

# GLTN PHASE 2 PROGRAMME

## Mid-Term Review

MDF TRAINING & CONSULTANCY



# GLTN PHASE 2 PROGRAMME

## Mid-Term Review

MDF TRAINING & CONSULTANCY ©

### AUTHORS:

Saskia Brand (PhD)

Hadewijch Klaassen

Maurits Spoelder

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Mid Term Review (MTR) report is meant to establish the progress made in the implementation of the Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) Phase 2 Programme (2012-2017), covering the period of 2012-2015. The GLTN, a unit within UN-Habitat, is a partner-network of over seventy international institutions. It is established in 2006 and works to promote secure land and property rights for all, through the development of pro-poor and gender sensitive land tools. The GLTN's Programme objective is to ensure that international organisations, UN-Habitat staff and related land Programmes including targeted national and local governments, are better able to improve tenure security of the urban and rural poor.

Phase 2 of the GLTN Programme is coordinated by the GLTN Secretariat. Its task is to support the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the activities of the Network in collaboration with its Partners at global, regional and country level. The GLTN Phase 2 Programme has three "expected accomplishments", concerned with *policy*, *knowledge & awareness*, and *Partner capacity*. To realize the mentioned accomplishments, a number of activities were undertaken and outputs achieved that are regularly reported upon. For the first accomplishment the focus is on the development and testing of tools and approaches, for the second the focus lies on research, advocacy and communication, and for the third the focus is on capacity development and support for tool implementation. The GLTN Phase 2 is to be implemented with an estimated budget of USD 40 Million.

## *Scope of the MTR*

The emphasis of the MTR is on capturing progress towards outcome achievements on the one hand and the assessment of the network governance structure on the other hand. The MTR hereby goes beyond its initial scope, including both pre- and post-Phase 2 developments other than mere progress implementation. Programme's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact were measured along a five level appreciation scale ranging from highly satisfactory to highly

unsatisfactory. The MTR took place in the period from March to September 2016.

## *Methodology and methods applied*

A combination of methods was applied during this MTR. The team conducted an extensive document review, interviewed 32 internal and external Partners and stakeholders of GLTN<sup>1</sup>, made 3 to 7 day field visits to selected countries (DRC, Uganda and Kenya), initiated an on-line survey and assessed a sample of four GLTN tools that were implemented in the visited countries (the land mediation tool, the Gender Evaluation Criteria checklist (GEC), the Social Tenure Domain Model (STDM), and the Participatory Enumeration Approach).

In line with the emphasis on outcome achievement and network governance, the approaches of Outcome Harvesting (OH) and network dynamics were applied. OH collects evidence of what has been achieved in a number of predefined "outcome areas" and works backward to determine whether and how the GLTN programme contributed to the change. This makes it suited for complex change processes that involve many stakeholders and are difficult to predict, such as Programmes implemented in a network context. As for the analysis of the governance structure and vibrancy of the Network, the Capacity WORKS building blocks for successful network cooperation were used. These consist of five elements i.e. strategy, cooperation, steering structure, processes, and learning and innovation.

The overall appreciation of the GLTN tool development and implementation was analysed using the model of the Spiral of Initiatives (E. Wielinga, 2011). The Spiral of Initiatives shows the path a GLTN tool takes, from the birth of an idea, through inspiration of others, via planning, development and up scaling of the idea, towards the dissemination and embedding of the tool.

---

<sup>1</sup> Half of these interviews took place in Washington DC during the Annual World Bank Conference on Land and Poverty held in March 2016. The interviewees represented 21 different GLTN Partner organizations.

In March 2016 an inception workshop with Programme staff took place in Nairobi to investigate the network vibrancy and connectivity. A stakeholder analysis was done and a Programme “pathway of change” was reconstructed through focus on stakeholder-based outcomes. The MTR team coordinated with the steering group within the Secretariat for technical and organizational matters. The inception report was reviewed and validated by the Secretariat and the International Advisory Board (IAB).

#### *Findings and conclusions*

Regarding the GLTN Phase 2 **Programme** the Mid Term Review rates the overall performance as “satisfactory”, with a tendency towards “highly satisfactory.”

Regarding Programme relevance, the GLTN Phase 2 responds in an increasing degree to the needs of global, regional and national players in the field of land rights and land tenure policies and practice. As the majority of the World’s population has no access to conventional land administration systems, there is a great need for alternative ways to secure land tenure. The tools of GLTN offer this alternative by combining technical tools with a social perception of land and tenure security for all, including poor men, women and youth. It is also observed that an increasing number of Partners and donors opt for inclusion of the GLTN agenda and principles like the Continuum of Land rights in their policies, tools and approaches. This apparent ‘demand’ for GLTN products creates an array of challenges for governments, land actors and stakeholders, many of whom do currently not have the awareness or capacities needed to make the necessary changes. Capacity development is therefore central to the achievement of the GLTN’s Programme objectives. In addition, the objective and implementation of GLTN Phase 2 is consistent with UN-Habitat strategies and responds to UN-Habitat’s Medium Term Strategic and Institutional Plan. GLTN is especially responsive to cross-cutting issues of the UN-Habitat strategy regarding the integration of gender and youth perspectives. The role that GLTN takes on local, national, regional and global level is currently diverse ranging from programme implementer, capacity builder, knowledge expert and broker, convener of policy debate, and lobbyist / advocate.

Regarding effectiveness, GLTN has made important progress on global and regional levels. Final outcomes remain work-in-progress, as expected with the programme being half-way, though still a range of global and regional “emerging” outcomes are observed covering 9 of the 16 outcome areas being distinguished. These emerging outcomes illustrate the degree in which the expected accomplishments for phase 2 have been achieved. They show that global land policy stakeholders have endorsed the most important GLTN policies and included them in their own strategies that global land policy frameworks now include the GLTN agenda and that GLTN tools are used. It is furthermore found that GLTN Partners start to mobilize their own resources to implement the GLTN agenda and provide implementation support to national governments, and that international academic institutions develop knowledge and mainstream the GLTN agenda in their learning programmes.

GLTN has for example exerted itself to have the concept of the Continuum of land rights endorsed. This resulted into Partners incorporating the concept into the GLTN tool development; countries showing interest and requesting GLTN for further guidance; as well as the UN-Habitat Governing Council’s committing itself to the Continuum. The adoption of the GEC by the Internal Land Coalition (ILC), who together with the Huairou Commission set out to expand and monitor the implementation of gender sensitive land policies in numerous countries is another example. On the global level, GLTN made an important contribution to the inclusion of land indicators into the SDGs through GLII, the inclusion of the Continuum in the VGGT as well as the growing involvement of GLTN in the implementation of the VGGT at country level, and the inclusion of Land in Habitat III. The active involvement of the GLTN Secretariat and Partners has been important to achieve this last example.

Furthermore, GLTN Partners are increasingly including GLTN’s agenda and values in their own strategies and programming. This process of inclusion is a result of coinciding affinity (vision and mission) with and/or increased involvement in GLTN’s work. Use of own resources towards the GLTN agenda is happening, but not by all in the same degree. Africa is most advanced in this respect, but Asia and the Pacific, Eastern

Caribbean regions and Arab states have started to follow. This is clearly a result of the active involvement of the GLTN (Secretariat and Partners) in Africa over the past years. Tool development, knowledge building and advocacy and capacity development, all three implementing strategies belonging to the three Expected Accomplishments were needed to make the above mentioned changes happen.

The area where progress is lagging behind is in the way donors go about land rights. Donors accept land as an important issue, but programming and funding GLTN inspired land programmes is still limited. Another area for improvement is GLTN's involvement in regional research and training institutes in mainstreaming and dissemination of the new GLTN concepts and tools. Research and training institutions are slowly moving away from training graduated land specialists to changing land management curricula of universities, although the number of changing universities is still very low. Furthermore, collaboration and coordination among global land actors has increased and joint land programmes are initiated. However, within the Network there is still competition among a number of Partners, especially among the powerful players at global level. There is hard work going on to define how to monitor global and regional changes. This goes for the land indicators of the SDGs, LPI and Habitat III monitoring frameworks. The current need for establishment and harmonisation of these three frameworks is a major opportunity to bridge the existing gap on global land monitoring.

On country level, strong results are achieved at the community level in terms of increased awareness and understanding of land/tenure rights. An improved relationship between community representatives and local authorities as well as enhanced negotiating power of the inhabitants, providing a feeling of increased tenure security, is clearly noticed. The capacity built of national country partners (CSO's and national, country/municipal government) has furthermore led to an enhanced understanding and promotion to implement pro-poor land policies. The application of GLTN tools has identified development needs in informal settlements attracting funding of third-party settlement upgrading programmes. Bottlenecks also still exist, like the slow progression of national land reforms and access to official

documentation that legally protects community citizens. These elements are at present beyond the control of the Programme, but respondents have suggested that GLTN, as a Network, comprising important global players and hosted by a UN organisation, can put more efforts in encouraging national and local governments in this respect.

GLTN's M&E strategy is well designed and aligned to its Results framework as presented in the GLTN project document (Project's Logic Model and Logical Framework). The M&E system is based on the three Expected Accomplishments mostly capturing quantitative successes on the achievements of promised deliverables. The monitoring strategy does not capture qualitative information on targeted stakeholders changed behaviour. This information could however be instrumental in steering the GLTN Phase 2 towards achieving its ambitions. At present, GLTN delivers on its commitments at output level, while progress at outcome level is emerging with a significant contribution of GLTN. It is however too early to draw firm conclusions about how far the Programme has progressed towards enhanced tenure security, being GLTN's ultimate objective.

GLTN consciously tries to do its best to be as efficient as possible, mainly by making maximum use of Partners who make various efforts on a voluntary basis. GLTN is focused on transfer of competencies as soon as possible via guidelines and Partner platforms and as such the value of GLTN goes beyond what is delivered by the Network itself. Developing local capacities as quickly as possible, via collaboration with national implementing partners, contributes to less expenditure and more efficiency. GLTN indeed has increasingly invested in partnership, with almost half of the budget spent on capacity development on country level in 2015. A firm conclusion about the managerial efficiency of the Network is difficult to make given limitations in the breakdown of expenditure and the absence of a reasonable benchmark. It is however clear that GLTN has made significant efficiency gains in the period 2012 – 2015 with overhead costs reducing from 36% to 12% of expenditures. Despite this, a number of Partners still is critical about GLTN's efficiency, due to bureaucracy and delays, e.g. in the making of plans and strategies, and the high costs of a Secretariat that runs under UN terms and conditions.



Regarding the sustainability of the Programme, the GLTN partners play a crucial role in the GLTN approach. They help drive the Programme, with their collective large scope of interests and skills, and their critical understanding of the needs in the land sector, particularly at the country level. The key GLTN strategy is to embed tools and new thinking in Partner's programmes and business models to ensure scale and sustainability. GLTN is herewith on the right track and sustainability is potentially high. Up scaling of the Programme via dissemination and embedding of tools within partner organisations or country governments, within the budgetary availability of the programme, is the biggest challenge.

#### *Governance Structure*

Overall, the MTR rates the GLTN Phase 2 **governance structure** as "partially satisfactory". The governance structure has functioned well during the initial years of the GLTN being a relatively small Network. However, at this point in time the existing mechanisms of representation of Partners and decision making no longer meet the needs and requirements of the Network.

The long-term strategy formulation has taken place at the start of GLTN in 2006 and fine-tuned at the formulation of GLTN Phase 2. Partners (in and outside the IAB) miss a more continuous discussion on long-term goals and strategic choices. They like to be involved from early stages of preparation.

The Network has an added value for Partners and it has created new (unexpected) partnerships, as they meet at the Biannual Partner Meeting and in different expert groups. Partners have started to collaborate on common issues and increasingly understand and appreciate each other. The network gives authority to the Partners and weight to their points of view on pro-poor land management outside the Network. Partners highly appreciate the way tools and approaches are developed among different kinds of stakeholders. The strategic mixture of land stakeholders can be intensified even more, especially when it concerns the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues like gender and youth. Collaboration with government and private sector is still limited in the cooperation dynamics of the GLTN and new partners come in on own initiative, not because of strategic invitation from the GLTN.

Partners appreciate the work of the Secretariat. They perceive the Secretariat as being a liaison between UN-Habitat Steering Committee and the IAB and as being loyal to the Network. Decision making mechanisms are aligned with UN-Habitat procedures, which do not necessarily always meet the needs of the Network Partners or the Programme. Decision making is perceived as non-participatory, which hampers the development of collective ownership and participation of Partners. The formal division of tasks among IAB, Steering Committee, Secretariat and Clusters doesn't correspond with daily reality and current needs of the Network. The naming of the different entities reinforces confusion (e.g. the Steering Committee does not actually steer the Network but mostly verifies compliance with UN-Habitat principles, objectives, rules and regulations). The composition of the IAB is questioned as the donors present in discussions have a stronger voice than others, while partners do not feel adequately represented by the cluster representatives and grassroots organisation still play a marginal role. In addition the majority of Partners feel that the cluster division, the representation of the clusters in the IAB and the internal processes are not adequate anymore. Clusters miss overall strategic guidance and a long term vision. The clusters, due to their growth, do not perform optimally in terms of using their capacities, commitment, leadership, and internal collaboration.

The Secretariat's network coordination is sub-ordinate to its programme management responsibility due to a mixture of tasks assigned to staff and staff-shortages. The Secretariat has many functions and is wearing many hats, which risks to create confusion and tensions in the management of the Network. The Secretariat's role in project management is not clear to all Partners.

The Network is very much appreciated by the Partners, as it has facilitated access to innovations, to recent research, new knowledge, the latest experiences and publications. Through participation in the Network, Partners have acquired new insights and have strengthened their capacities. The current M&E system serves the purpose of accountability very well, but as it is mainly focused on outputs and immediate outcomes, the purpose of learning of Partners is limited. GLTN struggles with the measurement and attribution of higher impact level results, especially

when Partners use their own funding for the implementation of the tools.

However, Partners experience limited ownership within the Network. Due to the growth and functioning of certain Clusters, the limited participation and transparency in decision making processes together with the lack of strategic invitation of new partners and strategic use of Partners' capacities for the Network's purposes, Partners do not participate, collaborate and contribute to their full capacity.

#### *Recommendations<sup>2</sup>*

##### *Recommendations for immediate action to enhance Programme performance under phase 2;*

In order to confirm the added value of the Network for future funding, it is recommended that in the remaining 18 months under Phase 2 GLTN captures and demonstrates more compelling evidence of the impact of its work beyond its own sphere of control i.e. the extent to which tool and capacity development contributes to behavioural change of target actors that will impact tenure security. To do so a temporary focus on selected tools or capacity building approaches with a high potential for making and capturing significant progress is needed (1).

A dedicated campaign to further the development and up-scaling of these selected tools and approaches aimed at achieving change at outcome level would then be needed. These campaigns ideally would have to be based on a well-articulated 'pathway of change' that illustrates GLTN's thinking of how these high-potential tools & approaches are going to make a difference towards the development and implementation of pro-poor gender sensitive land policies and Programmes. From this pathway, a clear results-chain can be developed, including key assumptions in regard to this (2).

This results chain would have to be accompanied by a fitting monitoring system that does justice to the complexity of reality and offers a systematic, yet practical way to capture outcomes (3). Captured outcomes can serve as evidence to enhance visibility

of the Network as well as help in the formulation and management of Phase 3 of GLTN (4).

##### *Recommendations to enhance Programme performance on the longer run (phase 3).*

Given the political sensitivity of the global, national and local land debates with many actors having big and often conflicting interests, it is recommended that GLTN positions itself as an entity that depoliticizes the debate. This by offering broadly supported and tested technical 'solutions', whilst levelling the playing field by empowering the less powerful with objective evidence to pursue their land and tenure rights (5).

In line with its clarified position, GLTN can become more specific about its complementary role at local, national and global level. At *local* level, GLTN may want to stick to playing a catalytic role equipping individual Partners to become more effective in promoting the implementation of pro-poor gender sensitive land policies and practices. At *national level* GLTN can convene its own partnership for the sake of sharing and learning as basis for providing joint technical inputs into relevant policy debates (i.e. not convene the national land debate). Although a number of Partners mention the neutral position of GLTN as UN related network and therefore see the Network fit for lobby purposes at national level, the MTR team is convinced that the major added value of GLTN lies in promoting a joint technical message concerning the best possible way forward in practicing pro-poor / gender sensitive land governance. This message should be consistently used by the collective as well as individual Partners in their advocacy / policy influencing work. At global level, the essence of GLTN would be to facilitate processes of cross-learning between global players and between countries with the aim of up-scaling, always around technical solutions equipping other like-minded organizations to influence pro-poor gender sensitive global land policies and resolutions (6).

Based on the GLTN's collective conceptual thinking, it is advised that it's next strategic framework is to be more explicit about how desired change at local, national and global level can be brought about. This strategic framework would make it easier to formulate a comprehensive results chain logically linking GLTN outputs (sphere of control, distinct from individual partners) to outcomes (sphere of influence, in terms

---

<sup>2</sup> Numbers refer to the recommendation in the report.

of behaviour change of GLTN's target actors) to impact (sphere of concern, in terms of broader societal change in land and tenure rights) (7). Having clearly articulated outcomes and impact expectations will make it possible to develop a fitting monitoring system that helps capturing success beyond the achievements of promised deliverables. This monitoring system will have to complement the existing output-oriented monitoring efforts and would need to include a practical protocol for capturing outcome-level achievements and contribution analysis that offers systematic and practical help in distinguishing GLTN's added value from that of its Partners and other key actors in the land arena (8).

To have real impact, GLTN is advised to remain engaged beyond the development and (pilot) application stage of its technical tools and approaches. This implies that the nature of GLTN's activities may become more diverse with a changing involvement and prominence of Partners in the evolution of a particular GLTN initiative. The GLTN should become more explicit about how the full diversity of its Partnership can play a meaningful role in all phases of the initiative (9). To do this capacity is needed to go beyond the application of tools. It is recommended to build (institutional) capacity of those GLTN Partners that can play a role in the dissemination of GLTN tools and approaches. This could be done by sharing evidence based knowledge among GLTN Partners to come up and use a joint *technical* message concerning the best possible way forward in practicing pro-poor / gender sensitive land governance. This message should be consistently used by the GLTN collective as well as individual Partners in its advocacy / policy influencing work (10).

particular a more hands-on role for the IAB in the preparation and monitoring of GLTN's strategy. The Secretariat is recommended to guide and coordinate but not take the lead in writing this strategy but expected to lay out a process plan (roadmap) for the coming strategy development (1).

*Make space to encourage cooperation and vibrancy*, which requires the future strategy to explicitly address this issue including the formulation of a deliberate Partner and Member engagement strategy. The GLTN Secretariat needs to make the creation of a functional and attractive platform for exchange among members a priority and strengthen its internal capacity to do so. This as GLTN is not an organisation but a Network, which means that enhanced Partner cooperation is not just a means but a goal in itself and the reason for many Partners to join (2).

*Optimise GLTN's steering structure*. This requires an in-depth review of the current division of responsibilities among the different entities that together shape GLTN (in particular Steering Committee, Secretariat and IAB and the representation of Partners in the decision making processes) for which a dedicated task force or working group, to be nominated by the IAB, is suggested. This includes articulating a more distinct and feasible role for the Secretariat with more emphasis on its role as network facilitator (including provision of administrative support) and less as manager and implementer of Programme activities (3). Linked to this is reducing the existing confusion and conflict of interest that results from the current arrangement of GLTN under UN-Habitat (GLTN being both a programme and a Secretariat). This most likely requires a more distant hosting arrangement that serves GLTN's sustainability and ascertains its

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

[https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5\\_19477](https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_19477)

