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INTRODUCTION

Africa faces daunting land governance challenges. Rapid population growth and unbridled urban expansion are among the key factors contributing to intensify competition for land, with higher conflict risks. In the last decade, Africa finds itself at the center of the global rush for agricultural land, while the pace of land degradation accelerates. The continent’s vulnerability to these challenges is to a large extent the result of weak resource governance, in particular of land. In recent years, consensual principles and normative frameworks have been agreed at the international and regional levels, with notably the 2012 Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Land Tenure (VGGT, 2012) and the 2009 Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa (F&G, 2009). The ability of African countries to implement their land policies and laws while aligning them to emerging norms is constrained by lack of capacity, at all levels.

The need to prioritize and urgently address the continent’s capacity gap in land governance is well understood. The Heads of States and Government of the Africa Union, in their 2009 ‘Declaration on Land Issues and Challenges in Africa’, call on Member States to build adequate human, financial and technical capacities to support land policy development and implementation. On the same lines, the Africa Land Policy Framework and Guidelines (2009) observes that African countries lack capacity to design, develop and implement comprehensive land policies. In response to this challenge, the F&G identifies the need to “build capacities for transformative land policy processes in Africa” as one of the priority areas for action.

Similarly, capacity development features prominently in the 2014 Guiding Principles on LSLBI in Africa. These require Member States to develop “the required capacities at all levels for engagement in processes related to development, implementation, monitoring and review of investments”. Among the key areas identified for capacity development in the Guiding Principles are the ones on investment contract negotiation; investment contract literacy; alternative business models, etc.

In pursuit of its role to assist Africa Union member states in the implementation of the 2009 Declaration on Land Policy, the F&G and the Guiding Principles on LSLBI, the LPI Secretariat launched in 2014 the Programme for Strengthening Capacities for Land Governance in Africa (SLGA), supported by GIZ and the World Bank. Under the “Training and Education” component of SLGA, two sub-components are defined: (a) on improved training opportunities (Diploma, Bachelor, Master, specialized courses) on land governance offered by African universities and higher learning institutions; and, (b) on human capacity development on land governance, targeting decision-makers, practitioners and other relevant stakeholders.
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As part of the first sub-component, substantive progress has been made already, with the completion of a curricula needs assessment on land governance for institutions of higher learning in Africa (July 2016). On the basis of the ‘Curricula Needs Assessment and Mapping of Existing Land Training Centres in Africa’ (July 2016), ‘Guidelines for the Development of Curricula on Land Governance in Africa’ have been prepared by LPI (October 2016).

The ‘Short Course Training Needs Assessment on Land Governance in Africa’ --the purpose of this report-- is part of the second sub-component. The objective of the needs assessment is to identify the capacity gaps and propose key areas for tailored short training courses on land governance for policy makers, practitioners and other relevant stakeholders.

The report is organized as follows. The first section presents the context and justifications of the study. It succinctly discusses, from a capacity point of view, Africa’s preparedness to respond to some of the key land-related challenges it faces. The second section recalls objectives of the study and describes the methodology used for information collection. This section reflects on the targets of the planned short course training, policy makers and practitioners. The stakeholder analysis and mapping carried out in this section builds on succinct descriptions of the main institutions of the land governance landscape in Kenya and Senegal, two countries chosen to reflect the geographical and language diversities as well as differences in colonial legacies found in the continent. The third section is the core of the report. It analyses the results of the training needs assessments, primarily based on the online survey responses and on information collected through interviews and literature review. The results presented include the critical land challenges facing the continent as well as the key areas for capacity development as prioritized by stakeholders consulted during the study. The fourth section is a brief review of the types of training options that can contribute to responding to the priority needs identified in the previous section. The fifth section provides content elements that could be considered out of the six priority thematic areas identified. The sixth and final section makes general recommendations on principles to guide the design of the short-course training and on the format of the training course to be considered by CLPA.
1. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

Africa is undergoing rapid and profound physical and socio-economic transformations in all sectors. Most of these changes are land-related or have direct repercussions in the way land is accessed, used and managed. Although there are common features and trends, Africa’s heterogeneity manifests itself in marked regional and country differences in priority land governance challenges.

This section briefly describes some of the key common land-challenges and regional specificities, and discusses the continent’s preparedness -- from a capacity point of view -- to take up these challenges. This serves as basis for reflecting on the relevance of a training programme targeting land policy makers and practitioners.

1.1. Emerging land governance challenges facing the continent

As a result of a convergence of factors, land for residential as well as productive use is an increasingly scarce resource at the international, regional and national level. This is particularly true in Africa, which is experiencing rapid population growth that increased from 300 to 500 million people in the 1960s and 1980s to 1.2 billion people today, and is projected to increase to 2.4 billion in 2050. The average population density increased from 16 individuals per km$^2$ in 1980 to 40 currently and is projected to reach 77 people per km$^2$ in 2050.

The increased demographic pressure on land in Africa has been accompanied by rapid urban expansion. Today it is estimated that 455 million people live in urban areas in Africa, 40 percent of the total population, compared with less than 130 million people in the early 1980s. By 2050, it is projected that the majority of Africans (1.3 billion people) will be urban residents.\(^2\) As the result of these trends, the value of land, housing and property has increased in urban zones, which have expanded at the expense of surrounding farming and pastoral areas. There is increasing evidence that land is often a critical issue in conflict-triggered emergencies and forced displacement. The intensity of the competition for land poses major governance challenges, including overcoming gender-based land disparities and the exclusion of vulnerable groups in access to land.

Secondly, there is a growing global anxiety as to how the world will be able to feed itself in the coming decades because of climate change, shrinking farmland, declining soil fertility and water scarcity. Africa is considered one of the last frontiers for agricultural expansion and intensification. Large-scale transnational land acquisitions and land-based investments are hence primarily targeting Africa. At the same time, Africa needs to conserve its land and water resources as the continent faces the challenge of feeding its fast-growing population and of developing its farming sector which
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employs two-thirds of its labour force. If current domestic and international pressures on and
competition for land are not entirely new, their scale and intensity are unprecedented.

Thirdly, as Africa’s city economies grow the demand for support infrastructure and well-located
industrial zones and commercial areas increases. This poses threats to informal urban settlements of
their displacement far from the source of livelihoods. Responding to these challenges –many of
which are land-related-- requires reforming land laws and urban policies to accommodate improved
tenure and property rights, for women as well as men. Africa will also need to establish appropriate,
accessible and affordable land information management systems to effectively capture, store,
update and disseminate land information for transactional needs and planning.

But Africa’s response to emerging land governance challenges will need to be adapted to the realities
of regions and countries. And these can differ markedly, as shown in the regional land policy
assessments carried out by LPI from 2006 to 2010. These assessment results, still largely valid, are
summarized below

West Africa. The assessment report stresses the diversity of the member states in the region,
comprising three main language groups and different political regimes, with dissimilar land policies,
regulations and land use practices. They vary greatly in climatic conditions, the stage of economic
development, their colonial legacy and nature of resulting tenure pluralism – the vitality of
customary institutions being stronger in some countries than others. The principal issues identified
include:
- tenure insecurity a major factor in the poverty of rural women, migrants, returnees and
  pastoralists and dwellers in city slums;
- state sovereignty of land which is beset with problems, given the prevailing financial and
  organisational capacity of governments;
- weak land governance often resulting in corruption and land grabbing and the failure to deliver
  on institutional mandates;
- perceived lack of political will for national land policy reform in some countries.

Southern Africa. The report states that although there are important regional commonalities as a
result of geography and history, there are also significant differences among individual countries
within the region. The principal issues identified include:
- state sovereignty over land, which stems from adherence to unreformed colonial laws and tends
to limit the fundamental land rights of rural people;
- persisting tenure dualism with varying consequences in the individual member states;
- persisting unequal distribution of land resources in terms of race and class in some countries;
- gender bias in land relations, with women being discriminated against in terms of access to and
  control over land;
- insecure rural tenure, including dispossession of communal agricultural and pastoral land by
  foreign investors and local elites;

3 These summaries are essentially based on inputs to the assessment process by M. Martin Adam, consultant
- unsustainable land use and climate change disproportionately affecting the poor;

**Central Africa:** The region touches upon all the ecosystems of the continent, from desert to tropical forest and has a complex colonial history. Many of the states have been disrupted by wars and the cross-border movement of refugees in recent decades. The principal issues identified include:
- inconsistencies in statutory and customary laws relating to the use of land and forest;
- conflict roles and responsibilities of state and customary chides in land allocation in urban and rural areas;
- gender based nature of customary tenure in rural areas compared to urban areas where women can own land or lease it;
- chaotic planning and development in coastal areas, partly as a result of land speculation by the elite;
- increasing tenure insecurity and risks of uncompensated forced removal faced by dwellers in informal settlements;
- climate change impacts affecting sub-humid and semi-arid zones in Cameroon, Central African Republic and Chad where pastoralists engage in cross-border migrations for grazing and water.

**Eastern Africa.** The countries in the region have diverse colonial legacies, ecosystems, cultures and tenure systems and a complex and dynamic history. There are significant differences in size, population, levels of urbanization, national economies and land tenure arrangements. The principal issues raised include:
- land and natural resource degradation as a major problem, especially in the most densely settled states;
- Fierce competition for land and property rights, leading to higher risks of conflicts and tenure insecurity for the poor;
- state sovereignty over land and in the allocation of property rights not always used judiciously;
- land conflicts resulting from resource scarcity, population pressure, ingress of non-local populations, etc.
- FDI and grabbing by national elites
- Gender discrimination
- Global warming, climate change:
- Biofuels impacts on food security

**North Africa:** All states encounter acute land and natural resource scarcity, particularly water and agricultural land, in the face of rapid population increase. Rules relating to land rights are similar and derive from pre-Islamic and Islamic traditions. The principal issues identified include:
- Scarcity of cultivable land and water resources, compounded by the uncontrolled rapid urban growth;
- Water scarcity worsened by climate change, especially in countries such as Egypt;
- large tracts of productive land exposed to saline intrusion and rising sea water levels on the fringes of the Nile Delta;
- threat to agro-biodiversity by desertification, soil degradation and exploitative use of land (i.e. overgrazing, deforestation, unsustainable agricultural production).

In response to these challenges—which are in some respects also posed in many other continents--, important policy processes have been initiated in recent years with the aim of strengthened normative frameworks for land governance globally and in Africa. These include the Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Land Tenure, Fisheries and Forests, and the Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment, adopted in 2012 and 2014 under the auspices of the UN Committee on World Food Security. They also include the 2009 Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa (F&G) and the 2014 Guiding Principles on Large Scale Land Based Investment in Africa (LSLBI).

African States are expected to reflect these emerging norms and values on land governance in national policies and laws. An even greater challenge for Africa is the implementation of these land policies and laws, once updated. Africa’s capacity gap constrains the continent’s ability to develop and implement sound land policies and laws.

### 1.2. The importance of capacity development for delivering Africa’s land governance agenda

The very notion of land governance refers to the process by which decisions on access to and use of land are made and implemented. The process is therefore informed by the nature and quality of normative frameworks (policies, laws, regulations, decision-making processes) and institutions involved. Improving land governance therefore requires the strengthening of these institutions—or institutional capacity development. Key conditions for achieving this institutional objective typically include organization and individual capacity development. Organisational capacity refers to the efficiency of organisational bodies, structures, agencies, the quality of their leadership, the level of motivation of the workforce, etc. Individual capacity is concerned with competencies, skills, knowledge, technical expertise and attitudes of the staff of the organisations and of key actors in the land sector. Individual capacity is to a large extent acquired through formal and informal training. Training courses delivered by learning institutions can be in the forms of: (a) initial academic education or vocational training aimed at students with no previous professional experience; (b) continuing long-term training of already employed individuals; (c) continuing training—often vocational—of already employed individuals through short courses. While the first two types are typically recognized through academic awards of degrees and diplomas to qualifying persons, employees who go through short training courses may receive attendance certificates.

There are many arguments why approaches to strengthen land governance in Africa should pay due attention to the need for training of professionally active land policy makers and practitioners, in addition to investing in the initial training of young students. Some of the arguments are adduced below:

a. In the foreseeable future, experienced land professionals are expected to remain the principal conceivers, planners and implementers of land governance policies and laws. Their preparedness to
meet this challenge will be a determining factor in the continent’s progress in achieving improved land governance in Africa.

b. Land governance practitioners holding leadership and senior positions in land commissions, government agencies and other institutions are typically seasoned employees, with many years of service, who have therefore left the formal university and other higher education institutions for a decade or more. In any case, the teaching of land governance in such institutions is a relatively new departure and a high priority.

c. The international concern for improved land governance in developing economies is a relatively new development, arising from awareness of the impact of demographic growth, rapid urbanization, climate change and the surge in large-scale land acquisition. Accordingly, the new normative frameworks on land governance at international (e.g. the VGGT, RAI Principles) and regional level (F&G, Guiding Principles on LSLBI) are timely responses to the changing circumstances.

d. Technical advances in land titling and information management can reduce costs and speed up the process of mapping and securing poor people’s tenure rights, if designed and implemented with empowerment as an explicit goal.

The rapidly changing values, norms and tools in support of land governance in Africa require significant efforts to update the knowledge and upgrade the skills of serving land practitioners and decision-makers, in addition to increasing the efforts to train new land professionals at undergraduate and graduate levels.

Given that the current changes are anticipated to accelerate in the future, especially if the continent is to fulfil its aspiration of thriving economies in coming decades, capacity development needs to be a continuous effort, targeting current and future generations of land professionals and other allied actors.
2. OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

2.1. Objectives of the Training Assessment Exercise

Taking into account the previously-described changing context and arguments for targeting the already active workforce, the CLPA seeks to contribute to improving Africa’s capacity in land policy formulation and implementation. This goal is pursued through various initiatives, including the possibility of short course training programme on land governance directed at policy makers and practitioners. This programme would complement efforts being already made to expand and improve the quality of initial and long-term continuing land governance training offered by institutions of higher learning in Africa.

The purpose of this study is to assess the needs for short course training on land governance in Africa, in the frame of the Africa land governance agenda, as set out in: (i) the AUC Declaration on Land Issues and Challenges in Africa, (ii) the AU Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa, (iii) and the AU Guiding Principles on Large-Scale Land-Based Investment in Africa.

The specific objectives of the needs assessment for short-course training are the following:

i. Update the list of policy makers, practitioners and stakeholders who should be targeted in delivering the short-course training. This requires stakeholder analysis and mapping and the identification of the specific stakeholder groups to be targeted.

ii. Assess the training needs of land policy makers, practitioners and stakeholders in Africa. This will require the identification of gaps in capacity (knowledge, skills and competency) from previous LPI’s regional assessments and by conducting surveys and interviews of a wide range of representatives of stakeholder groups, including potential trainees, as well as representatives of organization that hire or use the services of land governance practitioners.

iii. Review ongoing partner training courses and identify opportunities for synergies in development and delivery of training. This requires an inventory and assessment of other significant land governance training courses, especially courses targeting practitioners and policy makers. This exercise should help the identification of training needs that are being covered satisfactorily, as well as those that require scaling up and, more importantly, the key areas where the needed training is unavailable.

iv. On the basis of i-iii above, the key areas for focus of CLPA-sponsored short courses will be identified.

v. Provide advice on the structure and principal components of the proposed short courses, taking into account possible differences in the needs of stakeholder groups and sub-regions, taking into account any short courses on land governance conducted in the past.

2.2. Methodology

A normal training needs assessment of the kind envisaged in this report would ideally cover the following steps: (i) define the target audience, the prospective trainees whose needs are to be
assessed; (ii) the desired nature, level and quality of competencies (knowledge, skills, attitudes) expected to be acquired by the target audience; (iii) the current state of competencies displayed by prospective trainees; (iv) capacity gaps and hence training needs, determined by comparing the desired and current competencies; (v) assessment of what is being done or envisaged to fill the identified capacity gaps; (vi) identification of the specific needs not or insufficiently covered by current and planned training offers, which then would be recommended as areas of focus, taking into account the mandate, experience and comparative advantage of the sponsoring institution (here CLPA). Given the the circumstances of the study (loosely defined and high heterogeneity and geographically dispersed nature of the audience), it was impossible to strictly follow the above steps. The table below, indicates the efforts made to gather, as much as possible, the information required for each of the steps.

Table 1. Methodological adjustments to meet the requirements for training needs assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Steps to follow in ideal circumstances</th>
<th>Adjustments made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Defining the nature, size and characteristics of the target audience</td>
<td>Stakeholder analysis, with illustrative examples of countries (Senegal and Kenya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Analysis of the desired competencies to be acquired by the target audience</td>
<td>Competency expectations derived from: CLPA’s regional assessments (2006-2010); Draft Study on Industry needs for land professionals in Africa (2017); Draft Curricula needs assessment of land training centers in Africa (2016); Guidelines for the development of curricula on land governance in Africa (2017); 2012 VGGT; 2014 RAI; 2009 F&amp;G; 2014 GP-LSLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Current state of competencies of the target audience</td>
<td>Current competencies are capacities are implicitly and partially covered through the identification of pressing land-related challenges faced by stakeholders and their prioritized training needs areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Capacity gaps (Step 2 minus step 3),</td>
<td>Focus on the main types of training offers, regionally and at country level, with illustrations from Senegal and Kenya (a comprehensive inventory of training offers at continental level being impossible (at least in the frame of the current study).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Current and planned training offers addressing some of the needs prioritized by representatives of the target audience</td>
<td>Recommendations for thematic areas of focus for CLPA’s possible training programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Recommended areas of focus of suggested training programme</td>
<td>Recommendations for thematic areas of focus for CLPA’s possible training programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.1. Stakeholder analysis

As per the ToR of the study, the target audience –prospective trainees– for the short courses on land governance is composed of land policy makers, practitioners and other stakeholders.

This target, regardless the geographical scale considered, which is compounded by the fact that the notion of land governance –which is the “sector” covered by the study—has very loose boundaries.
In an attempt to carry out a stakeholder mapping for the needs assessment we use two countries as illustrative examples: Senegal and Kenya. The implications of the findings in terms of the scoping of the study are discussed subsequently.

2.2.1.1. **Defining the target population: Illustrative case examples of Senegal and Kenya**

The case examples of Senegal (a French-speaking country) and Kenya (an English-speaking country) are here used in support of the analysis of relevant stakeholders for the training needs assessment. In each country example, we briefly describe the landscape of government bodies and other formal and informal institutions involved in the formulation and implementation of land governance policies, laws, strategies and programmes. These institutions host land policy makers, senior leaders, managers, and experts and junior technicians.

**Case example of a French-speaking country – Senegal**

In Senegal, a central player in land governance and administration is the Directorate General for taxation and domains (*Direction Générale Imports et Domaines - DGID*). DGID is responsible for the core land administration functions. Four its Divisions are of high relevance to capacity development in land governance:

- **Directorate of Domains.** It is responsible for conceiving and monitoring strategies aimed at improving land management and governance. It is responsible for overseeing the management of public land and the national domain and for protecting private propriety rights; and for carrying studies and generating knowledge needed to guide the formulation of land policies and laws.

- **Directorate of Cadastre.** It is responsible for maintaining and updating of a geospatial database of land assets and related property rights. It ensures that appropriate quality technical tools and approaches are used in land surveying at national level. It monitors changes in the development of properties and support land valuation activities.

- **Directorate of land legislation, studies and litigation.** It is, among others, responsible for ensuring the national land- and tax-related laws and regulations are supportive of national economic and social objectives and aligned to international agreements and norms to which the government has subscribed.

- **Administrative and human resources directorate.** It is, among others, responsible for the identification of the need for new recruitments and for the training of existing staff. Within the Directorate, the Training Unit (Bureau de la Formation) implements the training policy approved by DGID, and works in close collaboration with relevant training institutions. It manages DGID’s dedicated training center.

Many other entities are involved to varying degrees in the formulation and/or implementation of land policies, laws and bylaws. These include:
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4 Source : Decree (*Arrêté*) No. 20287 dated 31/12/2013 related to the organisation of DGID
The Ministry of housing and urban development. This Ministry is, among others, responsible for developing the strategies and regulations related to urban planning and the management of urban areas. It contributes to the formulation and ensure effective enforcement of urban land laws.

The National Agency for Territorial Management (Agence Nationale de l’Amenagement du Territoire – ANAT). Under the authority of the Ministry of Territorial development and management, ANAT is responsible for promoting and implementing government’s policies on territorial planning and management. As part of these responsibilities ANAT develops and maintains geo-referenced data base and topographic and thematic maps.

Various sector ministries such as the Ministries of Agriculture, Livestock, Water Resources, Industry and Mining, etc. Each of these ministries can initiative legal projects for addressing specific sectoral governance aspects, which is the case when the Ministries in charge of Agriculture and of Livestock initiated the Framework agro-pastoral law (Loi d’Orientation Agro-Pastorale – LOAP, adopted in 2012). These Ministries also contribute to the implementation of national land governance laws and policies in their respective sectors.

Ministry of Justice, through its relevant organs, ensures that the land laws are consistent with constitutional provisions. At national and local level, legal courts are increasingly involved in land-related conflicts, which multiply as competition for land intensifies.

Many other ministries have a stake in land issues. The ministry in charge of investments seeks to have a land governance system that offer incentives for investors. The ministries responsible for gender issues and the youth mobilise part of their staff to influence land policy process so that access to secure land rights for women and the youth is facilitated.

Decentralised collectivities. Decentralized collectivities in Senegal, headed by elected officials, are comprised of 45 Departments, 5 cities and 552 rural and urban communes. Government has devolved substantial land management and governance powers to communal councils, headed by mayors. Devolved responsibilities range from defining and implementing land use modalities and plans; exercising responsibility for land allocation and expropriation on land that is part of the national domain; defining pastoral land, and conditions for access to and use of water bodies, and of other natural resources (Article 81 of the 2013 General Code of Local Collectivities).

The Parliament has the authority of adopting law proposals initiated either by government or by the Parliament itself, through one of its commissions. The Commission on Laws, Decentralisation, Labour and Human Rights has primary roles of initiating or critically examining land laws before they are voted upon by the Parliament as a whole.

---12---
The National Land Reform Commission (Commission Nationale de Reforme Foncière – CNRF) was established in 2012, within the Office of the Presidency. Bringing together representatives of all government ministries and agencies involved in land issues as well as representatives of elected decentralized bodies, CNRF was tasked with the responsibility of carrying out thorough reviews of existing land laws and practice and extensive multi-stakeholder consultations to come up with key measures for securing land rights and preventing land-related conflicts. The Commission completed its report in April 2017 and was subsequently disbanded. The government has not yet initiated any concrete follow-up action based on the CNRF report.

Surveyors and notaries. They are private sector service providers supporting the implementation of land laws, and efforts to clarify, register and secure land rights. They work closely with the DGID, and especially the Directorates of Domains and of the Cadastre. There are today in Senegal a total of 66 registered surveyors (2014 figure) and 33 notaries. The size of the professional and technical staff (lawyers, engineer-level and high-school level surveyors) in the officers of notaries and surveyors varies from less than 5 people to tens of staff.

Civil society and other non-state entities. Other important land governance institutions include non-state entities such as village and other local-level customary institutions headed by chiefs; producer organisations; youth and women’s associations; NGO and civil society organisations; the private business sector, etc. Many social movements and civil society organisations involved in land governance have established in 2010 the multi-stakeholder platform for dialogue on land issues in Senegal (Cadre de Réflexion et d’Action sur le foncier au Sénégal -CRAFS).

Technical and Financial Partners. Senegal’s Technical and Financial Partners are well organized and influential. They bring together bilateral and multilateral aid organisations, UN agencies, international NGO, etc. They finance major development programmes and policy reforms processes in all sector including land-related one, such as agriculture and rural development, urban planning, environment and natural resources, etc. They also support actors such as social movements and CSOs.

The above brief and schematic overview of institutions involved in the management of land and formulation and implementation of related policies and laws in Senegal illustrate the fact that the realm of land governance is huge with fuzzy boundaries. Even at the level of a country like Senegal—one of Africa’s smallest countries, in terms of population size and land mass—designing sound short course training would be a serious challenge.

Case example of an English-speaking country -- Kenya

Land governance in Kenya is primarily driven by the State Ministry responsible for Land and Physical Planning, other State Ministries with land governance related mandates, the National Land Commission, Parliament (National Assembly and Senate), County Governments, County Assemblies
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and the Judiciary. Other key players include professional bodies, the private sector, civil society organisations and the development partners. All these institutions are usually involved in the formulation, implementation and/or monitoring of implementation of policies, laws and programmes on land. The State institutions may vary in name and form depending on the whims and priorities of the government of the day. Currently, the institutions discussed below play the land governance roles highlighted.

**Ministry of Lands and Physical Planning:** This Ministry is charged with the responsibility of ensuring efficient administration and sustainable management of the land resource in Kenya. Its mandate includes: formulating and implementing land policy; physical planning; registration of land; surveying and mapping; land adjudication and settlement and land valuation. Its key departments are:-

- **Department of Administration and Planning:** This coordinates activities of the technical departments by providing support services like, transport, procurement, accounts, human resource management, among others.
- **Department of Physical Planning:** This department aims at achieving balanced regional development within Kenya. Its activities include the preparation of regional and local physical development plans and advising on matters relating to planning, alienation, subdivision, use and change of use of land within Kenya.
- **Department of Land Adjudication and Settlement:** This Department has two divisions. The Land Adjudication division is responsible for ascertaining rights and interests on land in trust land areas and the transformation of ownership of land from customary tenure to individual/group ownership through demarcation, survey and registration. The Settlement division is responsible for the acquisition, planning, demarcation, survey and allocation of economically viable agricultural settlement land to landless, poor and unemployed Kenyans on loan basis.
- **Department of Survey:** This department implements the Government’s policy of sustainable exploitation of land and its natural resources. It consists of an Administration, Cadastral, Mapping, Land Adjudication, Hydrographic as well as a Geodetic and Geographical Information System (GIS) divisions. This Department runs its own internal training institute (Kenya Institute of Surveying and Mapping (KISM)) which is charged with the training of surveyors, cartographers and other support technical disciplines to Diploma level.
- **Department of Lands:** This department consists of the Land Administration, Land Registration and Land Valuation divisions.

Other sector State Ministries with mandates touching on land governance includes: Agriculture; Environment; Water & Irrigation; Mining; Energy & Petroleum; Transport, Infrastructure, Housing & Urban Development and the State Law Office under the Attorney General. The policies and laws that operate these Ministries are complementary to those on land and at best, should be formulated and implemented with regular inter-sectoral consultations. The State Law Office usually provides technical support to the sector Ministries during the drafting of policies, laws and regulations to ensure harmony with existing ones and alignment to the constitution.
National Land Commission: The national land commission manages public land on behalf of the national and county governments. It consists on the Directorates of: Audit & Risk Management; Finance & Administration; Human Resource Management; Information & Communication Technology; Land Administration; Land Information Management Systems (LIMS); Land Use Planning; Legal Affairs & Enforcement; Natural Resource; and Research. It has County coordinators, usually land professionals, to facilitate its operations at county level.

Parliament: The Kenya parliament is constituted by the national assembly and the senate, each with legislative powers. The senate considers, debates and approves bills concerning counties while the national assembly considers, debates and approves all the bills of concern to the people of Kenya. Each of the houses establishes departmental committees charged with scrutinizing sectoral bills. Members of such committees, most without any land governance expertise, usually have to contend with scrutinizing very technical land bills.

County governments: Some land governance roles in Kenya got devolved on the application of the 2010 constitution. Under the constitution, Kenya’s forty seven (47) county governments are charged with the land governance roles of planning and development control, land survey and mapping and housing. The county governments are also responsible for the land governance roles such as zoning, land use regulation and change of user of land in Cities, Municipalities and Towns. These functions are driven by various land administration experts.

County Assemblies: These are institutions consisting of elected and nominated representatives of the people at county level. The assemblies consider, debate and approve county level bills and expenditure. Most members of these assemblies have no competence in land governance issues, yet have to discuss related bills and programmes.

The judiciary: Judges of the Environment and Land Courts are charged with the role of determining disputes relating to environment and land. These judges have to determine complex land cases, usually calling for good background understanding of policies and laws on land.

Professional bodies: Kenya is home to vibrant professional bodies that inform land policy, laws and practice such as the Institution of Surveyors of Kenya (ISK), the Kenya Institute of Planners (KIP) and the Law Society of Kenya (LSK). Land administration experts such as surveyors, GIS specialists, valuers, planners and lawyers are to be found in these professional associations. There are other experts, including in agriculture and forestry, who are to be found in other professional associations. Land governance at all levels is greatly influenced by practising experts in these professional associations.

The Private Sector: The private sector in Kenya engages government to inform policy, law and practice through an apex organization called the Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA). Sector specific concerns such as land are addressed through Sector Boards consisting of business organisations whose interests map onto the sector. Some of these include property development organisations, real estate organisations, conveyancing firms and surveying firms. KEPSA is usually
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Footnote: 7 Constitution of Kenya 2010
keen to ensure that the business aspects of policy and law are well taken care of during formulation and implementation. KEPSA engages the Ministry of Lands and Physical Planning and the National Land Commission quite intensely on matters of policy and law.

**Civil Society and other Non-State Organisations:** These organisations are currently quite many in Kenya. They have been quite helpful in providing a link between State institutions and communities during the formulation and implementation of policies and laws in Kenya. While some are lucky to have some few land experts in their management boards and/or executive leadership, most do not. Yet these organisations drive fairly useful interventions on various sub-sectorial concerns on land and land rights.

**Development Partners:** Development Partners in Kenya have worked closely with the State and Non-State institutions to drive the formulation and implementation of policies and laws on land by providing technical and financial assistance. These partners currently engage under a the platform called Development Partners Group on Land (DPGL) which helps them to discuss sector issues and priorities jointly for synergy. The approval and monitoring of projects tabled for technical and financial support by development partners calls for background understanding of the priority land governance issues in Kenya and some of the allied global concerns. Some development partners have recruited land experts to support such functions.

Land experts in different disciplines and levels are to be found in the above institutions. Depending on their roles, such experts may need occasional short term training to bring them abreast with technical or policy developments at global, national and even local level with fundamental implications to their work. But their diverse roles, different levels of technical training and the lack of any technical training for some make the design of appropriate short term courses quite a challenge.

The two country case examples demonstrate that governance of land is all-encompassing, touching almost all sectors – from land tenure reform and land administration, *stricto sensu*, to territorial planning, rural and agricultural development, mining, water resources, forestry and natural resources management in general, etc. All three key state organs play a role in the formulation and enforcement of land governance policies and laws: the executive branch through various ministries; the legislative branch which is responsible for the enactment of land laws; and the judiciary with courts in charge of arbitration of land-related disputes, and paralegal entities (notaries and private lawyers) involved in land transactions. The management and administration of land also involve the different levels of governance: central government, regional and field representations of the State administration and technical directorates, as well as decentralized institutions (urban and rural collectivities, communes, counties, local authorities).

### 2.2.1.2. Implications for the scoping of short CLPA-sponsored courses and targeting potential trainees

The above overviews of institutions involved in land governance in Senegal and Kenya are certainly not comprehensive, but show the difficulty of defining the contours of the notion of land governance
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practitioners and stakeholders, and hence the difficult task of mapping the potential trainees, even at the level of a single country.

a. Stakeholder categories

On the basis of country overviews, we can identify two groups among the target population of the needs assessment. The first, composed of land policy makers, can be understood to include senior government officials and members of parliament who have the power to trigger policy reform initiatives and/or drive policy formulation processes. The second group—the land practitioners and other relevant stakeholders—would include public and private sector senior experts, advisors, technicians as well as non-state actors engaged in formal and informal land management processes, including the initiation, formulation, enactment, operationalization, promotion, implementation and monitoring of land-governance related policies, laws and regulations. Among non-state actors involved in land policy processes include leaders of decentralised institutions; representatives of civil society organisations, social movements, private sector and professional organizations; traditional chiefs and customary and religious leaders; journalists; members of academic and research institutions; etc. Seven categories of actors are identified below within the broad group of practitioners and other stakeholders. They are listed below, in addition to the category of policy makers:

(i) Policy makers: leaders of land commissions; senior government managers and Members of Parliament and their advisors;
(ii) Government/public service land practitioners; including land administration experts; experts in sector ministries; judges;
(iii) Elected representatives of decentralised ‘communities’ and Local Government Units and their advisors;
(iv) Traditional/customary/religious authorities (chiefs and their senior advisors);
(v) Representative of private sector: notaries/lawyers, surveyors and planners; representatives and agents and representatives of corporate enterprises;
(vi) Representatives of CSOs/NGOs;
(vii) Representatives of producer groups and small businesses;
(viii) Representatives of financial and technical partner organisations. These stakeholder groups can be further broken down to 21 stakeholder categories. The rationale for targeting each of these categories is briefly discussed in the table in Annex 1. The level of priority for targeting each of the stakeholder categories will be analysed in detail during the assessment work, and especially the interviews of experts that are recognised to be highly knowledgeable on land issues in Africa and of leaders of institutions employing and/or using the services of land governance practitioners.

b. Survey population

The categories of actors listed above are the “target population” for the needs assessment study. The information to be collected and the priority needs to be identified are meant to be applicable to this
target population as whole. Members of this population segment are in principle all potentially eligible to the short-course training programme to be formulated.

In practice though, it is appreciated that not all the actors in the target population can be reached/consulted in the actual information gathering process. We need a sub-set of the target population that is “accessible” for information collection for the needs. This is the “survey population”, that we restrict to CLPA’s constituency, i.e. actors who have been interacting with CLPA, and who are in the CLPA’s database of contacts. After we found that the CLPA’s database of contacts had many information gaps (regarding the contacts details such as email contacts) and was not up-to-date in many respects (because including people who have passed away, or people whose change of positions or institutions was not reflected), we explored ways of expanding the list. We tried the possibility of adding the contacts of all attendees of CLPA events in the last 5 years. Here again, the outcome was far below expectations. We were however able to add the contacts of 36 members of the Civil Society Platform on Land Policy which was established in 2014 with the support of CLPA. We also added the 31 people (mainly from academic institutions) who were invited to attend the consultative workshop for Central and West Africa on “Strengthening capacities for land governance in Africa”, held in Yaoundé (Cameroon) in October 2017. The latter helped to substantially increase the number of French-speaking stakeholders invited to take part in the survey. In total we had a survey population of 1420 people who were sent the online survey questionnaire in English and in French.

2.2.2. Information collection methods:

Against the backdrop of challenges to define the contours and quantify the target population for the needs assessment, we had to explore ways of collecting information that is as credible as possible, on the basis of which priority needs for training would be suggested. The approaches to information gathering used include: (a) a desk review of relevant documents; (b) a structured web-based survey, with the aim of reaching out to the broader CLPA constituency; (c) a limited number of interviews face-to-face or phone-Skype interviews of leaders and/or representatives of selected institutions and organizations that are under-represented in the survey. The core of the information gathering work is the online survey carried out in October 2017.

2.2.2.1. Desk review of relevant documents
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8 We considered and discarded the option of adding other network of contacts, or the consultants’ own contacts, because that could generate important biases resulting in having some regions or stakeholder categories over-represented.

9 Most of the lists of participants received had either incomplete information (e.g. missing email contacts) or were handwritten with hardly readable contact details.
We conducted a detailed review of key documents pertaining to land governance in Africa and on short land governance-related training courses. Among the documents that were thoroughly reviewed to inform the needs assessment process, we need to mention the following:

- LPI/CLPA documents: Reviewed documents include the five regional land policy assessments mentioned earlier and carried out between 2006 and 2010, covering West Africa, East Africa, Southern Africa, Central Africa and North Africa; the AUC Declaration on Land Issues and Challenges in Africa (2009); the Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa (2009); The Guiding Principles on Large-Scale Land Based Investments in Africa (2014); Draft report on Curricula Needs Assessment and Mapping of Existing Land Training Centers in Africa (July 2016); the draft Guidelines for the Development of Curricula on Land Governance in Africa (Oct. 2016); Draft Concept note for the LPI Programme on Strengthening Capacities for Land Governance in Africa;

- Also reviewed were the FAO, UN-Habitat and documents of the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS), especially: (a) the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (2012); (b) the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems (2014);

A key feature of these documents is that they identify key land-related challenges, propose principles and norms for strengthening land governance and/or assess gaps (including capacity gaps) that need to be addressed. The review of these documents helped cover one key requirements of the methodology, that is to define the nature, level and quality of competencies expected from land policy makers and practitioners and other concerned actors in order to take up the land-related challenges (See sub-section 3.2 on Training needs areas).

2.2.2.2. Structured survey of potential trainees

A web-based questionnaire was prepared for an online SurveyMonkey questionnaire targeting a “survey population” of 1420 contacts, taken from the CLPA’s contact database (1370 contacts) and 50 people invited to attend the October Yaoundé workshop on capacity development and contacts of members of Land Policy Civil Society platform.

The online survey invitations were sent on October 1st and closed on October 20th. In total 140 responses with entirely filled questionnaires were received after removing the duplicate replies (essentially a handful of respondents who filled the questionnaire both in French and in English). This is a good response, knowing the usual difficulty of attracting interest in this kind of survey, and taking into consideration the many imperfections in the CLPA contact database.

The key question is whether respondents can be considered as a group representative of the Survey population (the 1420 who were invited to fill the questionnaire) and of the target population of land policy makers, practitioners and other stakeholders.

10 For more details on documents reviewed, see the section on “References”
This question cannot be answered because of the following reasons: (1) the “target population” is a loose entity that is not quantifiable (see earlier discussions). The “survey population” (essentially composed of the CLPA contacts) is quantified (1420) but its composition (country representation, sectors, institutional affiliations, etc.) is not clear because of the many holes in the contact data base. Therefore, it is impossible to assess if the group of 140 people who have responded to the survey is representative of the survey population. There is an added challenge: Of the 1420 contacts who were invited to participate in the survey, only about 420 opened the questionnaire (either the French or English questionnaire). There were about 50 message invitations that bounced back. For the rest, about 950 contacts, the reasons why they did not open the questionnaire is not clear. We found that many messages were treated as spams and sent to junk email folder, with little chance of being noticed and answered. But we don’t know if this is the main reason that would explain the large number of people who did not open the online survey questionnaire.

While the statistical representativeness of the surveyed sample cannot be analysed, the extent to which this sample (respondents to the online survey) mirrors the target population, on the basis of some of its known features in terms of gender balance, representation of the 54 African states and regions (West, North, Southern, Eastern and Central Africa), of the main types of institutions (government, civil society, academic/research institutions, etc.) can. Below is a summary of the key features of 140 the respondents to the online survey:

**Language groupings:** Of the 140 responses received, 48 (34%) were in French, against (66%) in English. This is a good reflection since for about 20 of the 54 (or 37%), French is one of the official languages.

**Country representation:** In total, responses were received from 33 countries, with the number of participants varying from 1 to 13 per country. Given the conditions of the survey this coverage is exceptionally high, although key countries such as Egypt, Algeria, Angola and Guinea are not represented. The table below shows the number of participants from countries that are represented among respondents.
Coverage of Africa’s main regions. All 5 regions of the continent are well represented in the sample, with West Africa and Eastern Africa having the largest percentages (about 30% each). Taking into account their demographic weights, Eastern Africa, West Africa and Central Africa—with respectively 33%, 29% and 13% of Africa’s total population) are fairly represented among respondents to the survey, while North Africa with 18% of Africa’s population is under-represented in the sample. Southern Africa (only 5% of Africa’s population) is over-represented in the sample, while North Africa is largely under-represented with only 3% of respondents.\(^\text{11}\)

Gender representation. One third of respondents to the overall survey (English and French) are women, which is remarkable compared to the level of women’s participation in similar types of survey. We note important differences between the French-speaking and the English-speaking sub-samples: Only 16% of respondents in the sub-sample of responses received in French are women against 40% for the sub-sample in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>ALL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\(^\text{11}\) The demographic information is from worldometers.info based on UN and World Bank data.
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### Table 2: Gender distribution of participants to the online survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL en %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional affiliations of respondents:** Three key types of institutions that are among the most actively engaged in land governance in Africa—government agencies, NGOs and academic institutions—are equally represented in the sample of respondents, with about 1/3 each. The private sector—which is rather weak in Africa—is nevertheless fairly represented with 8% of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional affiliation</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL en %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/IHL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autres (We mean ‘Others’ ?)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. Institutional affiliations of participants to the online survey**

**Representation of policy makers vs practitioners and other stakeholders.** Although the exact function was not asked in the survey, we tried to fill the gap *a posteriori* through various means including consultants’ own knowledge of respondents and by web-search. We could identify 27 respondents who occupy top rank positions in public, private and non-profit organisations, with functions such as chairperson, managing director, department or division director, President of University, dean of university.

**Distribution of based on length of experience.** Although there was no explicit question about the age of respondents, we can deduct the information from the answers to the question about the length of experience. The answers to the question (summarized in the table below) vindicate a point made earlier: many in the land governance workforce in Africa have several years if not decades of experiences. Many of the land policy makers and practitioners (many of whom occupy the most senior positions in their respective organisations) were active several years before the current international and regional normative frameworks on land governance (the 2009 F&G and 2012 VGGT) were developed. Almost half of the respondents have more than 12 years of experience working on land governance. The younger staff (less than 4 years of experience) make only 11%. The low representation of the youth is compensated by the fact a component of the CLPA’s capacity development programmes targets undergraduate and graduate levels training in land governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>ALL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 4 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Length of experience of participants to the online survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More than 12 years</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary. The sample of 140 respondents to the online survey displays many positive features: the high level of country coverage; and relatively fair representation of the two key land groupings (English and French); the high level of women’s participation (1/3 of respondents); the good coverage of many of the main types of institutions (public, private and non-profit entities).

There are however weaknesses. Some of the key countries of the continent are missing. North Africa is under-represented. Some important stakeholder categories are either missing or under-represented, including notably elected officials of decentralized institutions (such as the mayors), representatives of the judiciary (the judges), members of parliaments and traditional/customary leaders.

The under-representation of judges and mayors (they are in fact entirely missing in the sample of respondents), is probably the consequence of the fact that the CLPA has not yet fully engaged with them, hence their under-representation in the CLPA’s contact database. We observed that they were among the key missing stakeholders at the November 2017 CLPA land conference.

With regards to traditional leaders and MPs, their under-representation in the sample of respondents might be because online surveys are not the best approach to engage with them. In order to attenuate the bias against these groups, semi-structured interviews were organized targeting them in priority.

Overall, the sample of 140 respondents has many key features that largely mirror the known characteristics of the target population of land policy makers, practitioners and concerned stakeholders. We consider it therefore as a valid basis for assessing the priority needs for short-course training on land governance in Africa.
3. IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING OF PRIORITY AREAS FOR CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT IN LAND GOVERNANCE IN AFRICA

As indicated earlier, the ideal approach to identifying training gaps to be filled (i.e. training needs) is to compare desired and current competencies. The peculiarity of the study (in particular loose and geographically dispersed nature of the target population) does not allow such an approach. Instead, we opted for an approach consisting, first, to identify the desired competencies, mainly through literature review. We then analyse what the surveyed population (whom we consider as broadly representative of land policy makers and practitioners in Africa) perceive as the most pressing land-related challenges that they face in their work. Finally, we analyse the key areas where respondents to the survey see a priority need for training. We also discuss the extent to which the pressing challenges and areas identified as priority needs for training are in coherence. The key outcome of this section is to identify the top priority areas on which CLPA’s sponsored-short course training should focus on.

3.1. Critical land challenges facing practitioners and policy makers

This sub-section analyses the responses to question 7 of the online survey. The question, which is open-ended, reads: What are the most pressing land governance-related challenges which you are facing in your work?

We compiled and analyse the responses by systematically reviewing the text-answers. We identified a total of 265 words and phrases used by respondents to define the nature or characterize the types of challenges they are facing. We grouped the words/phrases into 26 themes. We then analysed and collated the frequency at which each of these themes are used. The Word Cloud Chart below illustrates the frequency at which each of the 26 themes were used in responses provided by the surveyed sample.
Fig. 3. Major land-governance-related challenges faced by respondents in their work

The most frequently used challenges are: tenure insecurity; land-related conflicts; lack of capacity; outdated land policies and laws; land grabbing; lack of awareness; gender inequalities; poor information management; weak enforcement of land laws.

**Land tenure insecurity** (frequency 35). This theme (which reads “Insecurity” in the chart above) regroups responses related to insecurity of tenure, especially of informal and customary land; precarious tenure rights for communities and for vulnerable groups; tenure insecurity resulting from the lack of clarity of land rights, especially customary and community land rights.

**Land-related conflicts** (frequency 26). This theme (which reads “Conflicts” in the chart) refers to land conflicts at the level of communities (e.g. between farmers and herders); between communities and foreign investors or urban-based elites. It also refers to the increasing number of court cases that are land-related. It is also mentioned to deplore the limited capacity in conflict prevention and dispute resolution.

**Lack of capacity** (frequency 24). This theme (referred to in the chart as “Capacity”) is used to refer to the weakness of institutions in charge of delivering land governance at all levels, to the weak capacity of concerned actors at all levels in the land governance value-chain. It is also mentioned in reference to cases where lack of capacity is one of the key causes leading to the slow pace and delays in the formulation and implementation of land policies and laws. The theme also covers cases of lack of adapted training material to support training activities. It is also used to point to cases of inadequate institutional accountability.

**Outdated laws** (frequency 21). This theme (“OutdatedLaws” in the chart) refers to cases of the many African countries that do not have a national land policy. It also includes cases where the process of formulating the land policies and laws were not inclusive. The theme covers also cases where respondents believe that existing land laws do not fully take into account emerging challenges (such large-scale land acquisitions, urban pressure, land degradation, customary land under assault, etc.), as well as cases where the policies and laws are not aligned to international principles and norms (as reflected in the VGGT; F&G, etc.)

**Land grabbing** (frequency 19). This topic (“LandGrabbing” in the Chart) refers to cases of large-scale acquisition of land (farmland, mining areas, etc.). It includes international as well as domestic land grabbing (acquisitions by local elites). It is also used by respondents to refer to compulsory land acquisitions for urban expansion and commercial and infrastructure development. Respondents’ concerns also related to the fact that land allocation practices and investors’ commitments tend to be far below emerging norms (RAI, Guiding principles on LSLBI).

**Lack of awareness** (Frequency 17). This theme (referred to as “Awareness” in the chart) covers issues such as the limited awareness of the land policies and laws among concerned actors and the general
public. It refers also to the fact that there is limited investment in communications aimed at raising public awareness. Respondents are also concerned by what they consider as weak public ownership of land laws and policies. They also believe that there is limited awareness of good practice examples available from other countries. Some also make the point that failure to factor in other resources associated with land (water, forestry, mining, etc.) is often the result of lack awareness of interlinkages between land and these resources.

**Gender inequality** (Frequency 16). This theme (“Gender” in the chart) refers to prevailing gender inequities in access to and control over land, with women being typically at the losing side. Respondents specifically referred to women’s limited access to secure land rights in urban as well as in rural areas, and the fact that a small proportion that they own is formalized.

**Poor information management** (frequency 15). This issue (“Information” in the chart) refers to what respondents see as lack of reliable data on land governance, and the lack of related infrastructure for data collection, storage and analysis (e.g. adequate geodetic infrastructure). Respondents point to the need for accurate land surveying and mapping information. They are also concerned by the weakness of land monitoring capacities and the fact that that land governance data is typically not included in national statistical surveys.

**Weak enforcement of the law** (frequency 14). This issue (called “Enforcement” in the chart), refers to what respondents consider as weak enforcement of the law, due to lack of political will or limited capacity. The issue of also covers discrepancies noted between the law and the practices – the latter being more based on customary, traditional rules than on the laws and policies of the State.

The other pressing challenges, with lower frequencies, include: poor urban planning and management and well as tenure insecurity in urban and per-urban areas; the perceived lack of will from government to engage in and effectively ensure the implementation of progressive land policies; the existing dualism between statutory and customary tenure regimes; the persisting and worsening inequalities and injustices in land access, in addition to gender disparities; the fact that existing national legal frameworks tend to be complex, cumbersome; the inconsistencies that often exist within national legal frameworks, between the various land-related laws and policies; the rampant corruption plaguing land transactions; the lack of transparency of land governance practices; the misunderstanding and neglect of community land rights; the youth’s limited access to secure land rights; the fact that land governance systems and tools are often obsolete; etc. See Annex 1 for the full list of pressing challenges and their frequencies.

### 3.2. Training needs areas

The documents reviewed (see section 2.2.2.1.) explicitly or implicitly suggest key areas that future efforts for strengthening capacities on land governance in Africa should optimally focus on. We considered these areas as the **desired competencies** expected from land policy makers and practitioners. These are competencies for:
1. Addressing the clash, disharmony and clash between statutory and customary land tenure
2. Land titling and formalisation of land rights, including land under informal customary tenure
3. Understanding and addressing gender-based land tenure disparities
4. Understanding and addressing the impact of climate change on land use and land rights (and, implicitly the role of land tenure in climate adaptation and mitigation efforts)
5. Seizing the potential opportunities and managing the risks associated with large-scale land acquisition and land-based investment
6. Understanding and driving or influencing land policy and land law formulation processes
7. Understanding decentralisation and institutional development dimensions of land governance
8. Understanding and promoting land tenure security, including as part of urban development efforts
9. Understanding and strengthening capacities for land conflicts management and alternative dispute resolution
10. Understanding the opportunities and challenges associated with technical advances in land titling and information management
11. Understanding and addressing the need for access to secure land rights for the youth as part of efforts to promote inclusive and equitable land governance
12. Understanding and capitalizing on the land governance dimensions of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

We note the high level of convergence between the above areas —identified through documentation before the start of the online survey—and the most pressing challenges faced by respondents to the online survey. Key areas of convergence include: tenure insecurity and the need for securing land rights through various means, including land title; land-related conflicts; need for capacity development; need to address gender disparities in land access; to ensure the youth’s access to secure land rights; to address risks associated with large-scale land based investments, etc.

While recognizing the relevance and importance of all the above 12 competency areas, they cannot all be accommodated in the planned short-course training envisaged by CLPA. The task is then to identify top priority areas that the CLPA could focus on, which is done in the following sub-section.

### 3.3. Prioritization of training needs

One of the questions of the online survey requested the surveyed population to choose three of the 12 areas—with the possibility of adding any other area—and to rank the selected areas from 1st to 3rd.

In the analyzing of the results, we assigned weights to the priorities depending on their rankings: a weighting factor of 5 was given to first priorities; 3 for 2nd priorities; and 1 for 3rd priorities.

As the table show, the following ranking resulted from the exercise:

- **First priority:** Addressing the clash, disharmony and clash between statutory and customary land tenure
• **Second priority:** Understanding and driving or influencing land policy and land law formulation processes
• **Third priority:** Understanding and strengthening capacities for land conflicts management and alternative dispute resolution
• **Fourth priority:** Understanding decentralisation and institutional development dimensions of land governance
• **Fifth priority:** Seizing the potential opportunities and managing the risks associated with large-scale land acquisition and land-based investment
• **Sixth priority:** Understanding and addressing gender-based land tenure disparities

The table gives more details on the ranking of the other 6 areas.

It is not surprising that the two areas ranked the highest –disharmony and clash between statutory and customary tenure; and the formulation (and implementation) of land policies and laws— relate to two very difficult, challenging topics that have direct implications on all aspects of land governance in Africa, especially on efforts to securing land rights, which is the major pressing challenge that respondents said they are faced with. Similarly, respondents considered land conflicts (ranked 3rd) and large-scale land based investment and land grabbing (ranked 5th) among the other key challenges they are facing. The fourth priority –decentralised land governance—is important because the actual enforcement of land law and of other tenure systems take place on the ground and bring together field representatives of central government, elected officials and traditional authorities. That is probably the level at which the land governance battle will be won or lost, and it is therefore not surprising that it features high in the prioritized areas for training. The ranking of gender inequalities (6th) can be considered as surprising low, but it is rather the result of gender-biased perspectives on the subject –while women consider it high, men tend to rank it lower (see discussion in section 5 below).

**Table 5.** Training needs areas prioritized by respondents to the online survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSSIBLE TRAINING AREAS</th>
<th>PRIORITY 1</th>
<th>PRIORITY 2</th>
<th>PRIORITY 3</th>
<th>Total weighted</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>TOT.1</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation of statutory and customary tenure laws</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titling / formalisation of customary land</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-based land tenure disparities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of climate change on land use and land rights</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-scale land acquisition and land-based investment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land policy and land law formulation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land governance, decentralisation and institutional development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land tenure security and urban development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land conflicts management and</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.4. Stakeholders’ justifications of prioritized training needs areas

This sub-section summarises the arguments given by respondents to the online survey to justify their first, second and third priority areas. The responses received are compiled and organized in sub-themes which can be useful when designing the content of the courses for each of the priority areas. For reference the sources of the arguments are indicated: responses received in French (FR) and in English (ENG) are differentiated followed by their ranking order in the SurveyMonkey platform.

**Priority 1. Harmonisation of statutory and customary tenure laws**

*Customary land tenure is the dominant mode of tenure of land in Africa:* In Africa, most of the land is under customary tenure (ENG17: Zambia; ENG50). In Madagascar, more than 75% of plots (of land used for housing and productive activities) are under customary and informal tenure arrangements, with no formal title attached to them (FR3).

*Customary and statutory tenure co-exist.* Although statutory rights are typically superimposed on them, customary tenure rights persist (ENG19) and continue to co-exist with statutory tenure rights (FR32; FR45; ENG91).

*Customary and statutory tenure often overlap, conflict.* The inconsistencies and contradictions between coexisting customary and statutory tenure systems are source of tensions and disputes around land in general (ENG1: Malawi; FR23; ENG84) and particularly around land governance in peri-urban areas (ENG19) and around communal land. The latter is normally held in trust by state but subject to competing and conflicting management/governance responsibilities by state land administration structures and traditional authorities (ENG74). These inconsistencies weaken the capacities of decentralized collectivities to manage the land in their jurisdictions (FR19).

*Customary tenure systems tend to be marginalized and unfairly treated (compared to statutory tenure), resulting in the fact that customary tenure rights are often precarious.* Contrary to formal land title holders, those who hold customary land rights do not feel secure to invest in their land and cannot use their land as collateral to access credit (FR6). No clear provisions are taken by governments to establish land tenure management frameworks that respect the community rights derived from customary tenure systems (FR32). The fact is that prevailing laws typically ignore customary rights, which penalizes the majority of the population (FR40). Pastoral communal land,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-theme</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Weighting Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical advances in land titling and information management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land governance and the youth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land governance and the Sustainable Development Goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify topic and level of priority)*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other: FR = 11 ; ENG = 11
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which is under customary tenure, is the most neglected, and is considered as a no-man’s land (ENG67). As a result, real owners of the land tend to lose it at the benefit of those who can manage to get a land certificate from government (ENG54: Cameroon).

**Customary tenure systems have their own challenges.** Traditional leaders tend to display authoritarianism in the way they manage customary land (ENG76). Women and the youth and other traditionally marginalized groups are inequitably treated in many customary tenure systems (FR21).

**Addressing the disharmony, inconsistencies and contractions between customary and statutory tenure regime have many benefits.** These benefits include higher tenure security, which can unlock the economic growth and sustainable development potential of the continent (ENG71; ENG83); help avoid/minimize conflicts (FR22); strengthen social cohesion while addressing inequalities within society (ENG5; ENG85); contribute to efforts to build strong governance environment by strengthening rule of law in the land sector.

Conclusion: Customary and statutory land tenure regimes co-exist side by side or overlap, the former being still predominant in Africa. The two systems often clash, weakening each other, which leads to rampant tenure insecurity, inequalities in access to land and conflicts. While harmonising the two systems is key to improving land governance in Africa, there is little knowledge available on tested experiences on ways of building bridges and reconciling the two tenure regimes. To address this challenge, it is needed to build capacity among land policy makers as well as leaders/managers and practitioners.

**Priority 2. Land policy and land law formulation**

**Land policy formulation is a foundational step to building an effective land governance system at national level.** A land policy is the basis, the foundation upon which the framework and modalities of land-related interventions are defined (FR2; ENG13; ENG28). It is the pivot around which good land governance revolves (ENG63). A sound land policy enables the establishment of a good land governance environment (FR29; FR40; ENG41; ENG70). It is a pre-requisite for defining policies related to territorial planning, including for urban and rural land (FR42; ENG84). In countries such as Ethiopia, it is felt that the real land governance problem is not due to lack of expertise of technical knowledge but rather results from the lack of strategic direction that a comprehensive land policy would provide (ENG69).

**Land policy formulation (and revisiting existing frameworks) is a matter of urgency.** The current context of large-scale land acquisitions and intensified land-related conflicts throughout the continent (FR8; FR29) show the urgent need to formulate land policies and laws that respond to these emerging challenges. Well-conceived land policies contribute to creating an enabling environment for many development sectors and for achieving most of the SDGs while outdated and non-adapted land policies and laws are a key hindrance to progress in most development sectors (FR11). The pace of intensification of conflicts over land in urban and peri-urban areas, pastoral land and in riparian zones of water bodies in the continent justifies that appropriate land policy and legal responses be conceived at national level (ENG65; ENG76; FR11).
Land policy formulation is an opportunity to explore ways of addressing the need for land tenure security for all. Land policy formulation offers the opportunity to formalize land rights (FR5; FR17). It is an opportunity to respond to the need for greater clarity in land right tenure arrangements (FR14) and to envisage land titling as a means of conflict prevention (ENG11; ENG25).

Land policy formulation is an opportunity to address the need for greater equity in access to and control over land while empowering women and marginalised groups. Land policy formulation is needed to tackle inequities and hence prevent or minimize conflicts (FR35).

Land policy formulation gives the opportunity to upgrade and align land-related policies, laws and regulations to emerging international and regional norms and principles. Land is a highly dynamic sector, and existing policies in countries are often obsolete, outdated (ENG38; ENG22; ENG28; ENG75). There is a need to ensure that land policies and laws are regularly updated, adjusted (FR26). These adjustments are opportunities for taking into account innovations and emerging norms and values in land governance such as the VGGT, the AU Land Policy Framework and Guidelines, the Guiding principles on LSLBI in Africa (FR13; FR43; ENG18). Land policy formulation processes need to be highly participatory (FR36), which requires careful management of multi-stakeholder interests (ENG28). New land policies and laws are also expected to contribute to community empowerment and to improving tenure security for all (ENG88).

Land policy formulation is an opportunity to address inconsistencies between existing land-related policies, laws and regulations. There is lack of coherence in land policies and laws (ENG73). In order to harmonise the many land-related laws, it is necessary to develop a new overarching land policy (FR20).

There is a glaring capacity gap regarding the modalities of formulating land policies at national level. A precondition for triggering land policy reform and the formulation of new land laws is to raise awareness of policy makers and government leaders about the challenges resulting from poor tenure and governance of land – an increasingly disputed resource (FR38). The real meaning of a land policy and land laws as well as the purpose they serve is often not well understood in responsible government entities (ENG67). Other substantive aspects that are not fully understood by land practitioners and policy makers include approaches to securing land rights, modalities of land acquisition (including for public interest) and for compensating expropriated land owners, as well as approaches to restoring the livelihoods of affected populations. This is illustrated in the case of Niger, a country engaged in the formulation of land policy. An important part of the debates taking place as part of the land policy formulation process focuses on the very meaning of a land policy and the modalities and processes to follow in its formulation (FR8). Therefore, there is clear need for guidance and capacity development in the area of land policy and land law formulation.

Conclusion: Many of the existing legal frameworks governing land tenure in Africa are obsolete, outdated. Emerging values and norms (such as those reflected in the 2012 VGGT, the 2012 Africa Land Policy Framework and Guidelines, the 2014 RAI principles, the Guiding Principles on large-scale land-based investments in Africa) are not fully reflected in existing land-related laws and regulations in Africa. Moreover, there exist many inconsistencies between the various land-related laws in many
countries, where land governance is typically characterized by a lack of strategic vision and clearly stated long-term objectives. There is therefore an urgent need for formulating sound land policies aligned to emerging norms and standards. A sound land policy formulation process requires that appropriate inclusive consultation mechanisms are in place. It also implies making strategic choices on complex subjects such as ways of securing land rights, conditions for allocating land to domestic and foreign corporate investors, addressing gender disparities, dealing with customary and community land rights, etc. Capacity development in the formulation of land policies and laws are needed for most countries and could target policy makers, managers of public institutions responsible for land management, leaders of decentralized government units and of civil society organization and well as customary leaders.

**Priority 3. Land conflicts management and alternative dispute resolution**

*Land-related conflicts escalate and amplify, as competition for land intensifies in Africa.* Land conflicts are recurrent in urban as well as in rural areas in Africa (FR14; ENG73). They seem to have increased in frequency and in intensity in recent years (FR18; FR37). Land-related conflicts are the dominant type of conflicts sent to courts (FR22; FR24; FR25; ENG52). In Ethiopia, Kenya and many other countries, the overwhelming majority of conflict cases are land-related (ENG15; ENG21; ENG60).

*Land-related conflicts have many adverse effects.* They often result in murder, with many victims, especially women and vulnerable groups (FR18; FR26; FR35; ENG60; ENG82). They are time-consuming, financially costly and socially disruptive (FR11; FR24). Disputes and conflicts are among the greatest hindrances to Africa’s development (ENG71; ENG54). Unresolved conflicts can persist for generations (ENG46).

*Africa is unprepared to prevent, minimize and manage growing disputes and violent conflicts.* Government land professionals are not trained to deal with customary land tenure, the dominant tenure regime in Africa (FR6; FR36). Local-level institutions (field segments of the State, elected decentralized bodies and traditional authorities) are ill-prepared to handle the unprecedented levels and intensity of land conflict, which is compounded by their inability to work together (FR1; FR18).

*Preventing and solving conflicts will benefit land governance and sustainable development in Africa.* When conflicts are prevented, minimized and properly managed when they occur, land users are encouraged to invest in their land, and sustainably manage shared village territoirs (FR6). Effective land conflict management also contribute to intra- and inter-state peace and stability (FR17).

*There is need for capacity development on the management of land-related disputes and conflicts.* Significant attention need to be paid to preventing land-related conflicts, which will require that customary and statutory tenure systems be reconciled, harmonized (FR34). Capacity development is needed on mediation approaches which are the preferred options for resolving disputes among communities (FR6) and other alternative dispute resolution methods that are sensitive to local socio-cultural realities (ENG55).

Conclusion. Throughout the continent, land-related conflicts increase in frequency and magnitude. While deeply rooted in the clash between co-existing and often overlapping customary and statutory
tenure systems, land conflicts exacerbate because of the growing competition for agricultural and urban land. Land conflicts take a heavy toll on human life as well as on economic and social wellbeing, peace and stability. The continent is not prepared to deal with the current level and patterns of land-conflicts. The profound changes that have occurred in recent years make traditional mechanisms of conflict management less efficient, while government land professionals are typically not trained to deal with customary tenure systems. There is need to strengthen the capacity of government representatives, elected officials and customary leaders to work together and collaborate in devising and implementing adapted conflict management and dispute resolution mechanisms.

**Priority 4. Land governance, decentralisation and institutional development**

*Decentralisation contributes to efforts toward improved land governance with viable institutions.* Prevailing land use and tenure practices (tenure arrangements, modalities of negotiating land allocation and expropriations) at local level should be the basis upon which land policies and laws are formulated (FR21; ENG44). Good land governance needs to be supported by strong institutions and regulatory framework at local level (FR4). These are needed for the implementation of the land policies and laws on the ground (FR37). Decentralised land governance is an opportunity to devolve land management responsibilities to credible institutions with democratically elected and legitimate leaders. It can contribute to promote greater accountability, and combat corruption in land management, and promote socially and culturally adapted conflict prevention and management approaches (ENG13; FR42). “When institutions that govern land are developed and strengthened at all levels, land governance becomes effective” (ENG89).

*While many countries are engaged in processes of devolution of power to decentralization institutions, the implications for land governance are not always clearly understood.* Decentralisation is high on the agenda of many African countries where current momentum toward greater decentralized governance seems irreversible (FR8; FR41). The conditions and means of such decentralization programmes, especially with respect to land management, are not always well understood (FR33; FR16). The competencies conferred to decentralized entities vs those remaining in the hands of central government in the area of land administration and territorial governance are not always clearly fleshed out (FR16; FR8).

*Decentralised land governance is an opportunity to better handle the management of customary and community land tenure systems.* In countries like Ghana (which also applies to all of Africa), most of the land is under customary ownership while its administration and management is done by state agencies (ENG4). Prevailing land administration systems tend to exclude land owners and traditional authorities (chiefs, clan/family heads, religious leaders) from major land-related decisions despite the fact that they are still influential actors on land matters and local governance issues (ENG52). Having effective decentralized institutions helps establish close links between State (central government) and communities, and therefore contributing to reconcile statutory and customary land management systems (ENG71). Deficiencies in decentralization policies can lead to rivalries and mismanagement of land and associated natural resources by local administrative authorities, elected officials and
customary leaders (FR34; ENG21). “Decentralisation and institutional development is critical in involving and putting local communities at the center of decision-making” (ENG88).

Decentralisation helps improve effectiveness in the implementation of the land law. Devolving land management powers to local institutions can facilitate the operationalization and actual implementation of existing land policies and laws (FR48; ENG3). But it is unclear if emerging land management principles and new land administration tools can work effectively in rural areas, and help avoid/manage risks of violent conflicts between pastoralists and farmers (ENG62).

There is a capacity gap to address land governance aspects of decentralization programmes. There is need to strengthen capacity and expertise on the development of institutional frameworks that ensure cohesion and harmony at local level while being supportive of effective decentralized land governance (ENG28). One of the key questions is whether and the extent to which the application of innovative land administration tools, land taxation and emerging land information systems can benefit decentralization of land governance efforts and the overall decentralization of programmes (FR8). There is a feeling that emerging international and regional normative frameworks on land governance are yet to be reflected on the strategies for devolving land governance to local institutions (ENG88). Local governments play a central role in land use and management activities at community level, but often lack the institutional and human capacities to deliver on their responsibilities (ENG76; ENG24; ENG63). More knowledge is needed on appropriate tools for monitoring land governance.

Conclusion: In practice, it is at local levels (of provinces, inter-village territories, urban and rural communes, villages and hamlets) that the land is managed, and related conflicts resolved. It is at local levels that the deficiencies in land governance are laid bare. The existence of competing and conflicting land-related roles and responsibilities of local representatives of line ministries (territorial development, land commissions, ministries of agriculture, mining, forestry, livestock, infrastructure development, etc.), elected officials of local government units, traditional chiefs, etc. can be source of poor resource governance and paralysis of decision making. Many African countries are fortunately engaged in or contemplate the possibility of strengthening decentralized governance by devolving decision-making powers to local institutions. This is a unique opportunity for improving land governance at the levels where it matters most. On the other hand, land administration (with the financial resources that it can help mobilise locally) can be key to the success of decentralization strategies. Yet, land governance—let alone its emerging principles—is either ignored or not properly integrated in decentralization efforts. There is need for substantial capacity development in adapted approaches to conflict management and dispute resolution targeting land professionals at all levels as well as local leaders (provincial representatives of line ministries, elected officials of decentralized units and traditional authorities).

Priority 5. Large-scale land acquisition and land-based investment

Africa is one of the key targets of large-scale land acquisitions and land-based investments. As a result of the scarcity of agricultural land being experienced globally (especially in Europe, the Middle East and in densely populated Asian countries), Africa is increasingly targeted by transnational agri-
business corporations that use all kinds of means to access and control vast swaths of land in Africa (FR45). The intensity of the phenomenon varies from a country to another. Malawi, Kenya, DRC, Madagascar are among the countries where the phenomenon is felt as major challenge (ENG68; ENG35; FR12; FR3).

*Large-scale land acquisitions perceived as a major threat to the continent’s food security, youth employment, economic growth.* The consequences of the intensified competition for Africa’s agricultural land can be far-reaching. African agricultural land is expected to feed Africa’s exponentially increasing population and livestock, create jobs for the youth and be sustainably managed to preserve the fragile natural resources of continent (FR18; FR38; ENG8). These objectives are hardly attainable where massive large-scale land deals take place. When unguided, this phenomenon threatens food sovereignty in Africa (ENG56).

*Large-scale land acquisitions perceived as a threat to land rights for the poor and for vulnerable groups, to family farmers, and to indigenous peoples.* The land held and used by African family farmers is increasingly targeted by powerful foreign actors seeking to find the necessary fertile farmland to feed the world (FR18; FR3; FR41; ENG86). Indigenous peoples are disproportionately affected by existing patterns of land acquisitions in Africa. They are systematically stripped of their land which plays a key role in their social, cultural, religious and economic lives (FR45). In the struggle for land between indigenous people and foreign corporations, African governments typically take the side of the latter (FR45).

*Africa ill-prepared to respond to the challenges and potential opportunities of Large-scale land acquisitions and land-based investments.* Although what is sometimes referred to as “land grabbing” is taking place for a decade now, with Africa being the main target, African governments have been unable to equip themselves with appropriate political and legal instruments to respond to the phenomenon (FR19). The context of rampant corruption in the land sector in Africa contributes to accentuate the scale of land grabbing, resulting in devastating consequences (FR19). In some country contexts (such as Madagascar), the existing economic, agricultural and land policies even encourage large-scale foreign investments that strip communities of their land rights (FR3). In other contexts (such as DRC), the lack of a clear strategy for dealing with large-scale land acquisitions leads to continuous encroachment of newly allocated concessions on land that is traditionally controlled and used by communities, resulting in a profound land governance crisis (FR12). Overall, massive land grabbing an only take place where there are deficiencies in the territorial governance and in the modalities of devolution of power to decentralized entities (FR33).

*The need to guide the process, to devise appropriate policy responses to LSLAs and LSLBIs.* It is the role of government to conceive appropriate and carefully designed strategies to deal with the phenomenon of land grabbing (FR23; FR21). There is need to guide the wave of large-scale land-based investments in Africa by giving priority to types of investments that require the transfer of limited amounts of land (FR18; FR29).

*There are key elements to take into consideration to build capacity to respond to the LSBI challenge.* Priority should be given to allocations that lead to substantive investments while contributing to
improving the productivity of the land (ENG25). Given the fact that mass unemployment is the biggest problem faced by Africa, large-scale land based investments are expected to contribute a substantial number of new jobs (ENG10). As most land-based investment projects are implemented in communally-owned land, it is essential to ensure transparency and community participation in processes leading to concessions to foreign investors (ENG74). Measures should be taken to ensure that the land given to foreign investors is put to the beneficial use of communities while protecting the interests of the investors (ENG10). The rights of indigenous peoples needs to be protected (FR45). It is also important to recognize the linkages between access to secure land rights and the SDGs (FR45).

Conclusion: The tracking of large-scale land deals globally and in Africa over the last ten years shows that the phenomenon is far from being a short-lived phenomenon. Despite the disappointing outcomes of the first concessions given to foreign actors, the wave of large transnational land acquisitions persists, unabated, and there is no indication that it will recede any time soon. When carefully vetted, land-based investments can contribute to Africa’s development, boost the agricultural sector and contribute to creating the much-needed jobs (ENG10; ENG19; ENG43). When they are unguided or poorly managed, large-scale land acquisitions can worsen the plight of the majority and Africa’s poor and of the most vulnerable groups (IPs, women, etc.) (ENG19; ENG58). Robust political and legal responses are therefore needed to optimize their potential benefits and avoid the many adverse impacts that they can cause (ENG18). There is need for consistency in national policies that have implications of foreign direct investments (such as policies on agriculture, biofuels, mining) (ENG51). Communities leaders and representatives need to develop their skills as negotiators that are able broker investment arrangements that generate sustainable benefits for their constituents, including the rural poor (ENG26; ENG51). There is a need to better understand how large-scale land deals affect other key dimensions of sustainable development such as water and food security (ENG26). National-level governance frameworks to deal with the phenomenon are absent or weak. While promising normative frameworks are now available at the international and regional levels to guide large-scale land acquisitions – the RAI principles and the Guiding principles on LSLBI in Africa--., they are typically not yet operationalized and implemented at national level.

**Priority 6. Gender-based land tenure disparities**

Women’s limited access to secure land tenure rights. Women are an important part and often the majority of providers of farm labour. This prominent role is at odds with their limited access to land ownership rights (ENG38; ENG54; ENG55; FR18; FR43).

Land right is a human right—challenge is to understand and be able to operationalise this rights-based approach. Women’s access to land is a human rights issue (FR28; FR47).

Gender disparities in access to land have far-reaching consequences on many development objectives. Women’s economic role is constrained by their limited access to land ownership (FR41). Gender-based land tenure disparities are a major hindrance to poverty reduction, food security (ENg19). If sustainable development goals are to be met, gender disparities in land access must be addressed (FR28; ENG19).
There are significant gender imbalances—with women at the losing side—in land access both in customary and statutory tenure systems. Despite the context of increasing feminization of farm labor, women continue face serious obstacles to access ownership rights over the land they farm (FR43). Women-headed smallholdings do not typically have ownership and control over land and other productive resources (ENG38). In recent years strides have been in addressing gender equity as part of land policy formulation efforts (ENG35). Even in cases where the land law fairly treats men and women, the implementation of the law, the day-to-day land tenure practices (including inheritance systems), continues to be discriminatory against women (FR32; FR23). Women continue to be denied access to land because of cultural values in various country and local settings (ENG68).

There is need for gender mainstreaming and for achieving greater equality in access to and control over land, taking into account the availability of limited knowledge/experience as to how to meet these objectives. Gender disparity in land access is not receiving the attention it deserves in the African development agenda (ENG30; ENG89); It is important to better understand issues such as constraints related to inheritance rights as well as how factors such as large-scale land acquisitions and climate change affect women’s access to and control over land (ENG8; ENG31). As discussed in section 4, there are significant differences in priorities between men and women, especially with regards to the gender thematic area. Women put the need for gender training far ahead on their priority list, while men only rank gender training as their 6th priority.

Conclusion: Women’s access to secure land rights needs to be considered from a human-rights perspective, and therefore to be addressed as a matter of priority. Closing the gender gap in land ownership helps empower women as citizens and economic agents (ENG29). Gender inequalities are deep rooted in society and very difficult to solve, especially in the land sector. There is critical need for capacity building in understanding and addressing gender disparities in land access and sharing practical examples that have been implemented in the continent and beyond.

**Priority 7. Land governance and the Sustainable Development Goals**

The fact that land is taken into account in the SDGs is an opportunity for promoting improved land governance in Africa. As can be expected, land is ubiquitous in the 2030 global agenda for sustainable development: Seven (7) of the seventeen (17) SDGs directly deal with land issues or have strong land implications (Mennen, 2015)\(^{12}\). Issues covered in land-related goals and targets range from resource tenure security, gender and equity, efficient and sustainable land use, restoration of degraded land, etc. (ENG72; ENG66; ENG91). Land is key to ensuring economic growth and sustainable development in Africa (ENG79; ENG89), and all efforts by African countries, including in the land governance area, should be directed to the attainment of the SDGs (ENG17).

The current revival of land governance policy reforms in Africa is an opportunity to contribute to creating an environment that is supportive of the many land-related sustainable development goals.
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and targets. Indeed land is key to achieving these goals (FR1). Therefore, the SDGs should be mainstreamed in the formulation and implementation of land governance policies and laws (ENG10).

There is a need to better understand how land is covered in the SDGs. The SDGs define the priorities in the international development agenda for the decades to come. African governments have subscribed to the SDGs and are hence expected to fulfill their related obligations, in all concerned areas, including in the land sector (ENG56; FR20). However, a lot more needs to be done to improve land practitioners’ and policy makers’ understanding of how land is framed and incorporated in the SDGs (ENG64; ENG34).

Conclusion. Improved land governance is key to attaining the 2030 development agenda, and thus the many land-related sustainable development goals and targets. An increasing number of African countries are engaged or contemplate the possibility of formulating new land policies or revisiting the existing ones. Concerned land practitioners, senior government officials and policy makers in these countries need to better understand the land dimensions of the SDGs to ensure that land policy reform processes contribute to creating an enabling environment for delivering the 2030 development agenda.

Priority 8. Titling / formalisation of customary land

Customary tenure, the dominant mode of tenure, neglected and marginalized. While land tenure rights for more than 80% of the people in Africa are under customary regime, they tend to remain unclear, undocumented, not recognized by State and therefore insecure (FR12; ENG18). In many contexts, governments are reluctant to recognize customary land rights as equivalent or even close to private land rights under statutory regime. Customary and community land is vulnerable to elite capture because it is often held under informal and precarious tenure rights (ENG29). Similarly, prime dry-season grazing areas, and pastoral land in general, are being encroached and alienated to non-pastoral uses (ENG37). As competition for land intensifies in the continent, customary land owners are being massively dispossessed and deprived of their land (ENG91).

There is urgent need for protecting, securing customary and community land. In many contexts, land titling is a means of securing land rights, especially village and community land (FR30). It is essential to secure land rights via formal titling and recognition of the customary management of land resources, which helps ensure that land owners and users are fairly compensated when they are expropriated (ENG37).

Current experiences of land titling offer opportunities for sharing lessons on success and challenges. The examples of recognition and regularisation of customary rights through land titling in contexts such Rwanda, Malawi (ENG1), Kenya (ENG35) are worth sharing. There is need to prioritise more innovative ways of land administration and land titling, taking into account both informal and informal, customary and statutory rights (ENG16). Titling of customary land needs to take into account local cultural and socio-economic specificities (FR40).
Land titling efforts can take advantage of current and emerging low-cost technologies. Improvement in technology (such as GPS, mapping via unmanned aerial vehicles and other geomatics tools) can create conditions for better management of land titling processes (FR30; ENG22).

Land titling has many benefits. It helps better defend, protect tenure rights of land owners and users (ENG18), attract investments (ENG77) and limit land grabbing (ENG15).

Conclusion: An increasing number of African countries are going through or contemplate the need to engage in new land reform processes, involving the formalization of existing customary land rights, and land parcel titling (ENG51). But the titling of informal and customary land is a contentious matter difficult to operationalize. There is hence need to improve understanding of the extent to which and the conditions under which land titling can help protect customary and community land owners and users (ENG18). The desirable role of decentralized local units in land titling efforts deserves a closer look, taking into consideration the fact that many Africa governments are engaged in efforts to devolve power to decentralized entities (urban and rural communities and other decentralized collectivities). There is an urgent need for capacity building on approaches to and challenges related to land titling and formalization of customary land in order to accompany the current wave of land reform and regularization initiatives in Africa.

Priority 9. Land tenure security and urban development

Persistence and expansion of informal settlement is one of the features of Africa’s rapid urbanization. The rapid urbanization of the continent results largely from the acceleration of rural outmigration (FR45; ENG56). Land tenure insecurity with the coexistence of formal and informal processes is one of the biggest challenges facing African cities, which generally expand in total anarchy (ENG6; FR23).

Urban planning challenges. As the value of land increases in urban and peri-urban, corruption becomes rampant, constraining efforts to guide urban development processes. The rapid encroachment of urban areas on rural land often leads to tension and sometimes violent conflicts (ENG21; ENG92. In this context, it is urgently needed to invest in rigorous urban planning with clear norms to guide land allocation and housing development (FR45).

Need for capacity development to guide urban development. There is need to better understand approaches for effective integration of land governance dimensions into urban planning activities (ENG6). The need for capacity development should also focus on approaches to guiding urban expansion, managing conflicts and hence addressing modalities of acquisition of rural land and compensation of holders of agricultural land (ENG21; FR27). There is also a knowledge gap regarding the importance and ways of achieving gender equity and youth’s access to secure land rights in urban areas (ENG79)

Conclusion. Africa’s unguided rapid urbanisation poses internal planning challenges for cities, but also requires management of the conflict risks with surrounding rural areas. There is need to better understand how land policy choices can effectively contribute to improved planning of urban development in Africa.
Priority 10. Impact of climate change on land use and land rights

*Climate change is real, with significant adverse impacts in Africa.* Climate change is one of the major threats facing Africa (FR48; FR28), and requires immediate response before it gets worse (ENG70). It manifests itself in the form of extreme events (unusual droughts and floods), adverse impacts on water availability and water use (ENG8; ENG66; ENG92; FR10).

*Climate change affects the physical condition of the land as well as land governance and use practices.* Climate variability and change leads to land degradation and loss of arable land (ENG86). Extreme events and long-term declines in water availability translate into declining productivity of the soil, and changes in farming practices, outmigration from rural areas and swelling of slums in and around urban areas (FR44; ENG1; ENG33; ENG87).

*Land governance can contribute to improve resilience and adaptation capacity to climate change.* Efforts to improve land governance should include approaches aimed at strengthening resilience to climate change and ensuring sustainable livelihoods (FR48; ENG79).

*Improved land governance can contribute to climate mitigation efforts.* Land governance and land use planning projects need to better integrate the objectives of preserving the vegetation cover of the soil and hence improving carbon sequestration (FR12).

*Africa faces a capacity gap to develop and implement land-based responses to the challenge of climate change.* There is need for more evidence-based knowledge on how climate change affects land tenure and management (FR22; ENG59); and whether and how climate change has differential impacts on users and residents of the land depending on land tenure types (ENG60). There is also a knowledge gap on the role of land tenure on women’s vulnerability to climate change (ENG60; ENG82).

Conclusion. Africa is highly vulnerable to climate change due to rampant poverty and the fact that livelihood systems of the majority of its population (especially in rural areas) are highly dependent on the exploitation of natural resources (rainfed agriculture, pastoralism, fishing, exploitation of forest products, etc.). This context explains the importance of land-based options for strengthening resilience to climate change in Africa. It is well known that access to secure land rights is an important safety net for the poor, in rural as well as in urban areas, in times of devastating extreme events (droughts and floods). Securing access to land rights is a key incentive for investments in land and water management infrastructure and other oil restoration interventions aimed at minimizing the impacts of climate variability and improving the carbon sequestration capacity of the land. There is need for capacity development to ensure that the formulation and implementation of land policy and land laws are seized as opportunities for strengthening Africa’s resilience to climate while contributing to efforts to combat global warming.

Priority 11. Technical advances in land titling and information management

*Progress to deliver secure land rights at scale and to establish effective land administration systems in Africa is constrained by the high-cost and time-consuming nature of traditionally available tools and*
techniques. The prevailing land governance practices and institutions are inefficient largely because they do not use modern technologies (ENG22). Africa faces poor delivery of land governance services because of outdated land information systems that are costly to establish (EN24).

**Newly available tools and techniques are an opportunity to secure land rights and improve land information systems.** There is need for faster and more affordable land titling and land administration techniques (FR24). Available technologies can help ensure efficient management of land registries and monitoring of land titling programmes (FR1).

**Using the new tools and techniques for land titling and administration has many benefits.** The new tools and technique for land titling and land information management can help allocate land titles to land owners while contributing to prevent and manage land-related conflicts (FR17; FR30). The new technologies allow mass titling in tight deadlines (ENG3). The use of new technologies can contribute to promoting transparency and open access to land data and hence to fighting the currently rampant land-related corruption (ENG9; ENG25). They can also serve as basis for fair compensation of ownership and usufruct rights holder in case of expropriation.

**Need for skills development in the use of new and emerging land governance tools at appropriate levels.** The availability of good land policies and laws are important but not enough; they need to be complemented by training to improve capacity to use the appropriate tools and techniques to implement the land policies and laws (ENG69). The land commissions and other institutions responsible for the delivery of property rights titles and for guiding land transactions in urban as well as rural areas are not up to date in land engineering and have no or limited knowledge of new land management tools and techniques (FR14). As shown by experience gained from Rwanda, building capacity on the use of new tools for land management also has to take into account the need for the maintenance and regular updating of the information base, while improving the accuracy of the information collected (ENG34).

**Conclusion.** The need for securing, documenting, storing and monitoring land rights is massive in Africa where most of the land is under informal tenure arrangements. The cost and time-consuming nature of traditional approaches to surveying, demarcating, adjudicating and titling land rights have until recently been a major obstacle to improving land governance and administration in Africa. New technologies (such as GPS, remote sensing, use of unmanned aerial vehicles) are today available to help achieve fast and cheap mass land titling and effective land information management. There is an urgent need to build capacity of relevant institutions (at national and local levels) in the use of these technologies.

**Priority 12. Land governance and the youth**

**Unequal access to land affect the African youth.** In African patriarchal society where men exercise stifling powers over children and women, ensuring access to land ownership for the youth is not considered as a priority (FR16). The youth suffer from unequal access to land, which tends to be exacerbated by the propensity to sell off the land to foreign actors (FR13; ENG68). One of the reasons why the youth is sidelined in land allocation decision is the fear that once given full control
over the land (ownership rights) they will sell it and emigrate (ENG68). With these obstacles, the rural youth face massive unemployment, such as in Tunisia (FR31) and Madagascar (FR3). In such conditions, the youth tend to resort to outmigration to cities and to neighboring countries and other continents (ENG55).

Access to land for the youth is key to combatting youth unemployment in Africa (especially with opportunities of job creation in the agricultural sector). Improved access to land is one of the greatest opportunities to channel and mobilise the youth’s energy for Africa’s development (FR35). When young people are empowered by giving them secure land tenure rights, they can contribute significantly to the economic growth of their respective countries (ENG85).

Improving access to secure land rights for the youth has many benefits. There are more and more young Africans trained at secondary and tertiary level schools as soil scientists, farming technicians and experts. They are potentially efficient agricultural entrepreneurs who can bring innovation and higher productivity in the farming sector of the continent, provided that their access to secure land rights is facilitated (FR31). Giving secure land tenure rights to the youth will inculcate in them a greater sense of responsibility to sustainably manage the land (ENG70). Africa’s exponentially growing population is a “tinder box” for the continent, especially if we fail to resolve the massive youth employment, for example through access to secure tenure rights in productive lands (ENG43). Therefore, the youth who are the present and the future of the continent need to be at the center of land governance policies and strategies (ENG41).

There is need for capacity development on means of improving secure access to land rights for the youth. The impact of prevailing land tenure practices on the youth and how more progressive land governance systems could address the challenges facing the youth in the continent are an under-researched topic (ENG6).

Conclusion. Africa’s rapid population growth is rightly considered as a major threat, a time-ticking bomb. But it is also potentially a demographic dividend. For the latter to materialize, the massive youth’s joblessness needs to be addressed. In the foreseeable future, the agricultural sector will remain the main provider of employment in the continent, which shows the critical importance of unlocking access to land and to the farming sector for young people. In addition to contributing to addressing unemployment in the continent, access to secure land rights for young people (often highly educated), who can quickly become skilled, entrepreneurs can help modernize the farming sector, with spillover benefits on the entire economy of the continent. But as is the case for women, there are many obstacles to improving access to land ownership for the youth. There is need for better understanding of the cultural, economic, legal and political constraints to and opportunities for improving youth’s access to land tenure security and to learn from experiences gained from around the world in efforts to address this problem.
4. CURRENT/PLANNED TRAINING OFFERS RELEVANT TO IDENTIFIED PRIORITY NEEDS

This section gives an overview of the types of existing short-course training opportunities targeting professionally active land specialists and other stakeholders interested and involved in land-governance matters. The objective is to gauge the extent to which the training needs prioritized in the previous section are being already covered. Initial academic training leading to degrees (such as Bachelor, Master, PhD or their equivalents) is touched upon but is not the focus of this review. We distinguish between training opportunities offered at country level (i.e., delivered by an institution to nationals/residents of the countries where it is established), and at sub-regional, continental and international levels. The section describes succinctly some of the online courses and training material that are accessible to in-service professionals to upgrade their skills and update their knowledge on various aspects of land governance.

4.1. Types of training offers at country level: illustration from Senegal and Kenya

We use the examples of Kenya and Senegal—countries used earlier to describe the landscape of land-governance institutions at national level—to illustrate the types of short-course training opportunities on land governance that are accessible to land policy makers and practitioners. We are assuming that African countries share many common features in this domain, especially when they have a common colonial legacy.

4.1.1. Training offers for short course in land governance for practitioners in Senegal

In Senegal, the types of training in land governance available to serving land professionals and relevant actors include the following:

**In-house training by public land governance agencies.** The government Directorate of Taxation and Domains (DGID), which is the backbone of government’s land administration services, has its own training center, providing refresher short courses to its staff. At the Cadastre Directorate (a Department within DGID), one of the established rules is that each has attend an a short training course, at least once each three years, at the DGID training center or at other learning institutions in Senegal or abroad.

**Training offers by public higher learning institutions.**
Almost all the public schools specialized in training the land management cadres and specialists organize annually a series of short courses targeting their own alumni and other land experts, The National School of Administration (ENA) which the main learning institution from where many senior and middle level managers of the Directorate of Domains and of Legislation are trained provide long-term courses leading to diplomas as well as short refresher courses on various aspects of land administration, with a focus on taxation. Engineering schools such as ESP (Higher Polytechnical
School) and the Faculty of Engineering Sciences of the University of Thies train surveyors at Engineer level and, for ESP, at the level of specialized technicians. They organize 2-3 year-long evening courses for mid-level professionals. Various public and private secondary and tertiary learning institutions train technicians and experts in remote sensing and geomatics in general, many of whom are hired by organisations such as the Directorate of Cadastre or the Agency of territorial management (ANAT). Many of the senior and middle managers and staff of ANAT, ministries in charge urban development, agriculture, livestock, decentralization, etc, are graduates from ESEA (School higher learning in Applied Economics). ESEA offers long-term courses in land use planning and rural development for mid-career professionals. All these schools as well as the law faculties of universities such as Gaston Berger in Saint-Louis and Cheikh Anta Diop in Dakar organize workshops from time-to-time and seminars on-demand for land practitioners on various aspects of land governance.

Training offers by NGOs and think tank organisations.
A number of NGOs organize regularly short courses and seminars on various topics related to land governance and land administration. That is the case for EDJA (Editions Juridiques Africaines) which focuses on purely legal aspects; or IPAR (Initiative Prospective Agricole et Rurale) whose training courses are rather centered on the political economy of land governance. In the context of efforts to promote the VGGT, IPAR has organized since 2014 a series of short courses on land governance targeting members of the Parliament, journalists, judges, leaders of farmer organisations, and elected officials of decentralized collectivities: rural and urban communes.

These are only few of the many examples of institutions offering short- and longer-term courses to land governance policy makers and practitioners in Senegal.

4.1.2. Training offers for short courses in land governance in Kenya
Short term land governance courses for professionals working in the public and private sectors in Kenya are few. These are offered by the government and some civil society organisations. The bulk of land governance experts in Kenya have been trained by the local Universities to Bachelors, Masters and PhD level. These Universities include: the University of Nairobi; the Jomo Kenyatta University of Science and Technology; the Technical Universities of Kenya and Mombasa; Kimathi University of Science and Technology; Kenyatta University; Egerton University; and Moi University. Other middle level land experts been trained in government training institutes and polytechnics which offer full time diploma courses. The Universities and the diploma training institutions are not known to run any short term courses targeted at policy makers and practising professionals in the public and private sectors.

Courses run by government
Kenya Institute of Surveying and Mapping (KISM). The Kenya Institute for Surveying and Mapping (KISM) is run by the Survey of Kenya, a department of the Ministry of Lands and Physical Planning. KISM provides ordinary and higher level diploma training courses in: surveying; cartography; photogrammetry and remote sensing; and in map production. These are all long term courses
though. Staff in the Ministry can apply for consideration for admission along with other qualified applicants from outside government. The skills imparted are required for inhouse technical processes in Survey of Kenya but also in the private sector.

KISM is also used by the Ministry for the provision of short term basic computer courses for the operational staff in the various departments.

**Courses run by think tank and professional bodies**

*Capacity building by The Institute for Law and Environmental Governance (ILEG).* The Institute for Law and Environmental Governance (ILEG) is an independent non-profit public interest organisation which focuses on law and policy. ILEG has made efforts to promote access to environmental justice in Kenya. ILEG organises capacity building workshops for judicial officers and legal practitioners in Kenya on environmental law in partnership with the Centre for Advanced Studies in Environmental Law (CASELAP) of the University of Nairobi and the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA). These forums have helped to improve the capacity of judges in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania on issues relating to environmental law. Discussions shared in such forums by senior judicial officers have helped to build jurisprudence on land and environmental law. ILEG has also hosted a series of seminars and symposia on environmental law and policy for lawyers practising in Kenya. Such meetings have brought together lawyers from the public sector, private practice, business and industrial organisations as well as from the non-governmental organisations.

*Trainings by Land Development and Governance Institute (LDGI).* This is a non-profit organization which mainly focuses on the capacity building of land sector stakeholders, evidence based advocacy, thematic research and monitoring of the implementation of land policy and laws in Kenya through the issuance of score cards. The Land Development and Governance Institute (LDGI) has organised short term trainings for practising professionals in the public and private sectors, journalists and county governments. The one day training conducted for practising professionals aimed at enhancing their understanding of the policy and constitutional provisions on land as well as the new land laws. Participants for the training were drawn from: property developers, property managers and agents, bankers, auditors, accountants, mortgage firms, microfinance managers, sacco managers, pension fund managers, housing cooperatives, insurance companies, planners, valuers, surveyors, architects, lawyers, local authority officials, conservation agencies, infrastructure and utility companies.

The two day trainings conducted for journalists have given them an understanding of: the centrality of land to national development; the policy and legal context underpinning land reforms; the key land issues in Kenya; the national and local level institutions that drive land governance in Kenya; and the topical national and regional land issues of the time.

The trainings for county governments have been aimed at providing the county governments with an appreciation of the policy and institutional framework context within which they operate and their roles in relation to other land institutions. LDGI has also helped some county governments with in-depth training on: land policy; land laws; land tenure issues; land use planning and environment
issues and land management issues to enhance their capacity to prepare county level land bills. These county trainings have been for periods of one to three days.

LDGI has lately designed structured training programmes to commence in the year 2018 targeted at: county governments; county assemblies; infrastructure and utility service agencies; and for cooperative societies and agencies investing in the purchase and development of land in Kenya.

**Trainings by the Institution of Surveyors of Kenya (ISK).** The Institution of Surveyors of Kenya is the professional organization in Kenya which brings together land professionals in the disciplines of the surveying profession like Valuers, Land Surveyors, Geomatic Engineers, Registered Estate Agents, Property Managers, Building Surveyors, Land Administration Managers and Facilities Managers. ISK members provide services in the public and private sectors. They support processes of service delivery, formulation and implementation of land policies and management of land resources. ISK aims at promoting adherence to professional ethics during service delivery by members and that members actively contribute towards the development of national and international policies, strategies and plans for land management in a sustainable manner.

The Institution of Surveyors of Kenya (ISK) organises seminars and workshops targeted at practising land professionals in the public and private sectors. Such trainings/seminars cut through various land governance themes and will usually be for periods of between one to three days. For more indepth training on technical matters such as new tools and technology, the ISK occasionally partners with the Regional Center for the Mapping of Resources for Development (RCMRD) to deliver such courses which usually run for one week. These short term courses are usually pegged against the annual Continuous Professional Development (CPD) scores for the participating ISK members.

The examples of Senegal and Kenya illustrate the fact that there are numerous and diverse training opportunities on short-course training on land governance aspects that are available for serving land professionals, policy makers and other actors. The diversity relates to the topics covered – ranging from classic land administration subjects, to the use of emerging land information management techniques, to soft governance themes. The diversity is also reflected in the types of institutions that deliver the courses, which include university faculties, public and private vocational training schools, civil society organisations and think tank institutions. The CLPA-sponsored short course training should recognise and build upon the training opportunities being offered by the national level and the experience gained by training institutions that are organising these courses.

### 4.2. Training offers available at regional and international level for African practitioners

**Regional Short Term Training Initiatives**

Some regional institutions have been providing short term training in land governance related courses. These are discussed below.
Short Term Courses in the Regional Centre for Training in Aerospace Surveys (RECTAS). The Regional Centre for Training in Aerospace Surveys (RECTAS) is located at the Obafemi Awolowo University (O.A.U) Campus, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria and was established in 1972 under the auspices of the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) with a mandate for Training, Research, Consultancy and Advisory Services in Geoinformatics. The Centre is a joint project of African countries, the participating countries at the moment are: Benin, Burkina, Cameroon, Ghana, Mali, Niger, Nigeria and Senegal.

RECTAS offers short term courses in a variety of computer, cartographic and geo-information sciences for durations of three weeks. The Centre can also provide short term training targeted at specific audiences on request.

Short Term Courses in the Regional Centre for the Mapping of Resources for Development (RCMRD). The Regional Centre for Mapping of Resources for Development (RCMRD) was established in Nairobi – Kenya in 1975 under the auspices of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) and the then Organization of African Unity (OAU), today African Union (AU). RCMRD is an inter-governmental organization and currently has 20 Contracting Member States in the Eastern and Southern Africa Regions; Botswana, Burundi, Comoros, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, Rwanda, Seychelles, Somali, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The RCMRD offers professional and short courses that cover a wide range of technical subjects for durations between 3 to 10 days. The courses covered include include remote sensing, GIS, GPS, cartography, mapping, computer, photogrammetry and instrument repair. RCMRD has also lately been running two week courses in innovative concepts, tools and practices in land administration and on effective land administration in collaboration with the Global Land Tool Network (GLTN), University of Twente (ITC), Dutch Cadaster, the Land Policy Initiative (LPI) and the Land Development and Governance Institute (LDGI). The courses are aimed at policy makers and practitioners from the member states of RCMRD.

Short term courses in the African Institute for Economic Development and Planning (IDEP), Dakar (Senegal). The African Institute for Economic Development and Planning (IDEP) is a pan-African institution created in 1962 by the United Nations, with the mandate of accompanying African governments in their training and capacity development efforts in the fields of economic management and planning and socioeconomic development. IDEP’s capacity development support to African country involves capacity needs assessments and the development and implementation of training courses for mid-career and senior officials. IDEP offers short training courses in the forms of core courses, thematic courses and tailor-made, on-demand courses. As part of the latter type of courses, IDEP, in collaboration with LPI, organised in 2016 a three-day Training of Trainers (ToT) workshop on “Land Policy and Large-Scale Land Based Investment in Africa”. Typically targeting mid-career professionals and policy makers, these courses bring together cohorts of 25 people for a maximum of two weeks of training.

Other related Initiatives:
Relevant training/capacity development events by LPI/CLPA. Without always calling them training activities for in-service land policy makers, practitioners and other land-concerned actors, CLPA has organized many events—often in the form of workshops—that are in fact training courses. In some cases, these training events are organised in partnership with other organisations. The following are few of these initiatives:

- A one-day seminar for journalists on “Writing about women’s land right”, organised (Nov 2017 in Addis Ababa) in collaboration with Reuter and Pulitzer Center on. Similarly, in 2015, a one-day workshop was organised by LPI for journalists on Land Policy in Africa with the objective of improving their understand of and ability to competently communicate about issues and concerns about land in Africa.

- A three-day workshop for Land Commissioners of 16 African countries, organised in collaboration with Rights and Resources Institute (RRI), on Securing Community Land Rights (Accra, Ghana, July 2017),

- A two-day training seminar held in Nov 2017 in Accra (Ghana) on the principles for negotiating land investment deals that are sustainable and beneficial to African people and communities. The Seminar brought together 50 traditional leaders from 10 countries.

- A one-day workshop organised for parliamentarians by the PanAfrican Parliament (with LPI support) on strengthening women’s land rights (Johannesburg, March 2016)

- A three-day Training of Trainers workshop on Transparency in Land Administration, organised in October 2015 (Nairobi), in collaboration with GLTN and the Nairobi-based Regional Centre for Mapping of Resources for Development (RCMRD).

Other training offers at regional and international level. We here only mention some illustrative examples from the numerous training offers that are available, including:

- Dakar-based CSE (Centre de Suivi Ecologique - Center for Ecological Monitoring) organizes short-course training in Geomatics, targeting technicians as well as decision-makers from Senegal and neighboring countries.

- IPAR mentioned earlier organizes sub-regional training courses on selected provisions of the VGGT, in collaboration with FAO

- GLTN, in collaboration with IFAD, launched in 2011, the Land and Natural Resources Tenure Security Learning Initiative for Eastern and Southern Africa (TSLI-ESA): The objective of the programme which targets staff of Technical and Financial Partners (IFAD) and other practitioners, focuses on the development and integration of pro-poor tools and approaches for securing land and natural resources rights into development programmes.

- University of Twente (Netherlands) offers a three-week international course in land governance. Targeting prospective and current researchers as well as land practitioners;

- Among short-term online courses on land governance available to African practitioners we can mention: USAID’s USAID’s Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) on Land Tenure and Property Rights;

- An international six week MOOC facilitated by edX—a learning platform founded by Harvard University and MIT— on “Introduction to land administration”.
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4.3. Training tools available for courses on land governance in Africa

Training tools in the forms of training guides, manuals, documented good practice examples are important not only as resources for short training courses but also for self-learning by land practitioners. Some of the key resources available include:

- FAO’s Governance of Tenure Technical Guides and E-Learning Modules (www.fao.org/nr/tenure/information-resources/en/)
- Teaching guide notes (Fiches pédagogiques) prepared by the Comité Foncier et Développement (Committee on Land and Development, supported by the French Development Agency – AFD): available guide notes touch on various land governance topics, with a focus on Africa, especially French-speaking Africa.
- GLTN’s land tools on many relevant subjects land policy and land law formulation.

4.4. Implications for targeting CLPA’s support

The previous sections have shown the magnitude and diversity of the capacity development needs for Africa’s land policy makers, professionally active practitioners, and other land concerned actors. Even if they are not fully meeting the demand for training on land governance in the continent, training offers in the form of short or online courses that are targeting the same categories of professionals and stakeholders are significant and diverse.

Many dynamic and highly competent learning institutions of different types—public, private and non-profit—are delivering these courses at various levels. In each country, many of learning institutions—the same that trained current leaders and practitioners—continue to provide continuing training, in the form or short or longer courses leading to degrees and certificates in fields such as taxation, land law, geomatics, etc. In recent years, short training courses on the political-economy of land governance (land governance and food security, land and equity, equity aspects, large scale land acquisitions and alternative business models, etc.) are increasingly being offered, targeting senior leaders of land commissions, members of parliament, leaders of producer groups, women’s associations, civil society organisations, etc.).

The challenge at hand is therefore is to be able design a pan-African short-course training (with possible sub-regional adjustments) that avoids duplicating or spreading the efforts too thinly to make a difference.

To be relevant, the short course training initiative being considered by CLPA at the regional level needs to build on training efforts underway at national level. It needs to be designed primarily to amplify and strengthen the existing capacities of countries so that they are able to respond themselves to their own training needs.

CLPA’s own experience organizing capacity development events is an important asset to build upon. As shown earlier, CLPA has organised or supported many training seminars and workshops that have
targeted diverse types of land policy makers and practitioners (land commissioners, members of parliaments, journalists, traditionalist leaders).

The CLPA can consider entering into partnerships with some of the existing institutions discussed above to provide short term land governance courses in the respective regions of Africa, based on the curriculum to be developed following this study.
5. SUGGESTED PRIORITY THEMATIC AREAS FOR CLPA-SPONSORED SHORT COURSE TRAINING

This section suggests six (6) priority thematic areas for training, reflecting the priority needs identified in section 3, and also taking into account the types of training being offered and the existing types of institutions offering short course training in land governance.

For each thematic area, some content elements are proposed, to a large extent building on the justifications given by respondents to the survey in support of their selected priority needs. The suggested topics also take into account the information collected during the interviews with informants. The suggested topics are to some extent consistent with the guidelines for curriculum development on land governance. That said, the suggested elements are not an exhaustive list of all items that need to be covered.

The suggestions are meant to be inputs to the phase of designing the short-course programme, which will be the follow-up phase to this needs assessment.

Priority thematic Area 1. Understanding and reconciling statutory and customary tenure

The capacity need for harmonising, reconciling, statutory and customary tenure laws come first both as priority 1 choice of respondents but also in the aggregate ranking. The reasons respondents placed this topic so high in their priority needs can be linked to the fact that the co-existence and clashes between statutory and customary tenure is often at the root of many other key land-related challenges facing Africa: tenure insecurity, conflicts, gender disparities, marginalization of the youth, weak implementation of the statutory law, etc. The second reason is that the subject is difficult to address, as it emerges from the colonial and precolonial historical legacies, with the high resiliency of the customary regime with its deep-rooted value-systems, land use and allocation practices and traditional institutions. A third reason is the fact that customary tenure regime is typically absent from curricula for training land professionals at all levels in Africa.

In designing a module to cover this thematic area the following content elements could be considered (list not exhaustive)

Content elements to be considered:

- Key concepts: statutory tenure; customary tenure; formal and informal rights; community land rights; tenure dualism; legal pluralism
- What is customary tenure? What is statutory tenure? The common key features and differences; their strengths/challenges with respects to emerging norms and socio-economic aspirations
- Influence of historical/colonial legacies
- Extent/vitality of each tenure type depending on regional and country contexts.
- Problems/challenges posed by coexisting and often conflicting tenure regimes
- Responding to the challenges:
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Priority thematic Area 2. Land policy and land law formulation

The formulation of land policies and laws is ranked 2nd priority for training. This can be linked to the fact that land laws tend to be outdated, while few States have formulated a land policy, with a clear vision of how they intend to manage their land. A second reason is that the process of formulating a new land policy and related laws is an opportunity to address many of the other land-related challenges.

Some of the key elements for training on this theme include the following:

- Understanding the difference between land policy and land law; and their respective purposes
- What do we need in a land policy?
- Process of land policy development as outlined in F&G
- Trends in land policy formulation and land law reform in Africa
- Extent to which current/emerging regional and international land governance norms are reflected in existing land policies and laws
- Enabling and constraining factors to land policy and land law formulation (capacity; political will; etc.)
- Approaches to land policy reform/law formulation: roles of key actors
- Content of land policies and land laws: key elements from emerging principles and norms (VGGT and F&G)
- Challenges of implementing land policies and land laws: from policies to laws, to operational texts (decrees, bylaws, programmes);
- Capacity constraints
- Benefits and risks:
  - Opportunity to address many land governance issues: tenure dualisms; tenure insecurity; access to land tenure security; gender equity; youth access to land; land conflicts management; opportunity to align the national legal frameworks with emerging norms, while addressing internal inconsistencies in land-related policies
  - Risks of postponed reform agendas or bad land policies: accumulation of land-related problems
- Lessons from recent land policy formulation and land law reform experiences;

Potential targets: Management and senior staff of land commissions, and directorate of land administration agencies; members of parliaments; traditional leaders, leaders of civil society
organiisations involved in or advocating for land reform; representatives of research and academic institutions.

Priority thematic area 3. Understanding and managing land conflicts risks

Land conflict management and alternative dispute resolution is ranked 3rd priority. This is consistent with the fact that, in the eyes of the survey population, the frequency and intensity of land conflicts is one of the most pressing challenges faced by land policy makers and practitioners. While the costs of uncontrolled conflicts and the benefits of peaceful management of land are enormous, the continent is not well prepared to deal with the magnitude of conflicts in natural resource use, especially of land.

Content elements for training:
- Key concept: conflicts: violent conflicts; disputes. conflicts mediation, arbitration; Land-related vs non-land related conflicts
- Types of land conflicts: boundary conflicts; resistance to compulsory land acquisition (state); competing land uses/rights (e.g. farmers and herders); inheritance conflicts; rights derived from overlapping tenure regimes (statutory vs customary); land grabbing; LSLBI triggered conflicts
- Trends in land-related conflicts in Africa
- Impacts of the multiplication and intensification of land conflicts
- Understanding the underlying causes of land conflicts (tenure insecurity; inequities in access to land; raising interests in and pressures on land; weak enforcement of existing laws; etc.)
- How were conflicts prevented/managed in the past? How are they managed today?
- Approaches to the management of land-conflicts risks:
  - Addressing injustices and unjustifiable biases in the land laws;
  - Alternative dispute resolution;
  - Role of traditional authorities
  - Role of civil society
- Sharing good practice examples on local authorities –leaders of decentralized authorities, local representatives of government’s territorial administration, and traditional chiefs—working together in conflict prevention and in conflict mediation/arbitration.
- Sharing good practice examples on cases where innovative approaches and modern information technologies (participatory community mapping, GPS, aerial maps, remote sensing data) are used in support of conflict management activities (e.g. solving border disputes; preventing farmer-herding conflicts by agreeing on the grazing areas and pastoral corridors).

Potential targets: This theme is of highest relevance to those that are called upon for mediation or arbitration when conflict erupts; on those whose land governance decisions (land allocation, expropriation) are often cause of conflicts and tension. Training on this theme should therefore as a priority target decentralised authorities (mayors of urban and rural communes, county governments); administrative authorities (local representatives of government); judicial officers; traditional leaders; leaders of CBOs.
Given the differences in national contexts, two steps could be envisaged: A first step would relate to training of trainers at continent or sub-regional levels; and, a second scaled-up step would be to organize training sessions at national level in selected countries, in collaboration with local learning institutions (public, private institutions and NGOs).

**Priority thematic area 4. Land governance and decentralization and institutional development at local level**

Land governance, decentralization and institutional development is ranked 4th. Most African countries have embarked on processes of devolution of power to decentralized (often elected) bodies at the local level. In theory, decentralized institutions have authority to manage the land in their respective jurisdictions, but in practice this power is disputed by central government and by customary authorities. The resulting decision-making process is unclear, ineffective and a source of tensions and conflicts. Land professionals are not well prepared to address these types of challenges.

Elements of content for training:

- Key concepts: decentralization; (administration) deconcentration; devolution of power
- Purpose of decentralization
- Implications of decentralization policies on land governance: in rural areas; in urban areas
- Status of decentralization processes in Africa – extent of devolution of land governance responsibilities to local authorities
- Nature of decentralized authorities and modalities of their appointment; representation of women, the youth and vulnerable groups in decision-making bodies of decentralized institutions
- Actual roles and responsibilities of decentralized authorities (urban and rural mayors), representatives of central government and traditional leaders in land governance processes at local level: cooperation vs conflicts
- Approaches and models of decentralization and their benefits and challenges on land governance at local levels:
  - on the need for land conflict risk management
  - on the need for safeguarding and responsibly managing local land in the context of large-scale land acquisitions
  - on the need to protect community land, including land of the poor and vulnerable groups (e.g. indigenous peoples)

Capacity development challenges:

- Elected decentralized authorities (key actors in land management), often do not have prior training or experience in land governance;
- Addressing the capacity development needs for elected officials of decentralized institutions, need to take into consideration the high turnover of these officials (with local elections taking place each 4-5 years).

Potential targets: Elected officials of decentralized institutions, customary chiefs/traditional leaders; representatives of territorial administration; representatives of national land commissions and...
national land administration agencies. Here also a two-step process could be envisaged: (a) training of trainers for which there could one session designed for French-speaking and one for English-speaking countries; (b) second step would be to organize training sessions in selected countries.

**Thematic area 5. Seizing the opportunities and managing the risks associated with large-scale land acquisitions and land-based investments in Africa**

Large-scale land acquisitions and land-based investment is ranked 5th. The patterns and magnitude of this phenomenon are new. Its potential impacts –positive or negative—are far-reaching. Land-concerned actors have uneven understanding of and exposure to this phenomenon. In general, the currently active land policy makers, practitioners and other key actors (leaders of farmer organizations, civil society) are ill-prepared to devise approach to seize potential benefits while avoiding/minimizing the risks associated with the phenomenon.

Content elements for training:
- **Key concepts:** The scale issue: what is “large” scale land acquisition; Land acquisitions vs land-based investment vs land grabbing
- **Root causes and triggers**
- **Facts and figures:**
  - The global phenomenon: magnitude, trends and key features
  - Scale of the phenomenon in Africa
  - Key countries/regions targeting
  - Roles of domestic vs foreign actors
- **Promises and observed impacts:**
  - Impact on modernization of the agricultural sector
  - Impact on food security in Africa
  - Impact on energy security
  - Impacts in terms of job creation
- **Seizing the benefits and minimizing adverse effects of LS/LBI**
  - International and regional principles and standards
    - Principles for Responsible Agricultural investment
    - Guiding Principles on Large-scale land-based investments in Africa
  - Securing land rights for communities and vulnerable groups
  - Corporate social responsibilities – holding investors accountable
  - Best practice examples of negotiating land deals contracts with investors
  - Best practice examples regarding alternative business models (e.g. contract farming
  - Information disclosure and transparency
- **Addressing capacity development needs of states and decision-makers at all levels**

Potential targets: Managers/senior officials of land commissions and national land administration agencies; Members of parliaments; traditional chiefs; leaders of civil society and community-based organisations (e.g. representatives of the Federation of African Farmer Organisations; representative
of African Civil society platform on land governance in Africa). Training sessions could be organised at sub-regional levels, in collaboration with Regional Economic Commissions.

**Differences of perspectives on the levels of priority of themes 1 to 5**

On the above 5 prioritized themes it is worth mentioning the differences based on language groupings. While English-speaking and French-speaking respondents agree on the high rankings of the themes on Land policy formulation and on decentralization, they have different perspectives on the four others. The training needs for capacity development on land conflicts management and on harmonizing statutory and customary regimes are given higher levels of priority by French-speaking than for English-speaking respondents. The latter respondents give more priority to capacity development on large-scale land acquisition than French-speaking respondents, which could be interpreted as a difference in the level of awareness of the phenomenon.

**Table 6.** Differences of priorities from language groupings (French-speaking vs English-speaking Africa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training needs areas</th>
<th>FRENCH (48 respondents)</th>
<th>ENGLISH (92 respondents)</th>
<th>RANK (ALL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation of statutory and customary tenure laws</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titling / formalisation of customary land</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-based land tenure disparities</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of climate change on land use and land rights</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-scale land acquisition and land-based investment</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land policy and land law formulation</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land governance, decentralisation &amp; institutional develop.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land tenure security and urban development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land conflicts management and alternative dispute resolution</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical advances in land titling and inf. management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land governance and the youth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land governance and the Sustainable Development Goals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thematic priority 6. Understanding and addressing gender-based inequities in access to secure land rights**

Gender-based land tenure disparities is ranked 6th. Addressing women’s access to secure land rights is a requirement from a human rights and social justice point of view. It is also justified from a socio-economic point of view. But constraints to achieving gender equality are many. Customary systems tend to be patriarchal, and while emerging land laws and policies contain provisions to ensure
gender equity, they are often not implemented. Even where advocacy efforts succeed, land policy makers and practitioners are not always aware of concrete and tested approaches to address gender disparities in land governance. We note that while French-speaking and English-speaking respondents to the online survey accord the same level of importance to capacity building on addressing gender issues, there are notable differences in the way men and women perceive the importance of strengthening their capacities in this area. As shown in the table below, for women the need for training on gender and land is far atop of their priorities, while for men it is only ranked as their 6th priority.

Elements of content for training:

- **Key concepts**:
  - Gender equity; gender equality; women’s empowerment
  - Rights-based perspective vs instrumentalist/efficiency perspective on gender

- **Gender disparities in access to and control over land**
  - Facts and figures
  - Rationale for addressing gender disparities in land access: Human rights perspective; Social equity; Economic efficiency

- **Understanding the causes of gender disparities in land access**
  - Historical roots of gender inequities in land access
  - Comparing the performances of customary and statutory tenure in addressing gender equity in land access

- **Benefits of achieving greater gender equity in land access**
  - On food security
  - Women’s empowerment
  - On social security
  - Economic performance

- **Approaches to addressing gender disparities**
  - Emerging norms and principles: VGGT; F&G;
  - AU’s call for the allocation of 30 percent of land to women (through individual or joint ownership by 2025),
  - Addressing gender equity in land access in constitutional and legal reforms
  - Case examples of addressing women’s rights: quotas; joint-titling; etc.
  - Representation in local level land governance organs

- **Capacity development**
  - Awareness raising
  - Advocacy
  - Understanding of approaches and tools to address gender aspects in land governance

Potential targets: Two types of training could be considered: one is to continue to raise awareness of the broader land constituency and about the gender dimensions of land governance in Africa. As evident in the table below, not all stakeholders are fully aware of and recognize the critical importance of addressing the gender gap in land tenure in Africa. The first type of training could therefore be ½ day of 1 full-day session appended to workshops and conferences organised by the
CLPA. These workshops would be open to all stakeholders. The second type of training would be focused on equipping selected participants to influence the processes of land policy and land law formulation and implementation to ensure that concrete measures are taken to improved women’s access to secure land rights. Participants to this latter type of training would include managers and senior officials of land commissions and land administration agencies; civil society organisations (including women’s associations, human rights advocacy organisations), researchers; mayors and traditional chiefs.

Table 7. Gender differences in areas of priority needs for training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training needs areas</th>
<th>FEMALE (44 respondents)</th>
<th>MALE (96 respondents)</th>
<th>RANK (ALL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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Common core elements

When introducing training sessions, it is important to ensure that there is a basic common understanding of some of the key features that make land unique; of key land governance-related concepts; and of the general historical context and regional differences.

Selected core content elements:

- **Nature of land** – Multiple dimensions, values and perspectives: land as natural resource, commodity, factor of production; linkages between land and other natural resources (water, forests; mining, etc.); Multiple uses/values of land: economic, social, cultural and ecological values; territorial control, power imbalances and inequities in land access.

- **Key concepts**: land tenure; land right; tenure security; statutory and customary tenure; formal vs informal tenure; land policy vs land law; land reform (redistributive vs market-based reforms; land restitution; land readjustment; formalization of existing rights; etc); land management vs land governance

- **Africa’s historical legacies**
• Overview on the AU agenda on land and emerging regional, continental and global land governance issues/challenges

6. SUGGESTIONS FOR GUIDING THE PACKAGING AND DELIVERY OF THE COURSE

The previous section has suggested content elements for each of the six (6) suggested priority themes for training. To move to the actual design of the modules of modalities of delivering the course, this section makes recommendations of the general principles to follow. These are derived from the analysis made in earlier sections.

6.1. Principles and approaches to the design and delivery of short-term land governance training activities

The following recommendations are to guide the formulation of the final design of the short-course training, from packaging of the course into modules, to the selection of prospective trainees, of potential host institutions and of trainers/facilitators, or the choice of training material.

• Avoiding duplication of efforts. Previous sections have shown that numerous and diverse training courses on various aspects of land governance are being offered throughout the continent at various levels to land policy makers and practitioners, to leaders of civil society organisations and community based organization. These courses are being offered by universities and other public and private vocational training institutions, as well as by civil society and think tank organisations, as well as by financial and technical partner organisations. The training course and related specific training sessions to be sponsored by the CLPA should seek to complement and/or amplify these initiatives, not duplicate them.

• Applying the subsidiarity principle. This principle means that problems posed are to be solved at the most immediate, local level where they matter most, and be transferred to higher scales only if possibilities of solving them at the lowest levels are exhausted. In other words, the solutions to training needs posed at local levels are to be sought first at local and national levels. Where land commissions and land administration agencies have their own in-house training structures, these platforms do not need to be unnecessarily duplicated.

• Developing synergies with and among training institutions. Delivering the short course training on land governance and any of the suggested thematic areas require a mix of expertise and experience that are often not entirely available at the level of prospective training institutions. These training institutions can fill their gaps in expertise and experiences through horizontal (among similar types of learning institutions within the same county or sub-region or South-
South) and vertical collaboration (between institutions of different kinds or North-South) collaboration.

- **The supply of short course training is not and should not be the exclusive prerogative of academic institutions.** Classic Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) have a key role to play in delivering short course training in land governance. But the demand is huge, and traditional IHL do not always have the academic flexibility to accommodate curricula tailored for vocational training or for certain types of prospective trainees (such as traditional chiefs or some of the elected officials). Organisations such as vocational training schools, research institutions, civil society organisations, think tank institutions, etc. have sometimes an established experience delivering short and long term training courses on land governance. This role has to be recognized and capitalized on for the future.

- **Building bridges between academic and non-academic institutions.** The preparation and facilitation of the short course training are opportunities to build and/or strengthen linkages between the learning institutions and non-academic worlds (the “land industry” at large).

- **Investing on trainers to escalate training to meet demand at local level.** At its initial stages, the delivery of the short-course training should devote substantial efforts to training of trainers. This can contribute to responding to the high demand for training or when the demand is localised -- requiring that training modules be adapted to local peculiarities.

- **Ensuring that the short course training build as much as possible on real life experiences and lessons.** To be attracting and fulfill its objectives of building capacity to deal with real life problems, the short course training should create enough space for experience sharing, starting with experience brought by trainees and from the CLPA’s own projects and programmes.

- **Building a data bank of good practice examples in support of the short-course training.** The CLPA should invest more on documenting and capitalizing on the experiences being generated by its programmes and projects (e.g. CLPA’s EU-funded Land Governance programme).

### 6.2. Format and duration of the training courses

It is recommended in earlier sections that the types of training courses could be in the forms of workshops and seminars (of half-day to two to three-day duration) to one-two week long training courses. Similarly, the delivery of the training course could be in various forms, depending on the themes and target trainees.

The surveyed prospective trainees and interviewed informants favor by far that the training course be delivered via face-to-face classroom lectures. They however suggest that these classroom courses be combined to the extent possible with field visits. Exchange visits are often the most suitable...
approach for categories of prospective trainees such as mayors and traditional chiefs to allow them to learn from direct experience of their peers.

Table 8: Preferred forms of training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of training method</th>
<th>English speaking</th>
<th>French-speaking</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video-conferences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. Recommendations for improving CLPA’s capacity to interact with the land governance constituency in Africa

This sub-section derives from efforts to prepare a preliminary list/category of potential trainees (policymakers, practitioners, stakeholders), as requested by the ToR of the study. The intention was to build the exercise essentially on the analysis of CLPA’s contact database — with the assumption that the database would reflect the diversity of land-concerned actors.

The database has many imperfections that affected not only our ability to come up with a list of prospective trainees, but also the conduct of the mission as whole. We noted for example that there are some categories of stakeholders missing or under-represented among the groups that the CLPA used to interact with. Mechanisms for engaging with stakeholders at country level also proved challenging.

Importance of CLPA’s contact database. We found that CPLA’s contact database—with about 1400 contact names—is potentially a very powerful tool for exercises such as capacity gap assessments and identifying priority needs. The database can also be very useful when evaluating the performance of CLPA or its specific programmes.

There were imperfections noted in the data base. Quite a lot of contact information in the database is outdated, not reflecting changes in contact address, email, telephone, designation, institutional affiliation, etc. This may be the reason a lot of mail on the online survey bounced back and could partly explain why a huge amount of email invitations (more than 900) were not opened by addressees. We found also that many of the people who interacted with CLPA in the last 2-3 years were not in the data base, which means that it is not regularly updated. The database therefore needs a systematic updating to make it accurate and current. If such an exercise had been done before the online survey, the number of respondents could easily quadruple, which would allow more representatives and information. This update can easily be done by an intern or a short term consultant.
Missing and/under-represented stakeholder groups. In reviewing the contact database and participants to many CLPA’s sponsored events, it is observed that it does not include important actors such as elected officials of decentralized institutions such mayors of urban and rural communes whose roles in land governance on the ground is fundamental. Another key category that is missing is that of judicial officers. With land disputes and conflicts escalating and the number of land-related court cases growing, this category needs to be drawn in. In many countries, judges are ill-prepared to handle complex land cases.

Now that the CLPA has contacts of various traditional leaders, these can be integrated in the database as well. The category of parliamentarians or legislature, which plays a major role in land governance, needs more inclusion in the database. Given that members of parliament only serve for a term, efforts can be made to include the contact details of the applicable secretariats at national and regional level.

In addition, effort is needed to improve the involvement of countries such as Egypt, and regions such as North Africa, in CLPA’s activities.
## Annex 1. Most pressing land-related challenges faced by respondents in their work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word/phrase</th>
<th>Stands for</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Covers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Tenure insecurity</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Tenure insecurity for informal, customary, non-registered land; precarious tenure rights for vulnerable groups; Tenure insecurity due to lack of clarity of land rights, especially customary and community land rights;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts</td>
<td>Land-related conflicts</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Land conflicts at the level of communities (e.g. between farmers and herders); between communities and foreign investors or urban-based elites; increasing number of court cases that are land-related; limited capacity in conflict prevention and dispute resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Lack of capacity</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Weakness of institutions in charge of delivering land governance at all levels; weak capacity of concerned actors at all levels in the land governance value-chain; weak capacity leading to slow pace and delays in the formulation and implementation of land policies and laws; lack of adapted training material to support training activities; inadequate institutional accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdated Laws</td>
<td>Outdated laws</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lack of a national land policy; Non-inclusive approach to the design of the policy or laws; Fact that existing land laws do not fully take into account emerging challenges (large-scale land acquisitions; urban pressure; land degradation; customary land under assault); Fact that they are not aligned to international norms and standards (VGGT; F&amp;G, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Grabbing</td>
<td>Land grabbing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Large-scale acquisition of land (farmland as well as mining areas); international as well as domestic land grabbing (acquisitions by local elites); compulsory land acquisitions for urban expansion and commercial and infrastructure development; land allocation practices and investors’ commitments far below emerging norms (RAI, Guiding principles on LSLBI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Lack of awareness</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Limited awareness of the land policies and laws by concerned actors and the public in general; limited investment in communications aimed at raising public awareness; weak ownership of the land laws and policies by the public; limited awareness of good practices examples available from other countries; failure to factor in other resources associated with land (water, forestry, mining, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Women’s limited access to secure land rights in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality</td>
<td>Urban as well as in rural areas; a limited proportion of women’s land is formalized;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Poor information management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of reliable land data; lack of adequate geodetic infrastructure; need for accurate land surveying and mapping information; fact that land governance data typically not included in national statistical surveys; weak land monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Weak enforcement of the law</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak enforcement of the law, due to lack of political will or capacity; discrepancy between the law and the practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Poor urban management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unbridled urbanization; poor management of urban land; informal settlements in urban and peri-urban areas;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoliticalWill</td>
<td>Lack of political will</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of political from government to engage in land policy/law reform or reluctance to enforce existing laws; reluctance to mobilise the funding needed for land governance;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dualism</td>
<td>Dualism of the land law</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clash between customary and statutory tenure systems; co-existence and overlap of traditional and modern institutions governing land use and management; multiplicity of tenure regimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequities</td>
<td>Inequities in land access</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persisting and worsening of historical injustices; inequity in access to secure land rights between the rich and the poor; marginalization of indigenous people and ethnic minorities, women and the youth; unfair compensation of expropriated land owners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Complexity of land laws</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy, cumbersome land-related procedures; multiplicity of land tenure regime and of actors, conflicting and often long procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>Land-related corruption</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corruption in land transaction; in the management of land-related projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Poor planning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of spatial/territorial planning and land zoning; where such planning exists, it is often outdated;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Lack of transparency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of transparency regarding land transactions and regarding land-related decisions made at all levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Weak coordination</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of coordination among government entities involved in land governance; among land-concerned actors; and among donors supporting the land sector; challenge of reconciling conflicting interests; lack of multi-stakeholder platforms on land issues;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Neglect of community rights</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-recognition, ignorance or marginalisation of community land rights; elite capture of community land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistencies</td>
<td>Inconsistencies between laws and policies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistencies, and contradictions between the different land-related policies, laws and bylaws, which needs harmonization;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Youth’s landlessness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth’s limited access to secure land rights; marginal role of the youth in land-related decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degradation</td>
<td>Land degradation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degradation of the quality of the land, including its productivity, due to a combination of factors (such as climate change, unsustainable resource use practices, land tenure insecurity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Competition for land</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Competition for land among urban residents, farmers, between sectors (agriculture, mining, forestry, environment conservation, etc.), or between users (e.g. farmers and herders) at national and transboundary levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObsoleteSystems</td>
<td>Obsolete land administration systems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Archaic land surveying methods; obsolete cadaster system; outdated land information tools and systems; resistance to technological innovations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2. Online Survey Questionnaire

Short Course Training Needs Assessment on Land Governance in Africa - Questionnaire

1. Introduction and Background

This survey is commissioned by the Land Policy Initiative (LPI) in collaboration with PLAAS (Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, Cape Town, South Africa). LPI has been jointly established by the Africa Union (AU), the African Development Bank (AfDB) and the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), with the mandate of assisting member states in the implementation of the 2009 AU Declaration on Land Issues and challenges in Africa, in accordance with the Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa (2009), and the Guiding Principles on Large-Scale Land-Based Investment in Africa (2014). In the frame of this mandate, LPI facilitates capacity building at all levels in support of land policy development and implementation in Africa. This needs assessment for short training course on land governance in Africa is being carried as part of LPI’s capacity development activities. The short course will target: (a) policy drivers, managers in line ministries, land commissions, parliamentarian committees on land; and, (b) practitioners (agents/experts in line ministries, government agencies, NGOs, civil society, research/academic institutions, development partner organisations, etc.).

Your answers to the questions below will be used to identify the critical issues to be addressed in the short training courses, and help design training courses that are tailored to the needs of stakeholders in each of the sub-regions of the continent. Thank you in advance for your input!

1. With whom do you work?
   - Government
   - NGO
   - Private sector (land sector service provider)
   - University or Technical Institute

2. In which country are you working?

3. Gender
Male  Female

4. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   ○ Primary
   ○ Secondary
   ○ Technical Institute/University

5. How long have you worked in the land sector?
   ○ Less than 4 years
   ○ 4-8 years
   ○ 9-12 years
   ○ More than 12 years

6. What particular aspect of land governance do you specialise in?
   ○ Land allocation
   ○ Land redistribution
   ○ Boundary survey, boundary rectification, land subdivision
   ○ Land registration
   ○ Registration of customary land
   ○ Compulsory land acquisition and compensation
   ○ Land dispute resolution
   ○ Other (Specify)

7. What is the most pressing land governance-related challenges which you are facing in your work? (max 50 words)

8. What are your top 3 priority subjects for short course training in land governance? (max 3 boxes to check, 1 per column)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other (Specify topic and level of priority)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Please provide the justification of your selected priority 1 area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Please provide the justification of your selected priority 2 area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Please provide the justification of your selected priority 3 area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 1</th>
<th>Priority 2</th>
<th>Priority 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation of statutory and customary tenure laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titling / formalisation of customary land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-based land tenure disparities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of climate change on land use and land rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-scale land acquisition and land-based investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land policy and land law formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land governance, decentralisation and institutional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land tenure security and urban development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land conflicts management and alternative dispute resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical advances in land titling and information management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land governance and the youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land governance and the Sustainable Development Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. What would be your preferred short-course training method?

- Face-to-face training involving seminars and fieldwork in a tertiary training institution in one member state?
- A series of video conferences streamed to participants in a number of participating member states?
- On-line web-based seminars (webinars) or correspondence course with a tertiary training institution in a member state?
- Other (Specify)
Annex 3. Terms of reference