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The Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) was established in 2006 to address issues of secure land and property rights. It does this through the development of pro-poor and gender-appropriate land tools within the continuum of land rights framework, to ensure these rights are fulfilled for everyone. Since then, the Network has grown from strength to strength in terms of the diversity of partners, the development of innovative land tools, the growth in expertise and capacity, as well as international endorsement of its normative approach and agenda by Member States, global frameworks and other key land institutions and actors. So far GLTN has had two cycles: Phase 1 (2006–2011) and Phase 2 (2012–2018). This report presents the findings, lessons and recommendations of the end-of-phase evaluation for Phase 2.

As was the case in Phase 1, during Phase 2, the GLTN Secretariat was hosted by UN-Habitat and the GLTN’s programme was implemented with the participation of various international and national partners.

GLTN’s project performance and impact were assessed according to the criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability, with consideration of participation, ownership, financial management and monitoring and evaluation, among others. The evaluation was conducted between January and March 2018 and included interviews with the GLTN Secretariat and international partners, and visits to five pilot countries (Kenya, Uganda, Zambia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Nepal).

According to the programme’s design, GLTN 2 aimed to:

• improve the ability of international organizations, UN-Habitat staff and targeted national and local governments
• improve the tenure security of the urban & rural poor.

The Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) was established in 2006 to address issues of secure land and property rights. It does this through the development of pro-poor and gender-appropriate land tools within the continuum of land rights framework, to ensure these rights are fulfilled for everyone.
1. This report presents the findings, lessons and recommendations of the end-of-phase evaluation of the Global Land Tool Network – Phase 2 (GLTN 2). According to the programme’s design, GLTN 2 aimed to improve the ability of international organizations, UN-Habitat staff and targeted national and local governments to improve the tenure security of the urban and rural poor. The GLTN Secretariat was hosted by UN-Habitat and the GLTN’s programme was implemented with the participation of various international and national partners. Project performance and impact were assessed according to the criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability, with consideration of participation, ownership, financial management and monitoring and evaluation, among others. The evaluation was conducted between January and March 2018 and included interviews with the GLTN Secretariat and international partners, and visits to five pilot countries (Kenya, Uganda, Zambia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Nepal). The GLTN’s second phase started in January 2012 and is scheduled to end in June 2018; hence some of the in-country pilot initiatives were still in progress at the time of the evaluation. As a result, results are pending in some cases and may not be fully captured in this report.

2. The general findings of the evaluation indicate that the Global Land Tool Network’s second phase has successfully delivered expected results, in relation to their performance indicators and targets. The GLTN has been effective in shifting the discourse on land governance at global and national levels towards pro-poor and gender-responsive land tools and approaches. Overall, performance was satisfactory in terms of the evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.
The positive assessment takes into account the geographic scale of the various initiatives, the performance of the GLTN Secretariat in managing the programme, and the considerable coordination and administrative efforts that were necessary to work simultaneously at global, regional and national levels. The evaluators have additionally considered the level of GLTN involvement and attribution when assessing effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

3. The GLTN has proved to be relevant to land rights and tenure issues at global and national levels, and in both urban and rural contexts. GLTN tools have been highly relevant for post-conflict and disaster resettlement strategies based on experiences from pilots in Africa, the Middle East and Nepal. The Network addresses a key gap in the implementation of land policies by offering cost-effective and inclusive approaches that lead to tenure security, and by advocating the continuum of land rights and fit-for-purpose land administration concepts in various global platforms, including the New Urban Agenda that was approved at Habitat III. The GLTN 2 has global relevance for the challenges of urbanization and rural-urban migration, inequitable access to land, and the displacement of communities by armed conflict or natural disasters. The tools and concepts that were promoted have influenced national land policies in several countries. The adoption of land tenure indicators for various Sustainable Development Goals – and the momentum that this has generated with international donors and partners - has the potential for global impact.

4. These initiatives were driven by an intelligent implementation strategy that was catalytic and based on facilitation and working through global and national partners, rather than direct implementation. Its design was responsive to the urban governance, legislation and land objectives of UN-Habitat’s Medium-Term Strategic and Institutional Plans for the 2008-13 and 2014-19 periods. The project’s relevance was reinforced by its consistency with the Voluntary Guidelines for the Governance of Land Tenure (VGGTs) and regional programmes implemented by the consortium of
the African Union, African Development Bank and United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, as well the IFAD-supported TSLI-ESA programme. GLTN relevance was further strengthened by the adoption of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2016, several of which address land issues. The GLTN has attracted a growing number of international and national partners that are actively engaged in land issues; this has benefited the Network in terms of visibility, peer guidance and access to partner constituencies.

5. The programme was generally efficient in delivering its planned outputs and outcomes. Budget delivery is high – with a cumulative expenditure rate of 92 per cent six months before its end – but with differences in the efficiency of services provided by UNOPS and UNON. Output delivery was satisfactory; most outputs have been completed, with the exception of in-country pilot initiatives that started late and are still in progress, e.g. Nepal. Programme efficiency was also affected by initially low budget delivery and late receipt of donor funds, the transition of UNON’s financial system to the new UMOJA format, and the delayed disbursement of the final tranche of funds for the pilot country activities. The contracting of UNOPS to service the in-country activities has ensured efficient processing and disbursement. The programme was extended by six months without an increase in the budget and is was expected to fully disburse the remaining funds by June 2018.

6. Effectiveness and impact were satisfactory, with most of the planned outputs and outcomes fully delivered. Preliminary estimates indicate that the combined in-country pilot activities have improved

The project’s relevance was reinforced by its consistency with the Voluntary Guidelines for the Governance of Land Tenure (VGGTs) and regional programmes implemented by the consortium of the African Union, African Development Bank and United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, as well the IFAD-supported TSLI-ESA programme. GLTN relevance was further strengthened by the adoption of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2016.

Combined in-country pilot activities have improved tenure security for more than 200,000 urban and rural households.

Capacity development enabled national partners and target beneficiaries to make efficient use of the GLTN’s support, while creating opportunities for international partners to participate in the provision of technical guidance and training.

International and national partners applied GLTN tools.

International, national and local partners incorporated land tools and approaches in their plans and programmes.

The pilot application of land tools has, in turn, strengthened the capacity and vision of community organizations that have developed working relations with municipal governments and are initiating parallel local development initiatives.
tenure security for more than 200,000 urban and rural households; a portion of these beneficiaries has received or is in the process of receiving certificates of occupancy and other legal documentation that strengthen property rights. Overall effectiveness was enhanced by the inclusion of achievable performance indicators in the programme’s design, and cross-component linkages that enabled synergies between the design and demonstration of land tools and capacity development, advocacy and communications initiatives. The consistent focus on capacity development enabled national partners and target beneficiaries to make efficient use of the GLTN’s support, while creating opportunities for international partners to participate in the provision of technical guidance and training. This raised the relevance and efficiency of the programme’s activities in the pilot countries.

7. As a result, the three expected accomplishments (EAs) that were foreseen under the GLTN’s second phase were met and their targets surpassed:

- A set of land tools and approaches was designed to deliver tenure security at scale, targeting the rural and urban poor. A set of land tools and approaches was developed that addresses the challenges of delivering tenure security at scale, particularly for the urban and rural poor; at the time of the evaluation, 71 international, national and local partners have adopted or shown interest in using them (EA 1).

- Global knowledge and awareness of pro-poor and gender-appropriate land policies, tools and approaches was increased; 47 international and national partners applied GLTN tools and 52 international, national and local partners incorporated land tools and approaches in their plans and programmes (EA 2).

- Capacities for implementing pro-poor and gender-appropriate land tools and approaches were strengthened for 31 national land actors, 21 international partners and 7 cities/municipalities in different regions (EA 3).

8. The pilot demonstration of land tools and approaches in different regions (particularly Africa) was the programme’s most effective aspect in terms of results, visibility and leverage. In particular, the application of the Social Tenure Domain Model (STDM) in association with the participatory mapping and enumeration tools has been cost-effective and led to tangible improvements in tenure security in diverse contexts. The building of local consensus around clear boundaries that are legally recognized and mapped has reduced land disputes significantly. In addition, thousands of urban and rural beneficiaries are in the process of receiving occupancy certificates or other legal documents that will improve their tenure security. The data generated through the STDM and associated tools have enabled land-use planning, leading to the incorporation of informal urban settlements into municipal plans. Likewise, the land mediation tool was successfully piloted in three provinces of the DRC as part of a broader participatory land-use planning initiative.
9. The pilot application of land tools has, in turn, strengthened the capacity and vision of community organizations that have developed working relations with municipal governments and are initiating parallel local development initiatives. At various project sites, the application of land tools led to significant public investments in infrastructure and service improvements. According to the data provided, the combined budgets of the in-country initiatives have leveraged government/donor investments at a ratio of 1:28. Some of the land tools have been adopted by international development agencies, such as IFAD and Habitat for Humanity International.

10. The development of land tools and their demonstration have fed into the programme’s capacity development, advocacy and communications components. Capacity development was implemented at different levels and combined regional workshops on GLTN land tools and concepts with local on-site practical training. Community-based organizations gained experience and confidence through their participation in the programme and several are in the process of promoting new local development initiatives. Although the evaluators were unable to review evaluations of training events, the intermittent feedback provided by participants was consistently positive.

11. A major achievement in global advocacy was the design and incorporation of land tenure indicators for relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), enabling the monitoring of progress towards their achievement. This has led to partnerships with major donors and development agencies associated with the Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII), hosted and facilitated by GLTN and the Global Donor Working Group on Land. Likewise, the advocacy of GLTN partners was decisive in GLTN concepts – the continuum of land rights and fit-for-purpose land administration – being included in the New Urban Agenda that was approved at the Habitat III conference.
12. The evaluation findings indicate that the programme´s main objective was achieved through the satisfactory delivery of outputs and outcomes. There were various contributing factors:

- The design of GLTN 2 benefited from the experience and lessons of its initial phase.
- The programme´s expected deliverables and performance were viable within the approved timeline and budget.
- The success in promoting the adoption of tenure security concepts and indicators within global platforms such as the SDGs and New Urban Agenda was, in part, reinforced by their validation on the ground.
- The GLTN Secretariat assumed a facilitative and catalytic role by working through partners and focusing more on technical backstopping and training than direct implementation; this approach enhanced cost-effectiveness and commitment, as observed during the country visits.
- The implementation approach articulated vertical and horizontal dynamics: global advocacy, research, technical advice and capacity building were linked to in-country demonstrations of land tools that, in turn, provided evidence-based case studies for dissemination.
13. To a large extent, the evaluation focused on the implementation of land tools in six pilot countries that were selected under the GLTN’s second phase, five of which are in Africa. The lower level of activity in other regions ultimately limited the programme’s global impact. Most in-country demonstrations were based on the Social Tenure Domain Model (STDM) tool and participatory enumerations, with lesser use of tools such as the Gender Evaluation Criteria (GEC).

This reflected the different stages of land tool development, several of which are still in progress and require field testing before they are validated or disseminated. Likewise, the selection of tools was demand-driven and different tools were selected to address specific issues.

These combined factors prevented the GLTN from applying the full “tool box”, limiting opportunities to demonstrate the aggregate benefits of combining associated tools according to their logical sequence. As noted, most of the in-country initiatives were focused on specific tools and their potential synergies – for example, following STDM with participatory land-use planning or land valuation and readjustment tools that have yet to be demonstrated. Despite the collective potential of GLTN’s land tools, only the STDM, participatory mapping/enumeration, Gender Evaluation Criteria (GEC) and land mediation tools appear to have been fully validated under the programme’s second phase.

14. The GLTN is largely driven by international partners that provide peer advice, funding and visibility. Their participation in the programme has been satisfactory. International partners were consulted in the design of the second phase and they participated in its implementation through an International Advisory Board and cluster working groups that supported training activities and provided technical guidance as implementing partners.

However, the participation of partners and donors did not extend to programme supervision or oversight, which were entrusted to a UN-Habitat Steering Committee. This has led to internal tensions among partners who feel that the GLTN has outgrown its present institutional arrangements, and that new mechanisms for partner participation within GLTN’s governance framework is needed to sustain commitment and build ownership. There are also perceived ambiguities in the GLTN’s identity, with blurred distinctions regarding its status as a global network that is accountable to its members and that of a UN-Habitat programme that legally binds the Network to one of its technical branches.

This arrangement connects the GLTN Secretariat to the internal corporate dynamics of UN-Habitat and a significant share of staff time is devoted to work...
stream and parallel initiatives that are not always related to core issues. The GLTN has strengthened UN-Habitat’s global positioning on land issues; by broadening its thematic focus to include the expanding “urban-rural interface”, UN-Habitat has attracted new partners and funding that have complemented the agency’s ongoing initiatives in settlements planning and slum upgrading. On the other hand, GLTN has clearly benefited from its association with UN-Habitat in terms of global image and access to government levels. This has helped national partners in building collaborative relations with government partners on land issues that are often politically sensitive.

15. These issues are likely to gain momentum as GLTN continues to develop. The evaluators acknowledge the need to review current institutional arrangements and consider more inclusive options, and to discuss guidelines that improve the internal organization and performance of the clusters. One of the main challenges in this respect is how to secure more consistent commitments from international partners that volunteer their time and (in most cases) work.

16. An ambitious monitoring plan was approved after the second phase’s commencement that incorporated complementary indicators related to programme management, the implementation of in-country pilot initiatives and gender inclusiveness, and new formats for documenting progress towards specific indicators and targets. All outcomes and outputs have been monitored according to their indicators and presented in annual reports that are comprehensive and well-documented. Much of the monitoring information has provided inputs for GLTN’s training and advocacy initiatives. There are information gaps, however, and several ongoing pilot initiatives have not been evaluated or final reports submitted, nor has there been a benefit-cost analysis that quantifies the cost-effectiveness of land tools (which is admittedly difficult given the influence of different urban and rural contexts on performance). The mid-term evaluation took longer than expected and underwent successive changes of team members; the MTE findings were positive, yet several were questioned by key recipients and donors, which contributed to the delayed disbursement of funds. The end-of-phase evaluation was scheduled approximately one year after the MTE’s conclusion and several months in advance of the programme’s termination. As a result, GLTN’s overall M&E performance was not optimal.

17. Most GLTN initiatives are likely to be sustained and there are opportunities to replicate land tools on a broader scale. Likewise, the inclusion of land tenure indicators for the SDGs (of which UN-Habitat is a designated custodian) and GLTN’s work with the Global Land Indicators Initiative involve long-term horizons, e.g. strengthening the capacities of national statistical offices, data agencies and the general land community, and developing periodic global status reports on land governance issues. Most of the visited in-country initiatives appear to be sustainable because they have led to the issuance of occupancy certificates and other legal documents that provide tenure security; they have also leveraged public investments in basic services and infrastructure. In most of the pilot countries, land tools were being replicated by national partners at other locations or were planned for replication. As a network, the GLTN is sustainable to the extent that its tools continue to assist the implementation of pro-poor land policies and international partners and donors can sustain their level of commitment.
2. LESSONS LEARNT

1. The GLTN’s second phase provides an interesting case study from which various lessons can be derived. The programme has demonstrated satisfactory levels of performance and was able to fully achieve most of its planned outputs and outcomes. A contributing factor was the programme implementation strategy that made effective use of the GLTN’s comparative advantages and of emergent opportunities. In addition, GLTN partnerships have been productive and mutually beneficial; as the GLTN has strived to expand partnerships and funding opportunities, it was also sought by international and national partners to support their own advocacy platforms, projects or research activities.

The GLTN’s second phase has strengthened UN-Habitat’s global position on land issues and broadened its thematic and programmatic scope through the consideration of land tenure issues and their effects on the “urban-rural interface”. This has, in turn, attracted new partners and resources, expanded cooperation opportunities and generated extra-budgetary income for the agency.

2. Land tools are the GLTN’s “signature” product and its most valued contribution on a global scale. The Social Tenure Domain Model (STDM) in particular has consistently demonstrated its value as a cost-effective tool that facilitates land surveying and registration through the use of open-source software and accessible technology that can be managed by targeted beneficiaries. There is the potential to combine associated land tools sequentially as a “toolbox” to maximize their collective utility, i.e. following STDM with participatory land-use planning, land valuation/readjustment or GEC. However, various GLTN tools are at different stages of development and several have not been field-tested or validated.

The experiences drawn from in-country demonstrations suggest that community participation enhances the effectiveness and impact of land tools but does not necessarily improve timeliness or efficiency. At the global level, the participation of international partners should be extended to the GLTN’s governance framework to sustain their commitment, strengthen ownership and build a shared vision of the Network’s future direction. The evaluation findings confirm that there are opportunities to expand the scale of GLTN activities and impact, justifying continued donor support.
1. This report makes several recommendations discussed in plenary at the partners’ meeting in April 2018. The most immediate recommendation is that the GLTN Secretariat ensures that ongoing pilot initiatives are completed and that the development of land tools is concluded so as to offer the full toolbox. This should be followed by the documentation of final results to convey the second phase’s full impact.

To achieve this, UN-Habitat and the principal GLTN donors may need to approve “bridge financing” to complete ongoing activities and sustain the Secretariat into the next programme phase. Looking forward, the over-arching goal of the GLTN should focus on contributing to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals that address land issues, in a manner that articulates its global advocacy, capacity development and regional/country-based initiatives.

The GLTN Secretariat needs to develop a growth management strategy that considers adjustments to current institutional arrangements, to effectively plan and manage the Network’s development over time. In this respect, the evaluation recommends the integration of advisory and steering/oversight functions under a single body, enabling the participation of international partners within the GLTN governance framework, and the selective decentralization of operational and administrative tasks to regional focal points posted at the UN-Habitat regional offices.

2. Based on these findings, the evaluators endorse the proposal for a third GLTN programme phase that would be broader in scale. This will require additional Secretariat staff and budgetary resources, as well as the selective decentralization of operational tasks to UN-Habitat’s regional offices to enhance responsiveness and efficiency. Likewise, adjustments are recommended to the present institutional arrangement to encourage greater inclusiveness in programme oversight and supervision, to sustain the commitment and “ownership” of international partners, and to build a strategic vision to guide the GLTN’s future direction.

Donor support for the GLTN should be continued and, to the extent feasible, incremented based on an agreed medium-term strategy and work-plan. The report’s recommendations on these issues provided inputs for broader discussion at the partners meeting in April 2018.
## 4. PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CRITERIA</th>
<th>SCORE / RATING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Relevance</td>
<td>★★★★★</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>★★★</td>
<td>Partially Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A strength of the Network has been its ability to build partnerships based on mutual benefit. Several partners and donors have supported the dissemination of land tools and use them within their own project portfolio. GLTN management and governance arrangements were efficient and enabled partner participation in providing technical guidance, training and other activities. However, there is a perceived need for greater international partner participation in strategic planning, oversight and decision-making;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CRITERIA</th>
<th>SCORE / RATING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>★★★★★ Satisfactory</td>
<td>GLTN 2 was well managed and cost-effective, in part due to an implementation strategy that was catalytic and driven by partnership rather than direct execution. The programme has been extremely effective in piloting STDM in association with participatory mapping and enumeration tools, improving tenure security for thousands of urban and rural households, strengthening local organizational capacities, and leveraging service/infrastructure improvements and follow-up local development activities. There were synergies linking the main GLTN components, with land tool development and demonstration feeding into capacity development, advocacy and communications. Much of the programme’s impact was generated in Africa, where most pilot countries are located, with less effect in other regions. Several tools are still in the process of development and the full “toolbox” was not available during the second phase. There is considerable potential to implement associated tools based on their logical sequence, demonstrating collective benefits. The inclusion of land tenure indicators for relevant SDGs provides the monitoring framework to measure progress of global goals. The continuum of land rights, fit-for-purpose land administration and pro-poor, gender appropriate land tools are recognized by the New Urban Agenda and are influencing national land policies in several pilot countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Outlook</td>
<td>★★★★★ Satisfactory</td>
<td>GLTN 2 achieved its objective and the three expected accomplishments were met and their targets exceeded. Most of the outputs were fully delivered. However, much of the impact outlook was focused on the Africa region where most of the pilot countries are located. This lowered global impact levels. Global advocacy efforts and in-country pilot initiatives have generated results and have a strong potential for up-scaling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>★★★★★ Satisfactory</td>
<td>Most results generated by the pilot in-country initiatives are sustainable with up-scaling potential. Tenure security improvements with certificates of occupancy and other legal documents are sustainable. Pilot initiatives are being replicated by national partners. The inclusion of land indicators in SDGs and GLTN’s association with the Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII) will require continued involvement over the medium term. A third programme phase was proposed and will be discussed with donors, UN-Habitat and other partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score &amp; Rating</td>
<td>★★★★★ Satisfactory</td>
<td>GLTN Phase 2 has successfully delivered its expected results, with overall satisfactory performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>