

Mid-Term Assessment Global Land Tool Network



Mid-Term Evaluation Global Land Tool Network

DECEMBER 2011

Evaluation Report 3/2011
Mid-Term Evaluation Global Land Tool Network

This report is available from <http://www.unhabitat.org/evaluations>

First published in Nairobi in December 2011 by UN-Habitat.
Copyright © United Nations Human Settlements Programme 2011

Produced by Monitoring and Evaluation Unit
United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)
P. O. Box 30030, 00100 Nairobi GPO KENYA
Tel: 254-020-7623120 (Central Office)
www.unhabitat.org

HS Number: HS/004/12E
ISBN Number(Series): 978-92-1-132028-2
ISBN Number(Volume): 978-92-1-132412-9

DISCLAIMER

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, the United Nations, or its Member States.

Excerpts may be reproduced without authorization, on condition that the source is indicated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors: George Collett & Anthony Burns
Editor: UNON
Design & Layout: Irene Juma

Photos: © Alessandro Scotti, SPARC, UN-Habitat and Julius Mwelu/UN-Habitat

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vii
I. Findings	viii
II. Conclusions	xi
III. Key Recommendations	xii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Project Background	2
1.2 Objectives of the Evaluation	3
2. REVIEW PROCESS AND METHODS	4
2.1 Team	4
2.2 Itinerary and Persons Consulted	4
2.3 Methods	4
3. FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	7
3.1 Relevance and Appropriateness of the Project Goal, Outcomes and Outputs	7
3.2 Project Progress and Performance	13
3.3 Project Management	32
3.4 Effectiveness, and Outcomes and Impacts achieved or likely to be achieved	46
3.5 Sustainability	51
4. CONCLUSIONS	54
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	56
ANNEXES	60
ANNEX I: TERMS OF REFERENCE	61
ANNEX II: INCEPTION REPORT	66
ANNEX III: LIST OF PERSONS CONSULTED	92
ANNEX IV: QUESTIONNAIRES	94
ANNEX V: SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO THE GLTN LOGFRAME	101
ANNEX VI: COMPARISON OF 12 GLOBAL LAND PROGRAMMES AND GLTN	108
ANNEX VII: GLOBAL LAND PROGRAMMES	111
ANNEX VIII: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON THE BALANCE BETWEEN GLOBAL AND NORMATIVE ACTIVITIES AND COUNTRY-LEVEL ACTIVITIES	120
ANNEX IX: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON GLTN TOOLS AND THE TOOL DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES	121

LIST OF BOXES AND TABLES

BOXES

3.1 GLTN outcomes and impacts—selected perspectives from partners	47
3.2 GLTN future and sustainability—selected perspective from partners	52

TABLES

2.1 Number of respondents targeted by each of the four questionnaires	5
3.1 Summary of progress in land tool development since 2006	16
3.2 Options to overcome GLTN staffing constraints and to reduce the burden of administration	34
3.3 Options to improve partner representation in the IAB	38

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AfDB	African Development Bank
AGRA	Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa
APC	Association for Progressive Communications
AU	African Union
AUC	African Union Commission
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
CASLE	Commonwealth Association of Surveying and Land Economy
COHRE	Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DFID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
DMP	Disaster Management Programme (UN-Habitat)
DPGL	Development Partners Group in Land (Kenya)
ECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
EGM	Expert Group Meeting
ENOF	Enhanced Normative and Operational Framework
ESCR-Net	International Network for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations
FIDA	International Federation of Women Lawyers
FIG	International Federation of Surveyors
GLTN	Global Land Tool Network
GRET	Research and Technological Group
GTZ	German Agency for International Cooperation
GUO	Global Urban Observatory
HAC	Harmonization, Alignment and Coordination
HPM	Habitat Programme Manager
HPS	Housing Policy Section
IAB	International Advisory Board
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee (United Nations)
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IHA	In-house Agreement
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IUM	International Islamic University of Malaysia
ILC	International Land Coalition
IMIS	Integrated Management Information System
IPSAS	International Public Sector Accounting Standards
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
IT	Information Technology
ITC	International Institute for Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
LADM	Land Administration Domain Model
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
LGAF	Land Governance Administration Framework (World Bank)
LRTU	Land Reform Transformation Unit (Kenya)
LSNSC	Land Sector Non-State Coalition (Kenya)
MCC	Millennium Challenge Corporation

MDG's	Millennium Development Goals
MTSIP	Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan (UN-Habitat)
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NSA	Non-state Actor
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OGC	Oslo Governance Centre (UNDP)
OICRF	International Office for Cadastre and Land Records
PMO	Programme Management Officer
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PSD	Programme Support Division (UN-Habitat)
RTCD	Regional Technical Cooperation Division (UN-Habitat)
SC	Steering Committee
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
STDM	Social Tenure Domain Model
SUF	Slum Upgrading Facility
TCBB	Training and Capacity-building Branch (UN-Habitat)
TLIMS	Tribal Land Information Management System (Botswana)
UEL	University of East London
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UN-Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
UNON	United Nations Office at Nairobi
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

I. FINDINGS

RELEVANCE AND APPROPRIATENESS

The GLTN project design was developed over a period of time, commencing with a design team in 2005, continuing with the project document in late 2007, up to the current GLTN logframe dated February 2009. The evaluation considered that the main design documents could be further clarified to provide a stronger framework for guiding implementation and evaluating effectiveness and impact. Notwithstanding, the goal of GLTN is clearly consistent with United Nations goals, the UN-Habitat agenda and the UN-Habitat Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan (MTSIP) and its enhanced normative and operational framework (ENOF). In evaluating the need for GLTN, given the wide variety of other programmes making important contributions to the land sector, the evaluation considered that the Network played a valuable and distinct role. This was attributed to a combination of characteristics:

- Its key role as an advocate for effective, pro-poor, gender-appropriate land governance and administration;
- Its impartial and independent position under a United Nations agency;
- Its breadth of network partners with their different perspectives, including influential multi-lateral organizations, technical and professional bodies, research and training institutions and grass-roots organizations;
- Its active promotion of grass-roots participation;
- Its emphasis on cooperation among partners (including within UN-Habitat) and on improved donor coordination (acting as a catalyst and facilitator); and
- Its support for innovation and new thinking (due in part to its multi-disciplinary and multi-stakeholder composition).

SUMMARY OF PROGRESS AND ACHIEVEMENTS

GLTN has made impressive progress in achieving its expected outcomes, given its limited staff base and the short time in which funding has been available to implement activities. While GLTN was launched in June 2006, it has only had sufficient funds to support a full programme of activities since the end of 2007. It has made the most of important global and regional opportunities in promoting global knowledge and awareness, and in some cases harnessed partners' interests at country levels to develop and test tools and approaches. In most cases, GLTN has more than achieved the targets set in the project document (November 2007), the logframe (February 2009) and the annual workplan for 2008.

The progress achieved by GLTN in land tool development is commendable. In the less than two years in which it has had effective funding, GLTN has made rapid progress in the development and documentation of land tools covering most of its targeted issues and themes.

In all, 41 GLTN-published documents were available on its website on 31 July 2009. Of the more than 70,000 downloads from the website, over 16,000 were of GLTN documents.

GLTN has initiated important country-level activities in Botswana, Ethiopia, Haiti, Kenya and Liberia and has worked in many other countries as part of its research, tool development and training programmes.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Staffing constraints at the Secretariat have affected the initiation of new tools and country programmes. Existing staff members have been stretched to their limit and the GLTN Secretariat staff ceiling, as set out in the project design, has already been reached. The evaluation considered the options of increasing staff numbers and reducing the administrative and management burden on the Secretariat. The most immediately

effective measure would be to increase the staff ceiling but such a step would have to be justified and negotiated with the core donors and UN-Habitat managers.

The Secretariat has engaged both large and small-scale partners in research, tool development and training. It has been very successful in encouraging and retaining a broad array of partner organizations from very different perspectives and backgrounds, providing them all with their own space yet keeping a balance; mediating between different groups of influential and vocal partners, and drawing them all towards GLTN core values and cooperative endeavours.

The Steering Committee provides a valuable base for decision making in the GLTN programme and offers accountability to donors. It is entirely composed of UN-Habitat staff, with no representation from GLTN partners and this allows partners to receive GLTN funds without being implicated in any conflict of interest. GLTN partners, nevertheless, provide pivotal advice through their representation on the IAB. Ideally, the Steering Committee should take a more significant role in assisting GLTN to overcome internal administrative constraints within UN-Habitat and UNON.

IAB has proved to be a very effective body; one that will be more representative following the agreements on partner representation and election of members made at the partners' meeting in November 2009.

Partners meetings, although expensive, have great value in strengthening the Network. These meetings strengthen the cooperation both within and between segments and clusters, as was clearly evident in the November partners meeting. Partners meetings need to be conducted regularly but their function needs to be agreed on with the IAB and the Steering Committee.

Until now the GLTN Secretariat has mediated most partner-to-partner collaboration. As the Network strengthens and expands, collaboration

between partners may be expected more frequently and the role of the Secretariat may not be so central. This raises the question as to when such collaborative activity between partners should be considered to fall within the GLTN, and when it should not. What role should be played by the Secretariat, the IAB and other partners in such cases?

Within the context of the GLTN Secretariat, this evaluation confirmed the findings of an earlier review of the Programme Agreement between UN-Habitat and Norway 2008-2009. That evaluation found administrative services within UN-Habitat and UNON to be inefficient and their approval procedures complex, placing a considerable burden on the already overstretched Secretariat staff and slowing the implementation of GLTN activities. The UN-Habitat Management Information System is restrictive and does not accommodate multi-year commitments. It is an essential requirement that monitoring and evaluation and their associated reporting must be in accordance with the UN-Habitat MTSIP and its biannual workplan, as well as the GLTN specific requirements for donors.

UN-Habitat is in the process of improving management efficiency, and GLTN is working with UN-Habitat and UNON to develop administrative reforms and innovations. Progress in this area has, however, been slow. If internal reforms cannot be successfully achieved before the middle of 2010, the evaluation recommends that GLTN should once again explore the outsourcing of aspects of its administration, particularly those associated with the procurement of services.

GLTN logframe indicators and targets are predominantly quantitative indicators, and information on many of them is very hard to come by, particularly at the goal and outcome level. As a result, this information has yet to be collected. The targets in the GLTN logframe continue to emphasize quantitative data and remain unchanged for the term of the project.

GLTN is about to implement its own project management system, which should improve and

facilitate monitoring and reporting. A quality control mechanism has also been designed but has not yet been implemented.

The percentage of the total project budget that goes to project administration and management (staff, agency support, and monitoring and evaluation) amounts to between 27 and 33 per cent, a figure that the evaluation considers to be very reasonable for this type of project. The project has been able to make a little go a long way, partly as a result of the often voluntary contributions and support of its partners, including UN-Habitat, and partly thanks to the work of the motivated and capable staff in the Secretariat.

EFFECTIVENESS, OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS

GLTN has been very effective in communicating technical and policy issues to different audiences, for example, through the United Nations Commission for Sustainable Development and its involvement in the African Union/United Nations Economic Commission for Africa/African Development Bank framework and guidelines on land policy in Africa. Successful messages have included the continuum of rights and the need for affordable, pro-poor, gender-appropriate approaches to land governance. Among the GLTN partners, it is the technical experts who have a greater understanding of social issues and the grass-roots organizations as well as greater understanding of technical issues concerning the land. The sharing of understanding between these groups has strengthened the advocacy efforts of GLTN, the tools it has developed and the Network itself.

Further efforts are now required to reach national governments and those designing land projects as conventional land titling projects are still being implemented while new ones are also being proposed. GLTN efforts towards improving global knowledge and awareness could also benefit from an updated website. In any event, the evaluation questionnaire indicated that most members had downloaded documents and had

read and used at least one document. Most of the respondents rated the site to be as good or better than other land-related information sites.

In the area of strengthened capacity for land governance a considerable number of very significant tools were developed or were in draft form at the time of the evaluation. Progress in testing tools at the country level has been limited, as GLTN country-level engagement is still at an early stage. There must be more country-level adaptation and adoption before strengthened capacity can be demonstrated.

GLTN efforts towards donor coordination at the country level have made very important contributions in Kenya, but those efforts are constrained in other countries, owing to its lack of presence. Nevertheless, at the time of the evaluation, GLTN had embarked on plans to support donor coordination in Ethiopia (led by the World Bank) and Liberia (with UN-Habitat support).

In the normal sequence of events, land tools are developed first and then their associated training packages are designed; only after these steps have been completed can training be conducted. A number of valuable training activities, however, have already been conducted and training materials have been drafted for testing and implementation. Given that GLTN development is still in its early stages, progress in training has been impressive but, as might be expected, the impact of training on capacity-building has so far been limited (with the exception of the very successful training course in transparency in land administration). It was not clear to what extent the GLTN planned to use its own training materials and provide support to related training courses, or make the material available to other training institutions to incorporate in their own training programmes. The evaluation has recommended that GLTN should revisit its initial training and capacity-building strategy to clarify these issues, and to

plan associated activities.

In the area of institutional capacity, the Network has been a success, with a continuously expanding number of registered members and partners. By the end of July 2009 there were 1,101 registered members and 42 partners.

GLTN management capacity has improved substantially since 2006 as the result of an increase in Secretariat staff and the development of management systems and databases. The GLTN project document has been finalized and the GLTN logframe developed. Secretariat staff have also made important contributions to the UN-Habitat MTSIP. In addition, GLTN has developed a project management system and quality control mechanism that are soon to be implemented.

The Secretariat, however, continues to have difficulty in disbursing its budgeted funds. One of the greatest challenges faced by GLTN relates to its capacity to manage multiple activities, initiate important new programme areas (e.g., new country programmes), and disburse the associated funds. This is due in part to the staffing constraints of the Secretariat coupled with the complex and unwieldy administrative and financial management procedures within UN-Habitat and UNON.

SUSTAINABILITY

The future and sustainability of GLTN are ultimately dependent on the strength of its Network. The enthusiasm that was evident at the recent partners meeting suggests that this does not pose a problem at present. In the short and medium-term, sustainability will be dependent on the capacity of the Secretariat and the level of donor support.

Capacity issues are a key concern for sustainability. Having made a promising start with advocacy, research and development of

tools, GLTN now needs to test tools at the country level to build its credibility. GLTN has limited capacity outside Nairobi and must find mechanisms and means to support this new phase of activity.

II. CONCLUSIONS

In the space of three years, from its establishment in 2006 to the time of this evaluation in 2009, GLTN has managed to achieve some significant successes, even with the drawbacks of a small Secretariat staff, a limited budget and in the face of administrative constraints imposed by its institutional environment. It has established a network that includes many of the most important actors in the land sector; it has a perceived brand and credibility in the international land arena and has attained notable achievements in the areas of advocacy, research and development of tools.

A large part of the success of GLTN lies in its ability to scale up through the use of its partners; partner capacities and contributions. The limited funds at the disposal of GLTN can be stretched to go a long way. Partners have shown their commitment to the vision and values of the Network.

It helps that the Secretariat staff are very motivated, skilled and committed. UN-Habitat, despite the inefficiency of its own administrative procedures, has been an enthusiastic supporter of GLTN and recognizes the benefits it can bring to UN-Habitat programmes and profile. UN-Habitat has contributed considerable staff and management time to ensure the success of GLTN.

Among the major constraints facing GLTN is its limited administrative and technical capacity in relation to the number of activities it is undertaking and the ambitious programme of country-level activities that has been planned. The most immediate solution to this constraint would be to take on more staff at

the Secretariat.

GLTN faces a number of significant future challenges, including:

- Resourcing and managing its expansion into country-level activities;
- Improving the efficiency of its contracting and overcoming constraints to procurement;
- Expanding Secretariat staff resources to make the most of emerging opportunities; and
- Disseminating wider awareness of GLTN activities among donors, land project managers, representatives of government agencies and consultants.

III. KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

Key recommendations proposed by the evaluation for immediate implementation include:

- Improvement of the GLTN website;
- Revising the training and capacity-building strategy;

- Holding regular partners meetings; and
- The provision of greater support to the Secretariat from the Steering Committee, with the cooperation of the UN-Habitat Programme Support Division and UNON, to improve the efficiency of administrative procedures.

Recommendations at the strategic level include:

- Development of an overall strategy for engagement at the country level, and definition of the respective roles of the Secretariat, partners and UN-Habitat;
- Development of country strategies for each of the GLTN priority countries;
- Development of a longer-term strategy for GLTN and an associated staffing plan; and
- Review of the effectiveness of GLTN communications and revision of the communication strategy.

A more detailed list of all recommendations is provided in Chapter 5 of the present report.

1. INTRODUCTION



The Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) was launched in June 2006 with the goal of contributing to poverty alleviation and the Millennium Development Goals¹ through land reform, improved land management and security of tenure. GLTN is supported by a project (the GLTN Project) implemented by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat). The Project is currently funded by both the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and the Government of Norway and is scheduled to run until 31 December 2011.

The project aims to improve access to land and security of tenure for the urban and rural poor through the joint efforts of international and regional partners working together to identify and develop pro-poor and gender-appropriate land tools. It also aims to improve global knowledge and awareness of issues related to equitable land rights.

A mid-term evaluation was commenced in August 2009 approximately half-way through

implementation of the GLTN Project. The terms of reference for the evaluation required the consultant to consider the key criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability and generally conform with the evaluation quality standards of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (Annex I: Terms of Reference)

An Inception report was drafted by the consultant and presented to key stakeholders in UN-Habitat in August 2009, describing the proposed methodology for the evaluation (Annex II to the present report). Two weeks were spent in UN-Habitat offices in Nairobi from 3 to 14 August 2009 consulting key GLTN Secretariat staff, members of the GLTN Steering Committee, and key UN-Habitat and United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON) stakeholders, and conducting telephone interviews with members of the International Advisory Board (IAB). Telephone interviews were continued from the consultant's home base until mid-September

¹ Specifically, goals 7 (addressing the environment and slums), 3 (relating to women's land, housing and property rights), and 1 (addressing food security) of the Millennium Development Goals.

and email questionnaires sent to GLTN partners and members, training participants and land project personnel were accepted until October. Numerous GLTN reports and documents were reviewed.

The consultant then returned to UN-Habitat offices in Nairobi from 3 to 11 November to present preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to the GLTN partners' meeting and IAB. Additional interviews were conducted with UN-Habitat senior management that it had not been possible to contact earlier and clarifications were sought from the GLTN Secretariat where needed. The consultant's initial report was updated based on the outcomes of the partners' meeting, resolutions from the IAB and additional information from the Secretariat.

The aim of this evaluation was to be objective and independent, and it drew upon a variety of qualitative and quantitative information. Nevertheless, its conclusions and recommendations are those of the consultant and do not necessarily reflect those of UN-Habitat, the GLTN Secretariat, the GLTN Steering Committee, the International Advisory Board (IAB), or GLTN partners and members.

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The design of GLTN and its partnership building activities commenced as early as the end of 2004 with funding from the Government of Norway under its framework agreement with UN-Habitat. Activities accelerated, however, following the launch of GLTN in 2006 and, in particular, after the development of the detailed project design (November 2007) and associated basket funding was agreed with SIDA and the Government of Norway.² Most of the activities considered by this evaluation were initiated after the end of 2007.

In a comparatively short space of time, GLTN

has developed a global partnership on land issues, bringing together key global agencies and organizations working in the land sector. These partners include international civil society networks, international finance institutions, international research and training institutions, donors and professional bodies involved in the land sector. GLTN aims to improve global coordination on land, strengthen existing land networks, and improve the level and dissemination of knowledge about how to foster tenure security on an extensive scale. It promotes the establishment of a continuum of land rights, rather than just focusing on formal land titling. GLTN is developing pro-poor and gender-appropriate land management and land tenure tools with the participation of grass-roots organizations.

The aim of the establishment of the Network was to address the need for land tools to support innovations in pro-poor, gender-appropriate tools that are affordable and can be applied at scale. Even where countries and international agencies have progressive land policies, the GLTN partners recognize that there are problems in policy implementation.³ Current tenure security programmes, where they exist, are generally making very slow progress, partly due to the high costs and complexity of their procedures, and the limited capacity of the Governments concerned. Most programmes do not fully recognize the rights of women, the needs of the poor and disadvantaged, or the full spectrum of rights to land. Participation by grass-roots organizations is minimal. Donor coordination or harmonization at the national and regional level is generally lacking. GLTN was established to address these shortcomings, to advocate progressive approaches, and develop the knowledge base through evaluation of innovative land programmes and priority research.

² SIDA funds were available to the GLTN Secretariat in December 2007 to implement the Project design and new funds from Norway were provided in June 2008. It should be noted that SIDA had also provided earlier funds to GLTN.

³ GLTN (2005). The Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) – Why, What and How. Workshop report, Stockholm, 24-25 November 2005.

1.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The main purpose of the mid-term evaluation was to inform planning and decision-making for the remaining period of the second phase of GLTN; that is to the end of 2011. It was expected that the evaluation results would be used:

- By donors for accountability purposes and as a basis for future funding decisions;
- As a learning process for UN-Habitat and partners; and
- To inform future strategies for GLTN and its future land sector interventions.

The mid-term evaluation covered the period between the launch of GLTN in June 2006 and the collection of interviews and information in August and September 2009. The evaluation considered the relevance of the Project, the extent to which its objectives were being fulfilled, the efficiency of its development, its effectiveness, its impact and its sustainability.

The terms of reference required that particular attention should be given to:

- Achievement in influencing a paradigm shift towards pro-poor land policies and tools;
- Engagement of global partners and maintenance of its network;
- Effectiveness of current institutional and management arrangements of GLTN;
- Assessment of GLTN in relation to other similar global land programmes; and
- Assessment of the performance of the GLTN Secretariat in relation to other global actors in related fields.

In April 2007, the Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plan (2008–2013) (MTSIP) for UN-Habitat was adopted. The evaluation also assessed how GLTN contributed to Focus Area 3 of the MTSIP, related to pro-poor land and housing, and also how it facilitated progress in Focus Area 6 “Excellence in management”, regarding institutional and management arrangements for GLTN.

2. EVALUATION PROCESS AND METHODS



2.1 TEAM

The consultancy team comprised an evaluation specialist responsible for designing the evaluation methodology and conducting the majority of interviews and analysis and who had overall responsibility for producing the report. The evaluation specialist was assisted by a land sector specialist who assisted with the review of land tools and contributed to the evaluation of GLTN effectiveness in comparison with other land networks and international land agencies.

2.2 ITINERARY AND PERSONS CONSULTED

Interviews and discussions were held by the consultant with managers and staff from GLTN, UN-Habitat and UNON at the UN-Habitat Headquarters in Nairobi (November 2009). Participants in these consultations included key GLTN Secretariat staff, members of the GLTN Steering Committee, and relevant representatives of UN-Habitat and UNON. While in Nairobi, the consultant also met with members of the Government of Kenya, private sector and civil society sector representatives and a member of the donor community to

discuss GLTN support activities in Kenya. A list of the persons consulted is provided in Annex III. Telephone interviews and email questionnaires continued into Mid-November.

2.3 METHODS

The evaluation relied on reviews of GLTN documentation, interviews with key informants (face-to-face and by telephone) and emailed questionnaires.

Interviews were guided by a checklist of questions, though these were not rigorously followed (Annex II: Inception Report).

In addition to face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews were conducted with a range of key stakeholders who were either not present in Nairobi at the time of the consultant's visit or based in other cities around the world. These included members of the International Advisory Board (IAB), active GLTN partners, GLTN donors, and UN-HABITAT senior management. Telephone interviews were conducted from the consultant's home base through September and into early October. A total of 39

informants were interviewed either face-to-face or by telephone (Annex III: List of Persons consulted).

Email questionnaires were also used to collect information and opinions from GLTN partners and members, participants in training courses and land project personnel. Questionnaire respondents were given three to four weeks to return the completed questionnaires and reminders were sent approximately halfway through this period. The last email questionnaires were submitted in early October.

The questionnaire to members focused on the use of the GLTN website and its materials (including its value relative to other sites dealing with land-related information). The questionnaire directed at land project personnel also covered their awareness of GLTN. Participants in training courses were asked whether they had developed skills and knowledge, and whether they had used these as individuals or had shared them with colleagues. Partners were asked a much wider range of questions (Annex IV: Questionnaires). Table 2.1 indicates the numbers of respondents targeted by each questionnaire.

TABLE 2.1: Number of respondents targeted by each of the four questionnaires

GLTN member questionnaire ⁴	62
Land project questionnaire ⁵	20
Training course participant questionnaire ⁶	14
GLTN partner questionnaire ⁷	9
Total	105

⁴ There were 1,101 registered members of GLTN as at 31 July 2009.

⁵ The land expert constructed a list of land-related projects (or natural resource projects with land elements) that included email contact details through examination of websites and communication with major donors. While not comprehensive, the list covered nearly 150 projects.

⁶ The questionnaire was sent to the 114 participants of the four courses on Transparency in Land Administration and the 38 Habitat Programme Managers who attended the training course on land and engagement in the land sector.

⁷ The 10 partners who were interviewed by phone were not requested to complete the questionnaire, although FIG did complete the questionnaire and also participate in a telephone interview. The Huairou Commission consulted its national member organizations and consolidated their responses.

As might be expected with email questionnaires, response rates were not high. Furthermore, it has to be assumed that the most active users of GLTN information and the most enthusiastic participants in GLTN training courses, together with partners, would be the most likely to respond and that such self selection might well produce skewed responses. The responses themselves were analysed using simple spreadsheets.

An additional questionnaire was developed for the participants in the partners meeting in Nairobi in November 2009. Twenty-seven participants completed this questionnaire.

Country visits were limited to Kenya: there was no opportunity to visit other GLTN priority countries (Botswana, Ethiopia, Haiti or Liberia) and attempts to contact stakeholders in those countries by telephone were unsuccessful. The Evaluation Team had the opportunity to discuss progress and performance with key stakeholders in the Kenya programme but not with those in any of the other country programmes. The land expert had some previous knowledge of the Ethiopian programme but the remaining three country programmes could only be assessed from secondary sources.

The evaluation relied on GLTN reports, interviews with the GLTN project management officer, discussions with UN-Habitat and Secretariat staff, UNON, GLTN donors, and telephone discussions with several key partners to assess GLTN project management performance. Selected land tools, used in the development process, were assessed against key criteria and critical questions (Section 3.2.2: Quality of Outputs and Processes). The progress of the project was assessed against the GLTN logframe and annual workplans.

Similarly, assessments of effectiveness, and outcomes and impacts achieved or likely to be achieved, were based on interviews with key stakeholders, reviews of GLTN literature and surveys of participants in training programmes, partners and land projects. In most cases there was insufficient objective data available to support assessment of effectiveness, outcomes

and impacts. The evaluation nevertheless endeavoured to provide a balanced and fair assessment using the available secondary information, consultations, and completed questionnaires.

Further details on approach and methodology are provided in Annex II: Inception Report.

3. FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION



3.1 RELEVANCE AND APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PROJECT GOAL, OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS

In 2005, UN-Habitat commissioned a design team for the GLTN programme, and the consultant's report provided a detailed approach on how to initiate the Network (Richard Stren and Consultants, 2005). The recommendations from the report were only partially implemented, however, due to budgetary and human resource constraints.

It was not until the GLTN project document was produced in 2007 that there was a clear design framework to guide implementation.

The GLTN project document (November 2007) and the subsequent GLTN logframe (February 2009) give details of the goal, outcomes and outputs of the project that have been considered in this mid-term evaluation.

The project document states the following development goal:

To contribute to poverty alleviation and the MDG's through land reform, improved land management and security of tenure.

The immediate objectives of GLTN as stated in the project document are as follows:

- To increase global knowledge, awareness and tools to support pro-poor and gender sensitive land management;
- To strengthen capacity in selected countries to apply pro-poor and gender sensitive tools to improve the security of tenure of the poor in line with the recommendations regarding United Nations reform and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

The project document lists a range of outputs expected to be achieved in the period from the start of 2008 to the end of 2011. Many of these are minor activities (e.g., four GLTN workshops and expert group meetings) or generic in nature (e.g., four GLTN partners developing pro-poor land tools), rather than the more substantial outputs specified by most land-tool designs that illustrate the design logic, in particular, how objectives will be achieved.⁸

⁸ DFID defines outputs as the specific, direct deliverables of the project. These provide the conditions necessary to achieve the purpose/objectives. DFID (2009) Guidance on using the revised Logical Framework.

The GLTN logframe (February, 2009) rephrases the overall goal more in terms of an impact or outcome:

Urban and rural poor have better access to land and security of tenure.

This, the most recent logframe at the time of the evaluation, proposes four outcomes:

- Improved global knowledge to support the implementation of equitable land rights;
- Increased awareness of and commitment to equitable land rights;
- Strengthened capacity to enhance quality of land governance, management and administration through pro-poor, gendered land tools and training activities;
- Strengthened GLTN institutional capacity to carry out equitable land rights.

It is the GLTN logframe (February, 2009), rather than the project document, that is currently guiding implementation and that is used by the GLTN Secretariat as the basis for reporting progress and performance.

3.1.1 DESIGN LOGIC AND APPROPRIATENESS

The project document clearly expresses the GLTN project goal and objectives, although in the main text it describes only the indicative outputs; many of which are more appropriately perceived as targets rather than as results that logically need to be accomplished to achieve the objectives. The logframe attached to the project document describes a variety of outputs in greater detail but these are not listed under the objective to which they contribute. The design logic is therefore difficult to assess.

The more recent logframe (February 2009) is more specific in terms of the outputs required to be achieved in order to attain each of the four outcomes. Outputs for Outcome 1 (***Improved***

global knowledge...) are considered appropriate.⁹

Outputs for Outcome 2 (***Increased awareness...***) are considered generally appropriate. The third output, however, (***Global monitoring mechanism developed and piloted to assess security of tenure in select countries***) could just as easily contribute to the first outcome (***Improved global knowledge...***).

Outcome 3 (***Strengthened capacity to enhance quality of land governance, management and administration through pro-poor, gendered land tools and training activities***) is arguably the key outcome for success of GLTN and the core of the activities described in the project document. The outcome is ambitious, however, and the outputs listed in the logframe (February 2009) are not in themselves sufficient to ensure its achievement. None of the outputs explicitly support training. It is arguable that outputs 3.2 (***Country level strategies developed***) and 3.3 (***Country level baseline data compiled...***) are not strictly necessary to achieve the outcome; while they may represent possible activities in a country programme, they do little to define the logic of what is needed to ensure that the outcome will be accomplished. The reasoning behind the baseline studies is not evident in the logframe and there is no reference to subsequent evaluation studies, as is customary, if the objective is to assess change. Output 3.5 (***Strengthened capacity at global, regional and national levels to implement pro-poor land programs***) is an objective ("outcome") in itself.

Outcome 4 (***Strengthened GLTN institutional capacity to carry out equitable land rights***) is to be achieved through a strengthened network of members and partners (output 4.1), effective project and financial management at the Secretariat (output 4.2), and a system of quality control of network activities (output 4.3). The capacity of GLTN is also influenced by the human

⁹ This assessment considers whether outputs are clearly described, whether they are relevant (or necessary) to the outcome or objective to which they refer, and whether they seem sufficient to achieve that outcome or objective.

resources available to plan, design, manage, coordinate, implement, monitor and evaluate activities at the Secretariat, at global, regional and country levels. The level of available funding is another key factor in GLTN capacity.¹⁰ Ideally these factors should be explicitly addressed within the outputs under Outcome 4.

The lack of clarity in the main design documents, particularly for Outcome 3, has not been a major constraint to implementation and can be readily addressed in clearly defined annual workplans. Neither the project document nor the logframe, however, provide a sufficiently clear framework for evaluation of effectiveness and impact.

Annex V suggests minimal revisions to the GLTN logframe to address these issues.

There are many assumptions implicit in the design and many of these are articulated in the project document logframe and revised logframe (February 2007). They are not, however, discussed in the project document text. A number of assumptions that come to mind on reading the GLTN design and project documents are not explicitly addressed as assumptions, for example:¹¹

- Pro-poor, gender-appropriate land tools are the key constraint to improved land governance, management and administration;¹²
- Normative, generic land tools are of value in the very specific political, social, cultural, historical and economic contexts of most developing countries.

The appropriateness of indicators and targets is discussed below (Section 3.3.3).

RECOMMENDATION:

There should be more clarity in the wording of a revised logframe, in particular with regard to the following issues:

- The nature and extent of capacity-building support to be undertaken by GLTN (what needs to be undertaken to build capacity, where, how etc.);
- The nature and extent of country-level activities of GLTN (what type of activity and support, where, how, who etc.).

Proposed changes should be considered by UN-Habitat and donors once the MTSIP indicators have been finalized.

3.1.2 CONFORMITY WITH UNITED NATIONS GOALS AND THE UN-HABITAT AGENDA, THE MTSIP AND THE ENOF

The goal of GLTN is explicitly linked with the Millennium Development Goals, specifically Goal 7 addressing the environment and slums; Goal 3, relating to women's land, housing and property rights; and, in a less direct manner, Goal 1, addressing food security.

The GLTN project is also clearly consistent with the Habitat Agenda, in particular the commitments made under paragraph 40, which include:

- (b) *Providing legal security of tenure and equal access to land to all people, including women and those living in poverty; and undertaking legislative and administrative reforms to give women full and equal access to economic resources, including the right to inheritance*

¹⁰ Funding is discussed as an indicator for this outcome in the Logframe.

¹¹ However, the rationale for the GLTN in the project document does give consideration to these points.

¹² In part, this assumption arises from the term "tool". In some circumstances the term is used in GLTN documentation as a counterpoint to land policy (e.g., "land policy needs appropriate land tools for effective implementation"). In other contexts, the term "tool" includes contributions towards policy development, legislation and regulatory frameworks, and also training programmes and materials and advocacy. In the broader meaning of the term, a "tool" may contribute to solving a variety of constraints to effective and equitable land governance, such as: inappropriate policy and legislation, limited capacity, even insufficient political will (through support for advocacy).

and to ownership of land and other property, credit, natural resources and appropriate technologies;

- (d) *Ensuring transparent, comprehensive and accessible systems in transferring land rights and legal security of tenure;*
- (m) *Protecting, within the national context, the legal traditional rights of indigenous people to land and other resources, as well as strengthening of land management;*

The goals and objectives of GLTN support the UN-Habitat Global Campaign for Secure Tenure, which was launched in 1999. This campaign was most active from 2000 to 2006, promoting debate on land issues; developing tools, indicators and guidelines; and launching national campaigns in ten countries. GLTN is facilitating the continuation of this campaign.¹³

The UN-Habitat Medium-Term Strategic and institutional plan (MTSIP) for 2008–2013 aims to support Governments and their development partners to achieve more sustainable urbanization. The goal of the plan is:

‘Sustainable urbanization created by cities and regions that provide all citizens with adequate shelter, services, security and employment opportunities regardless of age, sex, and social status’.

The MTSIP aims to promote policy and institutional reform and to ensure the wide-scale impact of UN-Habitat activities. Under the MTSIP, UN-Habitat plans to play a catalytic role, promoting partnerships within what its perceived as its new Enhanced Normative and Operational Framework (ENOF). GLTN is consistent with the MTSIP, particularly where

GLTN activities cover urban areas. It is less clear where GLTN activities support land governance, administration, management and security of tenure in rural areas. This issue was raised by some of the informants consulted during the conduct of the evaluation.¹⁴ It is recognized that land issues transcend any rural-urban divide. The supposed distinction between rural and urban land administration and management is an issue faced by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), and also by GLTN/ UN-Habitat. The need for holistic land policy and land governance, and the significance of peri-urban land administration and management issues, require the participation of both agencies to encompass all types of land.

This issue aside, GLTN particularly supports Focus Area 3 of the MTSIP—“Promotion of pro-poor land and housing”. The expected accomplishments of this Focus Area include: “improved land and housing policies implemented”, and “security of tenure increased”. The strategy for Focus Area 3 mirrors the strategy for GLTN: advocacy and knowledge management (targeting global, regional and national partners), capacity-building (targeting global, regional and national partners), and supporting implementation at the country level (targeting ministries, local authorities, non-governmental and civil society organizations, professional bodies, the private sector, etc.). Focus Area 3 is more explicit than the GLTN logframe on the issue of supporting improved land policy.¹⁵

GLTN can also contribute to other Focus Areas: Focus Area 1 “Effective advocacy, monitoring and partnerships”; Focus Area 2 “Promotion of participatory planning, management and governance”; and Focus Area 6 “Excellence in management”.¹⁶

¹³ While seen as successful in raising awareness, mobilizing political will and encouraging dialogue, one criticism of this campaign was that it was not well integrated within UN-Habitat programs and did not sufficiently link its advocacy work with follow-up investment (UN-Habitat Focus Area 3, Policy and strategy paper: Access to land and housing for all).

¹⁴ One suggested that this holistic land focus made GLTN stand out within UN-Habitat. Another believed that it was the nature of the current United Nations organizational structure; that neither UN-Habitat, with its focus on urban areas, nor FAO, with its focus on rural areas, have the perfect mandate to cover land issues. Nevertheless, this was not a significant concern operationally given that both agencies were undertaking activities that affected both urban and rural areas.

¹⁵ While the GLTN logframe does not mention land policy explicitly, GLTN is nevertheless doing much to promote and support land policy reform (examples include the assistance provided to develop the framework and guidelines on land policy in Africa, and continuing support for land policy reform in Kenya).

¹⁶ GLTN is contributing to more efficient business processes within UN-Habitat, and developing performance measurement and monitoring systems and quality control procedures (see section 3.3).

GLTN clearly supports the ENOF by aligning normative, capacity-building and operational activities (clearly set out in the structure of its logical framework), although the emphasis to date has been on normative activities at this early stage in the GLTN project. GLTN intends to promote successful pilot initiatives undertaken at the country level to be adopted at scale; though it is too early to evaluate progress in this area. In addition, GLTN plays a catalytic role in promoting collaboration and cooperation with other United Nations agencies and a large variety of stakeholders involved in the land sector at the global and regional level. At the country level, GLTN is promoting donor coordination and the involvement of multiple GLTN partners in research and capacity-building activities.

3.1.3 NEED FOR GLTN IN THE CONTEXT OF OTHER LAND SECTOR INITIATIVE AND PROGRAMMES

A key question that needs to be addressed in the evaluation is how GLTN fits in with other global land initiatives which have related objectives. This could be reformulated in the questions: what is the role of GLTN and to what extent is this role unique? Is a network such as GLTN really needed? In answering these questions it is essential to examine the role of GLTN and to look at other global initiatives.

The role of GLTN is summed up in the outputs to the first three external outcomes of the GLTN logframe and these have been used to provide a framework to compare GLTN with other global land initiatives.

There is an element of subjectivity in some of the outputs, for example, the 'critical gaps' in existing knowledge, the 'priority advocacy material' and the 'priority land tools'. The World Bank, for example, has come up with slightly different definitions of gaps and priorities as the

result of the development and testing of its Land Governance Assessment Framework (LGAF) in four countries.¹⁷

The need for GLTN and the importance of its 18–20 tools and eight cross-cutting issues is outlined in *GLTN Themes and Issues* (2006). This provides an explanation and rationale for most of the priority tools and issues of GLTN. This document should be revised to include the new themes and tools that have not already been covered, and to provide updated descriptions and rationale where necessary.

Keeping in mind the GLTN outcomes and outputs, the following 12 global land initiatives have been used as the basis for comparisons with GLTN:

- Cities Alliance;
- Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE);
- Food and Agriculture Organization – Land Tenure;
- International Federation of Surveyors (FIG);
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD);
- International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED);
- International Land Coalition (ILC);
- Landnet Americas;
- Lincoln Institute of Land Policy;
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Oslo Governance Centre;
- Wisconsin Land Tenure Center; and
- World Bank Land Policy Network.

¹⁷ The LGAF prioritizes: recognition of urban group rights; opportunities for tenure individualization; survey and registration of communal or indigenous rights; definition of institutional roles and mandates; transparency and efficiency in land use planning; transparency in valuation; identification and management of public land; efficient and transparent methods of expropriation of private rights, including non-registered rights; completeness of registries, customer focus in registries and the cost-effectiveness of registry operations; and, dispute resolution.

These organizations cover a broad range of educational institutions, multilateral institutions and non-governmental organizations active in the land sector. Many of these organizations are GLTN partners, but this does not detract from their relevance as a basis for comparison, given that most of these organizations have been independent of GLTN for many years.

Within the constraints of this mid-term evaluation, it is not possible to undertake an in depth review of these 12 organizations and their programmes. Instead, a brief assessment of the 12 organizations has been undertaken, drawing upon the information available on their websites, and using key outputs from the GLTN logframe as points for comparison.

A summary of the programmes of the 12 global organizations in relation to key GLTN outputs is provided in Annex VI. A more detailed assessment of each agency's programme is also provided in that annex.

There has been increased interest in the land sector in the past decade, reflected in the list of global players included in this brief review. Some of these global players are funding land sector activities e.g., Cities Alliance, IFAD, World Bank although the scale of these projects varies. GLTN also funds small-scale activities, but the scope of these activities is limited. Some of the global players place strong emphasis on publications e.g., FAO Land Tenure, FIG, IIED, Lincoln Institute, Wisconsin LTC. GLTN also produces publications and provides access to its reports and studies and those of its partners on its website. Some of the organizations provide a network or forum facility e.g., ILC, LandNet Americas. GLTN also provides a network and forum activity and this facility is perhaps the most active of them all. This is no small feat, as there is a real risk that a network or forum will at some stage cease being relevant as players and topics change.

While many of the organizations make reference to land tools, none provide a clear list of a variety of tools that would be readily available

to participants in the land sector. GLTN places a great deal of importance on land tools in its logframe and on its website.

Another point of difference is the definition of priority needs for the land sector identified by each organization. Many of the global players list different research priorities reflecting differences in the organization's objectives and views. GLTN has a very specific focus, as indicated in its logframe outcomes and its selection of land themes and issues.

In comparison with the 12 other organizations and programmes, GLTN stands out for a combination of reasons:

- Its key role as an advocate for effective, pro-poor, gender-appropriate land governance and administration;
- Its impartial and independent position within a United Nations agency;
- Its breadth of network partners with their various perspectives from technical to grass-roots, and its active promotion of grass-roots participation;
- Its emphasis on cooperation among partners (including within UN-Habitat) and on improved donor coordination, acting as a catalyst and facilitator; and
- Its support for innovation and new thinking (due in part to its multi-disciplinary and multi-stakeholder composition).

Its role in the development of tools is also very important and is discussed in more depth below.

Notwithstanding the issues concerning the design of the project as discussed above, the GLTN project is clearly consistent with United Nations goals, the UN-Habitat agenda, the MTSIP and the ENOF, and it fulfils a specific need. The MTA concludes that the project is very relevant and appropriate.

Even though other agencies and programmes are also addressing the needs of the land sector, there is still an enormous lack of institutional capacity to handle land issues effectively. Past

efforts have largely failed to deliver secure land rights on the scale that is required, and have generally failed to recognize the range of non-formal rights. The rights of the poor and of women have often been neglected in land projects and programmes. There are still global actors and organizations pushing conventional approaches to land administration based on formal titles and registration systems (generally resource intensive and sometimes unsustainable), but comparatively few that are investigating, developing and implementing effective programmes that can address the issue of secure land and property rights for all. GLTN was established in recognition of the need for progressive institutions and new thinking to deal with these challenges. At the global level, however, institutional capacity is still very limited and the scale of the need is considerable.

RECOMMENDATION:

A review should be conducted of the institutional capacity of all international land agencies against the scale of global land needs, highlighting any discrepancies identified. Given that the increasing recognition of the importance of the land sector and the scale of its needs has not been matched with increased capacity for support, a study of this nature would highlight this problem, identifying the nature and scale of the sector's needs, and provide impetus for additional global resources.

Such a study would analyse current institutional capacity to address land issues, highlight the challenges, and indicate what is required in terms of capacity and resources to meet these needs. This would not only provide valuable information to inform future GLTN strategies, but would be important for advocacy purposes and could be taken up by GLTN in its advocacy campaigns.

3.2 PROJECT PROGRESS AND PERFORMANCE

3.2.1 SUMMARY OF PROGRESS AND ACHIEVEMENTS ACCORDING TO OUTCOME

GLTN has made impressive progress, given its staffing constraints and the limited time in which it has had the available funding to implement activities. Although it was launched in June 2006, GLTN has only had sufficient funds to support a full programme of activities since the end of 2007. It has made the most of useful global and regional opportunities and in some cases has managed to harness partners' interests at country levels. In most cases, GLTN has exceeded the targets which were set in the project document (November 2007), the logframe (February 2009) and the annual workplan for 2008.

The GLTN annual reports for 2007 and 2008, and the semi-annual progress and financial reports (September 2008 and 2009) describe GLTN progress towards achieving its targets. That level of detailed discussion on progress is beyond the scope of this review.

It is possible, however, to summarize the significant progress that has been made since 2006 under all four outcomes. Some of the key achievements are:

Outcome 1: Improved global knowledge to support the realization of equitable land rights

- GLTN has documented the land inventory programme in Botswana, in particular the Tribal Land Integrated Management System.
- It has collected lessons from the upscaling of pro-poor, community-based land tools.
- It has conducted an evaluation of the Ethiopian experience in issuing rural land certificates (a cost-effective and efficient process) and the gender impacts of these procedures.

- It has commissioned research into the social and economic impacts of land titling in Senegal and South Africa, dispelling some of the claims of benefits from land titling programmes.

Outcome 2: Increased awareness of and commitment to equitable land rights

- The GLTN Secretariat used the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development as a forum to raise awareness and advocate key issues (impacts of urbanization, continuum of land rights, security of tenure for all, land rights and gender, and land policy options). *Secure Land Rights for All* was published in time for this meeting.
- GLTN has provided support to partners to produce key policy papers advocating land governance reforms including:
 - * FAO/GLTN Working Paper: *Towards Improved Land Governance*
 - * African Union/Economic Commission for Africa/African Development Bank: *Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa*.
- The GLTN Secretariat has organized or participated in a variety of forums and e-forums on various topics (see the 2007 and 2008 annual reports for a comprehensive list).
- GLTN conducted internal training for Habitat Programme Managers on land and engagement in the land sector (promoting increased awareness within UN-Habitat).
- There has been limited progress towards the development and piloting of a global monitoring mechanism to assess tenure security.¹⁸
- There were a total of 152 documents

available on the GLTN website e-library (41 published by GLTN, 41 by UN-Habitat, and 70 by other partners) as at 31 July 2009. There had been 70,054 downloads (16,053 of GLTN documents, 20,397 of UN-Habitat documents and 33,604 of partners documents) as at 31 July 2009.

Outcome 3: Strengthened capacity to enhance the quality of land governance, management and administration through pro-poor, gendered land tools and training activities

- As illustrated in Table 3.1, activities have commenced in most of the priority land tool topics and cross-cutting issues of GLTN. In many cases, activities cut across more than one topic or issue.
- Progress in the development of strategies, situational analyses and baseline studies at the country level has been limited (the approach, activities and level of GLTN involvement in priority countries varies; GLTN country-level engagement is still at an early stage).
- GLTN efforts towards donor coordination at the country level have made important contributions in Kenya, but similar efforts in other countries are constrained by its lack of presence.
- Valuable training activities have been conducted, in such areas as transparency in land administration (four courses), land markets and land modules of urban management, and also training of Habitat Programme Managers.
- Training materials have been drafted but have yet to be tested and implemented; the issues include Islam,

¹⁸ While the 2008 annual report indicates the intention of GLTN to "...deliver on this output within the next four years", there are important considerations of ownership (who will collect data on the indicators), the quality of information available, and how this information will be used. It is recommended that GLTN not rush to develop a global monitoring mechanism on its own purely to satisfy this output. GLTN has nevertheless contributed to indicators associated with the Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa oriented towards tracking progress in land policy development and implementation, and has supported other partner initiatives. See the proposed alternative statement for this output in the recommended revision to the GLTN logframe (Annex V).

gender and governance, post-conflict and post-disaster issues (Table 3.1).

Outcome 4: Strengthened GLTN institutional capacity to give effect to equitable land rights

The number of GLTN registered members and partners has continued to expand. The number of partners has grown to 42, although not all were actively involved in GLTN activities at the time of the review. Registered members have grown in number: 254 in 2006, 435 in 2007, 824 in 2008, and 1,101 as of 31 July 2009.¹⁹ While these numbers are impressive, not all members and partners are deeply involved in the Network (see subsequent discussion).

GLTN continues to struggle to overcome the cumbersome administrative and financial management procedures required by UN-Habitat and UNON. It has developed and tested a number of innovations to help overcome some of these constraints (see discussion under Section 3.3)

A quality control mechanism has been conceptualized but not yet implemented. This will be an important step for GLTN and will include a peer-review process for GLTN tools and publications, which should include a process for reviewing publications by partners before they are posted on the GLTN website.²⁰ Improvement of the website should be a priority.

It should be noted that some achievements are reported in the annual and semi-annual reports more than once under different outcomes or outputs.

RECOMMENDATION:

*In order to make reporting of achievements easier for readers, it is suggested that there be only one primary outcome or output under which any one achievement is reported. If an achievement contributes to more than one output or outcome it can be reported in both but with an appropriate explanation. For example, when a tool is also making an important contribution towards advocacy then the report should state that, in addition to advocacy materials and forums, the following **tools** are considered to be important for advocacy. These tools would also be listed under output 3.1 (the major output to which they contribute).*

PROGRESS IN TOOL DEVELOPMENT

Land tool development can take a number of directions and involve various steps: there is no standard development process.²¹ The GLTN Secretariat reports that implementation can be difficult to plan as it is often driven by the availability of suitable partners and consultants, as well as the dictates of partners' workplans and priorities. The limited human resources of the GLTN Secretariat pose an additional constraint. Notwithstanding, impressive progress has been made on land tool development and cross-cutting issues, especially since 2008, with the increase in GLTN funding and staff resources. The following table provides a summary of the progress made since 2006 and the key partners involved.

¹⁹ Statistics provided by the GLTN Secretariat in August 2008.

²⁰ The original GLTN design in the Project Document included a peer review mechanism to review donor projects and programmes; an idea that was supported by the World Bank, the African Union and the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC). This broader concept of peer review (beyond GLTN internal needs) is not part of the revised logframe and is not applied in any reporting procedure.

²¹ GLTN characterizes a tool as a practical method to achieve a defined objective in a particular context. A tool facilitates decision processes based on knowledge to move from principles, policy and legislation to implementation (undated presentation). Steps in tool development can variously involve: review of existing practices, workshops and stakeholder consultations, tool conceptualizing and development, documenting, piloting, scaling up, disseminating, and evaluating.

TABLE 3.1: Summary of progress in land tool development since 2006

Note: Documents and activities are only mentioned once in the table below even though they may contribute to more than one tool or issue

Tool/cross-cutting issues	Activities/outputs undertaken to date	Date	Partners involved	Next steps ²²
Land tool				
Enumerations for tenure security	Peer evaluation mission to Kisumu	October 2007	SDI, Hakijami, COHRE, FIG, Huairou,	
	Working Paper: "Enumeration as a grass-roots tool towards securing tenure in slums: an initial assessment of the Kisumu experience"	2008	Hakijami (Economic and Social Rights Centre), Kibera Human Rights Foundation, Pamoja Trust, Slum Dwellers International, UN-Habitat Regional Office	
	Writers' workshop took place in October 2009 to: document examples of how enumeration results have been used in tenure security; explore other possible applications of enumerations; and formulate recommendations	Current	Two groups: representatives from grass-roots organizations, and NGO's with specific experience in enumeration; and land experts including land surveyor, academics and GLTN staff	Development of: one main publication to be produced during the writers' workshop, and policy briefs including on why enumerations are important
	Publication: "Documenting land inventory process in Botswana"	2009	ECA, University of Botswana	
	Publication: "Guidelines for implementing a land inventory: lessons from TLIMS"	2009	ECA, University of Botswana	
Continuum of land rights				
Deeds or titles	Publication: "Social and economic impacts of land titling programmes in urban and peri-urban areas: international experience and case studies of Senegal and South Africa"	March 2008	Sweden and Norway	Extend impact evaluation approach working with WB in 4 countries (with partners in those countries)
	Summary Report: "Land registration in Ethiopia: early impacts on women"	2008	World Bank (peripherally), Norwegian University of Life Sciences	

²² Next steps have been indicated by the GLTN Secretariat. Some have been scheduled and some remain to be scheduled.

Tool/cross-cutting issues	Activities/outputs undertaken to date	Date	Partners involved	Next steps ²²
Socially appropriate adjudication			Mauritania with GRET	
Statutory and customary				
Co-management approaches	Documentation of co-management in Thailand and Indonesia as part of documentation of going to scale for grass-roots. First draft		Hakjiami	Finalize and upload to web.
Land record management for transactability	(see also STDIM) Work in Ethiopia relevant to this area but no specific tool yet in process			
Family and group rights	Research report on Islamic land rights in Bangladesh in relation to this topic		UEL	Regional Office working with UNDP are awaiting DFID funding to use this experience in Bangladesh to support a large slum upgrading project
	Research report: "Developing land tools for all age groups: implementing the land, property and housing rights of children, youth and older persons"	June 2008	UEL	
	Paper on Islamic land rights and rights of children, youth and older persons in Bangladesh		UEL	UN-Habitat will assist UNDP/DFID in their proposed 50 city slum upgrade where this tool will contribute to the approach
Citywide slum upgrading	Working paper: "Land and slum upgrading" (this may be a SUF publication)	2009	UN-Habitat Slum Upgrading Facility	SUF to disseminate
	Seminar and associated report: "Improving slum conditions through innovative financing"	June 2008	FIG, UN-Habitat Slum Upgrading Facility	FIG disseminating this publication. This tool will be linked with a €0m programme (APC funded) through UN-Habitat regional office covering 12 countries

Tool/cross-cutting issues	Activities/outputs undertaken to date	Date	Partners involved	Next steps ²²
	Concept Note: "Land for sustainable urbanization in Africa"	2008		
Citywide spatial planning	Publications: (a) "Citywide strategic planning guidelines" and (b) "Citywide strategic planning in Port-au-Prince, Haiti"	2009	UN-Habitat, Government of Haiti	Translate Report and guidelines into French. In discussion with UN-Habitat regional office to develop this tool
Regional land use planning	Publication: "Strategic citywide strategic planning: a situational analysis of metropolitan Port-au-Prince, Haiti" (long and summary versions)	2009	Haitian Ministry of Planning and External Cooperation, UN-Habitat	Translate into French. Seeking means to support Haiti implement citywide strategic planning.
Land readjustment (slum upgrading and/or post crisis)	Working paper: "Land and slum upgrading" Working Paper No. 10 (this may be a SUF publication)	2009	UN-Habitat Slum Upgrading Facility	
Spatial units (and STDm)	Publication: "The Social Tenure Domain Model: design of a first draft model"	May 2007		
	Briefing paper: "Review of the Social Tenure Domain Model conceptual design and functional/technical design: summary report and recommendations"	May 2009	FIG	Design adapted following the review. Testing STDm in Ethiopia in rural area with WB, ITC and FIG. This work to be published.
	Publication: "Documenting land inventory processes in Botswana"		ECA and University of Botswana	Finalization of draft underway (long and summary versions)
Modernizing of land agencies budget approach	Publication: "Guidelines for implementing a land inventory: lessons from TLIMS" draft	October 2008	ECA and University of Botswana	

Tool/cross-cutting issues	Activities/outputs undertaken to date	Date	Partners involved	Next steps ²²
Regulatory framework for private sector			In discussion with FIDA	
Legal allocation of the assets of a deceased person				
Expropriation, eviction and compensation		2009	In collaboration with Housing Policy Section at UN-Habitat and the Institute for Housing Studies (The Netherlands)	Scoping study of evictions, expropriation and compensation guidelines and practices EGM planned during WUF (March 2010)
Land tax for financial and land management	Land and property taxation conference in Warsaw	2009	UN-Habitat Warsaw office and the Government of the Republic of Poland	Proceedings, policy guide and report of the meeting will be drafted
	Urban and registry for taxation in Benin	2009/2010	Urban land registry in Benin	Report and guidelines will be available in 2010
(Land markets)	Terms of reference and questionnaire developed for "Handbook on Urban Land Markets for Africa"		Urban LandMark, UN-Habitat Regional Office for Africa and Arab States	First meeting with authors took place in November 2009
(Land reform/policy)	Publication: "How to develop a pro-poor land policy: process, guide and lessons"	2007	World Bank	
	Publication: "Secure land rights for all"	2008		
Cross cutting issues				
Land governance	FAO/GLTN Working Paper: "Towards improved land governance" Draft	July 2009	FAO	These will feed into the FAO "Voluntary guidelines on good governance of land and natural resource tenure" with GLTN to contribute to regional workshops
	Training package on land governance particularly with respect to gender equality and grass-roots participation. Draft	2009	UN-Habitat Training and Capacity Building Branch, Huairou Commission, Hakijamii,	Plan to test in September 2009. Will clear draft package through CSOs.

Tool/cross-cutting issues	Activities/outputs undertaken to date	Date	Partners involved	Next steps ²²
	Case study: "Institutional harmonization processes in the Kenyan land sector: a case study of the time period 2003–2007"	Jan 2008	At country level in Kenya: SIDA, USAID, DFID, JICA, FAO, UNDP	
	Publication: "How to establish an effective land sector"	2008	(Drawn from material above)	
	Report of GLTN round table: "Land governance within a grass-roots and gender framework"	2008	World Bank, FAO, Huairou, FIG, ITC, UN-Habitat Regional Office,	
	Publication: "Framework and guidelines on land policy in Africa" draft 5. (While not a GLTN document it benefited from GLTN contributions)	March 2009	AU, AfDB, ECA	
Tenure security indicators for the MDGs	Concept note: "Concept note for tracking progress on land policy development and implementation"	June 2009	AUC Land Policy Initiative, World Bank	
Capacity-building mechanism				
Islamic mechanism	Book: "Land, law and Islam: property and human rights in the Muslim world"	2006	University of East London	
	Briefing papers: "Land, property and housing rights in the Muslim world"	2008	University of East London	
	Database of relevant organizations	Sep 2008		
	Background paper on waqf	Sep 2008	University of East London	
	First draft of a training package		University of East London	
	Experts meeting to review the training package	Jan 2009	IUM, UN-Habitat Regional Office	

Tool/cross-cutting issues	Activities/outputs undertaken to date	Date	Partners involved	Next steps ²²
	Revised training package (draft)	2009	University of East London	International Islamic University of Malaysia (IIUM) are interested to partner with GLTN to roll out the training in SE Asia (more awareness oriented). Subsequent development of a more practical training package is envisaged. IIUM plan to hold conference on waqf land and possibly contribute to documenting it as a tool for land management.
Post conflict/natural disaster	"Guidelines on addressing land issues after natural disasters" (draft)	April 2009	UNHCR, FAO, UNDP, NRC, IRC, FIG, Huairou, Terra Institute, ITC, UN-Habitat's Disaster Management Programme	Final draft of guidelines to be completed by end of 2009. Develop a "Quick guide to post-disaster land". Development of training material. Final draft of guidelines to be completed by end 2009.
	Publication: "Land and Natural Resource Tenure in a Conflict Context" (draft)	June 2009	UNDP, UNEP, DPA, UN-Habitat Disaster Management Programme	First draft presented at EGM in June 2009. Revised draft in Sep 2009. To be completed by Nov 2009.
	Publication: "Quick guide to post conflict land" (draft)	June 2009	UN-Habitat Disaster Management Programme, UN Agencies and over 30 other organizations	Development of training material. Final draft of guidelines to be completed by end 2009.
	Publication: "Post-conflict land guidelines"	June 2009	UN-Habitat, UN Agencies and international NGOs	Final draft due end 2009. Training materials will also be developed.
Environment mechanism	Report: "Global land and environment challenges: how to secure environmental services and human livelihoods"	Ongoing, 2009	Norwegian University of Life Sciences	Publication will be finalized

Tool/cross-cutting issues	Activities/outputs undertaken to date	Date	Partners involved	Next steps ²²
	Summary of the e-discussion on "Land, environment and climate change: challenges, priority issues and tools"	Ongoing, 2009	Norwegian University of Life Sciences	Publication will be finalized
Gender mechanism	Publication: "Shared tenure options for women" (French) (only printing funded by GLTN)	July 2005	Huairou Commission, FIG, COHRE, SDI, FAO, UEL and UN-Habitat Gender Unit	
	Publication: "Mechanism for gendering land tools: a frameworks for delivery of women's security of tenure"	June 2006	UN-Habitat Gender Unit	
	Publication: "Policy makers guide to women's land, property and housing rights across the world"	March 2007	Including: FIAN, IFAD, Hakijami, Huairou Commission, COHRE, SDI, HIC, FIG, UEL, FAO, Melbourne University	
	Two workshops organized by GLTN with both grass-roots organizations/NGOs and professional bodies	2007, 2008	Huairou, FIG, UEL, UN-Habitat Gender unit	
	Publication: "Gendering land tools: achieving secure tenure for women and men"	Jan 2009	Huairou Commission, FIG, UEL, UN-Habitat	Revise the criteria following the pilot. Preparation of a guide on how to do a gender evaluation.
	e-forum to build on the two workshops	2008	Huairou Commission, FIG, UEL, UN-Habitat	
	Publication: "Gender evaluation criteria for large-scale land tools"	2009	Huairou Commission with local country NGOs	Meeting planned for Nov 2009 (alongside partners meeting) to get participation/'buy in' from other partners not yet involved. Proposals will be sought for a project to up-scale based on the criteria.
Grass-roots mechanism	Pilot testing gender evaluation criteria in Brazil, Ghana and Nepal	Current	Hakijami, Huairou Commission, COHRE, SDI	Meeting planned for Nov 2009 (alongside partners meeting) to get participation/'buy in' from other partners not yet involved. Proposals will be sought for a project to up-scale based on the criteria.
	Interim report: "GLTN grass-roots mechanism"	2008	Hakijami, Huairou Commission, SDI, COHRE	
	Publication: "Not about us without us: working with grass-roots organizations in the land field"	2009		

PROGRESS OF COUNTRY-LEVEL ACTIVITIES AND INTERVENTIONS

This section briefly considers progress and activities at the country level for the five countries that fall within the GLTN country strategy:²³ Botswana, Ethiopia, Haiti, Kenya and Liberia.

In many cases, the activities undertaken in these countries are perceived by national stakeholders as being implemented by UN-Habitat rather than GLTN. It could be argued that long-term engagement at the country level should be initiated through the activities of GLTN with implementation or coordination handled by UN-Habitat or another GLTN partner. While the testing of tools, evaluations, research and other discrete activities may justifiably be commissioned under GLTN, the role of the Network and the Secretariat should not extend to long-term donor coordination roles and other long-term support.

KENYA

UN-Habitat has been chairing the Development Partners Group on Land (DPGL) since its inception in 2003, before the establishment of GLTN. It has been instrumental in coordinating donor dialogue in the National Land Policy Formulation Process (NLPFP). DPGL has supported a range of key activities beyond the NLPFP, including the formulation of the Land Reform Support Programme (LRSP) and the continuing development of a land information management system (a component within LRSP).

The UN-Habitat/GLTN Secretariat constitutes the DPGL secretariat and holds regular consultations

with donors to encourage and harmonize support and involvement and to correct misinformation. It leads donor coordination in supporting the LSRP and providing technical expertise for the ministry. GLTN also helps source additional technical assistance, where required, aligning support from donors with priority technical needs.²⁴

All the stakeholders consulted, from civil society representatives to Government and donors, viewed UN-Habitat/GLTN as an independent entity without political bias, acceptable to all, and outside the competitive environment of development assistance. UN-Habitat/GLTN has been recognized by all the parties consulted—including local donors and the Government—as a force for attracting international experience and good practices. It has helped donors and the Government to make systematic plans and to progress in a systematic way, maintaining the agenda, assisting them to evaluate progress, and providing an independent assessment of performance.

UN-Habitat/GLTN, working with SIDA, has supported the entry of civil society into the process with the Land Sector Non-State Coalition (LSNSC) established in 2008.²⁵ GLTN helped LSNSC develop a strategy and encouraged other donors to give them support. LSNSC now has the opportunity for regular meetings with DPGL. UN-Habitat helped coordinate the initial meetings of LSNSC and the first meeting with DPGL. While the evaluation was being carried out there was no regular forum for LSNSC to meet with the Government; ideally the three groups should meet regularly.²⁶

²³ The May 2008 meeting of the IAB requested the Secretariat to develop a strategy for working at a country level providing the following guidance:

- GLTN's primary role is tool development, not implementation;
- GLTN should focus on a few countries each year to test and implement tools with the support of partners;
- GLTN should stay focused on the GLTN agenda.

In addition, a set of six criteria was proposed and agreed by the IAB (evidence of need; evidence of political will; potential for impact; evidence of donor support; GLTN partner leadership; GLTN added value). Five priority countries were assessed against these criteria and approved by the IAB.

²⁴ Before DPGL the Kenyan Government had to source donors individually, now the Government has, as it were, a "one-stop shop" for consulting donors and negotiating support.

²⁵ LSNSC had been very important in promoting and advocating land reform in NLPFP.

²⁶ Government representatives consulted during the review recommended that the Government should be represented in the LSNSC regular meetings with DPGL.

GLTN has been able to learn from the Kenyan experience; this practical experience has assisted it in the documentation of two guides: *How to Establish an Effective Land Sector* and *How to Develop a Pro-Poor Land Policy*.

The partnership of UN-Habitat/GLTN with SIDA in Kenya has been very effective; GLTN has sourced and provided technical skills and links to the Network, and SIDA has provided funding. GLTN has been enabled to use Secretariat staff to support the process. SIDA has funded two members of staff for the GLTN Secretariat: an administration and coordination officer, and a technical officer to support the development of the Land Information Management System.

ETHIOPIA

The activities undertaken by GLTN in Ethiopia include:

- Funding of various social and economic research activities and impact assessments through the World Bank and the Norwegian University of Life Sciences. One product of this initiative was a GLTN-funded publication entitled *Land Registration in Ethiopia: Early Impacts on Women*;
- Funding and participation in a World Bank-led mission to Ethiopia in June–July 2008, which developed a strategic framework and vision for the development of land administration in Ethiopia;
- Engagement with donors within the country to share the donor experience of UN-Habitat in Kenya;
- Funding the purchase of high-resolution satellite imagery so that cost-effective means of generating a spatial framework for land records in Ethiopia could be tested and demonstrated;
- The funding of efforts by the International Institute for Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation (ITC) in the development of the Social Tenure Domain Model (STDM)

and conducting trials of this software in Ethiopia (this is reviewed below).

These activities clearly meet the IAB guidelines for GLTN country engagement and focus on the opportunities identified for the addition of value by GLTN. More important, the GLTN activities listed above have been central to the activities to improve land administration in Ethiopia. Again, GLTN has been able to bring a broad range of experience to Ethiopia (including donor coordination in Kenya), along with testing and developing tools and approaches, such as STDM. GLTN has successfully engaged in country-level activities through its partners, with the World Bank taking a major role, unlike in the Kenyan model. The Government in Ethiopia recently announced the creation of new institutional arrangements for land administration and an ambitious programme to complete first and second stage certification throughout the country. As a result, Ethiopia has moved up to the highest level of the political will criteria and, as such, is a significant location of the continued involvement of GLTN.

LIBERIA

GLTN involvement in Liberia is still in the early stages, though there is potential for involvement on a number of fronts. At the time of the review, GLTN had been supporting the Government in including land governance in its Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), in addition to developing a concept paper and work programme. It had also assisted the Government to attract initial funding to the tune of USD750,000 from the United Nations Peace-Building Fund for the establishment of a land commission.

GLTN was instrumental in promoting the subsequent involvement of the World Bank and MCC. MCC had been planning a land project worth USD13 million, and the World Bank a grant of USD3 million. A joint mission (UN-Habitat/GLTN/MCC/World Bank) was planned with the aim of avoiding duplication

and a basket fund proposed. Negotiations were initiated to establish a land harmonization, alignment and coordination (HAC) process. GLTN had been instrumental in setting the activities in motion and additional partners and donors came on board in due course.

Liberia provides another example of the potential significance of GLTN at a country level and is also an example of good cooperation with the Regional and Technical Cooperation Division of UN-Habitat. The Regional and Technical Cooperation Division plans to provide a full-time technical adviser on site and to procure vehicles and equipment to continue this work. The work in Liberia will assist GLTN in learning practical lessons on land governance in a post-conflict situation.

While there is no doubt that a very promising start has been made, certain risks and concerns attach to the Liberia programme, including the departure of the key GLTN Secretariat focal person to take up a position in the UN-Habitat Disaster Management Programme. Another area of concern was that UN-Habitat officers consulted during the evaluation expressed some confusion as to the future roles of the GLTN Secretariat, the Land Tenure and Property Administration Section, the Disaster Management Programme and the Regional and Technical Cooperation Division.

HAITI

At the request of the Government, GLTN undertook research into city planning in metropolitan Port-au-Prince. Citywide strategic planning guidelines were drafted, a workshop was conducted to consider those guidelines, and a study entitled: *Strategic Citywide Spatial Planning: a Situational Analysis of Metropolitan Port-au-Prince, Haiti* was published, describing the local context and demonstrating how the tool could be applied.²⁷ The major partners were UN-Habitat through

its regional office in Rio de Janeiro, and the Department of Decentralization and Urban Planning in Haiti.

Further work in Haiti was in abeyance at the time of the evaluation. The Government of Haiti had accepted the recommendations of the situation analysis and created a metropolitan authority to coordinate planning activities. While the Department of Decentralization and Urban Planning was keen to implement work, however, and funds were potentially available, UN-Habitat did not commit itself to any further work on this activity. Its working base was the regional office in Rio de Janeiro and Haiti, as the only francophone country in the region, was not a priority. Moreover, there was no longer a Habitat Programme Manager in Haiti.

Undertaking and piloting city-wide strategic planning will require long-term technical support (e.g., a full-time technical adviser to the Government for a period of two years). GLTN will need to find another partner to support this work. The evaluation considers that this would be a valuable opportunity to develop, test and improve this new, untried tool and assess its usefulness.

RECOMMENDATION:

*It is recommended that efforts be made to find another interested partner to continue work on piloting the strategic citywide spatial planning programme in Port-au-Prince.*²⁸

BOTSWANA

At the time of the evaluation, GLTN had yet to commence a support programme to strengthen land governance capacity in Botswana or to pilot land tools. It had, however, undertaken studies of the Botswana land inventory process and its land information system and had evaluated the procedures against GLTN core

²⁷ Haiti is one of the few countries where a detailed situation analysis has been formally undertaken by GLTN and published (in line with output 3.2).

²⁸ A variety of options for the provision and management of long-term technical assistance are discussed later in this review.

values. The documentation process also led to the publication of two guidelines: *How to Develop and Implement a Land Inventory*, and *How to Develop and Implement a Land Information Management System*. It could be said that GLTN work to date has been largely an extractive process for its own purposes. There have not been sufficient opportunities for consultation with Government or negotiating a strategy for future GLTN support.

The work situation in Botswana and Haiti underlines the difficulty faced by GLTN in engaging at the country level without a permanent in-country presence, and with the limited staff and resources available to the Secretariat. Solutions to these difficulties will have to be developed and tested if GLTN is to expand its country-level engagement in accordance with the *GLTN Country-level Strategy, Discussion Draft* (October 2008) and *GLTN Priority Countries Summary Assessments* (undated).

The *GLTN Country-level Strategy* provides a clear and rational approach to GLTN engagement at country level. The strategy recognizes that GLTN cannot be the primary external focal point for the land sector among international partners nor can it be the principal donor (even if it had the resources). The strategy therefore proposes that a GLTN partner take the lead on behalf of GLTN in country-level engagement. This model presupposes the existence of a suitable GLTN member or partner who is interested and prepared to take on such a role and who is preferably already active in the country. The strategy appears to be working well in Ethiopia with the World Bank but, so far, less so in Botswana and Haiti. It underlines the importance of assessing GLTN partner leadership when commencing work in new countries.

The GLTN experience in Kenya was somewhat different, with GLTN taking on a more prominent role. Given the fact that UN-Habitat has its headquarters in Nairobi, GLTN was able to be more extensively involved in operations

to provide the experience for normative tool development (as discussed above). GLTN and UN-Habitat have learned much from nearly six years of involvement with donor coordination and support for land policy reform in Kenya. GLTN has worked with stakeholders to develop an approach for effective engagement with civil society organizations in these processes.

UN-Habitat, through its Regional and Technical Cooperation Division, can now replicate this experience more widely, as it is doing in Liberia at the time of writing, with GLTN providing technical support where required. As in-country engagement increases, however, there will be an important role for GLTN in initial coordination with partners, national Governments and donors, and in providing continuing but intermittent—technical backstopping.

The importance of GLTN country-level engagement is clearly recognized by its partners and core donors (Annex VII: Summary of the Comments on the Balance between Global and Normative Activities and Country-level Activities).

It is expected that Secretariat staff will need to spend an increasing proportion of their time coordinating, monitoring and evaluating country-level activities and providing periodic technical advice when necessary. There will be various developments to accommodate these increasing demands, including:

- Expanding Secretariat staff capacity to provide the necessary support to key GLTN focus areas that are crucial to country-level engagement (thematic focal persons who are capable of transferring experience from one country to the next);
- Dedicating several Secretariat staff members to work exclusively on country-level activities (as Secretariat staff resources increase over time);
- Sharing staff with other UN-Habitat sections e.g., the Regional and Technical Cooperation Division, donors or partners to kick off activities in new countries.

Building and encouraging partner capacity will also be important in this endeavour.

RECOMMENDATION:

Within the context of its own limitations, GLTN should continue to provide its partners with the necessary budget support and share responsibilities with them for activities at country level.

3.2.2 QUALITY OF OUTPUTS AND PROCESSES

This section of the mid-term evaluation focuses mainly on the quality of selected land tools and the processes followed in their development. The evaluation considered five land tools or cross-cutting issues:²⁹

- The Social Tenure Domain Model (STDM), which contributes to several land tool themes: continuum of land rights; statutory or customary land rights; regional land use planning; spatial unit;
- Land governance including harmonization, alignment and coordination in the land sector;
- Post-conflict and post-disaster response;
- Gender mechanism;
- Grass-roots mechanism.

The evaluation considered the following criteria and critical questions:

- At what stage of development is the tool? Has it been tested, piloted or demonstrated?
- To what extent were GLTN partners involved and at what stages? Is there broad ownership among GLTN partners?
- Was the grass-roots involvement sufficient and effective during the development of the tool? At what stages? Who was involved?
- What is the quality of the tool? Is it pro-poor, gender-appropriate, can it be applied

at scale, is it easy to use and apply? Can it be applied at the country level and with what sort of assistance? Will it apply to all national land contexts? Does it make sense? Is it a priority? Is it something new or innovative?

- Has the tool been completed? If not, what are the next steps?

This evaluation is based on documentation of the tool but it has also benefited from some discussion with Secretariat staff or partners involved in the development of the tool. Where aspects of the development process were not well documented, the evaluation may not have drawn accurate conclusions.

SOCIAL TENURE DOMAIN MODEL (STDM)

The STDM was considered by the GLTN Secretariat to be one of the most important new tools that it would develop in the near future, with the potential of making a major contribution to the process of recording and registering all forms of land rights held by all groups in society. The idea for the model arose from research undertaken by ITC and supported by FIG. FIG had sponsored the development of the Land Administration Domain Model (LADM) and was working to get it accredited by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO). The STDM was a more generalized form of LADM aimed at supporting a whole range of types of tenure, different categories of rights holders and overlapping claims. GLTN had contracted ITC to develop and test the STDM in a real world situation. FIG had also been contracted by GLTN to review the STDM development. GLTN lists the following objectives for the STDM:

- Addressing the tenure security of vulnerable groups in both rural and urban areas;
- Recording and registering the continuum of rights (from informal to formal);
- Making the system and the data available to all potential users.

²⁹ These were selected by GLTN as being those where the most important progress had been made to date.

These objectives clearly fit within the stated objectives of GLTN. GLTN has been working with three other partners i.e., ITC, FIG and the World Bank in developing and testing the STDM. An STDM prototype had been developed and was to be tested in both urban and rural environments; in Ethiopia a two-week test of the STDM was undertaken in a rural area of Amhara. The test identified some problems with loading the software and in its use, but these are not unexpected in the development of prototype software.

The development of STDM commenced at the end of 2007 and the original plan was to deliver it as open-source software by the end of 2008. The development, testing and evaluation of the prototype was delayed, however, although, at the time of the MTA, STDM was close to being made available as a tool and it was expected that the software and associated data model would soon be passed on to other parties for further development and upscaling.

As expected in software development, the involvement of grass-roots organizations in the development of the STDM was minimal. It is a pro-poor model, however, and supports the whole range of women's and men's rights to land and, moreover, is designed to be applied on an extensive scale. On the other hand, considerable capacity is required to adopt and use this tool effectively, more so than with other GLTN tools. It would have to be customized to fit the institutional and social setting of each country.

Concerns have been raised about the future requirements for software maintenance and consolidation, managing the open-source community and continuing improvement of the package. This will require continued support for some time to come. A strategy is required for continuous improvement of the STDM; releasing it or placing it on the GLTN website will not be enough to ensure its success.

LAND GOVERNANCE

GLTN has supported a wide range of activities

and has documented several tools that support improved land governance. Two of the simpler tools include *How to Establish an Effective Land Sector* and *How to Develop a Pro-Poor Land Policy*. Both draw heavily upon the practical experience of UN-Habitat/GLTN in supporting the national land policy formulation process and the land reform support programme in Kenya through a coordinated approach with the Government, donors and civil society. These publications do not attempt to be blueprints but offer simple, accessible starting points for policymakers and other involved stakeholders, and advocate participatory, pro-poor and gender-appropriate principles. Both identify common problems and issues that may be faced and offer potential solutions.

How to Develop a Pro-Poor Land Policy is the more practical and user-friendly of the two guides. *How to Establish an Effective Land Sector* is written as a general guide for multiple audiences, which makes it difficult to use as a step-by-step guide, given the variety of different roles that have to be looked at (the Government, donors and civil society). Its title does not indicate its real focus, which is on processes for Harmonization, Alignment and Coordination (HAC)—principles originally developed to apply to development assistance but in this case extended to cover all institutions in the land sector.

A training package on land governance was drafted which paid particular attention to gender equality and grass-roots participation. GLTN planned to test the package in September 2009, prior to its further review by GLTN partners.

Another important contribution to land governance was made by the joint FAO/GLTN working paper *Towards Improved Land Governance*, drafted in July 2009. This will feed into the FAO *Voluntary Guidelines on Good Governance of Land and Natural Resource Tenure*, with GLTN providing support for the running of regional workshops. *Towards Improved Land Governance* defines the concept of land governance and the principles

of good land governance, provides a framework for understanding land issues from a governance perspective, and reviews global experience in improving land governance in a range of key areas. It is a useful background paper and analysis, incorporating all the core values of GLTN and drawing upon several other GLTN tools. The paper advances pro-poor and gender-appropriate principles but has not yet engaged grass-roots participation in its development: this will take place as part of the ensuing regional workshops in preparation for the *Voluntary Guidelines*.

GLTN has supported the African Union, the Economic Commission for Africa and the African Development Bank in their development of the *Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa* because, even though it is not a GLTN tool, it has the potential to be very influential in land governance throughout Africa. GLTN supported the development of indicators of land policy and policy process assessment, assisted in editing the document and funded participants at workshops. The Framework addresses land governance, gender, urbanization issues, the continuum of rights, amongst other topics. GLTN will assist the African Union, the Economic Commission for Africa and the African Development Bank in the roll-out of the Framework, through training in how it is to be implemented. Five centres of excellence will be established, with GLTN supporting the development of curriculum and training materials.

GLTN will support a process of continuous assessment of how Governments are developing and implementing their policies using the indicators and tracking system. GLTN will assess how to develop the Framework into a tool for policy makers. This clearly shows the value of GLTN building upon and facilitating promising new initiatives. It is an example of the need for flexibility in the GLTN strategy and recognition that important opportunities emerge where GLTN can play a pivotal and catalytic role. GLTN and its Secretariat and the IAB are proving that motivated and innovative people

and organizations (the Network) at the right historical conjuncture can make a difference. Timing and opportunity can sometimes be more important in the work of small, under-resourced agencies than carefully planned and tightly designed projects. Not just with the Framework, but several areas of GLTN success suggest that opportunism can be a good strategy.³⁰

The GLTN Secretariat is now considering how to slow down its activity in land governance. Instead of supporting new land governance tools and initiatives, land governance principles and good practice will be embedded in all GLTN activities. The Secretariat recognizes that land governance is an idea that has increasingly been adopted at the global level and no longer needs to be a core focus of GLTN.

POST-CONFLICT AND POST-DISASTER RESPONSE

Land issues were identified as a critical gap in the 2005 UN review of humanitarian response to disasters and armed conflict. GLTN has worked closely with the UN-Habitat Disaster Management Programme and a variety of other agencies (including FAO, other United Nations agencies and international non-governmental organizations) to close this gap.

UN-Habitat/GLTN has employed a systematic and consultative approach and developed draft guidelines that are practical and fulfil an obvious need. The materials developed in draft include:

- Guidelines on Addressing Land Issues after Natural Disasters;
- Land and Natural Resource Tenure in a Conflict Context; and
- Quick Guide to Post-Conflict Land Issues

The *Guidelines on Addressing Land Issues after Natural Disasters* were developed as a collaborative effort of UN-Habitat/GLTN and FAO, with funds from the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Humanitarian Global Cluster/Global Capacity-building Appeal. This work commenced with the documentation

³⁰ Successful opportunism nevertheless relies upon careful assessment of situations and having the capacity to act upon windows of opportunity.

of seven country case studies of recent natural disasters. The case studies were then integrated into draft guidelines and reviewed at an expert group meeting. After revision, sections of the Guidelines were peer-reviewed by different experts. The Guidelines are pro-poor and give explicit attention to protecting the rights of women and the vulnerable. While a large document, and at times cumbersome to work through,³¹ it provides for the first time a comprehensive and interdisciplinary guide targeting humanitarian workers, land professionals, and Government officials who need to address land issues immediately after a natural disaster and through to reconstruction.

The *Quick Guide to Post-Conflict Land Issues* was planned and training material was being developed. Testing of the Quick Guide by a partner or humanitarian agency working in a post disaster situation may offer valuable lessons and strengthen the tool. In particular any testing should ensure participation by grass-roots organizations and should assess the adequacy and efficacy of approaches to protect the rights of women and vulnerable groups including informal settlers and the landless.

Land and Natural Resource Tenure in a Conflict Context provides a valuable background and analysis of the land issues around armed conflicts. While not a guide it provides important context for those who will be working to address land governance issues in post-conflict situations. That said, however, it provides little specific analysis of the impacts of conflicts on the land and natural resource rights of women, the landless or vulnerable groups.

These issues are, however, covered in the draft *Quick Guide to Post-Conflict Land Issues*, developed through wide consultation and based in part on a questionnaire to identify user needs. The Quick Guide covers: land disputes and conflict resolution, land records

and administration, human rights and property rights, women and children's land and property rights, vulnerable groups, informal settlements, donors and coordination, amongst others. It discusses the key issues, options for action, 'dos and don'ts', provides country examples, and it points to other useful tools and references. While coverage of the above topics is in many cases very brief, the guide provides a valuable reference for those with limited understanding of land issues, for example humanitarian workers. A workshop with a small group of key stakeholders and experts was convened to review progress on the Quick Guide and the Guidelines. Training material was planned and more detailed *Post-Conflict Land Guidelines* were being developed at the time of the evaluation. The challenge after documenting and testing the guidelines will be to raise awareness of land issues amongst key stakeholders and to strengthen institutional capacity to respond effectively. As with post-disaster tools, formal testing of the guidelines once developed is recommended.

Final drafts of the above post-disaster and post-conflict tools are expected to be completed by the end of 2009. Training packages will be developed in collaboration with the UN-Habitat Training and Capacity Building Branch (TCBB). These tools and training will be great practical value and should have a significant impact on improving emergency responses, recovery and reconstruction efforts by government agencies, non-governmental organizations and the international development assistance community.

RECOMMENDATION:

UN-Habitat and GLTN should continue their collaboration with international partners to refine and test these guidelines, develop and test training materials and support

³¹ For example the chapter "Land as a cross-cutting issue", which includes a mixture of valuable sections that are not well integrated into the Guidelines.

capacity-building among key stakeholders to ensure that the benefits of these valuable early efforts are maximized. Already these tools represent important contributions to support effective responses by the United Nations system to land issues in post conflict and post-disaster situations.

GENDER MECHANISM

Gender-appropriate land tools are among the core values and priorities of GLTN. The GLTN strategy is to evaluate and adapt existing and new land tools to ensure that gender is a key factor, and to create new gender-specific tools in response to identified requirements or gaps. GLTN work commenced at the high-level round table on “Gendering land tools” in June 2006 at the third World Urban Forum, in Vancouver, the resolutions from which are published in *Mechanism for Gendering Land Tools: a Framework for Delivery of Women’s Security of Tenure*.

UN-Habitat/GLTN then published the *Policymakers Guide to Women’s Land, Property and Housing Rights across the World*, which summarized research commissioned by UN-Habitat (Land and Tenure Section) between 2004 and 2005 (prior to the GLTN).

The most recent activity in the gender area has been the process for the development of gender evaluation criteria. Two workshops were organized by GLTN separately with grass-roots organizations, non-governmental organizations and professional bodies to ensure that both perspectives were fully explored and considered. An e-forum then built on the workshop outcomes and, finally, the *Gender Evaluation Criteria for Large-Scale Land Tools* were published. This was a long and very consultative process seeking perspectives from a large range of partners. While a slow process, it came closest to encapsulating GLTN participatory processes, grass-roots involvement, and broad Network ownership of any of the tools developed so far. At the time of the evaluation, pilot testing

of the Gender Evaluation Criteria was planned to commence in Brazil, Ghana and Nepal, to be managed by the Huairou Commission with national non-governmental organizations.

The criteria provide a framework to assess the gender-responsiveness of new or existing land tools. Six criteria have been proposed:

- Equal participation by women in the design and development of the tool;
- Capacity-building, organization and empowerment of women and men to use the tool;
- Inclusion of legal and institutional considerations;
- Inclusion of social and cultural considerations regarding access to land;
- Recognition of economic considerations regarding access to land;
- Addressing issues of scale, coordination and sustainability.

In addition to the criteria, a matrix is provided with critical evaluation questions for each criterion, and associated indicators. The tool recognizes that these evaluation questions, and particularly the suggested indicators, will need to be adapted depending on the tool being evaluated and the specific local context. It can be expected that the results of pilot testing of the criteria will result in some useful revisions of the matrix.

The gender criteria in common with the grass-roots mechanism (below) is moving from a process of tool research and development to one of advocacy and adoption. Sometimes adoption requires associated technical assistance. Now, with the tools developed and tested, these cross-cutting themes will be increasingly mainstreamed within all GLTN activities.

RECOMMENDATION:

The gender criteria, while originally designed for assessing land tools, should also be adapted for the evaluation of

land-related projects and programs (e.g., evaluating project designs at appraisal, mid-term and ex post facto).

GRASS-ROOTS MECHANISM

Following a GLTN grass-roots mechanism workshop and the drafting of an interim report (*GLTN grass-roots mechanism*), GLTN published *Not About Us Without Us: Working with Grassroots Organizations in the Land Field*. Key partner organizations with grass-roots expertise contributed to this tool and a meeting was conducted in November 2009 to get participation (what is often termed “buy in”) from other partners not previously involved. Proposals are now being sought for projects to be scaled up using the mechanism.

GLTN recognizes that effective grass-roots participation in tool development is essential to ensure that the tool can deliver the benefits expected and be practical and useful. The grass roots are defined as those who are the intended beneficiaries of the tool in question and should include all relevant marginalized and vulnerable groups, some of whom are difficult to engage (particularly for an international institution). The grass-roots mechanism therefore proposes a methodology that:

- Ensures grass-roots participation in land tool development;
- Scales up community-led initiatives;
- Strengthens the capacity of the grass roots to engage in land administration and management; and
- Promotes grass-roots participation approaches among GLTN partners.

The first of these includes evaluating and adapting existing land tools to ensure effective grass-roots participation. As with the gender mechanism above, criteria have been developed to support such evaluations. The criteria are rigorous and few of the current GLTN tools would meet them.

The proposed grass-roots mechanism is a timely

addition to GLTN tools, particularly as GLTN shifts more attention to piloting tools at the country level. It presents a rigorous approach that will require considerable commitment and resources if it is to be effectively implemented, and it will require a fundamental shift not only in how GLTN develops tools but also in GLTN representation and governance.

Given the recent completion of the gender and grass-roots mechanisms none of the GLTN tools and publications have been formally evaluated against them and adapted where required.

As stated earlier, GLTN has made impressive progress in the development of many valuable tools over a very short period. This is recognized by GLTN partners and donors alike. Annex VIII provides a summary of their feedback to the mid-term evaluation on GLTN tools and the tool development processes.

RECOMMENDATION:

The grass-roots mechanism should be tested during the development of new tools, the piloting of new tools in country, and the evaluation (and adaption) of existing GLTN tools.

RECOMMENDATION:

Once the gender and grass-roots mechanisms have been tested and finalized, a plan should be put in place with appropriate resources to assess all existing GLTN tools and publications using the above mechanisms and associated criteria. GLTN should then address any shortcomings, adapting the tools accordingly. In many cases, this can be done as part of in country pilot testing of tools, and as such should be incorporated in the terms of reference for such activities.

3.3 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

This section briefly assesses the effectiveness and efficiency of project management arrangements and selected management functions

(notably procurement and contracting, and monitoring and evaluation). It examines project management structures, systems and procedures and cost effectiveness of project management and administration.

3.3.1 GLTN MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES

The terms of reference for the GLTN International Advisory Board (IAB) and the GLTN Steering Committee are provided in the GLTN Project Design. The role of the Secretariat is also described.

SECRETARIAT

The GLTN Secretariat is based at UN-Habitat in Nairobi and consists of a small team funded both by UN-Habitat and the project.

As described in the project document, the role of the Secretariat is to:

- Facilitate the meetings of the Steering Committee;
- Facilitate the meetings of the IAB;
- Respond to comments from donors, GLTN partners and members and the general public; and
- Prepare terms of reference for the different tasks of documenting, developing and disseminating pro poor land tools.

Beyond this minimal role, however, Secretariat staff perform a variety of other functions, including:

- Planning annual work programmes for GLTN;
- Monitoring plan implementation;
- Managing consultancies and partner agreements (including other UN-Habitat sections);
- Writing, contributing to and editing GLTN tools and documents;
- Managing the quality of GLTN processes and outputs;
- Preparing advocacy materials;

- Developing, maintaining and updating the GLTN website;
- Attending various forums to advocate GLTN and its core values;
- Designing and implementing the GLTN communication strategy;
- Monitoring and reporting on the progress and performance of the GLTN Project;
- Managing and reporting on GLTN project and activity finances; and
- Liaising with donors (current and potential) and UN-Habitat management.

In addition to these functions, the UN-Habitat-funded staff have other duties and functions related to their substantive UN-Habitat positions.

The staff complement—and hence capacity—of the Secretariat have grown considerably since 2006. Approximate staffing levels since 2006 are as follows:

	Professional staff	General service staff
2006	2.5	1
2007	4	1
2008	8	2
2009	10	2

STAFF LIMITATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN

As a result of the limited number of staff at the Secretariat, there were constraints to the commencement of new tools and in-country programs. Existing staff were stretched. Each covered a variety of tools, partners and country programs. While the number of staff has increased considerably since 2006, so has the number of GLTN activities to plan, manage and monitor. Secretariat staff not only have administrative, management, coordination and supervisory functions but also take on important technical roles in tool development, research and advocacy.

Under the project document the GLTN Secretariat funding ceiling had been already reached at the time of the evaluation. However, the original design also allowed for an administrative counterpart and budgeted five per cent of the total budget for that role. Following the termination of the contract with the initial administrative counterpart in July, 2007 the functions of the counterpart returned to GLTN with some support from UN-Habitat.³² It would therefore seem appropriate that the Secretariat use this five per cent for staff resources.

At the same time, approximately 13 per cent of donor funds goes to UN-Habitat for management and administration (some of which goes to UNON). A further two per cent of the budget is allocated for monitoring and evaluation, as is common with most UN-

Habitat projects. The percentage of the total project budget for project administration and management (project-funded staff, agency support, and monitoring and evaluation) amounted to between 27 and 33 per cent.³³ Given that a portion of this budget funds staff not just to administer the project but to undertake technical functions, the total proportion of the project budget earmarked for administrative overheads appears very reasonable. The consultation by Evaluation Team with donors indicated that the latter did not have any in principle objection to providing a larger proportion of the budget for Secretariat staff. The key officers from SIDA and the Government of Norway who oversaw the GLTN project recognized the staffing constraints faced by the Secretariat.

TABLE 3.2: Options to overcome GLTN staffing constraints and to reduce the burden of administration

A. Increasing staffing levels		Issues and advantages/disadvantages
1.	Use the five per cent set aside for the administrative counterpart to hire more staff.	It is unclear whether this five per cent was budgeted in addition to the agency support costs (the 13 per cent).
2.	Seek agreement from donors and UN-Habitat to exceed the budget ceiling for Secretariat staff.	Donors appear willing to consider this option. It is uncertain whether UN-Habitat will have objections.
3.	Grow the GLTN annual budget so that staff ceiling percentage represents a larger absolute amount and more staff can be hired.	GLTN should be careful not to grow the budget quickly when it already has difficulty disbursing its existing budget. ³⁴ With limited staff it is difficult to disburse funds.
4.	Bring in additional full-time or part-time UN-Habitat staff from other branches and sections.	UN-Habitat should consider moving administrative and/or technical staff to GLTN in recognition of the expanding GLTN programme, its success, its opportunities to attract new donor funding, and the important potential for raising the international profile of UN-Habitat.
5.	Encourage in-country donors to directly support hiring of GLTN staff in country i.e., GLTN contracted technical officers. ³⁵	This is a solution for providing staff for in country programmes and is already taking place in the GLTN Kenya programme. In some cases GLTN or UN-Habitat could contribute part of the staff cost. This should be a temporary measure to establish a GLTN country programme and the officers should be considered as UN-Habitat contract staff.

³² Functions included contracting subcontractors, developing and updating the webpage, maintaining the GLTN contact database, and making arrangements for training courses, expert meetings, workshops and IAB meetings (travel, accommodation and per diems etc.)

³³ In addition to these Project funds, UN-Habitat contributes considerable staff time and expertise to GLTN MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION. The value of these staff resources is not included in the above percentages.

³⁴ At mid-June 2009, only 20 per cent of the annual GLTN budget had been disbursed (Concept Note: Challenges for scaling up, July 2009). In 2007 only 47 per cent of the planned budget was disbursed, and in 2008 63 per cent (GLTN PMO—personal communication).

³⁵ For example, funding a UN-Habitat technical officer could be an add-on to an existing bilateral or multilateral land project (with negotiated and mutually agreed terms of reference).

6. Increase use of HABITAT Programme Managers (HPMs).	UN-Habitat has approximately 35 HPMs worldwide who could be used to support GLTN country programs. These would not replace the need for full-time personnel as HPMs have multiple duties and run other UN-Habitat programs in-country. Many will have limited time to support GLTN in country activities but may be able to facilitate activities. An HPM provided initial support to GLTN's Haiti programme.
B. Reduce the administrative burden	Issues and advantages or disadvantages
7. Continue to seek efficiency gains within Secretariat, UN-Habitat and UNON.	Various innovations and agreements have been initiated by the Secretariat with UN-Habitat and UNON (in-house agreements, outsourcing of training, and pre-qualified roster of consultants - see discussion below). In the longer-term the MTSIP should deliver further efficiency gains. UN-Habitat and UNON should commit to providing clear procedures for GLTN to follow based on their minimum requirements and indicate their service standards.
8. Make greater use of In-House Agreements (IHAs).	Seven IHA's (covering GUO, HPS, TCBB (3), Warsaw RTCB and DMP) have been signed. These have proved very effective, especially for training with over USD0.5m channelled through TCBB since June 2007. Some UN-Habitat branches and sections face similar capacity constraints, however, and many must go through the same administrative procedures as GLTN.
9. Have RTCD support GLTN in country activities: manage donor-funded projects, procure and manage subcontractors and consultants, and manage some in-country programs when no other partners are active in country.	RTCD has delegation from UNON of up to USD150,000 for procurement and contracting in other countries (outside of Kenya) and also receives the support of UNDP country offices. This delegation of authority is for RTCD to support UN-Habitat operations especially in times of emergencies and may not be appropriate as a means to routinely implement all GLTN normative activities. When hiring consultants RTCD does not go through UNON but still requires approval of PSD. Contracting consultants by RTCD generally takes five working days but can be as short as three in an emergency. RTCD also offers interface between national UN-Habitat activities and Nairobi; RTCD manages some 35 Habitat Program Managers (HPMs) worldwide. The use of RTCD may be a valuable adjunct to involvement of GLTN partners at the country level.
10. Develop larger contracts	Larger contracts (higher value) for longer terms, larger activities or multiple inputs/consultants will also help reduce the administrative burden on staff. There is almost as much work contracting and managing small value contracts as large contracts. Many GLTN contracts with consultants are under USD10,000 in value and cooperation agreements with partners under USD30,000. However, small contracts, while not efficient for management purposes, do allow GLTN to spread its support to a larger number of small partners many of whom are not familiar with managing consultants and contracts.
11. Use umbrella agreements	An umbrella agreement could be used instead of several cooperation agreements (e.g. with ITC—used in the Sustainable Cities Programme). This provided needed justification to the Procurement Committee but enabled ITC to be called upon to do various work without re-contracting. ³⁶ Such agreements could be made for consultants or agencies and companies.
12. Permit use of multi-year contracts	Under United Nations Secretariat rules UN-Habitat and GLTN cannot sign multi-year contracts with partners and contractors (even though UN-Habitat has two year agreements with donors). This could be partly overcome with one year contracts with the option for a further year's extension based on review of performance and approval. The UN-Habitat Integrated Management Information System (IMIS) does not go beyond an annual basis for accommodating long-term contracts obligations or allotments can only be opened on a year-by-year basis.

³⁶ Gulelat Kebede, personal communication.

13. Increase use of partners (particularly UN agencies and not-for-profit organizations) to manage activities and recruit subcontractors.	While not all partners have the capacity to procure consultants and manage contracts, several do. Some also have representatives in country or their own networks. The World Bank was a recent example at the time of the mid-term evaluation. The greater use of partners not only relieves GLTN of some administrative functions, it promotes greater ownership of the Network and the output of the activities implemented. With new untested partners, progressive engagement is recommended—starting with small contracts and progressing up to larger contracts based on successful implementation.
14. Outsource administrative functions	While this did not work with the first administrative counterpart it is still worth investigating as it would free Secretariat staff for more technical contributions (its core competencies). Disaster Management has outsourced its recruitment of field people to companies that roster consultants and indicated that this worked well. GLTN recently explored outsourcing with UNOPS; it has relatively high costs and associated risks. Donors have expressed reservations about outsourcing as this is acknowledgment that UN-Habitat is not working ³⁷ . Some partners have expressed the view that GLTN shouldn't separate technical from administrative capacity as this will make contracting and managing consultants and contracts more difficult and may impact on the outcomes of the subcontracted activities.
15. Establish trust fund with partners (imprest account)	GLTN could establish a trust fund with key partners to undertake work and/or subcontract activities. This would be an imprest account which would need to be properly acquitted before a further tranche of funds was released. It would be overseen by GLTN but would be independently audited at the central level with auditing of partner financial management if expenditure exceeds an agreed level. Options could be that the trust fund agreement with partners is signed by UN-Habitat and/or by donors with GLTN overseeing fund expenditure and acquittals and approving release of subsequent tranches. Partners would be required to develop a rolling workplan for approval. This approach safeguards expenditure and gives greater responsibility to partners.

The MTA proposes two broad approaches to overcoming this constraint and a variety of options under each:

- Increase staffing levels;
- Reduce the administrative and management burden on staff at the Secretariat.

These are not mutually exclusive options. Some are already under way.

GLTN STEERING COMMITTEE

Based on the Project Document, the functions of the Steering Committee include the following:

- Approve GLTN policies;
- Approve work plans for GLTN;

- Approve, at a general level, GLTN activities;
- Approve GLTN rules and regulations.

The Steering Committee is composed solely of UN-Habitat officers. The Steering Committee is advised by the IAB.

Some members of the Steering Committee suggested to the Evaluation Team that they did not believe that the Steering Committee was playing a substantial role in supporting GLTN management; the Steering Committee functioned more as an internal advisory board for UN-Habitat discussing relationships between donors, coordination at country level, and coordination between sections in UN-Habitat.

³⁷ SIDA has a framework agreement with UN-Habitat which includes assistance to promote management efficiency; this is difficult to reconcile with outsourcing as it would seem to acknowledge that administration cannot be made more efficient.

The Steering Committee had done little to assist GLTN address administrative bottlenecks and inefficiencies in UN-Habitat. Others believed that the Steering Committee was weak and did not communicate GLTN issues well to other areas of UN-Habitat. Given the lack of understanding of GLTN among some areas of UN-Habitat, this failure to communicate should be addressed.

The perceived weakness of the Steering Committee was in part due to the absence of Steering Committee members from Steering Committee meetings due to travel and other commitments. Some Steering Committee members had missed nearly half of the Steering Committee meetings.

Several partners and one donor suggested that the Steering Committee would be more effective if not limited to UN-Habitat members as there would be value in including objective outsiders. This, it was argued, would promote more rigour in the Steering Committee meetings as they would then represent more than in-house meetings.

Conversely, one UN-Habitat manager proposed that UN-Habitat also be represented on the IAB and not just through the Secretary.

However, there is value in the Steering Committee as an internal UN-Habitat body whose role is to oversee the Project, make final decisions on programs, and be accountable to the core donors. The current arrangement is low cost and easy to organize. If partners were to be represented on the Steering Committee, there could be a conflict of interest if partners were to receive GLTN funds given their involvement in decisions on GLTN programs and activities. The current composition of the Steering Committee and the IAB allows partners to take an *advisory* role to the Steering Committee through the IAB, avoiding this potential conflict of interest.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Steering Committee should do more to take up the administrative issues and concerns facing GLTN with UN-Habitat

senior management, the Programme Support Division and UNON, and generally take a larger role in helping resolve such issues.

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

The Project Document defines the role of IAB to include:

- Advising on the priorities of GLTN activities;
- Advising, at a general level, on the decisions of the funded activities for the next funding period;
- Advising, at a general level, on proposals from partners;
- Advising on the development of the mid-term strategic plan for GLTN;
- Advising on the state of social, economical, legal, political, environmental and technical knowledge related to GLTN thematic areas and cross-cutting issues;
- Advising on research by identifying applied or targeted research which would improve the design and implementation of GLTN initiatives;
- Advising on the development of GLTN policies;
- Advising on the development of GLTN regulations and rules.
- Advising on GLTN performance against the GLTN logframe
- Promoting the GLTN agenda;

Under the original design the IAB was to include representatives from the following segments of the land sector on a two-year rotation:

- Rural international civil societies;
- Urban international civil societies;
- Bilateral organizations;
- Multilateral organizations;
- International training institutions;

- International professional bodies;
- International research institutions or networks.

At the time of the evaluation, each segment had one representative in the IAB, apart from SIDA and Norway who were founding partners of GLTN. The Project Document expected each segment representative 'to be responsible for considering the interests of all the members of that segment. Members were volunteers and where possible their agencies were requested cover the costs associated with attending IAB meetings.

The IAB was generally perceived by its members to be effective with very good dialogue and motivated and knowledgeable

representatives. IAB members and non-member partners alike recognized, however, that IAB members did not really represent their segment. Few, if any preparations, were made to collect opinions and ideas from their segment partners and members prior to IAB meetings. The concept of IAB legitimization through representation was not working as planned. This was discussed at the partners meeting in November 2009 (see below).

Several partners indicated that twice-yearly meetings of the IAB did not alone create a network and that more must be done to engage with partners. Options to improve partner representation that were proposed by partners are presented in Table 3.3 below:

TABLE 3.3: Options to improve partner representation in the IAB

Option	Issues and advantages/disadvantages
Revert to the two-year cycle of representation (with elections or rotation among GLTN partners)	<p>It is not clear how many partners are interested in being a member of the IAB (as members are volunteers). Current IAB members have had a long association with GLTN (including founding members) and many are very influential in the land sector – replacing them may weaken the GLTN profile and influence, and result in the loss or weakening of some key partner involvement.</p> <p>On the other hand, new members will bring new ideas and reinvigorate the IAB and GLTN.</p> <p>There are now many new partners since the IAB was first convened—they have not had the opportunity to be considered for IAB membership.</p> <p>Opening the IAB to new members will promote greater ownership of the Network among partners.</p> <p>Consistent with GLTN core values, the issue of GLTN governance and transparency is important and agreement must be reached with Network partners on participation and representation.</p>
Newsletter by each segment representative	A newsletter to all partners in the segment does not address the issue of representation but at least may better inform partners on GLTN activities and IAB-Steering Committee decisions. This could be drafted by the segment representative perhaps with a small fund provided to IAB members (or their agencies) to document issues, inform their segment and seek feedback. Feedback from segment members could then be emailed to their representative. However, this requires time and resources to be implemented effectively.

 Subgroup meetings

Funds could be provided to cover the cost of meetings of partners in each segment of the land-sector. This may not be needed for every segment.

This approach could either be a regular (e.g. annual) occurrence prior to an IAB meeting, or ad hoc to address important issues or consider new tools as required. (This option would not be relevant if more frequent partners meetings were conducted).

Some networks use subgroups or working groups to undertake most of their activities.³⁸

It was reported that the IAB members rarely came with advice from their segment on what to include in the GLTN workplan. Instead discussions were conducted throughout the year preparing activities and outputs with partners and/or groups of partners with the facilitation of the Secretariat. These formed part of the workplans. Several partners reported to the Evaluation Team their hope that the partners meeting held in November would provide the opportunity to review GLTN strategies and priorities in the light of the Network's future direction and activities.

Some partners raised the issues of geographic representation on the IAB. The Evaluation Team considers, however, that complex recipes to cater for regions and other demographic factors would complicate segment representation and should not become key criteria for selection. As the Secretariat pointed out, the partners were generally global agencies and it was left to them who should be their IAB representative.

One partner was dismissive of the Network and issues of partner representation as it had its own network. It was more concerned with GLTN activities and initiatives. Others believed that the Network was all-important (more so than tools, research and documentation) as it brought cooperation and exchange from a broad array of partners, and the IAB was key to promoting this synergy. The balance and cooperation evident

within the Network and the IAB can partly be attributed to the careful facilitation of the GLTN Secretariat. It has slowly nursed the expansion of the Network and mediated the different visions within the IAB and among the partners. It has carefully coordinated the involvement of different partners and provided appropriate opportunities for their cooperation in GLTN activities. Despite quite fundamental differences in interests and perspectives, an atmosphere of cooperation and enthusiasm was apparent to the evaluation consultant when he attended both the November partners meeting and the following IAB meeting.

Prior to the November meeting of partners the IAB had no election process, little or no consultation process prior to meetings, and no reporting back to partners. The November partners meeting agreed mechanisms to resolve these shortcomings. Each segment agreed a term of office and elected their representatives to the IAB. Elected representatives were now specifically required to consult with their segment partner members before IAB meetings and to report back to them.

MEETINGS OF PARTNERS

Several partners for various segments have proposed that meetings of partners be held more frequently to overcome issues of IAB representation and legitimacy, and to promote

³⁸ The International Network for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ESCR-Net) uses thematic working groups as the primary bodies to undertake the substantive work of ESCR-Net. These groups facilitate information exchange among network members; develop activities and projects; and implement activities jointly. Coordination of working groups and their projects is undertaken by individual members of the working group with the backup support of the ESCR-Net Secretariat. <http://www.escr-net.org/workinggroups/>

greater ownership of, and participation in, GLTN by the broader range of partners. Some proposed annual meetings, others every second year. The November partners' meeting took up this issue and it was agreed in plenary that another partners meeting would be scheduled in two years. A simple questionnaire after the partners' meeting indicated that 21 participants considered that partners meetings should be held every two years while six considered that they should be held every year.

When asked if their organization may be prepared to shoulder the costs of participation to partners meetings, 12 of the 22 who responded indicated that their organization may cover part of the costs, seven that their organization would cover none of the costs, and three that it may cover all of the costs.

The Evaluation Team believes that, while partners meetings have associated costs, they have great value in strengthening the Network—strengthening both the cooperation both within and between segments and clusters. This was clearly evident in the November partners' meeting. The role of future partners' meetings, if they are to be conducted regularly, needs to be agreed, particularly their function relative to the IAB and the Steering Committee, whose functions may need to be adjusted accordingly.

Important roles for partners' meetings to be considered include:

- Review of GLTN performance against workplans and strategy (in the form of a presentation by the Secretariat);
- Review of draft tools, evaluations, research etc. in relevant segment groups including next steps and tool and activity exit strategies;
- Identification and analysis of emerging issues in the land sector (priority knowledge

gaps and research needs, capacity-building priorities and options, priority tools, advocacy opportunities, etc.); and

- Identification of priority activities for GLTN in the coming period including the roles of partners.³⁹

Participants at the November partners' meeting, also suggested in addition to the above, that key objectives for future partners' meetings should include:

- Networking between partners and sharing of experiences/lessons;
- Preparing collaborative activities; and
- Presenting partner projects to be implemented under GLTN.

Initial meetings could review a GLTN membership and partnership strategy,⁴⁰ considering the roles and functions of members, partners, partner subgroups (segment groups or working groups), the Secretariat, the Steering Committee and the IAB. Subsequent meetings could revisit the GLTN strategy and contribute to a medium-term plan.

It is acknowledged that partners' meetings may be costly (for partners and GLTN)⁴¹ and that large more open meetings can be difficult to manage and reach agreements; partners' meetings should not replace the IAB.

The November partners meeting showed great enthusiasm for the idea that partners work together and partner collaboration was encouraged and planned for forthcoming GLTN activities. Until now the GLTN Secretariat has mediated most partner-to-partner collaboration. As the Network strengthens and expands, this collaboration may become more extensive and the role of the Secretariat may not be so central. This raises a number of related questions:

³⁹ If partners' meetings are to be held annually, the activities would be considered in the drafting of the annual workplan, if meetings were every second year they could contribute to a two-year workplan.

⁴⁰ Several agencies have developed transparent and well-documented membership strategies (e.g., ILC) that clearly lay out membership goals, principles, objectives and activities and the roles and responsibilities of partners and members.

⁴¹ GLTN should continue to subsidize partners who do not have their own funds to attend.

- When should an inter-partner collaborative activity be considered under GLTN? And when not?
- What role should be played by the Secretariat, the IAB and other partners in reviewing proposals and the outcomes of such activities? In endorsing findings and publications?

RECOMMENDATION:

Regular partnership meetings should be held at least every second year which should, among other functions, review new draft tools and propose activities for the coming planning period.

RECOMMENDATION:

A partnership and membership strategy should be developed and be continually reviewed and improved. This strategy should consider membership principles, goals, roles, responsibilities and rules of engagement for Network members, partners and the IAB. The role, if any, for subgroups or working groups should also be considered.

3.3.2 PROJECT MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND PROCEDURES

An evaluation of the development assistance and programme agreement between Norway and UN-Habitat was published in June 2009.⁴² Many of the findings of the evaluation (Kruse 2009) are pertinent to this evaluation and relate to the project management environment faced by GLTN under UN-Habitat. It identified important management achievements under the cooperation programme, but also highlighted a number of challenges. In summary these included:

- An inefficient arrangement for providing administrative services (UNON);

- An organizational structure within UN-Habitat that does not reflect MTSIP priorities;
- Incongruence between systems and procedures in the UN-Habitat biannual work plan versus the MTSIP; and
- The MTSIP reporting system not yet developed, combined with challenges associated with too many indicators, insufficient capacity to collect the necessary information, over-reliance on quantitative indicators, and problems with attribution of results.

Kruse's findings on management and administrative efficiency are particularly relevant to GLTN: "...*UN-Habitat ... remains a centralized organization in which even small decisions are taken at a high level involving complex approval procedures*". This was in part due to poor coordination between programme divisions, the Programme Support Division and UNON. Quoting from an earlier review,⁴³ the challenges to efficiency and effectiveness in key administrative services arose from:

- Overlapping and excessive certification and compliance checking;
- No clear delegation of authority and approval framework;
- Unclear role of UNON as a service provider and controlling agent; and
- Moreover, UNON was not directly accountable to UN-Habitat, making it difficult to change operating procedures.

As mentioned under Section 3.3.1, the GLTN Secretariat has capacity constraints which in part reflect the management systems and procedures under UN-Habitat and UNON. Some of the solutions to these constraints were presented in Table 3.2.

⁴² Stein-Eric Kruse (2009). Assessment "Excellence in Management" Programme Agreement between UN-Habitat and Norway 2008-2009. (http://www.unhabitat.org/downloads/docs/7420_852_Rapid_Assessment_of_FA_6_by_Norway.pdf). In the following, references are made from the report pages 12, 18, 21, 24 and 31.

⁴³ Dalberg (2007). Review of UN-Habitat's administrative structures and processes. Quoted in Kruse (2009).

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTING⁴⁴

Procurement and contracting individuals is complex with many steps and many authorities required. There are no procedure manuals for UN-Habitat or UNON that clearly set out all procedures for procurement (or for that matter other project management functions).⁴⁵ The UN-Habitat Programme Support Division is working on a document tracking system and documented workflows for business processes, but these are not yet completed.

There are various requirements for GLTN procurement dependent on the value of the contract and the nature of the contractor:

- If a contractor is not-for-profit then GLTN can use a “cooperation agreement”, which does not have to go through UNON but which is approved by the Director of the Programme Support Division. This could be made easier if the Programme Support Division delegated this authority to the divisional level (to Global Division). Cooperation agreements can take three weeks for approval and go through various hands in the Division (an administrative assistant, legal assistant, legal officer, Programme Support Division Director) and are sometimes sent back to GLTN for additional information. There are small and large-scale agreements on cooperation that differ in their reporting requirements (the cut-off is at USD25,000). The largest such agreement that GLTN had signed at the time of the evaluation was with the International Institute for Rural Reconstruction for over USD60,000 and this took about one month for approval; the Programme Support Division needed to be satisfied with the justification and required a comparison between three institutions [considering capacity, skills and appropriateness].
- For agreements with United Nations bodies GLTN can use a memorandum of understanding, a letter of agreement, letter of intent or a trust fund mechanism. These must be approved by the Programme Support Division.
- In-house agreements with other branches and sections within UN-Habitat can be signed at the section level. This is one of the modalities initiated by GLTN to exchange funds with other parts of the agency, in pursuit of a joint output. GLTN remains accountable to the donors for the outputs and financial reporting.
- At the other extreme, “sole source agreements” with institutions have to pass through the UNON Procurement Section (as does the procurement of equipment). This can take six months for approval and subsequent contracting (three–four months if there are no problems).
- Normal “institutional procurement” requires UNON approval at each step (e.g., terms of reference, request tender documentation, tender appraisal and selection), the requirements for which are not clearly documented, nor is there a service standard for the time required for approval. Contracts over USD200,000 go to a local procurement committee. GLTN had signed only two institutional contracts at the time of the evaluation (with ITC and UEL). These required assessment of the technical proposal by GLTN and a financial proposal by UNON.
- Hiring of individual consultants must pass through the UNON Human Resources Management Service. Under their service-level agreement, individual consultant processing for approval should take seven working days but generally takes between two and three weeks. This is in part because the steps and required documentation are not explicit.
- UNON does all negotiations with the consultant or institution and carries out the recruitment and hiring or awards the contract.

⁴⁴ Most the information on processes and issues discussed in this section was reported to the Review by the GLTN Project Management Officer.

⁴⁵ There are however a variety of generally complex “service-level agreements”.

- Final payments for all contracted work must go through the Programme Support Division. The typical steps for final payment are: GLTN evaluates the output; GLTN completes the payment voucher; the Programme Support Division approves payment; the UNON Budget and Financial Management Service Payments Unit processes payment and sends the payment to the consultant or institution.

The above description highlights the complexity faced by GLTN in engaging consultants and subcontractors and explains the Secretariat's interest in outsourcing key administrative functions associated with procurement and contracting. As mentioned earlier, GLTN is attempting to reach agreements with the Programme Support Division and UNON to streamline procurement procedures. This, however, may be a slow process of improvement, if indeed it is successful, as there are many different processes each with their own steps and persons involved.⁴⁶

At the time of the evaluation, GLTN was working with UNON to develop a roster of pre-approved consultants to expedite subsequent hiring. It is recommended that GLTN also explore similar approaches for pre-qualifying institutions and companies as service providers to GLTN for certain core areas of technical services (this approach is often used for contracting law firms and IT providers). This may take the form of an umbrella agreement or multi-year agreement (mentioned in Table 3.2).

Many in UN-Habitat are encouraging GLTN to pursue administrative reforms and innovations. They see GLTN as a pioneer for overcoming the obstacles posed by such inflexible, vertical structures—so-called “silos”—in UN-Habitat and as a model for management and administrative reform more generally. GLTN innovations and reforms, where successful, should be adopted and extended within the MTSIP. The Shelter

Branch in particular sees the MTSIP Focus Area 6 as offering an important opportunity and is happy to test innovations; it has given its full approval for GLTN to explore what can be done within UN-Habitat and its operating context. While these are encouraging sentiments, it takes time for GLTN to negotiate agreements, develop and test new procedures. The potential longer-term benefits do little to address the immediate capacity problems faced by the Secretariat.

The Programme Support Division is aware that many UN-Habitat procedures need to be streamlined and the delegation of authority needs to be reviewed. Ideally, most approvals should be the responsibility of the project manager or chief of the concerned office; only if there is wider impact on UN-Habitat should approval need to go through the Programme Support Division or the Programme Review Committee (e.g., for the approval of new projects or project extensions).

One donor, taking an agency-wide view, proposed that GLTN should be seen in the broader context of UN-Habitat, which ten years ago had to start from nothing as a small United Nations programme with big challenges. Internal administrative capacity in UN-Habitat has improved but still presents problems that affect GLTN. UN-Habitat is close to implementing a revised procedure for the delegation of authority to sign programme and project documents (and their revisions) at the regional and divisional level. As yet, however, it has made no progress with the delegation of authority for cooperation agreements, consultancies or other forms of procurement, which would do most to facilitate administration at the GLTN Secretariat.

The Evaluation Team believes that GLTN should only pursue or await internal reforms for a limited time before it moves to another option.

⁴⁶ One UN-Habitat informant stated it plainly: PSD and UNON are supposed to be service providers but often end up making decisions. There are too many steps and too many actors in UN-Habitat and UNON administrative procedures. Why are they signing? What are they accountable for? With signing comes accountability.

Outsourcing of procurement and associated administration is not new to development assistance agencies and projects, and there are many organizations that offer such services on a commercial basis. Given that procurement is not a core business to UN-Habitat, success in a limited pilot under GLTN may offer useful lessons for UN-Habitat and as such need not be seen as inimical to reforms under focus area 6 (“Excellence in management”). For GLTN, if successful, outsourced procurement would provide a solution to many of its administrative constraints and would allow much easier scaling up of GLTN operations. Outsourced procurement may also be appropriate if GLTN were in the future to establish a trust fund.

RECOMMENDATION:

*The UN-Habitat Programme Support Division and UNON should commit themselves to providing clear procedures for GLTN to follow based on their **minimum requirements (streamlining procedures as much as possible, and delegating responsibility as far as possible) and indicate their service standards. These same procedures would be of value for all divisions and sections and all projects in UN-Habitat.***

RECOMMENDATION:

GLTN Secretariat should identify, negotiate and test internal administrative reforms (including the options mentioned in this report) until June 2010. Ideally UN-Habitat should provide staff time to assist GLTN pursue these reforms. If by this time there has been little progress or potential efficiency gain, the Secretariat should consider all other options, including outsourcing procurement.

3.3.3 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

As with procurement procedures, the Secretariat faces constraints in its own monitoring and evaluation, partly resulting from the UN-

Habitat management and administration systems and procedures. As discussed earlier, Kruse (2009) has identified a range of factors which contribute to monitoring and evaluation difficulties within UN-Habitat: multiple reporting requirements under the MTSIP and its biannual workplan; a large number MTSIP indicators; limited capacity to collect information; a structure not well aligned to the MTSIP; and no integrated MTSIP reporting system.

The existing UN-Habitat information systems also pose problems. It currently uses the Integrated Management Information System (IMIS), but this system does not operate in an integrated manner with planning, human resources, financial, and procurement information on one platform. In addition, as indicated earlier, it cannot accommodate long term contracts as obligations or allotments can only be opened on a year-by-year basis. The proposed new system for UN-Habitat, the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS), is expected to be able to deal with these constraints: it is not clear, however, when it will be rolled out.

The Secretariat is developing its own project management system given that those of UNON and UN-Habitat do not meet its current needs. UN-Habitat also plans to adopt a new system to ensure better alignment with the MTSIP. These duplicate systems (that of GLTN, the UN-Habitat new system, and the UNON IMIS) will not be the most efficient solution.

A recent survey prior to the evaluation identified more than 30 stand-alone systems and databases for management information in UN-Habitat that were not hosted on the UNON platform. This results in fragmentation of information that does little to promote inter-divisional cooperation, programme cohesion and alignment.

As a result of these systems GLTN, under the Shelter Branch of UN-Habitat, has three sets of indicators to report against: the indicators in its own logframe, indicators under the MTSIP (mainly Focus Area 3) and indicators under IMIS.

In addition to these, GLTN must report to donors in annual and six-monthly reports (and also in ad hoc reports several times a year). GLTN final financial reports must be approved by UNON.

GLTN activities mainly fall under the MTSIP Focus Area 3 results framework but baselines for the results framework have not been finalized nor have targets been set. Several UN-Habitat sections contribute to the same accomplishments and results under Focus Area 3, undertaking their own monitoring. It is not clear who consolidates all this information. As suggested by Kruse (2009), the MTSIP suffers from too many indicators, and many of these it is very difficult to collect information. Responsibilities for collection of this information, and how it is to be collected, also remain to be determined. There is an emphasis on quantitative indicators to the exclusion of qualitative indicators that may be more explanatory.

Given that questions of attribution (or even contribution) will be raised with regard to many of the indicators, accomplishments and results of the MTSIP results framework, qualitative or explanatory indicators will be very important. In the specific case of focus area 3 the number of indicators are more modest, but still with an emphasis on the quantitative. The issue of attribution is again important. Good evaluation practice needs to help us answer: What difference have *we* made? What are the results of *our* efforts? Collecting information on the quantitative indicators selected will do little to answer these questions if we cannot separate the impact of GLTN or UN-Habitat from that of other influences and factors.

The Evaluation Team has similar concerns with GLTN logframe indicators and targets. There are many predominantly quantitative indicators, on many of which it is very difficult to collect information, particularly at the goal and outcome level. As a result, this information is yet to be collected. Again, if information were collected on some indicators there would be issues of attribution (e.g., *Number of countries*

implementing pro-poor land sector reform; Number of countries with systems to disaggregate gender data on land). In some cases the logical link between indicators and the outcome or output is obscure or indirect. This is particularly the case with outcome 1, where the links between improved global knowledge and, for example, reduction in days or cost to document a land right is not direct (and also difficult to verify).

The targets in the GLTN logframe continue the quantitative emphasis and remain unchanged for the term of the Project. This makes reporting simple, but merely reporting the number of best practices documented, priority research carried out, advocacy materials produced and priority land tools developed does little justice to the value of the work and implies that all tools are of equal importance and require similar effort. These numbers provide little information of value. Targets are carried forward into annual workplans which at times simply repeat the numerical target without indicating the nature of the activity planned or the partners to be involved.

The draft GLTN project management system should be very useful for monitoring and reporting, but only in as much as it is routinely used by Secretariat staff. A quick observation of the incomplete system during the evaluation suggests that it will capture and present the status (including financial status) and completion of most key activities. It will enable all system users to have this information quickly at their fingertips. At the time of the evaluation the system emphasized the management of activities internal to the Secretariat; it did not yet include status of the implementation by consultants and institutions. It is recommended that later versions of the project management system should include this information, particularly for larger, complex and longer-term activities.⁴⁷ Given the issue of slow approval of contracts, and the agreements being negotiated, there may also be a benefit from adding fields to allow the tracking of status of procurement and time taken for key

⁴⁷ This may require a simple report form to be developed for consultants and subcontractors.

steps in the process. Similarly, it was not yet clear how the proposed quality control mechanism would fit into the project management system.

GLTN financial monitoring and reporting also faces difficulties under UN-Habitat systems. The Network's own financial tools are limited. A very technical ledger is kept by UNON. Extracting detailed information from the UNON IMIS can be an involved process; the GLTN Project Management Officer separately maintains an up-to-date activity database, to facilitate the donor reporting process.

The Network's own database of completed partnerships and consultancies only goes back to 2008, as the database was not developed before that year. An independent Project Management Officer for GLTN was recruited in August 2007.

3.3.4 COST EFFECTIVENESS

The GLTN Project with a small budget has produced some very important and valuable documentation, established a growing Network of member and partners, and focused partner and global attention on key issues in land. It has contributed to greater understanding and cooperation among the key international actors in the land sector; actors from a variety of segments (professional organizations, grass-roots organizations, research and teaching institutions, donors and development banks, etc.). The project has been able to do a lot with little, partly as the result of the often voluntary contributions and support of its partners, including UN-Habitat, and partly due to the motivated and capable staff in the Secretariat.

As discussed earlier, the percentage of total Project budget assigned to Project administration and management i.e., staff, agency support, and monitoring and evaluation amounts to something between 27 and 33 per cent. This is seen by the Evaluation Team to be very reasonable for this type of project. Given that a portion of this budget goes to Secretariat staff not just to administer the project, but also to undertake technical functions, the total proportion of funds earmarked for administrative overheads is even more reasonable.

3.4 EFFECTIVENESS, AND OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS ACHIEVED OR LIKELY TO BE ACHIEVED

The following is the evaluation's assessment of effectiveness and likely outcomes and impacts of the GLTN Project. Given that there is little primary data and evidence of effectiveness and achievement of expected outcomes, the evaluation has drawn much of this assessment from interviews with key stakeholders and GLTN documentation. The questionnaires sent to members, partners, training participants and land-related projects augment this assessment (Box 3.1).

At this stage in the formation of GLTN, with less than two years of full funding to undertake activities, it is unreasonable to expect major impacts to be evident. This is particularly the case for tool development, where the major impacts are expected upon the adoption and use of tools at the national level and the development and use of associated training packages. As stated elsewhere in this report, country-level engagement and training on tools are at an early stage.

3.4.1 IMPROVED GLOBAL KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS (OUTCOMES 1 AND 2)

GLTN has been effective in communicating technical and policy issues to different audiences (for example, through the United Nations Commission for Sustainable Development and its involvement in the African Union/Economic Commission for Africa/African Development Bank *Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa*). The Evaluation Team believes that GLTN has been more successful in this endeavour than other networks. Successful messages include: the continuum of rights, which is now widely accepted; and the need for affordable, pro-poor, gender-appropriate approaches to land governance.

GLTN tries to influence decision-makers. Some partners believe that GLTN is "the right agency at the right time", grabbing opportunities as

BOX 3.1: GLTN OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS – SELECTED PERSPECTIVES FROM PARTNERS

- GLTN has helped raise the profile of UN-Habitat and demonstrated how to engage partners to help cover the breadth of its mandate.
- UN-Habitat's Land Tenure Section has become a credible land partner with resources and staff capacity as a result of the GLTN project.
- GLTN has set, to some extent, the agenda in the land sector even for the influential global agencies – it is doing what they have been unable to do in terms of advocacy and in some cases tool development.
- GLTN has gone further than any United Nations agency in opening up space for grass-roots women.
- GLTN has improved coordination in the sector – both at the global level and country levels (e.g., the HAC process in Kenya).
- GLTN tools will not be adopted without support as they are very broad – more a mechanism.
- Impact is a key concern – if tools are developed and never demonstrated and used then they remain at the conceptual level only.
- The real gauge of success is whether the tools are being implemented – the question is how to use these tools for national needs at the country level.
- GLTN impact has been minimal: it is difficult to influence Governments and policymakers; GLTN has a limited budget and little capacity to work on the ground. As a result, GLTN will remain a think tank, with an important role in advocacy but little direct impact.
- GLTN can raise its credibility to a new level, if it can successfully demonstrate its tools in the five priority countries.

they emerge and riding on a wave of change. It has high-level partners and is therefore more able to make its voice heard—i.e., to wield influence. Its messages still rarely reach Governments at the national level, however, or those who are responsible for designing land projects: conventional land-titling projects are still under way and new ones are still being proposed. Nevertheless, GLTN is at a very early stage in its development and will have ample opportunity to spread its messages and improve knowledge and awareness beyond international forums and international agencies.

Among GLTN partners, technical experts reported a greater understanding of social issues, and grass-roots organizations reported a

greater understanding of technical issues in land as a result of their involvement with GLTN. This sharing of understanding has strengthened GLTN advocacy efforts, the tools GLTN has developed, and the Network itself.

While some agencies may have greater analytical capacity, GLTN under UN-Habitat has a political advantage: greater acceptability to many at national and international levels. This contributes to its effectiveness as it is seen as impartial and independent.

Efforts deployed by GLTN to achieve improved global knowledge and awareness would be more effective with a better website. Many members reported difficulty in navigating the site and some had difficulty downloading specific documents. The structure of the site is confusing; many so-called “tools” are not in fact tools. For example, the heading *Tools and inventory* relates mainly to projects and offers project documents many of which are unrelated to tools and sometimes of little general interest. The site would benefit from highlighting the key GLTN tools and providing an annotated bibliography of these key tools to guide users. A section highlighting those new tools added in the last three months would also assist those regular users of the site.

Given that many of the Network's priority tools and issues are difficult to interpret from their short names, it will be important to include a brief summary of each tool and to post these summaries on the GLTN website in a prominent location. This information should make the role of GLTN more easily understood.

The site references too few key tools of other major partners which develop tools and guidelines. The site is not a repository of land tools but could become the first place to go, and the main point of reference for land-related tools and guidelines. Of the total 152 documents in the e-library at the time of the evaluation, 41 were GLTN documents, three were FAO documents (all in French) and three were World Bank documents. There were 885 entries under

Tools and Inventory, most of which were not in fact tools but links to project reports. There were very few tools under *Tool Development* by region (Africa, Asia and Latin America contained four, two and two documents respectively).

Nevertheless, the member questionnaire on use of the website indicated that most members had downloaded documents and had read and used at least one document. Of the 62 respondents, 37 (60 per cent) had downloaded at least one document and, of those, 28 (76 per cent of those who had downloaded documents) had used the document in some way: for example teaching, training, advocacy, research, or activity design, etc. Of the 39 who ranked the GLTN website in comparison to other websites which they had used to source land-related information, 25 (64 per cent) reported that it was “*as good*”, ten (26 per cent) that it was “*better*” and four (10 per cent) that it was “*not as good*”.

A number of members believed that much of the documentation was too academic and technical and suggested simpler versions. Some requested material especially designed for use by non-governmental and civil society organizations working with grass-roots groups. Others requested that documents be translated into other languages (most commonly Spanish).

There were 20 respondents to the questionnaire sent to project personnel on their awareness of GLTN. Only six reported that they had heard of GLTN (13 had not heard of GLTN and one did not answer). None of these six had downloaded any documents from the GLTN website. The projects that they represented were funded by various donors, including the German Agency for International Cooperation (GTZ), the World Bank, SIDA, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Norway, MCC, Finland, the Netherlands and the Australian Agency for International Development

(AusAID); many were supported by multiple donors.⁴⁸ Fourteen of the 20 respondents were consultants, three were government officers, and three did not answer.

In summary, GLTN has done well in the area of communications and made important progress in influencing a paradigm shift towards pro-poor, gender-appropriate land policies and tools. It has been more successful at the international level than at the level of national and project decision makers. Nevertheless, it is expected that over time GLTN will have greater impact in strengthening knowledge and awareness at the local level, as it develops more training materials and engages in priority countries testing tools.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that a brief summary be provided for each of the GLTN priority tools and issues on the GLTN website covering, for example:

- The nature of the problem or need that it will address; and
- The objective behind the tool or issue.

RECOMMENDATION:

The structure and content of the GLTN website should be revised to make it more user-friendly:

- The “Tools and Inventory” section should be renamed to reflect its actual content;
- The new tools and documents recently uploaded should be highlighted; and
- More of the key tools of partner agencies should be incorporated or links provided to their sites for users to download.

RECOMMENDATION:

The effectiveness of GLTN communications

⁴⁸ Interestingly, the majority of respondents from SIDA and World Bank funded projects had not heard of GLTN (in SIDA supported projects three out of four had not heard of GLTN, and in World Bank supported projects five out of six had not heard of GLTN).

should be reviewed and the communication strategy revised accordingly. The strategy should consider communications, awareness and advocacy with other donors, land projects, government land departments and land-related consultants. It should also consider interventions in the area of university curricula and continuing professional development. The strategy should review the relative merits of in-house Secretariat communications expertise and engaging short-term communication consultants.

As an immediate step, GLTN should consider recruiting a focal person for the Secretariat to take the major responsibility for communications and sustain the momentum created from successful advocacy initiatives.

3.4.2 STRENGTHENED CAPACITY FOR LAND GOVERNANCE (OUTCOME 3)

Strengthened capacity for land governance is expected to arise from the development and dissemination of tools, improved donor coordination and training activities. While the development of generic tools can take place at a global level, their adaptation and adoption needs to occur at the country level before strengthened capacity can be realized.

The number and nature of tools developed or supported by GLTN has been discussed earlier in this report (see Section 3.2) and effectiveness of their dissemination (see Section 3.4.1) immediately above. As discussed earlier, a number of very significant tools have been developed or were in draft form at the time of the MTA.

Progress in testing tools at the country level has been limited, however (see the discussion above in Section 3.2), as GLTN country-level engagement is still at an early stage.

As stated earlier, GLTN efforts towards donor coordination at the country level have made important contributions in Kenya, but GLTN is constrained in other countries by its lack of presence. Those constraints notwithstanding, at the time of the evaluation, GLTN had embarked on plans to support donor coordination in Ethiopia (led by the World Bank) and Liberia (with UN-Habitat support).

As stated earlier, a number of valuable training activities have been conducted (on transparency in land administration (four courses), land markets and land modules of urban management, and on the training of Habitat Programme Managers) and training materials have been drafted, awaiting testing and implementation (including: on Islamic land law, on gender and governance, and on post-conflict and post-disaster issues). In the normal sequence of events, first land tools are developed and tested, then the training package is developed and tested, and finally training is conducted. Given the early stage of the Network's development, progress in training has been impressive but, as can be expected, the impact of training on capacity-building has to date been minimal. This is not to deny the success and subsequent impacts of the specific training courses on transparency in land administration.⁴⁹

At the time of the evaluation, training materials were being finalized covering a variety of tools and topics (see Table 3.1). It was not clear to what the extent GLTN was planning to use these materials and to support related training courses, or to leave the material for other training institutions to incorporate in their own training programmes.

The original Project Document indicated that GLTN would eventually use its regional and country coordinators to organize training on land tools and mechanisms. This would take place after a systematic three-stage development

⁴⁹ See GLTN/TCBB report Working with and through Partners Works: Some Evidence from Transparency in Land Administration Training (undated).

process undertaken with the Training and Capacity-building Branch in the area of training and capacity-building:

- A global scoping study of available training and capacity-building packages and curricula in the land sector, based on the key thematic topics;
- Development of four–six training and capacity-building packages and curricula based on training and capacity-building gaps. The packages would then be pilot-tested before implementation.
- Conducting in-depth analyses and impact evaluations of GLTN capacity-building activities and documenting lessons learned with a view to improving the effectiveness of training and capacity-building.

The GLTN logframe is largely silent about training and capacity-building and the 2008 annual report does not discuss training strategy.

Training courses not only have potential benefits for individual and institutional capacity development but can be a valuable way to publicize tools and inculcate GLTN values and knowledge among representatives of regional agencies and national Governments.

RECOMMENDATION:

GLTN should revisit the training and capacity-building strategy outlined in the Project Document and if still valid incorporate the necessary outputs to achieve this strategy in the logframe, and the activities to implement the strategy in the annual workplan. If the strategy is no longer appropriate, GLTN should draft a revised strategy for consideration by partners, the IAB and the Steering Committee (before amending the logframe and workplans).

3.4.3 GLTN INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY NETWORK OF MEMBERS AND PARTNERS:

The Project has been very successful in establishing a Network with a continuously

expanding number of registered members and partners. At the end of July 2009 there were some 1,101 members registered and 42 partners. Not all members and partners can be considered deeply involved in the Network, however. A high proportion of registered members (40 per cent) responding the member questionnaire had never downloaded or read a GLTN document. Many of the partners responding to the partner questionnaire replied that they could not answer the questions because they had not yet commenced working with GLTN and knew too little to offer opinions.

Currently the Secretariat is the driving force behind the Network, as may be expected in the early stages. Some partners and other stakeholders believed that the Secretariat should offer more opportunity for partner participation in all aspects of GLTN activity to encourage a stronger, sustainable network. One step in this direction, discussed above, is the regular conduct of partners meetings. Drafting of a partnership and membership strategy is another. This should take into consideration the extent to which partners should be encouraged to participate in the development of strategies and workplans for GLTN, and the level of control retained by the Secretariat. To date the Secretariat has been very successful in encouraging and retaining a broad array of partner organizations and keeping a balance; mediating between different schemes of influential and vocal partners, and guiding them towards GLTN core values and cooperative endeavours.

How does GLTN empower partners given that it is a small network with limited resources? Under the United Nations system it is easy for the Secretariat to disburse funds through United Nations agencies and the World Bank. New, smaller partners are encouraged to undertake smaller activities. Some partners have limited capacity to implement and manage activities. GLTN can progressively engage smaller partners as they develop and demonstrate their capacity.

At the time of the MTA, a promising model was about to be tested. The recently developed

grass-roots mechanism was to be put into practice through a competitive small grants arrangement. An initial process had been agreed among those concerned prior to the November 2009 partners meeting. This had generated great enthusiasm among grass-roots partners and provided a potentially important avenue for the involvement and empowerment of smaller partners.

Involving partners in GLTN activities provides much of what we might term the “glue” of the Network. To do this the Secretariat should ensure that small activities remain available for new partners (as part of a process of progressive engagement) despite the administrative burden that many small contracts and agreements entail.

PROJECT AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT:

GLTN management capacity has improved substantially since 2006, as the result of expanded Secretariat staffing and the development of management systems and databases. It had finalized the GLTN Project Document and developed a GLTN logframe. Secretariat staff had also made important contributions to the UN-Habitat MTSIP.

At the time of the evaluation, the Secretariat was completing the design of a dedicated project management system and a quality control system. Nevertheless, the GLTN Secretariat suffers complex and inefficient administrative and financial management procedures under UN-Habitat and UNON. As discussed above, it has developed and tested a number of innovations to help overcome some of these constraints (see the discussion under Section 3.3 above). Given their effectiveness, in-house agreements have been adopted more widely within UN-Habitat. Its cooperation with the Training and Capacity-building Branch in outsourcing training has also proved very effective, and is a model for cooperation within the organization. The streamlined approach to the procurement of consultants recently agreed with the UNON Human Resources Management

Service remains to be implemented.

At the time of the evaluation, the Secretariat had also made little progress in improving its capacity to disburse funds. The capacity to manage multiple activities, commence important new programme areas (such as new country programs), and disburse the associated funds, arguably represents one of the greatest challenges facing GLTN and poses a major risk to the achievement of its ambitious goal and objectives. These constraints need to be overcome before GLTN can take full advantage of the many emerging opportunities that it has created.

RECOMMENDATION:

GLTN should investigate the feasibility of a competitive grant facility established to fund both partners and other organizations to develop or test tools, conduct training, and other measures. Proposals would build on GLTN tools, guidelines and training materials, where relevant. Funding rounds could target specific tools or countries for implementation. The facility should be based on competitive proposals independently assessed by an appropriately composed awards committee based on clear criteria and tendering procedures, with evidence of capacity to implement and document. Proposals would be for a maximum GLTN grant with contributions from the proponent.

3.5 SUSTAINABILITY

The future and sustainability of GLTN ultimately lies with the strength of the Network. In the short and medium term, however, sustainability will be dependent on the capacity of the Secretariat and the level of donor support (Box 3.2).

The strength of the Network, as discussed above, is inexorably linked to questions of representation and governance. The Network has been growing and evolving rapidly and the Evaluation Team heard many suggestions

about how to make it a more transparent and democratic platform that was driven more by partners and members. Great strides in this direction were made at the recent partners meeting in November. The outcomes of the partners meeting concerning the process of election to, and representation on, the IAB will largely allay these concerns. The Evaluation Team believes that these will strengthen the Network.

Capacity issues pose a key risk to sustainability. Having made a promising start with advocacy, research and tool development, GLTN now needs to test tools at the country level to build its credibility. Outside Nairobi, GLTN has limited capacity and must find mechanisms and means to support this new phase of activity. The capacity of the Secretariat in the Nairobi office is also critical—with limited staff, the loss of one or two would significantly set back the implementation of the workplan. The loss of the head of the Secretariat, given her formative role, would be a particular risk to GLTN.

The capacity of the GLTN Secretariat to disburse funds and to grow is impeded by the constraints placed on it by UN-Habitat and UNON systems and procedures. If these issues cannot be satisfactorily resolved, GLTN should consider its institutional options for the longer-term. Various partners have proposed alternative options for consideration. FAO has discussed with the Evaluation Team the notion of a GLTN jointly managed by FAO and UN-Habitat but under FAO procurement procedures. This would not only overcome many of the procedural constraints faced by GLTN under UN-Habitat and UNON but, it is argued, would be strategic and more influential.

Another possibility that could be explored is that of the World Bank Global Partnerships. Under these partnerships the World Bank can provide funds (matched or to support other funds) to bring into action innovative new approaches.⁵⁰ All these partnerships have a secretariat that

can be in any participating agency but financial management is performed independently. Such a partnership could be used to scale up GLTN activities and would provide financial security; this would enable GLTN to become a quasi-independent institution if required.

Donor support, while it can never be taken for granted, seems less of a short-term risk to GLTN as the existing donors take a long-term perspective and the level of funding is small. Furthermore, a range of other donors have expressed interest in supporting GLTN. That said, however, additional donors with their new priorities and project-by-project focus will pose problems for the small Secretariat. It will need to scale up to accommodate new donor projects and scale back down when they finish (unless it can find a continuous supply of new donors and projects). Such pressures can change the culture of an office and add a new complexity to management and administration.

BOX 3.2: GLTN FUTURE AND SUSTAINABILITY – SELECTED PERSPECTIVE FROM PARTNERS

- GLTN is valued for its research and should never neglect this in favour of a fully operational focus. The rush to demonstrate may be risky for GLTN—partners should be the emphasis for in-country demonstration. While GLTN likes to undertake research and generate new ideas, it needs to feed this back into training and dissemination.
- GLTN will never have sufficient staff to support in-country capacity-building: therefore it must get leverage from its partners.
- GLTN should expand and diversify donor support to give it greater flexibility and independence—but this is difficult to do if it has problems spending existing funds.
- GLTN work needs to be adopted at national, regional and global levels; tools and knowledge should be owned, used, developed and transformed. Advocacy is more than information, it is change-oriented. It involves mobilizing and organizing to promote progressive reform; it needs to challenge the status quo.
- GLTN staffing could in the future be decentralized with regional offices. But GLTN should not become too big; it should use the expertise of its partners.

⁵⁰ Examples include the Carbon Fund, the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research, the Global Environment Facility, the Consultative Group to Assist the Poorest, the Global Water Partnership, and Education for All.

After a number of years GLTN may find that its work in developing and testing normative tools is nearing completion. Its emphasis may then shift to the national level for advocacy and technical assistance covering the land HAC process and capacity-building for land tool implementation. The skills and technical capacity available at the global level to serve the 192 Member States of UN-Habitat in these areas of expertise are very limited, however. This necessitates the careful selection of countries and phased scaling-up of country-level activity, so as not to deplete the resources available from current global and normative activities. Sustainability and the future of GLTN may ultimately depend on the success of its work at the country level. As stated earlier, this poses

new challenges for GLTN as there is as yet no single model for country-level engagement that can be applied across all countries. Furthermore, country-level engagement is invariably resource-intensive.

RECOMMENDATION:

The GLTN Secretariat should plan for its future staffing needs and skill requirements for emerging areas of activity and new areas of demand. This will include human resource requirements for supporting HAC administration, for increased country-level engagement generally, and to meet emerging demands for technical assistance from partners as their land activities expand.

4. CONCLUSIONS



In the space of three years, from its establishment in 2006 to the time of this mid-term evaluation in 2009, GLTN has achieved significant successes with a small Secretariat staff and a limited budget and in the face of administrative constraints imposed by its institutional environment. It has established a network that includes many of the most important actors in the land sector, it has a recognizable brand and credibility in the international land arena. Notable achievements have been attained in the areas of advocacy, research and tool development.

A large part of the Network's success consists in its ability to scale up by the use of its partners: augmented with partner capacities and contributions, the small funds available to GLTN go a long way. Partners have shown their commitment to the vision and values of the Network.

Secretariat staff are very motivated, skilled and committed. UN-Habitat, despite its administrative inefficiencies, has been an enthusiastic supporter of GLTN and sees the benefits for its own programmes and profile. UN-Habitat has contributed considerable staff and management time to ensure that GLTN is a success.

With less than two years of effective funding, GLTN has made very impressive progress in the development and documentation of land tools covering most of its targeted issues and themes. Forty-one documents published by GLTN were available on its website as at 31 July 2009. There had been over 70,000 downloads from the website, of which over 16,000 were of GLTN documents.

GLTN has commenced important country-level activities in Botswana, Ethiopia, Haiti, Kenya and Liberia and worked in many other countries as part of its research, tool development and training programmes.

The Secretariat has engaged both large and small partners in research, tool development and training. It has been very successful in encouraging and retaining a broad array of partner organizations from very different perspectives and backgrounds, including them all yet keeping a balance; mediating between different schemes of influential and vocal partners, and influencing them all towards GLTN core values and cooperative endeavours.

GLTN stands apart in the land sector for a combination of reasons:

- Key role as an advocate for effective, pro-poor, gender-appropriate land governance and administration;
- Impartial and independent position under a United Nations organization;
- Breadth of different network partners with their different perspectives, including influential multilateral organizations, technical and professional bodies, research and training institutions, and grass-roots organizations;
- Active promotion of grass-roots participation;
- Emphasis on cooperation among partners (including within UN-Habitat) and on improved donor coordination (acting as a catalyst and facilitator);
- Support for innovation and new thinking (due in part to its multidisciplinary and multi-stakeholder composition); and
- Strategic focus and vision for the land sector.

One of the most important constraints facing GLTN is its limited administrative and technical capacity in relation to the number of activities that it is undertaking and the ambitious programme of country-level activities planned. The most immediate solution to this constraint is the hiring of more staff at the Secretariat. A proposal was under way for this very outcome at the time of writing. Progress in streamlining administrative procedures under UN-Habitat and UNON has been slow. Slippage in the implementation of activities by consultants and institutions constituted another all too common problem in implementation.

GLTN faces a number of challenges ahead, which include:

- Expanding the network and gaining wider recognition among donors, land projects, government agencies, and consultants;
 - More efficient contracting and overcoming the constraints on procurement;
 - Expanding Secretariat staff resources to make the most of emerging opportunities;
 - Resourcing and managing its expansion into country-level activities;
 - Progressively strengthening partners' role in GLTN strategy formulation and decision-making;
 - Implementation of the quality control system – particularly the review of tools and publications on the web (both GLTN and partner publications).⁵¹
- Partners and key stakeholders also recognized, however, the considerable opportunities that were emerging for GLTN based on its experience to date. At the time of the evaluation, there were an increasing number of requests for GLTN support and negotiations were under way with new donors. Besides those, the opportunities identified by partners and stakeholders included:

Expanding the successful country role played by GLTN in Kenya to other countries, in particular its roles in donor coordination and the subsequent matching of technical requirements for land governance reform with donor support and partner expertise. The GLTN role would include:

- Guidance on best practice examples, independent assessment of how reform programmes were progressing, and advice on land tools;
- Forming partnerships with international, regional and national training institutions to conduct training on the key tools developed to date (on Islam, gender and governance, post conflict and post-disaster issues, etc.);⁵² and
- Harnessing the growth potential and demand for post-conflict and post-disaster support and training. This could feed a subgroup or sub-network of humanitarian partners within GLTN working on post-conflict and post-disaster land issues.

⁵¹ This needs to consider both the gender and grass-roots evaluation criteria.

⁵² IIUM will work in partnership with GLTN to roll out training related to the Islamic mechanism in South-East Asia.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS



Recommendations have been proposed throughout the body of this report to address findings and associated issues as they arise.⁵³ Many of these recommendations can be implemented immediately. In addition to these, this evaluation proposes a number of more strategic recommendations.

Recommendations that can be implemented immediately to address issues identified by the evaluation, in order of importance, are as follows:

WEBSITE REVISION

Recommendation 1:

GLTN should revise the structure and content of the GLTN website to make it more user-friendly, rename the “Tools and inventory” section to reflect its content, highlight the new tools and documents recently uploaded, incorporate more of the key tools of partner agencies or links to their sites for users to download.

It is also recommended that an explanation be

provided on the website for each of the GLTN priority tools and issues:

- The objective behind the tool or issue;
- The nature of the problem or need that it will address.

TRAINING AND CAPACITY-BUILDING STRATEGY

Recommendation 2 :

The GLTN Secretariat should revisit the training and capacity-building strategy outlined in the Project Document and, if still valid, incorporate the necessary outputs to achieve this strategy in the logframe (and incorporate the activities to implement the strategy in the annual workplan). If the strategy is no longer appropriate, the GLTN Secretariat should draft a revised strategy for consideration by partners, the IAB and the Steering Committee before amending the logframe and workplans.

REGULAR PARTNERSHIP MEETINGS

⁵³ Recommendations have been placed at the end of the section or subsection to which they relate.

Recommendation 3:

Regular partnership meetings should be held at least every second year. These meetings should, among other functions, review new draft tools and propose activities for the coming planning period.

ADDRESSING ADMINISTRATIVE INEFFICIENCIES AND DELAYS

UN-Habitat and UNON should be encouraged to document clear procurement and other administrative procedures for GLTN to follow based on their minimum requirements (streamlining procedures as much as possible, and delegating responsibility as far as possible). These should indicate their service standards.

Recommendation 4:

The Steering Committee should take up the administrative issues and concerns facing GLTN with UN-Habitat senior management, the Programme Support Division and UNON, and generally take a larger role in helping resolve such issues. One immediate example would be for the Steering Committee to seek agreement from UN-Habitat senior management for GLTN to exceed the budget ceiling for Secretariat staff.

Recommendation 5:

The GLTN Secretariat should identify, negotiate and test internal administrative reforms (including the options mentioned in this report) until June 2010. Ideally, UN-Habitat should provide staff time to help GLTN pursue these reforms. If by this time there has been little progress or potential efficiency gain, the Secretariat should consider all other options, including the outsourcing of procurement.

PLANNING THE REVIEW OF EXISTING TOOLS USING GENDER AND GRASS-ROOTS CRITERIA**Recommendation 6:**

Once the gender and grass-roots mechanisms have been tested and finalized, a plan should be put in place with appropriate resources to revisit all GLTN tools and publications, using the above mechanisms and associated criteria, and to address any shortcomings, adapting the tools accordingly. In many cases, this can be effected as part of the in-country pilot testing of tools, and as such should be incorporated in the terms of reference for such activities.

LOGFRAME REVISION**Recommendation 7:**

It is recommended that further clarity be articulated in a revised logframe, in particular clarifying the following:

The nature and extent of capacity-building support to be undertaken by GLTN (what needs to be undertaken to build capacity, where, how, etc.);

The nature and extent of country-level activities of GLTN (what type of activity or support, where, how, who, etc.).

TESTING GENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PROJECTS**Recommendation 8:**

The gender criteria, while originally designed for assessing land tools, should also be adapted for the evaluation of land-related projects and programmes (e.g., evaluating project designs at appraisal, at mid-term and ex post facto).

PROJECT LIST**Recommendation 9:**

GLTN should maintain a list of current land-related projects and post it on its website. The list of current projects developed for

this MTA took some effort to compile. Even so, there are some serious gaps. There is still merit, however, in maintaining the list both to encourage interaction and sharing of information between the projects, and to facilitate and target GLTN dissemination.

Recommendations of a more strategic nature, in order of importance, are as follows:

COUNTRY ENGAGEMENT

Recommendation 10:

GLTN should develop a strategy for how GLTN is to support activities at the country level; the roles of partners, UN-Habitat (including the Regional Technical Cooperation Division), and the Secretariat. This strategy will need continual review as GLTN gains further experience in engagement at the national level.

Recommendation 11:

GLTN should develop strategies for each of its priority countries. This may require situation and needs analysis and analysis of opportunities (institutional analysis, effectiveness of civil society, policy environment, political economy, etc.). The strategy should identify the most appropriate tools to test, consider partners' capacities and gaps, available resources and potential funding. It should propose broad country-level objectives for GLTN and a provisional schedule of indicative activities.

GLTN STRATEGY IN THE MEDIUM-TO-LONG TERM AND ASSOCIATED STAFFING PLAN

Recommendation 12:

Consideration should commence of a longer-term strategy and role for GLTN – will tools still be the priority? What are the new, emerging priorities in the land sector where GLTN should play a role? The GLTN Secretariat should plan for its future

staffing needs and skill requirements to fit this longer-term strategy. This may include human resource requirements to supporting administration of the HAC process, for increased country-level engagement generally, and to meet emerging demands for technical assistance from partners as their land activities expand.

COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

Recommendation 13:

The effectiveness of GLTN communications should be reviewed and the communication strategy revised accordingly. The strategy should consider communication, awareness and advocacy with other donors, land projects, government land departments and land-related consultants. It should consider interventions in the area of university curricula and continuing professional development.

PARTNERSHIP AND MEMBERSHIP STRATEGY

Recommendation 14:

A partnership and membership strategy should be developed and should be continually reviewed and improved. This strategy should consider membership principles, goals, roles, responsibilities and rules of engagement for Network members, partners and the IAB. The role, if any, for subgroups or working groups should also be considered.

MULTIPLE TOOL IMPLEMENTATION

Recommendation 15:

Knowledge should be developed on the linkages between tools (the body of tools) and the value of multiple tools (not silos) implemented together should be tested and demonstrated. This will require appropriate country-level opportunities.

GLOBAL TECHNICAL CAPACITY TO SUPPORT THE LAND SECTOR

Recommendation 16:

The institutional capacity of all international land agencies should be reviewed against the scale of global land needs, and any mismatches highlighted. The increasing recognition of the importance of the land sector and the scale of its needs have not been matched with increased capacity for support. A study of this nature will highlight this problem, identifying the nature and scale of the sector's need, and provide impetus for additional global resources.

An aerial photograph of a residential development. In the foreground and middle ground, there are several modern, multi-story apartment blocks with light-colored facades and red-tiled roofs. The buildings are arranged in a somewhat grid-like pattern with some curved blocks. A paved road with streetlights runs through the development. In the background, a dense, older urban area with smaller, more varied buildings is visible on a hillside. A semi-transparent olive-green rectangular box is overlaid on the upper part of the image, containing the word 'ANNEXES' in white capital letters.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Post:	Evaluation Consultant for GLTN Mid-Term Assessment
Programme:	Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) (facilitated by UN-Habitat)
Duration:	3.5 months (spread over 4.5 months)
Supervisor:	Clarissa Augustinus, Chief, Land Tenure and Property Administration Section, UN-Habitat, with assistance from Monitoring and Evaluation Unit
Location:	Global
Starting date:	Mid-June 2009
Remuneration:	Negotiable
Summary of task:	To conduct a Mid-Term Evaluation of GLTN.

1. PURPOSE

The Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) was launched in 2006, and the second phase of GLTN will end in 2011. The main purpose of the Evaluation is to inform decision making for the remaining period of the second phase. More specifically, the Evaluation results will be utilized:

- By donors for accountability purposes and as a basis for future funding decisions
- As a learning process for UN-Habitat and partners, for consolidating lessons learned and for shaping new strategies for GLTN future, in particular, and for land sector interventions in general

In April 2007, the Medium-Term Institutional and Strategic Plan (2008-2013) for UN-Habitat was adopted, with a Focus Area 3 related to pro-poor land and housing. The assessment of GLTN aims to constitute a building block in the overall assessment of the implementation of Focus Area 3, as well as inform progress in Focus Area 6 (Excellence in Management) regarding institutional and management arrangements for GLTN.

2. BACKGROUND OF THE INTERVENTION

The overall goal of GLTN is poverty alleviation through land reform, improved land management and security of tenure, the GLTN partners have identified and agreed upon the 18 key land tools which need to be addressed in order to deal with poverty and land issues at the country level, across all regions. GLTN has focused on four key dimensions to achieve its goal: knowledge management, advocacy, tool development and capacity-building and GLTN institutional capacity. For more details, please see Attachment 1.

The GLTN has developed a global partnership on land issues pulling together global partners, as well as many individual members. These partners include international networks of civil society, International Finance Institutions, international research and training institutions, donors and professional bodies. It aims to take a more holistic approach to land issues by improving global coordination on land; through the establishment of a continuum of land rights, rather than just focus on individual land titling; through improving and developing pro-poor land management, as well as land tenure tools; by unblocking existing initiatives; assisting in strengthening existing land networks; assisting in the development of gendered land tools which are affordable and useful to the grassroots;

and improving the general dissemination of knowledge about how to implement security of tenure. More information: www.gltn.net.

Initial activities including design phase and partnership building has started as early as last quarter of 2004 but GLTN was finally launched in June 2006 with a 2008-2011 complete project documentation including estimated budget and donors' contribution through a basket funding approach. For more details, see Attachment 2.

3. SCOPE

The evaluation will cover the period since its June 2006 launching up to the present on a global level.

While the assessment is expected to focus on the achievements of outcomes and assess GLTN according to the standard assessment criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and to some extent impact and sustainability, a particular attention should be given to:

- Achievement in influencing a paradigm shift towards pro-poor land policies and tools;
- Engagement of global partners and sustaining its network;
- Effectiveness of current institutional and management arrangements of GLTN;
- Assessment of GLTN in relation to other similar global land programmes; and
- Assessment of the performance of the GLTN Secretariat in relation to other global actors in the related field.

4. CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The Evaluation criteria with the illustrative questions will include, but not limited to, the following:

- Relevance—How relevant is the GLTN work with regards to the UN goals, UN HABITAT's MTSIP and cross-sectoral issues, and land sector agenda at global and national level?

- Efficiency—What is GLTN's efficiency level in delivering its expected outputs? How do partners, donors and key stakeholders perceive GLTN efficiency? What are the underlying factors that facilitate or inhibit efficiency in GLTN. How feasible are current management (including finance and procurement) and institutional arrangements? What changes, if any, need to be undertaken to strengthen management and institutional arrangements including the International Advisory Board (IAB) and Steering Committee (SC)?
- Effectiveness—How effective is GLTN in achieving the LFA targets particularly on outcomes, outputs and indicators; How effective is GLTN's strategies and efforts in delivering its core messages and objectives externally and internally (within UN-Habitat)? How partners do perceived GLTN's effectiveness in the delivery of its planned outputs and activities? How effective is GLTN in engaging partners, other UN-Habitat units and key stakeholders into its core objectives and principles? What are the underlying factors that facilitate or inhibit effectiveness of GLTN? How effective is GLTN in managing partnerships? How does GLTN engage partners, build relations with partners and strengthen partnerships? How is GLTN able to sustain partnerships? How do partners contribute to the achievement of the expected outcomes of GLTN? What are the underlying factors that facilitate or inhibit GLTN partners in contributing to its expected outcomes? How effective is the current decision-making structure (i.e. IAB, SC) and processes and how they are contributing to GLTN in achieving results? How effective is the performance of GLTN and GLTN Secretariat in comparison to other similar global initiatives.
- Impact—What are the impacts so far of GLTN, if any? Has GLTN contributed to a paradigm shift in how land is addressed in the global discourse? Given its present situation and challenges, what is the likelihood that

GLTN will contribute to positive impacts?

- Sustainability—If positive results are identified as a result of GLTN, how likely are they to be sustainable? Will the GLTN network continue, if GLTN, as hosted by UN-Habitat was discontinued?
- Cross-cutting measures—How effective is GLTN in ensuring that cross-cutting concerns such as gender and grassroots engagement are incorporated in all its efforts? How can this be further improved?

The above list of Assessment criteria and illustrative questions are only for guidance and the Consultant is encouraged to pursue related questions when relevant.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS

After careful analysis of the findings possibly with discussions with key stakeholders, lessons and recommendations need to be put forward. A thorough discussion of the lessons learned based on key findings is required.

Proposed recommendations need to be timed (immediate, mid-term and long-term) with clear responsibilities and estimated resources, if applicable.

6. METHODOLOGY

The consultant is expected to outline the details of their proposed methodology in the Inception Report. It is anticipated that the evaluation will be organized into successive and partially overlapping phases focusing on:

- Document review and analysis,
- Interviews with key stakeholders, both through face-to-face in Nairobi and via by telephone/email, and
- Review of the development of selected tools.

The Evaluation will be independent according to United Nations Evaluation Group Norms and Standards. The involvement of the M & E Unit in all steps of the evaluation will facilitate an independent and impartial process. GLTN Secretariat will provide over-all assistance to facilitate the performance of the tasks.

7. WORK PLAN AND SCHEDULE

Output /Activity	Responsibility	Estimated No. of Days
Inception Report (including desk study)	Evaluation Expert	14 days
Presentation of Inception Report (including interviews with partners in UN-Nairobi and Kenyan government)	Evaluation Expert (With some support from GLTN secretariat on arrangements and schedule)	12 days
Draft Final Report (including results of the interviews with other partners)	Evaluation Expert	62 days
Presentation of Draft Final Report	Evaluation Expert (With some support from GLTN secretariat on arrangements)	3 days
Final Report incorporating comments and other requirements	Evaluation Expert	14 days
No. of days of inputs (Est.)		105 days

At least two visits to Nairobi are foreseen, for the presentation of the Inception report (including interviews), and for the presentation of the draft report.

8. PRODUCTS AND REPORTING

The Consultants should produce the following deliverables:

- **Inception report (First payment = 20 per cent)**—the inception report (*maximum of 25 pages, main report only*) which includes proposed detailed methodology, assessment criteria/questions and work plan, among others, should be made available to the GLTN Secretariat two weeks upon signing of the contract. A soft copy should be emailed to clarissa.augustinus@unhabitat.org and/or danilo.antonio@unhabitat.org. During stay in Nairobi, presentation of inception report and interviews with partners are expected. GLTN Secretariat will consolidate comments and will send within five (5) working days after the last presentation/discussion of the Inception report.
- **Draft final report (Second payment = 50 per cent)**. The draft final report (*maximum of 35 pages, main report only*) should be made available to the GLTN Secretariat within two (2) months from the submission of the inception report and at least one (1) week before the agreed date of presentation of the draft report. A soft copy should be emailed to clarissa.augustinus@unhabitat.org and/or danilo.antonio@unhabitat.org. After receiving the report, GLTN Secretariat will get back to the consultants on the timing and place of the presentation of the draft final report with key stakeholders. GLTN secretariat will send consolidated comments within seven (7) working days after the presentation/meeting. The report requirements are described in Attachment 3.
- **Final report (Final payment = 30 per cent)** - The consultant will have two weeks to incorporate the comments on the draft final report and send the final report to the GLTN Secretariat. A soft copy should be emailed to clarissa.augustinus@unhabitat.org and/or danilo.antonio@unhabitat.org. After receiving the report, the GLTN Secretariat will send its final comments, if any, within seven

working days. The consultant should make the necessary changes within one week and send the final report to the GLTN Secretariat. The final report should be accompanied with a brief presentation of key findings using Microsoft Power Point as well as a brief web statement (see Attachment 3).

GLTN Secretariat/Land, Tenure and Property Administration Section (LTPAS) of UN-Habitat with the assistance from the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit will review the reports with other partners and stakeholders, including the International Advisory Board (IAB) and the Steering Committee of GLTN and approve the deliverables, as appropriate.

9. QUALIFICATIONS/COMPETENCIES/ EXPERIENCES

The **Evaluation Expert** should have the following competencies and experiences:

- At least a master's degree in a relevant discipline;
- Extensive experience on programme, thematic and strategic evaluation;
- Proven experience in evaluation of partnerships;
- Experience in reviews of programme and operations management;
- Experience and understanding of development trends on global issues on both urban and rural lands particularly on security of tenure is highly desirable; Without this experience, the evaluation expert may get inputs from a land expert for limited number of days (inclusive to his/her estimated number of days of inputs) and he/she should specify this in his/her proposal;
- Knowledge of the dynamics of a highly complex environment such as land is preferred;
- Excellent drafting and editing skills;
- Excellent in English writing skills is required; and

- Previous work experience for the UN systems is highly desirable.

The evaluators are required to disclose in writing any past experiences, of themselves or their immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise. The evaluators are also required to familiarize themselves with the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system and the United Nations Evaluation Group Norms and Standards.

10. APPLICATION

Interested applicants should send (email preferred):

- Motivation letter (technical proposal) specifying the post.
- Curriculum Vitae
- Financial proposal (e.g. consultation fees, no. of days required, etc.)
- At least two samples of evaluation reports undertaken in the last five (5) years

Application should be sent to (email preferred):

GLTN Secretariat/ Shelter Branch, Global Division,
UN-Habitat
P.O. Box 30030, Nairobi 00100 Kenya
Tel: +254-20 762 3858/3116/4652
Fax: +254-20 7624265
Email: gltn@unhabitat.org; or danilo.antonio@unhabitat.org

The application deadline is **5th May 2009**.

ANNEX II: INCEPTION REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

The following represents the Inception Report of the Evaluation Consultant in preparation for the GLTN Mid-Term Evaluation. It is based on an initial review of several key documents in particular the GLTN Project Document, the Annual Report Year 2008 and revised GLTN Logframe 2008-2011 (as of 17 February 2009). The Consultant has also talked briefly by phone to a key GLTN staff member⁵⁴ and reviewed a variety of other documents, newsletters and the GLTN website. However, the document review is ongoing and will be guided by discussions with GLTN during the assessment advising the Evaluation Consultant and Land Expert of the key documents to be considered.

This Inception Report proposes an evaluation strategy, the evaluation methodology, evaluation indicators (both quantitative and qualitative), the questions for each key group of stakeholders, and a work plan and schedule. It considers the various objectives of the Mid-Term Evaluation, the variety of the stakeholders involved, the GLTN design and logframe and the methods that are feasible. It is the understanding of the Evaluation Consultant that the Inception Report will be the basis of discussions with GLTN and UN-Habitat early in the evaluation process to ensure there is clarity and agreement on the objectives of the evaluation, the key areas of concern, the methodology and the broad contents of the ensuing evaluation report.

A draft Inception Report was presented to key UN-Habitat and GLTN Secretariat officers in Nairobi on the 4th August 2008 and this final Inception Report incorporates their comments and suggestions.

⁵⁴ Danilo Antonio, in late July 2009.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Evaluation Consultant indicate that the Mid-Term Evaluation will cover the period since the GLTN launch in June 2006 up to the present. The evaluation will use standard DAC evaluation criteria and be a systematic and objective assessment of the GLTN Project, its design, implementation and results. It will aim to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

The TOR require that particular attention should be given to:

- Achievement in influencing a paradigm shift towards pro-poor land policies and tools;
- Engagement of global partners and sustaining its network;
- Effectiveness of current institutional and management arrangements of GLTN;
- Assessment of GLTN in relation to other similar global land programmes; and
- Assessment of the performance of the GLTN Secretariat in relation to other global actors in the related field.

3. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY:

As suggested by the TOR the assessment will be organized into overlapping phases focusing on:

- Document review and analysis,
- Interviews with key stakeholders, both through face-to-face in Nairobi and via by telephone/email, and
- Review of the development of selected tools.

See the Proposed Evaluation Workplan for more details.

While the evaluation will be conducted in an independent and impartial manner, GLTN Secretariat will provide over-all assistance to facilitate the evaluation. It is expected that GLTN will assist in the setting up of meetings and interviews in Nairobi, advise on the selection of the key stakeholders to be consulted (and provide background on the nature of their involvement with the Project), provide contact details for these stakeholders, identify the key documents and land tools upon which to focus the assessment, provide information on Project progress and performance, and website statistics.

Based on DAC evaluation criteria and the suggested emphasis on the evaluation indicated in the TOR, a variety of evaluation approaches and key issues are proposed (Table 1).

TABLE 1: Evaluation approaches and key issues

Evaluation analysis	To investigate	Survey / information collection approach	Key issues to cover
Relevance / Appropriateness	<p>Consistency with UN Goals, UNHABITAT MTSIP & ENOF, UNHABITAT Agenda.</p> <p>Consistency with other land sector initiatives: WB Land Thematic Group's Conceptual Framework for Land Governance; FAO Voluntary Guidelines on Land and Natural Resource Tenure; AU-ECA-AfDB Land Policy Initiative</p>	<p>Review of documentation</p> <p>Review of documentation</p>	<p>Importance of GLTN Project relative to other global initiatives.</p> <p>Any new or revised priorities for land sector by key stakeholders.</p>
	<p>Design clarity/logic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • GLTN logframe 		<p>Upcoming donor activities/intentions.</p>
	<p>Suitability of design as basis for evaluation ("evaluability" assessment).</p> <p>Current and continued relevance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perspectives, • Emerging priorities (GLTN, other land sector agencies, donors) 		<p>Level of coordination with other global and local initiatives – how to better coordinate implementation.</p>
		<p>Review of Project Document and logframe</p>	<p>Does the logframe provide sufficient strategic focus & clarity to guide GLTN? Sufficient basis for results-based management?</p>
			<p>Balance in GLTN design to support implementation at a national level; relative to global support for tool development and advocacy etc</p>
		<p>Consultations with GLTN, UNHABITAT, and representatives from WB, FAO, AU, ECA, AfDB, donors (Meetings in Nairobi, telephone consultations, questionnaires by email with reminders/follow-up)</p>	<p>Are all outputs necessary to achieve the outcomes? Are they sufficient to achieve outcomes?</p> <p>To what extent can progress against logframe indicators be attributed to GLTN activities? (ie issues of attribution)</p>

Evaluation analysis	To investigate	Survey / information collection approach	Key issues to cover
			<p>Are all logframe indicators related to the outcomes concerned? (ie issues of validity/ relevance of indicators)</p> <p>Are development objective, goal and outcomes realistic/ achievable? (within the capacity of GLTN to accomplish?)</p> <p>Balance in the design between flexible implementation and systematic, strategic support? For example, to what extent is there long term planning for tool development/ piloting/implementation for each key tool versus flexible implementation driven by available, capable partners?</p> <p>How to engender ownership of GLTN Project among member states? Implications for sustainability?</p> <p>Are all key design assumptions and risks addressed? What other assumptions inherent in the design should be considered/ investigated? (see later section)</p> <p>Are other qualitative indicators needed? Eg quality of tools, perspectives of stakeholders on usefulness/relevance of tools?</p>
<p>Accomplishment (of planned outputs, activities and targets)</p>	<p>Completion of planned outputs, activities and targets to date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GLTN Annual Plans and Reports <p>Quality of outputs and activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of sample of tools, best practices, evaluations, research (undertaken by GLTN, partners, contractors) • User and training participant perspectives • GLTN, international partner and donor perspectives 	<p>Review of documentation</p> <p>Need criteria for selection of sample for quality assessment.</p> <p>Email questionnaire of training participants.</p> <p>Review of training records and participant ratings.</p> <p>Meetings with Nairobi stakeholders, telephone consultations, email 'aires</p>	<p>Progress and performance against logframe outputs, targets and indicators and planned activities.</p> <p>Quality of tools, best practices, evaluations, research. How practical/applicable/useful?</p> <p>Duration and coverage of training, relevance to training needs, skills attained?</p> <p>Perspectives of usefulness by participants/ stakeholders/users</p>

Evaluation analysis	To investigate	Survey / information collection approach	Key issues to cover
Effectiveness (likely achievement of objectives/outcomes)	<p>Statements of progress and achievements in GLTN Annual Reports etc against each statement of goal and outcome.</p> <p>Perspectives of key stakeholders regarding achievement or likely achievement of goal and outcomes.</p> <p>APs and 6 mthly reports.</p>	<p>Performance data against targets, document reviews of accomplishment and impacts/outcomes.</p> <p>Partly a qualitative assessment of achievement of Goal & Outcomes 1, 2 & 3 with difficulties of verification & attribution.</p> <p>Survey/consultation with representatives from WB, FAO, AU, ECA, AfDB, donors (Meetings in Nairobi, telephone consultations, questionnaires by email with reminders/follow-up)</p>	<p>How effective has GLTN been in achieving planned outcomes?</p> <p>How do partners, and international land sector and development assistance agencies perceive GLTN's effectiveness in achieving planned outcomes?</p> <p>Outcome 1: How effective are the documentation of best practices, evaluations of innovative land programs, and priority research in promoting improved global knowledge?</p> <p>Outcome 2: How effective are GLTN's advocacy strategies and efforts in delivering its core messages externally and internally (within UN-Habitat)? What works best?</p>
		<p>Assessment of effectiveness at a country level – with particular focus on Kenya, Ethiopia and Liberia, Haiti⁵⁵ (Outcome 3) – through meetings, telephone and email consultations</p>	<p>Outcome 3: How effective has GLTN been in strengthening the capacity of countries in land governance, management and administration? What support activities have been most effective? In which countries has capacity-building been most effective? Which tools and guidelines have been (will be) most influential in strengthening capacity? What factors constrain or facilitate the adoption of tools and guidelines?</p>

⁵⁵ Botswana is also among the five key countries selected as part of the GLTN country strategy but activity to date has focused on an evaluation of their Tribal Land Registration System; GLTN activity to date has not intended to offer benefits to the country.

Evaluation analysis	To investigate	Survey / information collection approach	Key issues to cover
	<p>Costs and resources of GLTN management and administration relative to Project implementation</p> <p>Perspectives of efficiency by: GLTN, UN-Habitat, donors and partners</p> <p>Comparisons with other similar global initiatives</p> <p>Implementation expenditure and resources for country-level versus global activities</p> <p>Relative contributions of partners in GLTN/joint activities</p>	<p>Review of GLTN budget and expenditure</p> <p>Consultations with GLTN and relevant stakeholders</p> <p>Consultation with WB, FAO, AU-ECA-AfDB etc</p> <p>Review of GLTN budget and expenditure</p> <p>Consultations with partners and review of their budget and expenditure, where possible</p>	<p>Outcome 4:</p> <p>How effective is GLTN in engaging partners, other UN-Habitat units and key stakeholders? What are the underlying factors that facilitate or inhibit effectiveness of GLTN? How effective is GLTN in managing partnerships? How does GLTN engage partners, build relations with partners and strengthen partnerships? How is GLTN able to sustain partnerships? How do partners contribute to the achievement of expected outcomes? What factors facilitate or inhibit GLTN partners in contributing to expected outcomes?</p> <p>How effective is the current decision-making structure (i.e. IAB, SC) and processes? How effective is the performance of GLTN and Secretariat in comparison to other similar global initiatives? What are the major constraints to GLTN capacity – management capacity, structure, resources, skills etc? (see also Efficiency and Project Management) What changes, if any, need to be undertaken to strengthen management & institutional arrangements including the IAB & SC?</p>
Efficiency / cost effectiveness	<p>Costs and resources of GLTN management and administration relative to Project implementation</p> <p>Perspectives of efficiency by: GLTN, UN-Habitat, donors and partners</p> <p>Comparisons with other similar global initiatives</p> <p>Implementation expenditure and resources for country-level versus global activities</p> <p>Relative contributions of partners in GLTN/joint activities</p>	<p>Review of GLTN budget and expenditure</p> <p>Consultations with GLTN and relevant stakeholders</p> <p>Consultation with WB, FAO, AU-ECA-AfDB etc</p> <p>Review of GLTN budget and expenditure</p> <p>Consultations with partners and review of their budget and expenditure, where possible</p>	<p>How efficient is GLTN management and administration? What proportion of total GLTN resources/funds are used for management and administration? What can be done more efficiently?</p> <p>Are there better ways to deliver similar results with fewer resources (or greater results with the same level of resources)?</p> <p>How effective are general global activities (best practices, research, evaluations etc) relative to targeted country engagement? How can success of global activities be measured? Are there more efficient and effective ways to support national implementation or capacity-building?</p> <p>How to promote greater coordination in support to national land governance, management and administration? Success in adding value to existing national programs with limited resources? (and factors in success)</p>

Evaluation analysis	To investigate	Survey / information collection approach	Key issues to cover
Project management and implementation	<p>Administrative systems and procedures for procurement of good and services within GLTN Secretariat, with UNHABITAT PSU, UNON. Steps taken by GLTN to streamline and make more efficient (and steps under MTSIP)</p> <p>Financial management, monitoring and reporting procedures.</p> <p>Procedures for establishing partnerships and resourcing joint activities</p> <p>Typical consultant contracts (eg for research, evaluations etc)</p> <p>GLTN MOUs/agreements with donors</p> <p>Annual workplans and regular reports of achievement and management issues</p> <p>Perspectives of quality of management and management arrangements donors, partners, contractors</p>	<p>Examination of procurement, contracting and partnership models and procedures. Interviews with key stakeholders (GLTN, UNON, UN-Habitat, partners and contractors). Review of steps in processes, number of authorizations, time to complete.</p> <p>Review of financial management, monitoring and reporting procedures</p> <p>Review of agreements/contracts etc.</p> <p>Interviews/survey of donors, partners and contractors for their perspectives of quality of management and management arrangements (in Nairobi, by phone, by email)</p>	<p>How well do the project management arrangements operate? Can management and institutional arrangements be streamlined or made more efficient and effective?</p> <p>How efficient and timely are procedures for contracting goods and services? And for financial management?</p> <p>Quality of M&E systems and procedures? Suitability of indicators and targets in logframe for measuring progress and evaluating performance and impacts? Are standard annual targets appropriate? Is the level of targets appropriate for the value of the GLTN Project and the resources expended in implementation? Is information collected on logframe indicators?</p> <p>Effectiveness of annual planning process and quality of annual plans? (Does the logframe provide sufficient strategic focus, and do annual workplans support systematic implementation of this strategy?)</p> <p>How effective are the initiatives to promote greater grassroots involvement in Project implementation?</p> <p>How effective is management and coordination between GLTN Nairobi office and activities being implemented at national level (eg in Kenya, Ethiopia and Liberia)</p>

Evaluation analysis	To investigate	Survey / information collection approach	Key issues to cover
Outcomes / Likely impacts	<p>Qualitative assessments of impacts and outcomes presented in GLTN documentation (eg 2008 Annual Report)</p> <p>Validity of attributing quantitative information on outcomes to GLTN</p> <p>Other qualitative and quantitative indicators of outcomes/ impacts (likely achievement or intermediate outcomes etc)</p>	<p>Qualitative assessment of key outputs and intermediate outcomes can be undertaken.</p> <p>Claims of outcomes (or progress towards them) will be validated.</p> <p>Partners and key stakeholders will be surveyed to establish the extent to which progress and achievement can be attributed to GLTN activities/support.</p> <p>User/stakeholder survey conducted for key land tools, best practices, evaluations, research.</p> <p>Survey of training participants.</p> <p>Survey of international experts, partners and donors.</p>	(See Outcome/Output and Indicator table – Table 2)

Evaluation analysis	To investigate	Survey / information collection approach	Key issues to cover
Sustainability	<p>Breadth, diversity and sustainability of partnerships at international level</p> <p>Growth of membership (and breadth, diversity)</p> <p>Acceptance & promotion of GLTN objectives & outputs by other agencies and partners</p> <p>Widening support and funding from other donors and agencies</p> <p>Expansion of documents uploaded onto website (and diversity of sources). No. of downloads (by document & by type of user).</p> <p>Costs of maintaining GLTN website, possibilities of integrating with other sites in the future</p>	<p>Consultations (phone/email) with key informants, international partners and donors.</p> <p>Other agency use of GLTN outputs (consultations, review of their other agency literature [citations]).</p> <p>Review of GLTN progress in broadening its funding base</p> <p>Website statistics etc.</p>	

The GLTN Logframe 2008-2011 (as of 17 February 2009) proposes quantitative indicators for each of the Project's goal, outcomes and outputs. These indicators are valuable for Project monitoring and for reporting against targets. They are of less value in evaluation where a deeper investigation, analysis and understanding of results, outcomes and impacts is required. Therefore in addition to quantitative indicators a variety of qualitative indicators have been selected to be considered for the evaluation. Methods to collection information or information sources have also been proposed (Table 2: Outcome, Outcome and Indicators for Assessment. This table should be read alongside Table 1 (where it elaborates some of the key issues to be considered in the area of Outcomes and Likely Impacts).

These two tables provide the strategy for the Mid-Term Evaluation and provide a framework for conceptualizing the questions to pose to the variety of GLTN stakeholders.

Table 3 (GLTN stakeholders, consultation methods, and key issues for evaluation) summarizes the approaches and key issues that are proposed for each main stakeholder group.

While this aims to be a systematic and strategic approach to the evaluation there are several issues that will pose a challenge to the conduct of the evaluation:

- The degree of overlap between outcomes and reporting against them – for example some of the same materials and publications can be reported as achievements under Outcomes 1, 2 or 3. Amongst others, this makes evaluation of separate outcomes difficult as well as confusing for respondents.
- Some of the outputs may have made little progress or may no longer be appropriately described (possibly Outputs 2.3, 3.2, 3.3) or there may be new activities that no longer neatly fit the Logframe.
- There are a large array of partners and member organizations involved in different aspects of the Project and consequently a requirement to tailor questions to suit the specific involvement/interests of each (generic questions as below will only provide broad information and may not fully capture key information and lessons). The Evaluation Consultant will need to be briefed on the major activities of key partners and member organizations (prior to interviewing/consulting them).
- The inability to meet directly with the majority of key stakeholders means that the evaluation is reliant on email questionnaires and in some cases telephone discussions/interviews. Response rates for email questionnaires are generally low, and considerable follow-up is necessary. GLTN may need to email a note providing its authorization and encouraging participation.
- The implementation of GLTN country-level activities may be difficult to evaluate in terms of impacts – other than in Kenya – as it is expected to be difficult to capture responses from all key stakeholders.
- Email questionnaires must be short, simple and quick to complete to get a reasonable response rate. Complex issues are very difficult to explore.

TABLE 2: Outcome, output and indicators for evaluation

Outcome/output	Quantitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source	Qualitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source
Outcome 1: (Knowledge management)	No. countries adopting systems to disaggregate gender data on land.	Assessments by GLTN and/or partners.	Perceptions of partners, members and donors on the contribution of GLTN in global knowledge, attitudes and practices towards equitable land rights and tenure security (what impact, what specific areas of KAP, how contributed, what most effective GLTN activities).	Email questionnaire/ telephone interview of partners/members/donors. ⁵⁷
Improved global knowledge to support the realization of equitable land rights	No. countries/partners using or influenced by GLTN gender guidelines, best practices, evaluations and research. No. citations of GLTN materials.	Email questionnaire/ telephone interview of partners/members. ⁵⁶		
		Citation indexes, and review of sample of recent key land documentation.		
Outputs:				
1.1 Select land related best practices documented and disseminated consistent with GLTN values.	No. best practices documented. No. countries/partners using or influenced by these documents. No. of each best practice document downloaded.	GLTN records. Email questionnaire/ telephone interview of partners/members. Website statistics.	Quality of documentation. Perspectives of partners/ members/donors of value/ usefulness of the best practices.	Evaluation team review of sample. Email questionnaire/ telephone interview of partners/members/donors.
1.2 Evaluations carried out of innovative land programmes consistent with GLTN values.	No. evaluations conducted (by type/topic). No. countries/partners using or influenced by these evaluations. No. of each evaluation document downloaded.	GLTN records. Email questionnaire/ telephone interview of partners/members. Website statistics.	Quality of evaluations. Perspectives of partners/ members/donors of value/ usefulness of the evaluations.	Evaluation team review of sample. Email questionnaire/ telephone interview of partners/members/donors.

⁵⁶ Where a partner, member, donor is represented in Nairobi, face-to-face semi-structured interviews will be conducted. Telephone interviews may also be conducted for important partners to ensure their information/perspectives are captured in the evaluation.

⁵⁷ Where a partner, member, donor is represented in Nairobi, face-to-face semi-structured interviews will be conducted. Telephone interviews may also be conducted for important partners to ensure their information/perspectives are captured in the evaluation.

Outcome/output	Quantitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source	Qualitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source
1.3 Priority research carried out addressing critical gaps.	<p>No. research studies conducted and documented.</p> <p>No. countries/partners using or influenced by these documents.</p> <p>No. of each research study downloaded.</p>	<p>GLTN records.</p> <p>Email questionnaire/ telephone interview of partners/members.</p> <p>Website statistics.</p>	<p>Quality of research.</p> <p>Perspectives of partners/ members/donors of value/ usefulness of the research.</p>	<p>Evaluation team review of sample.</p> <p>Email questionnaire/ telephone interview of partners/members/ donors.</p>
Outcome 2: (Advocacy) Increased awareness of and commitment to equitable land rights	<p>No. countries undertaking pro-poor land reforms, and/or other steps to promote equitable land rights.</p> <p>No. countries/partners influenced by GLTN advocacy.</p>	<p>Assessments by GLTN and/or partners.</p> <p>Email questionnaire/ telephone interview of partners/members.</p>	<p>Level of awareness by key land experts/organizations, NGOs, national land agencies and policy makers, land administration and management projects, and donors of the key materials produced under the GLTN Project.</p> <p>Changes in awareness resulting GLTN from advocacy activities (how changed, why, what most effective for advocacy, future impacts of change in awareness).</p> <p>Perspectives of the effectiveness of GLTN advocacy methods and materials (by participants/ recipients/ partners/ members/ donors etc).</p>	<p>Email questionnaire of the key stakeholders.</p> <p>(As above)</p> <p>Email questionnaire/ telephone interview of participants to meetings and forums (plus of partners/ members/ donors).</p>

Outcome/output	Quantitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source	Qualitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>2.1 Priority advocacy materials identified, produced and disseminated.</p>	<p>No. materials produced by type/topic (for whom).</p> <p>No. downloads for each type of material where loaded on website.</p>	<p>GLTN records.</p> <p>Website statistics</p>	<p>Perspectives of key stakeholders on the value/usefulness of sample of specific materials (from those who have received/downloaded the materials), their intentions (will these materials change anything?)</p>	<p>Email survey of stakeholders</p>
<p>2.2 Forums used for advocacy and exposure to equitable land rights.</p>	<p>No. forums etc where GLTN participated (by type of forum, nature of GLTN participation).</p> <p>No. participants by organization/country.</p>	<p>GLTN records.</p>	<p>Participant perceptions of the effectiveness of each GLTN presentation etc, and whether it may result in any changes.</p>	<p>Informal discussions with a small sample of participants to the most important forums (if possible).</p>
<p>2.3 Global monitoring mechanism developed and piloted to assess security of tenure in select countries.</p>	<p>Monitoring mechanism developed and tested.</p> <p>No. countries testing/adopting these monitoring procedures</p>	<p>GLTN records.</p> <p>GLTN or partner records.</p>	<p>Nature of monitoring mechanism (what is being monitored, accuracy of data, consistency of methods).</p> <p>Perceptions of the value of information generated (who uses, how used).</p>	<p>(Note: the evaluation may instead look at GLTN progress to support other initiatives in global land indicator development)⁵⁸</p>

⁵⁸ The statement describing this output may need to be changed to better reflect GLTN's activities in this area.

Outcome/output	Quantitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source	Qualitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source
Outcome 3: (Tool development and capacity-building) Strengthened capacity to enhance quality of land governance, management and administration through pro poor gendered land tools on training activities	No. land tools developed (by type/topic) No. countries piloting and/or adopting land tools (by type of tool). No. training courses designed (by topic, type, etc). No. training events organized/funded by GLTN by topic, type and duration of training. No. participants trained (by sex, country, organization etc).	GLTN records. GLTN records, plus email questionnaire/ telephone interview of partners/ members. GLTN records. GLTN records. GLTN records.	Changes/impacts/reforms resulting from land tool development, training, and/or national land strategy development. Awareness and perspectives of key land experts/ organizations, NGOs, national land agencies and policy makers, land administration and management projects, and donors of the tools (incl. usefulness). Quality of training, participant selection, new skills/ knowledge gained, use of skills etc at the workplace, impact of training.	Email questionnaire of the key stakeholders who have downloaded/received/tested/ applied the tool, attended the training, or were aware of their country strategy. Email questionnaire/phone interviews.
Outputs: 3.1 Priority land tools developed, piloted and disseminated.	No. land tools developed (by type/topic) No. countries piloting and/or adopting land tools (by type of tool).	GLTN records. GLTN records, plus email questionnaire/ telephone interview of partners/ members	Awareness and perspectives of key land experts/ organizations, NGOs, national land agencies and policy makers, land administration and management projects, and donors of the tools (incl. usefulness).	Email questionnaire/phone interviews.

Outcome/output	Quantitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source	Qualitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source
3.2 Country level strategies developed.	No. country strategies developed (by country). No. strategies implemented and stage of implementation.	GLTN records. GLTN records, plus email questionnaire/ telephone interview of partners.	Nature of strategy. Ownership of strategy by national agencies. What accomplished in strategy. Quality of implementation. Impacts/outcomes to date. Perceptions of stakeholders.	Review of documented strategies. Discussions with GLTN staff. Email questionnaire/phone interviews ⁵⁹ covering one or two countries where most progress has been made. (Assessment to be dependent on progress).
3.3 Country level base line data (prior to tool development) compiled and disseminated for select countries.	No. countries where baseline data has been compiled.	GLTN records.	Nature of data that has been compiled. Quality of data/ usefulness.	(Assessment to be dependent on progress).
3.4 Strengthened donor coordination of the land sector in select countries.	No. countries where GLTN/ UNHABITAT has attempted to promote donor coordination. No. donor coordination meetings conducted in each country (per year)	GLTN/UNHABITAT records. GLTN/UNHABITAT or partner records.	Nature of coordination. Success of coordination (what has been accomplished). Level of participation by major donors and their opinions. Sustainability of these mechanisms without UNHABITAT.	Email questionnaire/ telephone interviews of key donor representatives in a small sample of countries (emphasis to learn lessons)

⁵⁹ Face-to-face semi structured interviews may be possible in Kenya.

Outcome/output	Quantitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source	Qualitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source
3.5 Strengthened capacity at global, regional and national levels to implement pro poor land programmes.	No. generic pro-poor guides/guidelines developed (by topic).	GLTN records.	Changes/impacts/reforms resulting from guidelines and training etc.	Email questionnaire of the key stakeholders who have downloaded/received/tested/applied guidelines, or attended training courses.
	No. countries/agencies using these guidelines (by topic).	GLTN records, plus email questionnaire/ telephone interview of partners/ members.	Awareness and perspectives of key land experts/ organizations, NGOs, regional bodies, national land agencies and policy makers, land administration and management projects, and donors of the guides/guidelines (incl. usefulness).	Email questionnaire/phone interviews.
	No. training courses designed (by topic, type, etc).	GLTN records.		
	No. training events organized/ funded by GLTN by topic, type and duration of training.	GLTN records.		
	No. participants trained (by sex, country, organization etc).	GLTN records.		
	No. participants using these skills/knowledge at their workplace.	GLTN records.		Quality of training, participant selection, new skills/ knowledge gained, use of skills etc at the workplace, impact of training.
Outcome 4: (GLTN institutional capacity)	No. and proportion of planned targets and activities successfully accomplished.	Email questionnaire of training participants. GLTN records and interviews with staff.		Email questionnaire/ telephone interview of training participants.
Strengthened GLTN institutional capacity to carry out equitable land rights	No. GLTN funded activities implemented by partners. Level and diversity of donor funds. Percentage of planned fund disbursement (each period). Appropriate management systems in place for: strategic and annual planning, M&E, HRM&D, financial management, procurement, asset management etc.	GLTN records and interviews with staff. GLTN financial records. GLTN financial records. Review of management systems and documented procedures.	Quality of planning and M&E systems and procedures. Stakeholder perceptions of constraints to GLTN capacity – management capacity, structure, resources, skills etc. Perceptions of stakeholders of the changes, if any, needed to strengthen management and institutional arrangements including the International Advisory Board (IAB) and Steering Committee (SC).	Review of planning and M&E systems. Interviews with SC, GLTN staff, UNHABITAT, UNON, donors and other key stakeholders in Nairobi (supplemented by email questionnaires of other stakeholders including IAB members).

Outcome/output	Quantitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source	Qualitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source
Outputs: 4.1 Strengthened network of members and partners.	No. of partners and members (by type, level and nature of participation). No. countries represented. No. key land sector organizations and experts etc represented/not represented.	Websites statistics and GLTN records (eg newsletter mailing list). As above. As above and comparisons with memberships of other land sector groups/networks.	Level of activity/involvement of partners and members in the network. Level of 'ownership' of the network and GLTN tools/outputs by the partners. Evidence of networking amongst partners/members outside that orchestrated directly by GLTN. Use of the network by other agencies. Clear and shared objectives for the network among partners/members. Sustainability of network.	Interviews with SC, GLTN staff and the IAB. Email questionnaires of partners. (As above) Discussions with GLTN. Email questionnaires of partners.
4.2 Efficient and effective project and financial management at the Secretariat level.	No. and proportion of planned targets and activities successfully accomplished. Project management manual/ procedures developed (incl procurement, financial management, asset management etc) Percent of procurement and financial payments to schedule or standard.	GLTN records. Review of project management systems, procedures, manuals etc. Procurement and financial records.	Perspectives of efficiency and effectiveness in financial management and procurement by key stakeholders. Recommendations to improve systems and procedures (eg streamlining of transaction steps and authorities, delegation of responsibilities, raising of financial approval limits, improved records/reports and monitoring etc)	Email questionnaires of partners, and discussion with GLTN/ UNHABITAT Interviews with SC, GLTN staff, UNHABITAT, UNON etc in Nairobi.

Outcome/output	Quantitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source	Qualitative Indicator	Evaluation Method/Source
4.3 System of quality control developed for network activities and outputs.	<p>QA system adopted and in place.</p> <p>M&E procedures include assessment of quality.</p> <p>No. quality assessments conducted; no. activities/outputs covered.</p>	<p>Review of QA system and associated documentation.</p> <p>Review of M&E practices and procedures.</p> <p>GLTN records and review of assessments.</p>	Perceptions of GLTN SC/IAB/ staff, network members and partners of QA system.	Interviews and email questionnaire with stakeholders.

TABLE 3: GLTN stakeholders, consultation methods, and key issues for evaluation

Stakeholder	Consultation method	Key issues
GLTN SC and staff	Direct discussions in Nairobi (with some telephone discussions for key staff who are absent)	<p>Relevance/appropriateness of Project design.</p> <p>Relevance/appropriateness of Project design.</p> <p>Progress, performance, issues and constraints.</p> <p>Effectiveness in achieving objectives/outcomes (or likelihood).</p> <p>Efficiency including Project management.</p> <p>Constraints facing Project management and implementation – appropriateness of management structures and functions.</p> <p>Effectiveness of the IAB.</p> <p>Most important actual/potential outcomes/impacts from GLTN perspectives.</p> <p>Use of outputs by partners, members, land agencies. Sustainability and strategies to promote sustainability of benefits/outcomes.</p> <p>Emerging priorities in the land sector.</p> <p>Recommendations/lessons for the future.</p>
UN-Habitat and UNON	Direct discussions in Nairobi (with some telephone discussions for key staff who are absent).	<p>Relevance/appropriateness of Project design.</p> <p>Relevance/appropriateness of Project design.</p> <p>Consistency with UN Goals, UN-Habitat MTSIP & ENOF.</p> <p>Most important potential outcomes/impacts from their perspectives.</p> <p>Effectiveness in achieving objectives/outcomes (or likelihood).</p> <p>Constraints/issues facing Project management and implementation.</p> <p>Roles they play in GLTN management, administration and implementation.</p> <p>Efficiency and effectiveness of management and administrative arrangements.</p> <p>Financial management and procurement procedures.</p> <p>M&E system and procedures during implementation and for evaluation at completion.</p> <p>Recommendations to improve Project efficiency and effectiveness.</p>

Stakeholder	Consultation method	Key issues
International Advisory Board	Telephone discussions with those members not present in Nairobi	<p>Relevance/appropriateness of Project design.</p> <p>Relevance/appropriateness of Project design.</p> <p>Importance of GLTN Project relative to other global initiatives.</p> <p>Level of coordination with other global and local initiatives – how to better coordinate.</p> <p>Most important potential outcomes/impacts from their perspectives.</p> <p>Efficiency and effectiveness of management and administrative arrangements – appropriateness of management structures and functions.</p> <p>Effectiveness of the SC and of the relationship between the IAB and SC.</p> <p>Planning and M&E systems, procedures and associated reports –getting the right information?</p> <p>Recommendations to improve Project management, efficiency and effectiveness.</p>
Partners	<p>Telephone discussions with key partners.</p> <p>Simple email questionnaires for other partners.</p> <p>(Where possible, targeted to the specific involvement of each partner in GLTN)</p>	<p>Relevance/appropriateness of Project design.</p> <p>Importance of GLTN Project relative to other global initiatives.</p> <p>Level of coordination with other global and local initiatives – how to better coordinate.</p> <p>Nature of their involvement with GLTN Project and network.</p> <p>Outcomes and benefits of their GLTN involvement for their own agencies.</p> <p>Respective roles of NGOs, development assistance agencies, professional bodies etc etc in the Network.</p> <p>Strengths, weaknesses and opportunities of GLTN Project and the Network.</p> <p>Most important/useful outputs (documents, forums, training etc) from GLTN Project to date.</p> <p>Most important potential outcomes/impacts for the global land sector from their perspectives.</p> <p>Recommendations/lessons to strengthen GLTN and its effectiveness/ impacts.</p>
Registered members	Simple email questionnaire	<p>Their use of the network and website.</p> <p>Their rating of potential usefulness of downloaded documents.</p> <p>Whether they have actually used any GLTN-sourced materials.</p> <p>How they have used these materials.</p> <p>Recommendations for other materials to be produced and for the website in general.</p> <p>What other internet sites or publications they use for finding land-related information.</p> <p>How they rank the GLTN site relative to other sources.</p>

Stakeholder	Consultation method	Key issues
Participants to GLTN training courses	Simple email questionnaire	<p>Their rating of the quality of training delivery.</p> <p>Their rating of the usefulness of training.</p> <p>Any new skills/knowledge they gained personally.</p> <p>Opportunity to apply these new skills/knowledge in their work (or intentions to). How?</p> <p>Recommendations for other land-related training or for improving GLTN training generally.</p>
Donors	<p>Direct discussions with donor representatives in Nairobi. (Also as members of the IAB or partners – see above)</p> <p>Additional email correspondence and/or telephone discussions (as required).</p>	<p>Awareness of GLTN Project, network, and advocacy activities.</p> <p>Their agency's interest and involvement in land governance, management and administration (pro-poor and gender-appropriate).</p> <p>Effectiveness of GLTN advocacy in terms of their agency.</p> <p>Relevance/appropriateness of the Project (where they are aware of the Project).</p> <p>Importance of GLTN Project relative to other global land initiatives.</p> <p>Level of coordination with other global and local initiatives – how to better coordinate.</p> <p>Strengths, weaknesses and opportunities of GLTN Project and the Network.</p> <p>Most important/useful outputs (documents, forums, training etc) from GLTN Project that they are aware of. Their use of these.</p> <p>Most important potential Project outcomes/impacts for the global land sector from their perspective.</p> <p>Recommendations/lessons to strengthen GLTN and its effectiveness/impacts.</p> <p>Interest in collaborating with GLTN in future.</p>
Kenya DPGL	Direct discussions in Nairobi.	<p>(All the above issues for Partners, plus...)</p> <p>Nature of country-level support from GLTN/UN-Habitat to date.</p> <p>Importance/outcomes of this support. Success to date in adding value to existing Kenyan programs with limited resources (constraints and factors in success).</p> <p>Effectiveness of country strategy, baseline data (participation in, ownership of, strengths/weaknesses etc).</p> <p>Use of other GLTN outputs (tools, guides, training etc) by each partner agency (and value/usefulness).</p> <p>Nature and effectiveness of donor coordination mechanism (who leads, participants, frequency of meetings, outcomes).</p> <p>Recommendations for future GLTN/UN-Habitat support to Kenyan land governance, management and administration.</p> <p>Sustainability of outcomes and benefits.</p>

Stakeholder	Consultation method	Key issues
International land-related agencies, bodies who are not partners/ members	Email correspondence and/or telephone discussions	<p>Awareness of GLTN Project, network, and advocacy activities.</p> <p>Relevance/appropriateness of the Project (where they are aware of the Project).</p> <p>Importance of GLTN Project relative to their own and other global/ regional land initiatives.</p> <p>Their agency's coordination with other global and local initiatives.</p> <p>Their use of GLTN outputs (documents, forums, training etc). The value of these.</p> <p>Interest in becoming a member or partner (if not a member, why not).</p> <p>Strengths, weaknesses and opportunities of GLTN Project and the network.</p> <p>Recommendations/lessons to strengthen GLTN and its effectiveness/ impacts.</p>

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Building on Tables 1, 2 and 3 draft checklists of questions have been developed to be used in semi-structured interviews (face-to-face or by telephone). These are broken into subjects. Not all subjects nor questions within a subject area will be applicable to all stakeholders.

As such these must not be considered as formal questionnaires but rather checklists to guide discussions. These will be refined in Nairobi after discussions with GLTN and will be improved based initial experience in using them.

General questions for a variety of stakeholders: (Note these are not to be asked verbatim, are not necessarily in order, and will not all be asked to all stakeholders but are to guide interviews and discussions. The choice of questions will be determined by the type of stakeholder and the nature of their involvement with GLTN).

Relevance and appropriateness of the Project:

Background: Your involvement with GLTN, your awareness of its program?

Importance of GLTN Project and its objectives relative to other global initiatives? Most important of GLTN activities/objectives?

Are GLTN priorities appropriate, do they accord with your agency's own priorities, are there other priorities that should be addressed in global initiatives to reform land governance, management and administration?

Are land tools the key constraint to pro-poor reform in land governance, management and administration?

Has GLTN contributed to a change in how land is addressed in the global discourse?

What is your opinion of the balance in the GLTN design between global support for knowledge development and advocacy, and its activities at a national level to support pro-poor land programs? How effective are general global activities relative to targeted country engagement? How can success of global activities be measured? Are there more efficient and effective ways to support national implementation or capacity-building?

How well does GLTN project sit with other global and regional land initiatives? Is there any overlap/duplication of effort? How effective is coordination? Do you have recommendations to improve coordination?

Design logic and clarity: (many of these questions only for those stakeholders with intimate knowledge of GLTN design – some relate to GLTN only)

Does the logframe provide sufficient strategic focus and clarity to guide GLTN? Is it sufficient basis for results-based management? Is there a clear distinction between Outcomes 1, 2 and 3 (for example, with regards to the materials produced under each)?

Are all outputs necessary to achieve the outcomes? Are they sufficient to achieve outcomes?

To what extent can progress against logframe indicators be attributed to GLTN activities? (ie issues of attribution)

Are all logframe indicators related to the outcomes concerned? (ie issues of validity/ relevance of indicators)

Is there also a need to consider qualitative indicators (eg perspectives of users on the value and appropriateness of tools)?

Are development objective, goal and outcomes realistic/ achievable? (within the capacity of GLTN to accomplish?)

Is there an appropriate balance in the design between flexible implementation and systematic, strategic support? (For example, to what extent is there systematic planning for tool development/ piloting/implementation for each key tool, versus flexible implementation of the tools program driven by the availability of willing and capable partners?)

Management of GLTN and the Project: (for selected stakeholders only)

How effective is the performance of GLTN and GLTN Secretariat in comparison to other similar global initiatives?

How effective is the current decision-making structure (i.e. IAB, SC)?

What, if any, could be changed to strengthen management and institutional arrangements?

What are the major constraints to GLTN capacity – management capacity, structure, resources, skills etc?

How efficient is GLTN management and administration? What proportion of total GLTN resources/funds are used for management and administration (versus operations/implementation activities)? What can be done more efficiently?

Are there better ways to deliver similar results with fewer resources (or greater results with the same level of resources)?

How efficient and timely are procedures for contracting goods and services? And for financial management?

How effective are M&E systems and procedures? Does the information generated and reports produced provide sufficient information for management, donors, implementing partners and other key stakeholders? Suitability of indicators and targets in logframe for measuring progress and evaluating performance and impacts? Are standard annual targets appropriate? Is the level of targets appropriate for the value of the GLTN Project and the resources expended in implementation?

How effective is the annual planning process and the quality of annual plans to guide annual implementation? (Does the logframe provide sufficient strategic focus, and do annual workplans

support systematic implementation of this strategy?)

How effective are the initiatives to promote greater grassroots involvement in Project implementation?

How effective is management and coordination between GLTN Nairobi office and activities being implemented at national level (eg in Kenya, Ethiopia and Liberia)

Effectiveness / Outcomes / Likely impacts:

Background: your awareness of the advocacy efforts, land tools, best practices, evaluations, research, training etc implemented through the GLTN Project?

What is your opinion on the quality of tools, best practices, evaluations, research? Which are you familiar with? How practical/applicable/useful? Have you downloaded any materials from the GLTN website? How many/ Which ones? Sourced any GLTN documentation any other way? (How) Have you used any of this documentation? How? Experience?

What is your perspective of GLTN performance in terms of each of the four Project outcomes:

Outcome 1: Knowledge management

How effective has GLTN been in promoting improved global knowledge through its documentation of best practices, evaluations of innovative land programs, and priority research?

Has GLTN influenced global knowledge, attitudes and practices towards equitable land rights and tenure security (how, what impacts, what specific areas of KAP, what have been the most effective GLTN activities in this area).

Have you read any of the best practice documentation, evaluations and research produced under GLTN (provide a list of titles)? (If yes) which? What has been your impression of the quality of these papers? Their value to global knowledge, their usefulness? Have you or your organization been influenced by any of this documentation? In what way?

Outcome 2: Advocacy

Have you seen any of the key advocacy materials produced under the GLTN Project (provide a list) or attended any events or forums where GLTN has presented or contributed? (If yes) which?

Do you think these materials and presentations etc have increased awareness or commitment to equitable land rights? (elaborate how, what strategy most effective for advocacy). Have they changed your own awareness or perspective on necessary actions and/or reforms? How?

Do you have any recommendations on ways to strengthen GLTN's advocacy effort and outcomes?

Of those materials you have read, what is your opinion of their value/usefulness? Have you or your organization been influenced by any of these materials? In what way?

Are you aware of GLTN's efforts to support global and regional land indicator development and monitoring frameworks?

(If yes) how effective has been this support? Has any of this work been tested and piloted at the country level? Where? What is the nature of the monitoring mechanisms (what is being monitored, who is undertaking this work, are there issues with accuracy

of data, consistency of methods). What are your perceptions of the value of this work? (Who will be the major users of this information, how will it be used)?

Outcome 3: Tool development and capacity-building

How effective has GLTN been in strengthening the capacity of countries in land governance, management and administration – specifically in the development of pro-poor, gender-appropriate land tools and capacitating key actors to use them?

Have you read any of the land tools developed with the support of GLTN (provide a list of titles)? (If yes) which? What has been your impression of the value of these tools, their usefulness? Have you or your organization used or promoted any of these tools? Describe how, results etc?

Which of these tools have the greatest potential for strengthening land governance, management and administration?

What factors constrain or facilitate the adoption of tools and guidelines? Are there any other areas that you think should be a priority for GLTN to support in terms of tools?

Are you aware or have you been involved in GLTN support activities at the country level? (If yes), which countries, what activities etc? Was a situation analysis conducted and/or baseline information collected? (By whom? Ownership? What data collected? Quality/value/importance of these?). Was a national level strategy and program developed subsequently? (By whom? Ownership? Quality of strategy? Implementation?) Has this national-level capacity-building been effective? Why/why not? Have you observed any changes/ impacts/ reforms resulting from land tool development, training, and/or national land strategy development.

Have you or your organization been involved in donor coordination in the land sector? (If yes) nature of coordination, what agency led this coordination, role of UN-Habitat, success of this coordination (what has been accomplished)? How has been the level of participation by major donors? Would these efforts continue without the involvement of UN-Habitat?

Have you or any members of your organization participated in any training organized by GLTN? (If yes) What training, when, where, duration? What is your impression of the quality of training, participant selection? What if any new skills/ knowledge were gained? Have you or your organization been able to use any of these skills/knowledge? How? Overall impact of training?

Have you or your agency read or used any of the GLTN/UN-Habitat guides/guidelines (eg Natural Disaster Guidelines, Rental Housing Guide – provide full list)? What is your impression of the value of these, their usefulness? Have you or your organization used or promoted any of these? Describe how, results etc?

Outcome 4: GLTN institutional capacity

How effective is GLTN in engaging partners? How effective is GLTN in engaging partners and managing and sustaining partnerships? What do you think is the importance of partners in the success of the GLTN Project? What factors contribute to successful partnerships and maximizing their contribution to the success of the Project? What factors inhibit the contribution of partners?

What do think is the level of 'ownership' of the network and GLTN tools/outputs by the partners? Do you believe there are clear and

shared objectives for the network among partners/members? Is there any evidence of networking amongst partners/members outside that orchestrated directly by GLTN? Have other agencies used the network? (If yes), which agencies, when? what for? outcome?

To what extent do you think the network can be largely self-sustaining beyond the Project? What external support may be needed?

Are you aware of any constraints to GLTN capacity to achieve its core objectives and implement the Project – management capacity, structure, resources, skills etc.

(For selected informants only)

What, if any, changes could you recommend to strengthen management and institutional arrangements of GLTN including the International Advisory Board (IAB) and Steering Committee (SC).

What are your perspectives on: GLTN structure and staffing levels, resources and skills; the quality of planning and M&E systems and procedures; efficiency and effectiveness in financial management and procurement; HRM&D systems and procedures? Do you have any recommendations to improve systems and procedures

(eg streamlining of transaction steps and authorities, delegation of responsibilities, raising of financial approval limits, improved records/reports and monitoring etc)

Are you aware of the (proposed) GLTN quality control mechanism? What are your thoughts on this system and the need/benefits?

Sustainability:

Do you believe such a project should be continued beyond 2011? Why/why not?

Do you think there is/will be donor interest in supporting GLTN into the future?

Do you have any recommendations to sustain key outputs and outcomes that have been/will be achieved by GLTN?

What would be the possibilities of integrating GLTN outputs (and key objectives) into other global programs should future funding not be assured?

(For GLTN/UNHABITAT)

Is there a sustainability strategy (or plans to develop one) to ensure key activities that will promote sustainability are incorporated into annual workplans.

In addition to the checklists provided above, several short email questionnaires will be developed covering, for example, registered members of GLTN, training participants to selected courses, and partners not contacted through telephone interviews. Note that all questionnaires will be accompanied by a letter of explanation.

5. PROPOSED WORKPLAN FOR THE EVALUATION

The following is the proposed workplan for the Mid-Term Evaluation indicating the start and end dates of the key activities and the responsibilities. (Table 5) The key dates and outputs are as follows:

- Draft Inception Report – 31 July
- Draft Report of the Mid-Term Evaluation - 30 September
- Final Report of the Mid-Term Evaluation - 20 November

TABLE 5: Proposed Workplan for the Mid-Term Evaluation

Activity	Start date	End date	Responsibility
Development of evaluation strategy and approaches	18 July	24 July	Evaluation Expert
Development of draft evaluation tools (checklists, questionnaires etc.)	25 July	7 August	Evaluation Expert with input from GLTN/UN-Habitat
Consultation with GLTN on evaluation strategy, evaluation tools and scope of evaluation ⁵⁹	3 August	14 August	Evaluation Expert with input from GLTN
Review of key GLTN documentation	18 July	15 September	Evaluation Expert with input from Land Expert
Data collection, interviews, discussions, and distribution of questionnaires	3 August	21 August	Evaluation Expert
Analysis of questionnaire returns, and other data and information	11 September	20 September	Evaluation Expert
Review of the development of selected tools	12 August	10 September	Evaluation Expert and Land Expert
Documentation of the draft evaluation report	17 August	30 September	Evaluation Expert with input from Land Expert
Incorporation of comments and other requirements into 2nd draft of the report	12 October	23 October	Evaluation Expert (with input from Land Expert if required)
Presentation of draft report to Secretariat, SC and the IAB	2 November	3 November	Evaluation Expert
Possible presentation of draft report to Partners Meeting	4 November	5 November	Evaluation Expert
Incorporation of comments and other requirements into Final Report	10 November	20 November	Evaluation Expert

⁵⁹ Which tools to review, which key informants to interview by telephone, which countries to focus on etc.

ANNEX III: LIST OF PERSONS CONSULTED

GLTN Secretariat	Clarissa Augustinus
	Danilo Antonio
	Remy Sietchiping
	Mariya Essajee
	Guglielma Da Passano
	Asa Jonsson
	Solomon Haile
	Mary Gachocho
	Humphrey Ngoiya (Consultant)
GLTN Steering Committee	Lars Reutersward
	Mohamed El-Sioufi
	Daniel Lewis
	Alaim Grimard
UN-Habitat	Inga Bjork-Klevby (Deputy Executive Director)
	Gulelat Kebede
	Claudio Acioly
	Bella Evidente
	Asenath Omwega
	Dorothy Mutizwa-Mangiza
UNON	Joerg Weich
	Sousa Jossa
Donors	Mikael Aterhog (SIDA)
	Eric Berg (Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs)
	John Ndiritu (SIDA Nairobi)
International Advisory Board	Klaus Deininger (World Bank)
	Mohamed El-Sioufi
	Stig Enemark (FIG)
	Chris Paresi (ITC)
	Jan Peterson (Huairou Commission)
	Siraj Sait (UEL)

Other GLTN Partners	Clifford Dann (CASLE)
	Joan Kajanwa (AGRA)
	Malcolm Langford (Hakijamii Trust)
	Mika Torhonen (FAO)
Kenya programme stakeholders	Reuben Murugu (Coordinator LRTU)
	Peter Kahuho (Deputy Commissioner, Land)
	Mr Mbaria (Ministry of Lands)
	Ibrahim Mwathane (Private Sector/NSA)

ANNEX IV: QUESTIONNAIRES

A. EMAIL QUESTIONNAIRE TO REGISTERED GLOBAL LAND TOOL NETWORK MEMBERS

Questions on use of GLTN documents and webpage

This is part of an independent Mid-Term Assessment of GLTN that is aiming to investigate the use and usefulness of GLTN documents available on the GLTN webpage among registered users.

Please answer honestly and comprehensively. Your answers are important to us even if you have made little use of your GLTN membership

1. Name:

2. Country:

3. Nature of your employment (*Mark with X as appropriate*)

4. Name of your organization/agency (*if employed*):

5. How long have you been a registered member of GLTN? (*Please complete as appropriate*)

.....months **or** years

6. Have you downloaded any materials from the GLTN website?

(Please circle, highlight or underline) Yes or No

If Yes, which? (Please provide the names of these materials as accurately as possible in the table below). If No, please skip to Q 10.

7. Which have you read? (*Please indicate Yes or No in the below table*)

For each that you have read, please rate its potential usefulness for land governance, management or administration: (1 = not useful, up to 5 = very useful)

Government employee
Private sector employee
International agency
Researcher
Consultant
Student
Other (specify).....

8. Have you used any of these materials? (*Please indicate Yes or No in the subsequent table below*)

9. How have you used them? *(Please briefly describe how you have used each)*

10. Do you use other internet sites or publications for finding land-related information?
Yes or No

If Yes, please list in the space below. If No, skip to Q 12.

11. How would you rank the GLTN site relative to these other sources of information?

(1 = not as good, 2 = as good, 3 = better) Score: []

(Please comment if you would like)

Name of document	Read? (Y/N)	Usefulness (1-5)	Used? (Y/N)	How used? (describe)

12. Do you have any general recommendations for GLTN on how to improve their website?

(Please comment in the space below)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE – IT IS IMPORTANT FOR OUR EVALUATION

B. PROJECT AWARENESS OF GLTN

Questions to land sector projects on awareness of the Global Land Tool Network, its webpage and its documents

This is part of an independent Mid-Term Assessment of GLTN that is aiming to investigate the awareness of GLTN among donor-supported projects in the land sector.

Please answer honestly and comprehensively and email back your completed questionnaire.

Name of your land project/activity:	
Country:	
Donors involved (if any):	
Project start date:	End date:
Your position in the project:	
Are you a government officer or consultant?	Government [] Consultant []

Q 1: Have you heard of the Global Land Tool Network (under UN-Habitat)?

(Please circle, underline or highlight) Yes or No

If No, thanks very much, your information is still very useful and we would love to receive your questionnaire.

Q 2: Are you a registered member of GLTN? **Yes or No**

Q 3: Have you downloaded any materials from the GLTN website? **Yes or No**

If No, go to Q5

Q 4: Have you used any of these materials? **Yes or No**

If Yes, please provide the name of each document used and how you have used each.

Q 5: Do you use other internet sites or publications for finding land-related information?

Yes or No

If Yes, please list below.

Q 6: How would you rank the GLTN site relative to these other sources of information?

(1 = not as good, 2 = as good, 3 = better) Score: []

(Please comment if you would like)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE – IT IS IMPORTANT FOR OUR EVALUATION

C. GLTN TRAINING IMPACT ASSESSMENT

This is part of an independent Mid-Term Assessment of the UN-HABITAT Global Land Tools Network that is aiming to understand the effectiveness and possible impacts of GLTN supported training. Please answer honestly and comprehensively where relevant to the training that you have attended.

Name of GLTN training event:
Date of training:
Your country of residence:
Nature of your employment (Mark below with X as appropriate):
UN employee
Other international agency
Government employee
Private sector employee
Researcher
Consultant
Student
Other (specify).....

Section A: Please write down any important skills or knowledge you developed or had strengthened as the result of the training. (*If none write "none"*)

Section B: Have you been able to use any of the skills/knowledge gained through the training in your work? (*Please circle, highlight or underline*) **Yes** or **No**

If Yes, please describe which skills/knowledge and how you have used them

If No, please describe why not

Section C: Have you shared any of the skills, knowledge or information from the training with your colleagues? **Yes** or **No**

If Yes, please describe which skills/knowledge/information

Recommendations: Please record any suggestions or recommendations to improve GLTN training effectiveness related to the training you attended.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE – IT IS IMPORTANT FOR OUR EVALUATION

D. QUESTIONS FOR PARTNERS BY EMAIL**Name:****Organization:****General questions to partners:***Please answer relevant questions in the spaces below and return by email:***RELEVANCE AND APPROPRIATENESS OF GLTN AND THE GLTN PROJECT:**

Are GLTN priorities appropriate, do they accord with your agency's own priorities? Do you have recommendations for other priority areas to be addressed by GLTN?

Have there been any benefits to your organization through being a partner/member in GLTN? If so, please describe.

Has GLTN influenced your agency's understanding of, or approach to, land issues? If yes, in what way?

Do you think GLTN has contributed to a change in how land is considered in the global discourse? Has it improved global knowledge or changed attitudes and practices? (Where/who? How? What issues?)

What do you think will be the most important potential GLTN outcomes/impacts?

What is your opinion of the balance in the GLTN design between global activities (knowledge development, advocacy, tools development) and activities at a country level (capacity-building, testing/applying tools, technical advice)?

TOOL DEVELOPMENT AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

How effective has GLTN been in development of pro-poor, gender-appropriate land tools and capacitating key actors to use them? Do you think this has strengthened (or will strengthen) the capacity of countries in land governance, management and administration?

Have you or your organization used or promoted any of these tools? Describe which tools, how, results etc?

What is your opinion on the quality of tools, best practices, evaluations, research? How practical/applicable/useful are they?

Are land tools the key constraint to pro-poor reform in land governance, management and administration?

What factors constrain or facilitate the adoption of tools and guidelines?

GLTN – THE NETWORK AND PARTNERSHIPS

What do you think are the strengths, weaknesses of the GLTN Network (and the Secretariat)?

Recommendations/lessons to strengthen GLTN and its effectiveness/impacts?

Are there any ways your agency could contribute to make GLTN more effective?

What do think is the level of 'ownership' of the network and GLTN tools/outputs by the partners and members? Do you believe there are clear and shared objectives for the network among partners/members?

Do partners contribute to GLTN strategic and annual work planning, future vision etc? Is there opportunity to contribute? Is this important? Any recommendations?

How effective is GLTN in engaging partners? Is there a role for existing partners in engagement of new partners/members?

Satisfaction with the range of partners involved? Who's missing?

Have you been involved in any networking amongst GLTN partners/members outside that orchestrated directly by the GLTN Secretariat?

Is GLTN fair and equitable in its dealing with partners?

OTHER GENERAL COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS NOT COVERED ABOVE

E. PARTNERS MEETINGS - ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR MID-TERM EVALUATION

Name:

Organization

1a. Should GLTN have regular Partners' Meetings? Circle as appropriate: **Yes / No**

1b. How frequently should they be held? Every years

2. Is your organization prepared to shoulder the costs of its participation?

Circle as appropriate: **In full / In part / None**

3. What should be the role of future Partners' Meetings? (What key objectives, activities?)

4. Are there other options that could achieve the same without holding face-to-face Partners' Meetings?

5. What is your opinion of the process used in this Partners' Meeting to generate a program of activities? Please indicate the strengths, weaknesses and any recommendations for the future

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING THESE QUESTIONS

ANNEX V: SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO THE GLTN LOGFRAME

	Core indicators	Proxy indicators	Annual targets	Means of verification	Assumptions
Overall goal:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban and rural poor have better access to land and security of tenure. Number of countries using a continuum, menu or range of forms of tenure⁶¹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of countries with systems to disaggregate gender data on land Guideline developed to disaggregate data by gender Number of countries reporting reduction of procedures to register land rights Number of countries reporting reduction in the number of days that it takes to document a land right Number of countries reporting a reduction in the cost of documenting and securing land rights Number of countries developing anti-eviction guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least two new countries using a continuum, menu or range of tenure forms At least three new countries reporting improved perceptions of land rights and tenure security through assessment At least one new country disaggregating data on land by gender At least two countries reporting a reduction of procedures to register land rights At least two countries reporting a reduction in the number of days that it takes to document a land right At least two countries reporting reduction in the cost of documenting and securing land rights At least three countries developing anti-eviction guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GLTN annual land report COHRE, Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International data on evictions Various country-level reports on land Research findings Annual questionnaire WB "Cost of doing business survey" Land Gini coefficient indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land and tenure security is a sector identified as national priority Demand for knowledge of pro-poor land tools remains high Dissemination challenges of Secretariat location are managed Disaggregated data are available
1 Outcome 1:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Knowledge management) Improved global knowledge to support the realization of equitable land rights Number of countries reporting improved perceptions of land rights and tenure security through UN-Habitat and GLTN partner assessments Number of countries implementing pro-poor land sector reform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of countries with systems to disaggregate gender data on land Guideline developed to disaggregate data by gender Number of countries reporting reduction of procedures to register land rights Number of countries reporting reduction in the number of days that it takes to document a land right Number of countries reporting a reduction in the cost of documenting and securing land rights Number of countries developing anti-eviction guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least three new countries reporting improved perceptions of land rights and tenure security through assessment At least one new country disaggregating data on land by gender At least two countries reporting a reduction of procedures to register land rights At least two countries reporting a reduction in the number of days that it takes to document a land right At least two countries reporting reduction in the cost of documenting and securing land rights At least three countries developing anti-eviction guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various country-level reports on land Research findings Annual questionnaire WB "Cost of doing business survey" Land Gini coefficient indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demand for knowledge of pro-poor land tools remains high Dissemination challenges of Secretariat location are managed Disaggregated data are available

⁶¹ Future indicators being developed - see 2.3.2 - since information of this nature at global scale does not readily exist.

	Core indicators	Proxy indicators	Annual targets	Means of verification	Assumptions
Outputs:					
1.1	Select land-related best practices documented and disseminated consistent with GLTN values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of best practices in land programmes published Website hits and downloads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one new best practice in land programmes published At least 250 monthly downloads from websites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Best practices publication and documents Website monitoring system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of innovation remains high in the land sector
1.2	Evaluations carried out of innovative land programmes consistent with GLTN values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of evaluations carried out on innovative land policies and programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one evaluation carried out on innovative land policies and programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner willingness to be involved in evaluations
1.3	Priority ⁶² research carried out addressing critical gaps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of priorities research carried out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one priority research carried out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority research reports 	
2	Outcome 2: (Advocacy) Increased awareness of and commitment to equitable land rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of countries including pro-poor⁶³ land sector reform in PRSP or national strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least two new countries including pro-poor land reform in their PRSP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Global, regional, national and thematic advocacy documents Mission reports of meetings (by partners' invitation) Keynote speeches at meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political will to address issues remains high Political risks are managed effectively Ideological approaches do not dominate the land agenda Network members are committed to a common advocacy agenda. Dissemination challenges of Secretariat location are effectively managed.

⁶² GLTN priority research issues include: (1) Land rights, records and registration; (2) Land-use planning; (3) Land management, administration and information; (4) Land law and enforcement; (5) Land value taxation; and (6) Cross-cutting issues. Each issue has a series of priority land tools. More information on 18 priority tools available http://www.glttn.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=11&Itemid=34

⁶³ A pro-poor land tool or policy is a tool or policy that will improve the lives of people living in poverty. In particular to; empower the poor and vulnerable part of the community; meet the needs of all the population including the poor; protect the poor from abuse (human rights); encourage participation (voice) of the poor and grass-roots communities. More information: http://www.glttn.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=102&Itemid=128#12

	Core indicators	Proxy indicators	Annual targets	Means of verification	Assumptions
Outputs:					
2.1	<p>Priority advocacy materials identified, produced and disseminated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of advocacy materials produced and disseminated Number of citations of GLTN materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Usage of GLTN advocacy material. User survey Advocacy and dissemination strategy developed and implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one advocacy material produced and disseminated. At least three publications produced, translated, printed and disseminated At least one impact factor evaluation report published At least 10 land-related institutions have used GLTN material in non-GLTN forums One annual user survey Monitoring and evaluation of dissemination strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report of user survey of GLTN advocacy material Advocacy materials Download rate of GLTN advocacy material Impact factor report. Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for the dissemination strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient resources. Production capacity available in Nairobi is sufficient
2.2	<p>Forums used for advocacy and exposure to equitable land rights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheduled presentations at meetings (e.g., CSD, WUF, regional ministerial meetings, World Bank SDN week) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in web forums (e.g., UNDP, GLTN) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least four meetings or events organized at global level At least four keynote addresses at a global level At least two web forums or video conferences on GLTN each year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Events advocacy materials Speeches Mission reports Website hits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Network committed to promoting common set of messages
2.3	<p>Support provided to partners' initiatives for the development of global monitoring mechanisms and indicators related to access to land and security of tenure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated and consistent approaches to global monitoring agreed and adopted Number of partner agencies and initiatives supported 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one initiative for global monitoring supported Support provided to development and testing of at least one set of global and regional land indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring mechanism documents and agreements Country level indicator list(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consensus among network members is possible Technical capacity exists to develop and implement monitoring mechanism Sufficient resources available

	Core indicators	Proxy indicators	Annual targets	Means of verification	Assumptions	
3	Outcome 3: (Tool development and capacity-building) Strengthened capacity to enhance quality of land governance, management and administration through pro-poor gendered ⁶⁴ land tools and training activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of countries piloting pro-poor land tools Number of countries piloting pro-poor land tools Number of countries adopting pro-poor land tools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of advisory missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least two priority land tools piloted in countries At least two advisory missions At least three GLTN training events At least one land tool prioritized At least two countries adopting pro-poor land tools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country request. Reports of countries using or adopting pro-poor and gendered land tools Advisory mission reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political will sustained for pro-poor land sector reforms Correct identification of opportunities for reform and linkage to national processes (e.g., PRSP, national strategies) Institutional strengthening measures provided by other actors Timely delivery of appropriate tools and training materials to support reforms
	Outputs:					
3.1	Priority land tools developed, piloted and disseminated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of priority land tools developed Number of priority land tools piloted Number of priority land tools disseminated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least two priority land tools developed At least two priority land tools piloted At least two priority land tools disseminated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available expertise to develop large-scale land tools Tools successfully adapted to local contexts 	

⁶⁴ A gendered land tool is a tool that explicitly and successfully incorporates and mainstreams gender into the tool development and implementation processes. More information: http://www.gltm.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=102&Itemid=128#13

	Core indicators	Proxy indicators	Annual targets	Means of verification	Assumptions	
3.2	Country level strategies developed for selected countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall strategy developed to prioritize countries for GLTN activities Number of individual countries with strategies developed Number of situation analyses, baseline studies, and subsequent evaluations conducted (as appropriate) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of countries with strategy developed Progress in strategy implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one country-level strategy and associated implementation plan documented Country strategies implemented to plan in at least 50 per cent of countries with strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country strategy document and implementation plans. Reports on country-level implementation (against strategy or plans) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective demand for GLTN assistance Partners interested and with capacity to support activities in the selected countries Effective management of different stakeholder interests
3.3	Strengthened donor coordination of the land sector in select countries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of land sector HAC established at country level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least two new countries formalizing global donor coordination on land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OECD DAC survey on monitoring the Paris Declaration meeting reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donor interest in coordination 	
3.4	Training strategy developed and implemented at global and regional levels and in selected countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training strategy developed Number of training packages developed Number of tools covered by training packages Number of training activities conducted Number of participants attending each training (disaggregated) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least two training packages developed and tested At least two training courses conducted at the global or regional level At least two training activities at the country level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training package documentation Training reports and evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective demand for pro-poor capacity-building Partners interested and with capacity to support training activities at the global, regional and country level 	

	Core indicators	Proxy indicators	Annual targets	Means of verification	Assumptions	
4	Outcome 4: (GLTN institutional capacity) Strengthened GLTN institutional capacity to carry out equitable land rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversity of donor funds Number of GLTN funded activities implemented by partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of partner engagements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase GLTN donors from 2 to 4 by 2010 Increase GLTN funds by at least 10 per cent (starting 2009) At least three activities implemented by GLTN partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation report Perception survey of GLTN stakeholders Partners quality assessment checklist and reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional land organizations committed to joining GLTN Partner commitment to GLTN and ownership of workplan Timely and effective support from UN-Habitat and UNON Political stability in Kenya
	Outputs:					
4.1	Strengthened network of members and partners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of partners and members Number of GLTN members, donors and partners Diversity of partners, donors and members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least two additional GLTN partners drawn from the GLTN partners group⁶⁵ At least 10 per cent increase in GLTN membership Lobbying donors, partners and members to join GLTN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of members and partners Memorandums of understanding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional rules permit GLTN membership Partners perceive transaction costs of work with GLTN to be acceptable Absorption capacity of partners 	

⁶⁵ The seven GLTN partner groups are: (1) rural international civil societies; (2) urban international civil societies; (3) bilateral organizations; (4) multilateral organizations; (5) international training institutions; (6) international professional bodies; and (7) international research institutions or networks.

	Core indicators	Proxy indicators	Annual targets	Means of verification	Assumptions
4.2	<p>Efficient and effective project and financial management at the Secretariat level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved absorption and disbursement capacity of the Secretariat Ratio of funds disbursed by secretariat versus partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase absorption and disbursement capacity of the Secretariat Number of agreements and memorandums of understanding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GLTN budget to increase by at least 10 per cent At least 90 per cent of funds are disbursed by GLTN At least two cooperation agreements signed each year between the Network and global partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management system innovations supported by United Nations Critical reform areas are correctly diagnosed and addressed by external experts Donors make available the resources on time
4.3	<p>System of quality control developed for network activities and outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidelines on quality control in place and implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> System in place for quality control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one quality control assessment conducted Monitoring and evaluation of quality control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality control report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective demand by countries for, and partner interest in, independent external evaluation

ANNEX VI: COMPARISON OF 12 GLOBAL LAND PROGRAMMES AND GLTN

SUMMARY TABLE: Comparison of 12 global land programmes and GLTN, against key GLTN outputs

	Best practices	Innovative programmes	Priority research	Advocacy	Priority tools	Donor coordination	Capacity
Cities Alliance	Limited	Limited	City development strategies; slum upgrading	Limited	Limited	Structured to coordinate donors	Project funding USD40,000 to USD500,000
COHRE	Substantial material, focused on key areas	Key emphasis forced evictions, slum upgrading, protection of rights	Maintains register of forced evictions	Advocacy focus on United Nations agencies	Focus on protection of property rights of the poor and vulnerable	Limited	Emphasis on material to support advocacy program
FAO land Tenure	Broad cover of formal systems, post-conflict, gender, taxation, expropriation	Covered in material, but not in depth	Voluntary guidelines on responsible governance of land and natural resources	Limited	Publishes Land Tenure series.	Supports World Bank and other donors	Limited
FIG	Substantial documentation on FIG website	Not directly. OICRF has reference to 6,000 papers	Not directly, but represents broad research interests of members	Not directly	Not directly, but involved with STDM	Not directly, but wide network of international agencies	Congresses and conferences major activity of FIG
IFAD	Community mapping; institutional and organizational analysis for pro-poor change	Limited	Support or grass-roots organizations, participatory mapping	2008 policy on improving access to land and tenure security	Community approaches to decision-making		
		Works with Governments and in-country organizations	Limited				

	Best practices	Innovative programmes	Priority research	Advocacy	Priority tools	Donor coordination	Capacity
IIED	Publishes extensively in priority areas	Areas include: human settlements, planning, rural-urban policy, land tenure, pastoralists, commons, and forestry	Climate change, governance, human settlements, natural resources and sustainable markets	Key contributor to many international policy processes	Some tools covers in areas such as participatory planning and forest management	Limited, but works with many partners	Significant training in topics of interest.
IILC	Newsletter provides overview of many projects	Limited	Globalization and commercial pressures, women's access to land, securing the commons, indigenous and pastoralists	Land reporting initiative, securing the commons, indigenous and pastoral rights	Limited	Limited	Run conferences and publicize land events.
LandNet Americas	Some material available, but dated	Some material available, but dated	Limited	Limited	Some material available, but dated	Limited	Limited.
Lincoln Institute	Quarterly newsletter and many publications focused on topics of interest	Many publications and evaluations of innovative programmes	Taxation of land, land market operations, land regulation, property rights, distribution of benefits from development	Limited	Provides many manuals and tools in areas of interest	None	Significant education and training program.
UNDP OGS	Policy and discussion papers	Limited cover in policy papers	Land governance	Limited	Limited	Focused on United Nations and UNDP	Facilitated some international conferences.
Wisconsin LTC	Extensive library of material, but getting dated	Extensive library of material but getting dated	Environment and livelihoods, environmental governance, ecosystem stewardship	Limited	Limited	Limited	Long history of providing training and education.

	Best practices	Innovative programmes	Priority research	Advocacy	Priority tools	Donor coordination	Capacity
World Bank Land Policy	Extensive documentation available, focusing on project activity	Land certification, computerization, family law, social and economic evaluation, land reform, land policy	Land policy, large-scale land acquisition, impact evaluation of innovative approaches to land administration, land governance	Limited	Limited	Building on global network established in 2003 PPR	Provides training through WBI and other partners
GLTN	Extensive material, but not peer-reviewed or well categorized	Extensive material, but not peer-reviewed or well categorized	Continuum of rights, pro-poor land management, pro-poor, gendered land tools, knowledge dissemination	Strong advocate for pro-poor, gender-appropriate policies	Many references to projects in Land Tools section of web-page, but limited references to tools themselves	Strong emphasis in developing partnerships	Undertakes training on specific topics and publicizes land sector events.

ANNEX VII: GLOBAL LAND PROGRAMMES

The 12 agencies and programmes are explored in greater detail below, with emphasis on their operations in key areas of GLTN activity. Readers are advised that these summaries are compiled based on the information available on their websites only, and as such may not adequately represent their programmes.

CITIES ALLIANCE

Webpage: <http://www.citiesalliance.org/index.html>

Brief description of organization: The Cities Alliance is a global coalition of cities and their development partners committed to scaling up successful approaches to poverty reduction. The Cities Alliance members are: Slum Dwellers International; local authorities represented by United Cities and Local Governments and Metropolis; Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom and United States; African Development Bank, European Union, UNEP, UN-Habitat and the World Bank. The Alliance supports: city development plans; citywide and nationwide slum upgrading; sustainable financing strategies. The Alliance has committed over USD110 million to date.

Governance arrangements: The governance and organizational structure of the Cities Alliance includes the Consultative Group, the Executive Committee, and the Secretariat. The Consultative Group—the Alliance’s board of directors—is responsible for setting the Alliance’s long-term strategy, approving its annual work programme and budget, and reviewing achievements. The Consultative Group consists of financial contributors to the Cities Alliance Trust Fund and the political heads of

the global organization of local authorities, UCLG, and Metropolis, which have pledged their commitment to achieving Alliance goals. The Consultative Group is co-chaired by the World Bank’s Vice-President for Sustainable Development and the UN-Habitat Executive Director. The Consultative Group has also set up the eight-member Executive Committee, made up of a subset of its members, to provide guidance to the Secretariat. The Alliance Secretariat, housed at World Bank headquarters, carries out the Alliance’s mandates and manages its operations.

Documentation of best practices: The Alliance webpage has provision for knowledge management under two topics: city development strategies; and slum upgrading. No papers are available under these headings, however. The publications page lists four recent references.

Evaluation of innovative land practices: Not an emphasis in the documentation.

Priority research: City development strategies and slum upgrading.

Advocacy: Limited.

Land tools: Limited.

Donor coordination: The Alliance is structured to coordinate donors within its scope of interests.

Capacity-building: Provides project funding in core grants ranging from USD40,000 to USD500,000.

CENTRE ON HOUSING RIGHTS AND EVICTIONS (COHRE)

Webpage: <http://www.cohre.org/index.php>

Brief description of organization: COHRE claims to be the only international human rights organization systematically monitoring the practice of forced evictions and seeking to prevent them wherever they occur or are planned. COHRE also focuses on the legal aspects of housing rights throughout the world, and is devoted to finding creative solutions to all housing-related problems, using international human rights law as a key tool. The key focus areas of COHRE are: forced evictions; housing and property restitution; women and housing rights; litigating housing rights; the right to water; and advocacy with the United Nations and other agencies. In 2006 COHRE reported offices in 12 locations, staff of nearly 60 and an annual budget of USD2.5 million.

Governance arrangements: The 2003–2005 activity report (the latest available on the COHRE website) states that in December 2005 COHRE had a four-person board of directors and an 11-person advisory board.

Documentation of best practices: A substantial amount of material is available in hard-copy and electronic form on the COHRE website covering a range of topics focusing on property rights and in a range of formats from special reports, bibliographies and legal sources, manuals and training material.

Evaluation of innovative land practices: Focuses on key areas of forced evictions, slum upgrading and protection of rights for vulnerable groups.

Priority research: Maintains a register of forced evictions.

Advocacy: COHRE has a strong focus on advocacy with the United Nations and other organizations. Areas of interest include work on the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the United Nations Principles on Housing and Property Restitution

for Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (the Pinheiro Principles).

Land tools: The main focus of the material is the protection of the property rights of the poor and vulnerable.

Donor coordination: Limited.

Capacity-building: Emphasis on material to support advocacy programme.

FAO LAND TENURE AND MANAGEMENT UNIT

Webpage: <http://www.fao.org/nr/tenure/lt-home/en/>

Brief description of organization: The Land Tenure and Management Unit is part of the Land and Water Division of the Natural Resources Management and Environment Department of FAO. The Unit assists member States in the analysis, design and formulation of policies and projects to improve access to land and other natural resources and increase tenure security. It provides technical assistance and action-oriented research to improve land tenure arrangements and administration of land and other natural resources, enhance access to land through land reforms and land market transactions, adapt land tenure arrangements under common property resource systems to promote rural development, and manage land tenure conflicts. The programmes and activities of the unit include the development of participatory approaches; policy advice, perspective studies and technical guidance at global, regional and national levels; supporting inventory and assessment of land resources status and trends; dissemination of appropriate technologies; management practices and decision support systems.

Governance arrangements: Part of FAO, a United Nations agency.

Documentation of best practices: The unit publishes extensively. There is a 10-volume compilation of FAO Land Tenure Studies that

covers: cadastral surveys and records; good practice guidelines for agricultural leases; land tenure and rural development; gender and access to land; rural property tax systems in central and eastern Europe; design of land consolidation projects; decentralization and rural property taxation; access to rural land and land administration in post-conflict situations; good governance in land tenure and administration; compulsory acquisition and land compensation. In addition the unit produces the Land Tenure Policy Series on topics for policymakers, Land Tenure Notes for use at the grass-roots level and manuals to support implementation.

Evaluation of Innovative Land Practices: The Land Tenure publications include evaluations of best practice.

Priority Research: The major emphasis in the unit is the development of voluntary guidelines on responsible governance of tenure of land and other natural resources. The unit has published 10 technical studies and policy papers in support of the development of these guidelines.

Advocacy: Limited advocacy is undertaken, mainly to raise the profile of land issues in the UN.

Land Tools: The Land Tenure publications are used as guides in the land sector.

Donor Coordination: The Land Tenure and Management Unit provides technical advice to the World Bank and a range of bilateral donors.

Capacity Building: Other than the production and dissemination of the various publications and the organization of the consultative meetings for the voluntary guidelines, the unit has limited capacity-building activity.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF SURVEYORS (FIG)

Webpage: <http://www.fig.net/>

Brief description of organization: FIG is the premier international organization representing the interests of surveyors worldwide. FIG is

structured into 10 commissions, on the following fields: professional practice; professional education; spatial information management; hydrography; positioning and measurement; engineering surveys; cadastre and land management; spatial planning and development; valuation and the management of real estate; construction economics and management.

Governance arrangements: The FIG General Assembly comprises delegates of the member associations and, as non-voting members, the Council, commission chairs and representatives of affiliates, corporate members and academic members. The General Assembly debates and approves policies. The General Assembly meets annually during the FIG working week or the FIG congress. The Council is elected by the General Assembly. Policies are implemented by the Council, which meets several times a year. The work of the General Assembly and the Council is assisted by an Advisory Committee of Commission Officers (ACCO); *ad hoc* task forces appointed from time to time to review existing work plans and develop new strategies; and two permanent institutions: the Office International de Cadastre et du Régime Foncier (OICRF) and the International Institution for the History of Surveying and Measurement. The permanent office undertakes the day-to-day management of FIG.

Documentation of best practices: FIG provides substantial information on its website, including the technical papers and proceedings of various conferences and congresses, information on technical standards and a surveying education database.

Evaluation of innovative land practices: not directly, but covered in technical papers

Priority research: No research priority itself, but FIG represents the very broad research interests of its members. OICRF provides access to over 6,000 articles on land administration matters (<http://www.oicrf.org/>).

Advocacy: Not directly.

Land tools: Not directly, although involved in various initiatives, including the technical development of STDM within GLTN.

Donor coordination: FIG is not active in donor coordination, although FIG has agreements with United Nations agencies, notably UN-Habitat, FAO, UNEP, the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs and the World Bank. FIG is officially recognized by the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

Capacity-building: The commissions prepare and conduct the programme for the FIG international congresses, held every four years, and annual working weeks, held in the intervening years. The last congress was held in Munich, Germany, in 2006; and the next congress will be in Sydney, Australia, 9–16 April 2010.

To increase regional activities FIG organizes regional conferences on a biannual basis. The last conference was held in Hanoi, Viet Nam, in October 2009.

In addition to their involvement with FIG congresses and working weeks, commissions and their working groups organize or co-sponsor a wide range of seminars and workshops, usually in collaboration with member associations or other international professional bodies.

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (IFAD)

Webpage: <http://www.ifad.org/pub/index.htm>

Brief description of organization: The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) is a specialized agency of the United Nations that was established as an international financial institution in 1977. IFAD works with rural poor people, Governments, donors, non-governmental organizations and many other partners. IFAD works with Governments to develop and finance programmes and projects through low-interest loans and grants that enable rural poor people to overcome poverty themselves. Since starting operations in 1978,

IFAD has invested USD10.8 billion in 805 projects and programmes that have reached more than 340 million poor rural people.

Governance arrangements: Membership in IFAD is open to any State that is a member of the United Nations or its specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Governing Council is the Fund's highest decision-making authority, with 165 member States represented by a Governor and Alternate Governor and any other designated advisers. The Council meets annually. The Executive Board, responsible for overseeing the general operations of IFAD and approving loans and grants, is composed of 18 members and 18 alternate members. The President, who serves for a four-year term (renewable once), is the chief executive officer of IFAD and chair of the Executive Board.

Documentation of Best Practices: reports on the IFAD webpage include topics such as "Good practices in community mapping" and "Institutional and organizational analysis for pro-poor change".

Evaluation of innovative land practices:

Priority research: The Fund's priority is support for grass-roots organizations and many of the publications on the IFAD webpage document good practices in participatory mapping,

Advocacy: In December 2008 IFAD published a policy document on improving access to land and tenure security.

Land tools: The tools listed on the IFAD webpage focus on community-led approaches in decision-mapping.

Donor coordination: IFAD works with recipient Governments and in-country organizations and other donors in funding its projects. IFAD has also provided substantial funding to ILC.

Capacity-building: Limited.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (IIED)

Webpage: <http://www.iied.org/natural-resources/group-publications/publications>

Brief description of organization: The International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) was launched in 1971 by renowned economist and policy advisor Barbara Ward, making it one of the first organizations to link environment with development. IIED receives funding from aid and development ministries, intergovernmental agencies, foundations, and corporate and individual donors. Annual receivable income in 2006–2007 was £8.8 million, covering approximately 250 projects involving over 1,000 partners.

Governance arrangements: IIED has a 13-member Board of Trustees.

Documentation of best practices: IIED publishes extensively and these publications are structured in the priority research areas listed below.

Evaluation of innovative land practices: IIED produces a wide range of publications, including:

- Human settlement publications on urbanization and planning, human settlements, urban poverty and rural-urban policy;
- Natural resource publication series on topics including: land tenure and resource access in Africa; pastoral land tenure; securing the commons; participatory learning and action; forestry and land-use.

Priority research: IIED lists the following areas of research activity: climate change; governance; human settlements; natural resources and sustainable markets.

Advocacy: IIED has been a key contributor to many international policy processes, such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the Millennium Ecosystem

Assessment, the Brundtland Report, Agenda 21, and the United Nations conventions on climate change, desertification and biodiversity. The Institute's association with its legal subsidiary, the Foundation for International Environmental Law and Development (FIELD), adds considerable weight to its engagement in international environmental processes.

Land Tools: Land tools are covered to some extent in the IIED publications, which include descriptions of tools in a range of areas including participatory planning and forest management.

Donor coordination: IIED works with many partners and receives funding from many donors, but plays a limited role in donor coordination.

Capacity-building: IIED undertakes a significant programme of training in topics of interest.

INTERNATIONAL LAND COALITION (ILC)

Webpage: <http://www.landcoalition.org/>

Brief description of organization: The International Land Coalition (ILC) is a global alliance of civil society and intergovernmental organizations working together to promote secure and equitable access to and control over land for poor women and men through advocacy, dialogue and capacity-building.

ILC was established by the founding organizations as the outcome of the Conference on Hunger and Poverty, which took place in Brussels in November 1995 under the leadership of IFAD. Originally called the Popular Coalition to Eradicate Hunger and Poverty, the Assembly of Members, at its meeting of February 2003, formally changed the name to the International Land Coalition, in order better to reflect its mission, nature and objectives.

Governance arrangements: The supreme governing body of ILC is the Assembly of Members, which meets every two years. The institutional report submitted to the Assembly

in Nepal in 2009 listed 65 ILC members – 16 in Africa, 15 in Latin America and 15 in Asia, mostly non-governmental organizations and 19 global organizations that included non-governmental organizations, the European Council, FAO, IFAD, GLTN, the International Food Policy Research Institute (IPFRI), UNEP, and the World Bank. The Coalition Council consists of 14 members, 8 of which are from non-governmental organizations, which is responsible for the oversight of the ILC secretariat and the management of ILC between meetings of the Assembly of Members. The secretariat of ILC is based at IFAD in Rome and is responsible for the management, operations and administrative services of ILC.

Documentation of best practices: ILC publishes a newsletter about every six months, which provides news of land activities. It has produced two publications, one on securing common property rights regimes and the other on participatory mapping. ILC also provides a range of member publications and other reference documents.

Evaluation of innovative land practices: As part of the land reporting initiative, ILC monitors policies and programmes.

Priority research: ILC lists the following research areas on its website: globalization and new commercial pressures on land; women's access to land; land-reporting initiative; securing the commons; indigenous peoples and pastoralists; land partnerships.

Advocacy: A strong advocacy programme underpins the research activities listed above. The land-reporting initiative monitors the implementation of land-related laws, policies and programmes. The data gathered on the commons and indigenous and pastoral rights also support advocacy.

Land tools: Limited focus on land tools.

Donor coordination: Limited.

Capacity-building: ILC runs workshops and provides a link to conference and training events provided by other organizations.

LANDNET AMERICAS

Webpage: <http://www.landnetamericas.org/>

LandNet Americas is the virtual office of the Inter-Summit Property Systems Initiative (IPSI), a mechanism created by USAID in partnership with the Organization of American States (OAS) in response to mandates from the Summit of the Americas.

IPSI strives to achieve improved coordination among various donors, government agencies and civil society, defined broadly to include non-governmental organizations, private enterprises, professional associations, and others. To do so, it sponsors activities and events that foster consensus-building through debate and information-sharing; it sponsors analyses and data-gathering that will help clarify issues, identify new approaches and monitor progress; and it sponsors activities aimed at motivating civil society resources towards achieving the property registration goals of the Summit of the Americas. These objectives are similar in some respects to the objectives of GLTN.

There is a range of categorized reference documents available on the LandNet webpage, but these documents appear not to have been updated for a number of years. There is an events directory that lists as the most recent event a meeting in Lima in September 2008. There is a bulletin board and a discussion forum, both of which have not been updated since 2006.

LINCOLN INSTITUTE OF LAND POLICY

Webpage: <http://www.lincolninst.edu/aboutlincoln/>

Brief description of organization: The Lincoln Institute of Land Policy is a leading international research organization — facilitating analysis and discussion of land use, regulation and taxation issues. The Institute brings together scholars, practitioners, public officials, policy advisers, journalists and involved citizens to share information and improve the quality of

public debate. The Institute undertakes research and provides education, training, conferences, demonstration projects, publications and multimedia material. The Institute structures its work in three areas: first, planning and urban form; second, valuation and taxation; and third, international studies.

Governance arrangements: The Board of Directors of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy oversees the Institute's policies, work programme, budget and investments. Its members include academics, practitioners, public officials and developers. It is a 16-member board.

Documentation of best practices: The Institute publishes a quarterly magazine called *Land Lines*, and also an extensive range of books, reports and other publications.

Evaluation of innovative land practices: Many of the Institute's publications focus on lessons from experience and comparative studies. Although there is a North American focus in the publications, there is an increasing international content in the published material.

Priority research: The Institute's main themes — taxation of land, land market operations, land regulation, property rights and the distribution of benefits from land development—build upon the ideas of nineteenth-century economist Henry George.

Advocacy: Limited.

Land tools: Provides extensive manuals and tools in its areas of interest.

Donor coordination: None.

Capacity-building: Significant education and training programme.

UNDP OSLO GOVERNANCE CENTRE

Webpage: http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/overview/land_governance.html

Brief description of organization: The Oslo Governance Centre was established in 2002 as part of the UNDP global policy network for democratic governance. The overarching purpose of the work of the Centre is to position UNDP as a champion of democratic governance, both as an end in itself, and as a means of attaining the Millennium Development Goals. This is achieved through knowledge networking and multi-disciplinary team work, aimed at providing policy guidance and technical support to the more than 130 UNDP country offices around the world. It also involves close partnerships with leading policy and research institutions in different parts of the world.

Land governance is one of six key activities of the Oslo Governance Centre. The Centre explores the links between democratic governance, conflict prevention and land and property rights, and considers how those relationships may contribute to or impede poverty reduction. The ultimate aim is to make such knowledge available to UNDP country offices and external parties, enabling them to support national and local responsive institutions and participative processes.

Governance arrangements: Part of the United Nations system.

Documentation of best practices: The Oslo Governance Centre has published a number of briefs and discussion papers on various aspects of land governance. Key reports available on the Centre's webpage are:

- OGC Brief 1: Land Policy and Governance: Gaps and Challenges in Policy Studies
- OGC Brief 2: Land-based Social Relations: Key Features of a Pro-Poor Land Policy
- OGC Brief 3: How Land Policies Impact Land-based Wealth and Power Transfer
- OGC Brief 4: Pro-Poor Land Tenure Reform,

Decentralization and Democratic Governance

- Discussion Paper 1: Democratic Land Governance and Some Policy Recommendations
- Discussion Paper 2: Gender, Land Rights and Democratic Governance
- Discussion Paper 3: Pro-Poor Land Tenure Reform and Democratic Governance
- Discussion Paper 4: The Challenges of Formulating a Land Policy in a Post-Conflict Context: The Case of Afghanistan
- Discussion Paper 9: Debate and Pro-Poor Outcomes when Regularizing Informal Lands: Urban and Peri-Urban Areas
- Discussion Paper 10: Gender Sensitive and Pro-Poor Principles when Regularizing Informal Lands: Urban and Peri-Urban Areas
- Discussion Paper 11: Reflections on Land Tenure Security Indicators

Evaluation of innovative land practices:

Covered to some extent in the briefs and discussion papers.

Priority research: Land governance.

Advocacy: Limited to United Nations system, focused on UNDP.

Land tools: Limited (briefs and papers).

Donor coordination: Limited.

Capacity-building: The Oslo Governance Centre has facilitated and participated in a number of international workshops and conferences.

WISCONSIN LAND TENURE CENTER

Webpage: <http://www.nelson.wisc.edu/ltc/publications.html>

Brief description of organization: Established in 1962 at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the Land Tenure Center (LTC) has evolved into one of the world's leading university-based institutions on land policy. LTC works

in Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America and North America on issues of land tenure and land use, agrarian reform, land markets, legislative drafting, land registration and titling, institutional dimensions of rural development, and environmental and natural resource management. The Center's mission of outreach is furthered by its globally recognized land tenure collection, housed in the university library system, and its publication series, which strengthens the link between research findings and policy formulation through technical papers, briefs and other documents.

LTC has reduced activity in recent years and has refocused its activities in the areas of:

- Environment and livelihoods
- Environmental governance
- Ecosystem stewardship

Governance arrangements: LTC now operates as part of the Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies. The Nelson Institute has been an incubator, laboratory and model of collaborative education, inquiry and public service for 40 years. The Institute is a campus-wide unit of the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Documentation of best practices: LTC has an extensive library of reports and references. The recent publications tend to focus on the key research areas of land tenure as it relates to natural resource management and environmental concerns.

Evaluation of innovative land practices: Currently limited.

Priority research: The current research areas of the university are: environment and livelihoods; environmental governance; and ecosystem stewardship.

Advocacy: Limited.

Land tools: Limited.

Donor coordination: Limited.

Capacity-building: LTC has a long history of education and training in the land sector.

WORLD BANK LAND POLICY NETWORK

Webpage: <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTARD/0,,contentMDK:20451195~menuPK:336688~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:336682,00.html>

Brief description of organization: The land tenure team supports the World Bank's land portfolio and works closely with the land policy and administration thematic group, which has been recognized as one of the most active in the Bank. A key objective is to support operational activities, improve the quality of the Bank's technical and financial support in this area, and to provide the analytical underpinnings to expand the Bank's land project portfolio in Africa and South Asia.

Governance arrangements: The World Bank Land Policy Team is run as a thematic group or virtual team that draws together all those interested in the land sector in the Bank. The team operates with overlapping co-chairs elected by the team and arranges a work programme that is largely funded by existing projects and a range of bilateral donors.

Documentation of best practices: Key reports and documents are available on land sector topics of interest to the Bank.

(<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTARD/0,,contentMDK:20451173~pagePK:210058~piPK:210062~theSitePK:336682,00.html>)

Evaluation of innovative land practices: Studies currently under way (many in association with GLTN) include (i) Evaluation of land certification and sustainable land management interventions in Ethiopia; (ii) Assessment of the impact of computerizing land records (using Bank data) in India; (iii) The impacts of changing inheritance legislation to give automatic shares to females in India; (iv) Socio-economic effects of (and demand for) formalizing informal settlements in Dar es Salaam; (v) Assessing the impact of systematic rural land titling in Rwanda;

(vi) Impacts of redistributive land reform on human capital accumulation in West Bengal; (vii) Effects of joint titling on female empowerment in Viet Nam; (viii) Impacts of legal reforms to increase tenure security in China, especially in the context of the financial crisis.

Priority research: The key research areas on the land team in the Bank are: land policy; large-scale land acquisition; impact evaluation of innovative approaches to land administration; and land governance.

Advocacy: Limited direct advocacy, but plays a key role in developing partnerships.

Land tools: Limited (but works in association with GLTN).

Donor coordination: Building on the global network established in preparation of the 2003 policy research report on land policies for growth and poverty reduction, the land team has been actively promoting dialogue with Governments, civil society (ILC, GLTN), development partners (FAO, IFAD, UN-Habitat, African Union, regional United Nations agencies, bilateral donors), academics, and other units in the Bank.

Capacity-building: Provides training through the World Bank Institute and other organizations, such as FIG, GLTN, FAO, etc.

ANNEX VIII: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON THE BALANCE BETWEEN GLOBAL AND NORMATIVE ACTIVITIES AND COUNTRY-LEVEL ACTIVITIES

FEEDBACK FROM PARTNERS, DONORS AND UN-HABITAT ON THE BALANCE BETWEEN GLTN GLOBAL AND NORMATIVE ACTIVITIES AND COUNTRY-LEVEL ACTIVITIES

- The country level should be the focus even for advocacy—it is where things need to be done. We have enough general principles; we need evidence to demonstrate how principles work.
- GLTN should be a catalyst; first to popularize its tools and then to get things going at a country level. The niche is for GLTN to take country dialogue further, then hand implementation on to partners. After analysing the situation at the country level, if not too complex, GLTN should then coordinate and bring in donors and partners.
- Country level work is difficult and slow with many factors outside the direct control of GLTN, but country-level work enables learning and can achieve impacts.
- Country activities should not take up all of GLTN's time as it has an important role in innovation and new thinking—a cutting-edge normative role. At the same time, to be really credible (not just academic), GLTN needs to show practical applications of tools, that they can be applied by national Governments with good impacts and results.
- Country work is currently a problem for the Secretariat: it needs lots of staff time, a different skill set, and lots of missions.
- Global level, normative tools and approaches, research on best practices, advocacy are very important. While more general and theoretical, they impact at high echelons of international organizations and forums.
- It is not research and documents, but implementation that is important. There are lots of good documents on the shelves. Need to incorporate grass roots into implementation. Need to use experience from rest of world to inform and come up with solutions.
- National Governments will rarely go on to websites to download tools and implement them without technical assistance, support and resources.
- Donors will give more money for activities at the country level—easier to raise funds.
- Sustainability of GLTN may depend on its success in country.
- It is not clear why GLTN Secretariat should be engaged at country level—better if through partners (testing of tools, etc.). If not GLTN partners, it should be UN-Habitat not the GLTN Secretariat working at country level.
- In undertaking country-level activities GLTN needs to consider the capacity of in-country partners and civil society groups. Capacity of partners to implement at country level may also be a constraint.
- The strength and importance of GLTN will be augmented if it gains experience at national level. There is no uniform context at country level—tools should reflect country experience.
- Should GLTN have country coordinators or representation? Maybe not one uniform way to be represented in a country (various ways depending on partners, specific country needs, donor interest, individual Habitat Programme Managers and the size of their programmes, etc.).
- Land issues require long-term perspective—no easy wins in demonstration of benefits and impacts of tools at country level—need opportunity for trial and error, and sufficient time.
- Neither GLTN Secretariat nor UN-Habitat Land and Tenure Section can stretch to all places; the focus should therefore be on normative tools, supported by regional offices and partners. GLTN Secretariat needs to be the hub of the Network but needs to try out tools at country level to be credible.
- It is hard to get information out to governments and policymakers; GLTN has limited budget and not much capacity to work on the ground. GLTN will remain a think tank, with role in advocacy and only minimal direct impact at the country level—only the World Bank has sufficient budget to make a difference. But if GLTN can successfully demonstrate its tools in the priority countries then this would raise its credibility to a new level.
- GLTN has an important role at global level but so far minimal impact on the ground. It now needs to move towards tool implementation—analysis of in-country constraints and problems, ensuring country buy-in and ownership, mobilizing partners and funds, etc. GLTN should ensure that the approach adheres to core values, ensure that partners do not miss key elements, ensure donor collaboration, ensure appropriate evaluation and quality control. GLTN should drive country strategy through its partners.
- GLTN should not start working in too many countries as it may not be able to follow up.
- GLTN is valued for its research so should never lose this in favour of a fully operational focus. The rush to demonstrate may be risky for GLTN. Nevertheless, there is increasing donor and global concern on impact.

ANNEX IX: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON GLTN TOOLS AND THE TOOL DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES

FEEDBACK FROM PARTNERS AND MEMBERS ON GLTN TOOLS AND TOOL DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES

- Tool development under GLTN has been very impressive especially given the short time in which GLTN has been funded.
- The past process for tool development has not been the same for all tools—but may need to be made more consistent to ensure that tools are universally pro-poor, gender-appropriate, scalable, with grass-roots participation, broadly accepted by partners, tested, refined, with appropriate training packages, etc.
- Grass-roots involvement in tool development was strong in women’s tools but not so strong in development of some other tools.
- E-forums have proved to be a good strategy to allow wide participation (but the level of participation has been variable).
- Partners need to play larger role in implementing tools at country level.
- Partners need to be made more aware of the tools, the rationale behind them, their stage of development and plans for their testing and adoption, etc.
- It is not clear to all partners and those using the GLTN website how the 18 tools were selected. (Why they were selected? What is expected from each tool?)
- Tools need to be described in more user-friendly way to promote better understanding.
- There are many tools—is the agenda too ambitious? This does, however, provide a broad menu for partners to find where they can contribute. With many tools under development at once, it is hard to finish any tool. It is a slow process because it is consultative. Should GLTN expand or consolidate its coverage of tools? Should it delay commencement of new tools? This is related to GLTN capacity.
- Need to prioritize the tools not yet started. Without more staff, GLTN Secretariat should not have too many tools under development at any one time. If GLTN starts two or three new tools each year and expands into two new countries yet is unable to finish earlier tools, this will lead to serious over-stretching of staff and consequent problems.
- If it develops a generic tool GLTN then needs to train people to use it. Needs training guides.
- Many tools are complex and need further tool development (testing and making sure that they can be applied). Some tools as they stand now will not be directly adopted nor will they be influential.
- Combining tools will be important at country level as many are not independent of each other and are supportive or synergistic.
- The word “tool” has some negative connotations (“prescriptive” or “blueprint”). Needs to be seen as a process of collaborative learning and applied research. Can never present a final tool or training programme—always needs to be adapted.
- Policymakers not interested in theory but how it is applied in practice—GLTN has to “get its hands dirty”, so to speak.
- Tools are being shared and adapted by partners independent of GLTN or the Secretariat.
- Testing and adoption of tools at country level are at an early stage. Each country has its own specific circumstances that will influence which tools will be most relevant or appropriate. Very opportunity-driven. Many partners do not have a systematic reach to all countries to support country-level activities.
- A number of important tools can now be tested—tools should not be kept in their case—a tool cannot be a tool unless it is used.
- General tools need to be adapted to country needs, this will strengthen the tools and demonstrate how they can be applied (leading to learning and improvement of tools). International partners with local level capacity (or local associates) are needed to support this.
- Tools developed at global level are good, leaving room for partners to implement at country level.
- Scale and impact are key concerns—if tools are developed and never demonstrated or used they remain at the conceptual level only.
- The real gauge of success is whether the tools are being implemented—tools are good so far but not many are ready to be implemented—tools are quite general—question is how to use these tools for national needs at country level.

- Several partners have published many good papers and guides with little impact—how many are needed to bring about change? This is a danger that GLTN may face.
- Publications do not change people's lives. Awareness of documents is not high—it is one thing to produce good documents, another to get them read and used—need to be read by Governments and not just by a small group of technical people at high levels.
- Can you produce a tool that makes a difference? There are big problems in land policy and governance that affect whether a tool is adopted and implemented successfully.
- Need a tool kit, not just one tool (various tools and training packages)—other tools and not just GLTN tools can be included. The time is now right—even if not all tools are fully developed.
- These tools will make a big impact once they are adopted at the country level.



UN HABITAT

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT)
P. O. Box 30030, 00100 Nairobi GPO KENYA
Tel: 254-020-7623120 (Central Office)
www.unhabitat.org

HS Number: HS/127/11E
ISBN Number(Series): 978-92-1-132028-2
ISBN Number(Volume): 978-92-1-132412-9