the target was exceeded by USD1 202 683, while for funds leveraged by members, the gap was USD 1 203 959. In other words, the gap in funding for the triennium is actually very small at USD176 315. The evaluation team deems ILC to be financially sustainable, though **ILC needs to be more ambitious in terms of raising funds**, setting higher targets for all three levels of funding.

Table 6: Progress against triennial targets

Funding type	Target in USD	Contributions in USD (approved)	Gap
Core	$21 000 000	$20 824 961	$175 039
Leveraged (global)	$7 000 000	$8 202 683	(+ $1 202 683)
Leveraged (members)*	$ 14 000 000	$12 796 041	$ 1 203 959
Total	$42 000 000	$41 823 685	$176 315

Asia is particularly adept at mobilising resources with a success rate of 52% and USD 5.66 million raised closely followed by LAC with a 41% success rate and USD 6.52 raised (see table 7). EMENA has been least successful in leveraging funds, which is not surprising as the RCU coordinator only started working with ILC in November 2023. These figures are **promising in terms of overall potential financial sustainability**. There is **scope for cross learning between the regions in terms of fundraising** with a view to enhancing financial sustainability.

Table 7: Overview of leveraged funding proposals

Region	No. of proposals	Successful	Unsuccessful	Status pending	Amount pending (USD M)*	Amount secured (USD M)
Africa	40	13	20	7	5,9	0,6
Asia	27	14	10	3	0,17	5,66
EMENA	1	0	1	0	0,25	0
LAC	37	15	12	10	1,3	6,52
GLOBAL	8	7	n/a	1	1,41	8,2
Total	**113**	**49**	**43**	**21**	**9,03**	**20,98**

* Amounts have been rounded and converted from other currencies

The evaluation team assesses that progress is being made towards securing institutional sustainability: ILC's institutional sustainability depends on several factors, including members' capacities. Some members are well-established, whilst other are nascent. According to some NLCs, the **weaker members should be given priority**. **Synergies created with national decision-makers** are also a sign of institutional sustainability, which are related to political support to keep land on the policy agenda and in securing political interest in keeping and changing policies on land governance. As noted above, **ILC adds value to the work of members in different ways**, including its convening power and their weight and role in supporting advocacy. Each of these factors underpin institutional sustainability. At this point, there is no reason to assume that members' commitment to the goal and ILC is at risk, especially as **ILC continues to grow in membership**. Finally, the **four challenges illustrate the continued importance of land**, even its increased importance for a peaceful and prosperous world.

2 Conclusions

This section summarises the findings, as presented in the body of this report and clusters them into conclusions according to the six OECD DAC evaluation criteria.

2.1 Relevance and quality of design

Conclusion 1.

Most members consulted as part of this evaluation confirm that the work carried out by ILC **responds to their needs** but there are limitations. For example, the limited amount of funding available means that some priority areas do not receive the support members require, while the level of demand for support within some priority areas greatly exceeds resources. Another limitation relates to the fact that certain members are frequently called on to share their expertise with other members but do not receive support themselves, hence, there is a sense that the needs of others are prioritised over theirs. Based on these findings, the evaluation team concludes that while ILC is responsive to members' needs, **operational and financial constraints** mean that some members' needs remain unanswered.

Conclusion 2.

The evaluation team concludes that **ILC has clear added value** in terms of keeping **land rights on the agenda**. The opportunity provided by ILC members to **learn from each other** is also one of its main added values, specifically through the sharing of experiences and expertise. In this regard, the diversity of members' competences; legal, technical, and moral, is considered positively, providing ample scope for intra-learning. **The advocacy role** played by the coalition is also singled out as a major added value; the strength in numbers argument is put forward as particularly relevant to smaller organisations as it gives them greater legitimacy and visibility. Closely linked to this advocacy role is the success achieved by ILC in **raising awareness** and getting public opinion on the side of different aspects of land governance which is also identified as a key added value. The **high level of representation of people's organisation/constituency groups** within the coalition is considered another major added value. Giving voice to people's organisations (POs) and engaging them in processes alongside government and international organisations is a key added value of ILC membership. Another area highlighted by representatives of the One Team and ILC members is the so-called **network effect** whereby ILC provides opportunities for both national and regional organisations to get involved with like-minded organisations in other regions (connecting); ILC serves as a window to the world, helping NLCs to think regionally and globally.

Conclusion 3.

In terms of quality of design, the evaluation team concludes that the ToC suffers from a number of weaknesses e.g. it lacks reference to the two Pledges and a link to the 10 commitments and the four challenges is also missing. The ToC is not based on assumptions, nor are (all) targets informed by a baseline study. Of note are the numerous inconsistencies between the ToC, the results framework (RF) for the ILC 2022-2030 Strategy, and the triennial workplan. These inconsistencies make it difficult to measure progress and weaken the ILC design.

Conclusion 4.

Highlighting the **link between land rights and the four global challenges** is considered to have been a good decision, firstly because of its inherent logic that land is a crucial factor in all of these, but also because it opens up other potential sources of funding, such as climate finance. However, whilst there is broad agreement that the linking of land rights to these key global challenges makes sense, there is less clarity about how it will it be translated into concrete actions. To date, progress has mainly been made regarding climate change and ecosystem

restoration through the "People, Climate and Nature Programme".[3] This programme is considered a good practice insofar as it pulls the different strands of the ILC's ToC together by detailing how work under each of its three pillars, will "cut across ILC's areas of engagement", namely NLCs, Data and Global and Regional Advocacy as well as Knowledge and Learning. As regards the opening of **possible alternative funding sources**, this is also confirmed as a positive development by interviewees and in some countries, climate change and gender related initiatives already constitute a significant proportion of leveraged funding.

Conclusion 5.

The **ILC triennial workplan adequately reflects the longer-term strategy (2022-2030)** and provides detailed information on the work to be carried out under each of the three SOs and two Pledges as well as activities related to governance of the network, monitoring and evaluation, knowledge management, and learning and communication. As regards the "indicators of success" and deliverables, these are deemed pertinent and realistic, though not very ambitious given the overall level of ambition the coalition has set itself through its 10 commitments. The deliverables are basically a series of activities and outputs that are not clearly linked to the achievement of the ILC's higher level goals.

2.2   Coherence

Conclusion 6.

NLCs and RCUs confirm that their **workplans align with the ILC Strategy** and ToC. The participatory and inclusive approach to developing workplans is commendable. The design is driven by the ILC strategy and ToC but is foreseen to be driven more by members in the next triennial, which is even more aligned with the strategy and vision of PCLG. However, limited funding calls for prioritization of actions and interventions thus limiting the scope of their actions. A second challenge is in coordinating and aligning diverse contexts, priorities, experiences, and language skills. Finally, diverse capacities between members call for continued strengthening of capacities. Despite these challenges, the evaluation team concludes that processes and structures are in place that allow for coherence between the national, regional, and global levels.

Conclusion 7.

Synergies and partnerships are continuously being created, e.g., with FAO, CAFI, Rainforest Trust, Tenure Facility and the World Bank. The added value of ILC in these partnerships is their priority on giving POs a voice, which is fully aligned with the in-country work of these large donors. Similarly, on the regional level, synergies have been created with regional organisations, like IGAD in Africa and the Arab Land Initiative in EMENA. These synergies allow members to do advocacy or engage in capacity strengthening through their participation in webinars and trainings. **Synergies on the national level** are often made with national decision-makers. The partnership between civil society and national governments was highlighted as an added value in-country. For example, some high-level officials notes that civil society will always have a role to play in showing them the realities of the people, in advocating for the need to change/adapt policies, and/or to implement the projects. The evaluation team determines that synergies and partnerships allow coalitions on all levels to expand on their work, to implement activities and reach their goals in a more efficient way.

2.3   Effectiveness

Conclusion 8.

---

[3] ILC's draft PROGRAMME ON PEOPLE, CLIMATE AND NATURE for consultation with partners

There has been significant progress in line with the **indicators of success** as listed in the workplan and results framework though the lack of ambition of most of these indicators/targets undermines their usefulness. Most progress has been made towards SO2. Areas for improvement include SO1 and the second Pledge on LEDs.

Conclusion 9.

While the commitment to youth inclusion is noted, it remains limited to tokenism in advocacy spaces. Though members highlighted the challenge of missing policies that allow for youth inclusion in national decision-making spaces, these are often easier reached on the international level. Hence, a missed opportunity has been highlighting youth-specific land issues and practices related to land governance.

Conclusion 10.

LANDex represents a serious attempt to **overcome the high level of fragmentation in the current, complex data landscape**. A key added value of LANDex is that more than half (18/33) of its indicators rely fully or partially on people-based assessments. However, and notwithstanding the efforts made by the ILC Oneteam to improve the user friendliness of LANDex, criticisms remain and several of the members consulted by the evaluation team were critical of the tool. The general feedback provided was that it is too centralised and not aligned with what is happening on the ground. As regards the global data sets that contribute to LANDex, Land Matrix, Landmark and ALLIED were frequently referred to in positive terms. As regards the links between the data component, namely SO2 and the other two SOs, several commentators in the Secretariat and NLCs felt that the links between SO2 and SO1 are not being sufficiently exploited. LANDex is creating a huge amount of data, but it is not clear how this data is being used and how it is bringing change. In the case of SO3, there is better integration, though the evaluation team concludes that the link could be strengthened.

Conclusion 11.

The **M&E system** is comprised of multiple tools for monitoring progress towards results. These include the results framework (RF), contribution analyses, and the Keystone Vibrancy Survey. There are several weaknesses in the RF such as a lack of consistency with the ToC, inappropriate indicators, and the inclusion of "Expected Results" which in some cases go beyond what the corresponding SO is trying to achieve. A total of 10 **contribution analyses**[4] have been produced during the first triennial and these serve a useful purpose both in terms of visibility (human interest stories) and donors, who appreciate the human-centred approach and who see it as one of ILC's strengths. The content and quality of the **vibrancy surveys** is considered commendable as is the level of interest and effort that ILC puts into accessing members' feedback, as it speaks to their commitment of being a member-led coalition. However, notwithstanding these positive aspects of the M&E tools, the evaluation team is of the opinion that they provide only a limited overview of progress towards ILC's overall goal and SOs as described in its ToC. Though each tool provides a side of the story, the tools are not linked in such a way that they tell a coherent story of progress. In particular the weakness of the RF indicators and the lack of ambition (and consistency) of the workplan "indicators of success" limit meaningful monitoring. The weak lack of linkages with the indicators tracked under LANDex is considered a missed opportunity for effective monitoring of progress towards results.

2.4 Efficiency

Conclusion 12.

---

[4] Contribution analyses are from Argentina, Bangladesh, Ecuador, Global (2022 and 2023), Guatemala, Indonesia, the Philippines, South Africa, and Togo.

Although the operational successes of the IFAD/ILC **hosting arrangement** are slow to emerge and limited in terms of coverage, the potential benefits of this collaboration are clear and are confirmed by a broad range of interviewees. Benefits of the arrangement cited by stakeholders refer to ILC being able to exploit IFAD's close relations with partner governments to get issues onto the table, and the increased credibility and visibility the IFAD brand brings to ILC members. Being able to use IFAD services such as procurement, payments, HR, IT was also identified as a benefit. From IFAD's perspective, the access provided to their target groups on the ground, in particular POs is considered a major benefit of the relationship.

Conclusion 13.

Problems have emerged in recent years due to ILC's lack of legal identity which prevents it accessing funds from potential donors (in particular, US philanthropic organisations/ foundations). This is leading to missed opportunities. There is a pressing need to resolve this issue as on the one hand, ILC is being pushed to raise more funds, but on the other, too many obstacles are being put in their way. Options such as increased autonomy for ILC within IFAD or the possibility of entering into a fiscal sponsorship agreement should be explored. According to information shared with the evaluation team, these discussions are ongoing.

2.5 Governance

Conclusion 14.

ILC's power shift towards POs represents a key pivot for the network and is what distinguishes ILC from other actors. All interviewees concur that this pivot is a positive development for the network that aligns with its goal and 10 commitments. This is also reflected in the findings of the Keystone Vibrancy Survey whereby in response to members' rating of the value of the relationships that they establish through the ILC with different types of organizations, one of the two most valued relationships by a large margin was that with POs. However, this power shift comes with challenges in terms of capacity, an emerging divide between NGOs and POs, and access to funding. As regards capacity, although some POs in the coalition are well-established and have been active in land rights for many years, this is not the case for all. The question therefore arises about the extent to which (limited) ILC funding should be focussed on increasing the capacities of these POs at the expense of other members. Linked to this discussion is the issue of access to funding. More and more donors, both traditional and non-traditional, are keen to work with POs, so this opens a range of funding opportunities. However, there are inconsistencies in terms of this stated desire and the reality, for example, EU Calls for Tender give extra points to offers presented by POs but at the same time include requirements that make this very challenging e.g. three-year audited accounts and high levels of financial thresholds. The same happens with other donors, for example, USAID, which requires POs to become members of the Council for Certification of NGOs. This means that de facto, it is much easier for NGOs with strong track records and the relevant permits to access donor funds, leading to the charge that "NGOs are capturing funds that should be going to POs". Although incipient, this potential fracturing of the network needs to be kept in check.

Conclusion 15.

Progress towards the targets set for the three impact indicators is not expected to be strong given that they were only set at the start of the Strategy (2022) and are not expected to be achieved until 2030. That said, according to the 2023 annual report, there is no data for the first indicator while for the second (WLR), from a baseline of 34% in 2022, this had risen to 46.43% a year later while for the third indicator (SDG reporting) the figures are 4.62% in 2022 and 5.13% in 2023. In both cases where data is available, the situation seems to be improving though as always with this type of high-level data the issue of attribution arises e.g. to what extent the the ILC can claim these positive developments are attributable to the work they are doing. Contribution analysis would have to be done i.e. for those countries where ILC is working on these issues

(alongside other stakeholders) and where shifts (positive or negative) occur, then ILC can claim to have contributed to those developments.

2.6 Sustainability

Conclusion 16.

There are significant signs of **sustainable outcomes** related to the ILC strategy, interventions and actions. These relate to raised awareness, strengthened capacities of members through learning activities and learning by doing, and increased resilience of members and people by creating a safe space in which collaboration, dialogue, and participation are prioritized. The multi-stakeholder approach is an added value of ILC, which supports overcoming a complex challenge from multiple perspectives. By shifting the power to POs, the process has become potentially more effective by allowing for more voices to be part of the conversation on land governance overall.

Conclusion 17.

ILC's decision to shift from being a funder to facilitating members' access to funding has had serious implications for the work of the coalition. Several interviewees say the shift happened too quickly and should have struck a better balance between capacity development and empowerment. The issue of limited resources was systematically raised with the evaluation team and many interviewees observed that the limited funding is holding back development of the coalition. Other repercussions of this shift from **funder to facilitator** are that members are being driven by the opportunities available to them through projects; they are responsive to available funds rather than a strategic overarching plan. Furthermore, leveraging funds is becoming a burden on both the Oneteam and NLCs who are obliged to spend a lot of their time chasing funds/writing proposals. Another serious risk posed by the current resource mobilisation model is that members who do successfully raise funds may not feel under any obligation to share those funds with other members of their NLC.

Without clear rules and guidelines in place setting out roles and responsibilities regarding resource mobilisation, and as (some) members become more adept at this, there is a strong risk that more and more of them will feel they can "go it alone" thus undermining the very basis of the coalition. However, notwithstanding these concerns, the figures tell a different story: according to the ILC resource mobilisation data, ILC is very close to hitting its targets. For the 2022-24 triennium, ILC's budget target was USD 42 million, evenly split between core/flexible and earmarked funding sourced through ILC platforms and members. By December 2023, agreements for core and earmarked funding exceeding USD 19 million had been finalised, with a top-up of EUR 2 million to the existing core contribution proposed for early 2024 leaving a small gap of USD 175,039. In the case of leveraged funding (global level), the target was exceeded by USD 1,202,683, while for funds leveraged by members, the gap was USD 1,203,959. In other words, the gap in funding for the triennium is actually very small, USD 176,315.

Conclusion 18.

ILC's **institutional sustainability** depends on a combination of factors, including members' capacities, willingness, and interest in being part of the coalition and to support its work, and the perceived added value of the coalition. The evaluation team observed that in general, members are willing to spend time, energy, and funds on the work of the NLC and its members, which is a good indication of their commitment. ILC is seen as a leading player in the space on land by partners, members, governments and donors. Partners highlighted their convening power, and members highlighted their weight and role in supporting advocacy. There are ample signs that ILC has an abundance of added value, which underpins its institutional sustainability. Though there are operational challenges of being a member-led network, like requiring time and energy to coordinate and facilitate collaboration, challenges of prioritizing inclusion and participation of

their members, at this point in time, there is no reason to believe that institutional sustainability is at risk, especially as ILC continues to grow in membership.

3 Recommendations

The following recommendations are linked to the corresponding conclusions and are split into a three-tier system, where is recommendation is assigned a tier speaking to its importance and the urgency with which it should not addressed. The tiers are:

- Red – URGENT: A critical change which should be made immediately. If left unresolved, it has the risk to undermine the work of the ILC, its impact, its reputation and member satisfaction.
- Amber – IMPORTANT: An important change which should be made whenever possible. It is unlikely to materially affect the ILC in the short-term but will reduce efficiency and could compromise impact in the long-term.
- Green – DESIRABLE: A 'nice-to-have', which should be considered in the fullness of time. Unlikely to immediately change the work of the ILC but can contribute to greater impact over time. While the lowest of the tiers, it should not be ignored or disregarded.

Recommendation 1 linked to C1 and C17 (One Team): URGENT To be able to meet the network's expanding needs, support to resource mobilisation by members needs to be prioritised and expanded on. This could also take the form of peer learning drawing on the success of NLCs in the Asia and LAC regions as regards resource mobilisation.

Recommendation 2 linked to C3 and C11 (One Team and members): URGENT The planning and management documents supporting the work of the ILC, namely the ToC, the RF and the Workplan need to be revised and made more coherent. The ToC needs to have clearly formulated results statements. As it stands, the overall goal of PCLG reads more like a means to an end rather than an end in and of itself. A more appropriate formulation of this goal would be "Securing land rights for and with people, who live on and from the land". The link between PCLG and the 10 Commitments needs to be made more explicit e.g. by using the relevant LANDex indicators.

The change process depicted in the ToC graphic needs to be accompanied by a narrative that also includes the underlying assumptions. The two ILC Pledges should also be included in the ToC and the four challenges should be placed on the far right of the ToC. The RF needs to remove the ERs; there should only be impact, outcome and output levels and these should be the same as those appearing in the ToC. They should be accompanied by relevant indicators, preferably drawn from LANDEX. The workplan should include the same results (outcomes and outputs) and indicators as the RF and as an operational document should include the clusters of activities what will lead to the delivery of those outputs. Possible formulations of these outputs could be: OP1: increased institutional and financial capacity of NLCs; OP2: Land related data available and OP3: Increased awareness of land rights.

Recommendation 3 linked to C4 (Council of the Coalition): DESIRABLE The holistic/programmatic approach that was applied to the development of the People, Climate and Nature programme should be extended to the other three challenges and to other key areas of work such as LED. In addition, these priority cross-cutting workstreams need to be adequately resourced and afforded more than just an advisory role.

Recommendation 4 linked to C5/C8 (One Team): IMPORTANT The indicators for success and deliverables of the ILC triennial workplan should be revised to reflect the overall level of ambition the coalition has set itself through its 10 commitments. Deliverables should be formulated as outputs with a clear explanation of how they will contribute to the achievement of the ILC's higher level goals SOs.

Recommendation 5 linked to C8 (Council of the Coalition, One Team and members): DESIRABLE Explore youth-related issues related to land: An area for improvement is youth inclusion (section 3.6.2) and youth participation. The ILC Secretariat, in collaboration with the RCUs and NLCs should consider exploring specific youth-related issues in land governance. There is likely much

to learn there in terms of access to rights and land tenure, access to decision-making processes, and youth-specific priorities. This could provide additional insights and could strengthen the ILC approach even further, for example by opening new funding streams.

Recommendation 6 linked to C10 (One Team): URGENT <u>Align data tools with reality</u>: LANDex needs to be better aligned with what is happening on the ground. Work on SO2 needs to be more embedded in the work of the other two workstreams (SO1 and SO3) and the thematic areas (gender, LED, climate, food systems etc.). A dedicated workshop on the data component should be organised as soon as possible with relevant stakeholders such as NLCs, RCUs, thematic experts, the leads of SO1, SO2 and SO3, and other organisations working on land data such as LMI, LandMark, Allied, Prindex, FAO etc.

Recommendation 7 linked to C11 (Council of the Coalition and One Team): IMPORTANT <u>Strengthen synergies between MELCK</u>: The One Team should strengthen the MELCK framework to allow for stronger and clearer synergies between its different components. More specifically, the bottleneck effect that has been created by slimming down the team must be overcome and a way to compensate for the loss of key staff/foci must be found. Simultaneously, ILC Secretariat should encourage stronger links between the areas through stronger and more transparent communication. The ILC Council could give recommendations on the levels of effort of various areas connected to the MELCK framework. By doing this, ILC will strengthen their structures and be stronger in linking the SOs.

Recommendation 8 linked to C13 (Council of Coalition, Secretariat and IFAD): URGENT There is a need to agree on a mechanism that facilitates a more efficient flow of funds either through collaboration with potential "new" donors to allow them to meet IFAD's requirements e.g. through some type of pillar assessment as is done by the EU, or through a more flexible arrangement within IFAD that caters for these types of donors e.g. through the appointment of a fiscal agent. In parallel, clear rules and guidelines need to be put in place setting out roles and responsibilities regarding resource mobilisation.

Recommendation 9 linked to C14 (One Team and members): IMPORTANT ILC's shift towards POs needs to be accompanied by an in-depth, participatory reflection by the One Team and the members on the implications of this shift in terms of fund allocation and capacity needs. A roadmap spelling out how this shift is taking place and what its implications for all (POs and non-POs) is needed in order to address the emerging tensions between POs and other members e.g. NGOs. In parallel, the increasing role of POs in the network requires a dedicated programme to build their capacities and to strengthen their ability to engage directly with donors.

Recommendation 10 linked to C15 (Council of the Coalition): DESIRABLE The Council should work to meet the coalition's expanding needs. Dialogue between members and national governments must continue to be facilitated. Members' capacities must continue to be strengthened, especially of those members that are less established. To support this process, a clear overview of members' capacities and learning needs, as well as specific needs for support could support and direct efforts more efficiently and effectively, leading to more impact and progress towards the PCLG on all levels.

Europe

MDF Netherlands
Ede, Netherlands
mdf@mdf.nl

Africa

MDF West Africa
Accra, Ghana
mdfwa@mdf.nl

MDF Eastern & Southern Africa
Nairobi, Kenya
mdfesa@mdf.nl

MDF Afrique Centrale
Goma, DRC
mdfac@mdf.nl

MDF Bénin
Cotonou, Benin
mdfbenin@mdf.nl

Asia

MDF Pacific Indonesia
Bali, Indonesia
mdfpi@mdf.nl

MDF Myanmar
Yangon, Myanmar
mdfmmr@mdf.nl

MDF Bangladesh
Dhaka, Bangladesh
mdfbg@mdf.nl