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1. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

Since the second half of the 2000s, large-scale land acquisitions (LSLAs) have been a major concern for several developing countries, especially those in sub-Saharan Africa. National and foreign investors in both the private and public sector are acquiring vast tracts of fertile land for agricultural production. The future of farmers', shepherds', foresters' and fishers' livelihoods depends on how African governments respond to this new challenge. It is therefore important to gain a better understanding of the related characteristics and trends to propose effective regulatory mechanisms and strategies. It was with this in mind that the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) launched activities in sub-Saharan Africa through its Governance, Security, and Justice program in 2011 to make land investment processes more accountable and equitable, as well as to prevent land-based social conflicts. The IDRC accordingly supported five action research projects in 10 countries over three years to study conditions conducive to accountability and better access to justice in land investment processes. The purpose of these research projects was to test various tools and methodologies to improve communities' ability to negotiate equitable conditions and protect their rights and interests.

The IDRC-supported projects are still underway but have yielded valuable preliminary results. In order to capitalize on this research, before the studies are completed, the IDRC organized a two-day workshop entitled, "Workshop on Large-Scale Land Acquisitions in Africa: Using Action Research to Build Greater Accountability," followed by a day of "Strategic Dialogue for Responsible Land Governance," in collaboration with the Embassy of Canada to Senegal and the Initiative Prospective Agricole et Rurale (IPAR). The purpose of this summary report is to document the dialogues and discussions from those three days of workshopping.
2. OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED RESULTS OF THE WORKSHOP

2.1 - Objectives of the workshop

The general objective of the workshop was to review research activities and preliminary results to date, as well as discuss follow-up opportunities for research and action. Correspondingly, two specific objectives were pursued. The first specific objective was to discuss practical experiences and lessons learned, as well as examine the methodologies and approaches used by the various research teams. The second objective was to identify advocacy strategies that could potentially be implemented by officials who want to effect change.

2.2 - Expected results

The workshop was expected to result in: (i) sharing and discussing preliminary research results; (ii) sharing lessons learned from the research projects, methodologies and approaches used among the research teams and the entire network of partners; and (iii) sharing and reviewing advocacy tools and strategies for influencing change by decision-makers.

3. WORKSHOP SUMMARY (November 24-25, 2015)

3.1 - Participation

Participants in the two-day Workshop on Large-Scale Land Acquisitions in Africa included representatives from research institutions, universities, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), farmers’ organizations, private businesses, public institutions, and the IDRC. They came from South Africa, Germany, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Ivory Coast, Ghana, India, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Uganda, the United Kingdom, Senegal and Zimbabwe (see participant list in Appendix 2).

3.2 - Introduction to the IDRC’s work

The opening ceremony was moderated by Adrian Di Giovanni and Ramata Thioune, who are both members of IDRC’s Governance and Justice program. Three presentations were delivered as part of the opening ceremony. First to speak, Mr. Di Giovanni emphasized the importance of the theme before indicating that five LSLA research projects involving 10 countries received support from the IDRC, and that the third day would be devoted to strategic dialogue. Ms. Thioune then spoke to the objectives of the workshop. She insisted on the fact that for the IDRC, research must promote substantial, positive changes for the affected communities. This involves not only publishing research results, but also using those results as a tool to advocate for improved accountability from decision-makers. Researchers are also responsible for sharing the conclusions of their studies with affected populations.
Participants were invited to share in turn what they hope to gain from the workshop. The most commonly expressed expectations included: (i) understanding the mechanisms that affect the LSLA process from a comparative perspective, as well as the overall environment where LSLAs are made; (ii) discussing the methodologies used and ways to overcome the difficulties facing participatory research; (iii) becoming familiar with the concrete tools that yielded conclusive results and helped communities and various stakeholder groups (notably women) to better defend their land rights; (iv) developing common advocacy strategies and establishing collaborative relationships with regional organizations to influence policies at a more widespread national and continental level; and (v) defining new issues and a new "narrative" to explain the causes of LSLAs and strategies used by communities to provide an alternative development model.

Dr. Anna Russell, independent consultant, then presented a Preliminary Synthesis of IDRC-Supported Research on Large-Scale Land Investments in Africa. Five themes emerged from the analysis of research reports: (i) enhancing land governance in contexts of legal pluralism; (ii) understanding the differential impacts of LSLAs; (iii) improving awareness and procedures around land investment decision-making; (iv) land valuation, compensation, benefit and risk sharing; and (v) dispute prevention and settlement mechanisms. Gender was noted to be a cross-cutting theme. Based on these identified themes, research project results indicate that there are issues with both the law in theory and as it is applied in practice; that LSLAs have distinct consequences based on gender, generation, ethnicity and social class; that awareness around land tenure, and procedural mechanisms to inform, consult and enable participation in decision-making by populations are insufficient; that the valuation of and compensation offered for land dispossession is often inadequate, especially for women; and that there are different dispute prevention and settlement mechanisms, varying from community, customary and judicial mechanisms through to organized opposition from social movements. Dr. Russell invited research partners to review the summary report to fill in gaps, provide additional information and suggest improvements to the structure and content of the draft report.

The preliminary results provoked reactions from participants. For example, a few audience members noted that the summary does not focus enough on the common or different key aspects for the 10 countries involved in the action research projects, notably in terms of the institutional and legal framework, but also as it relates to policy responses to LSLAs. That said, it is important to bear in mind that the purpose of that document was to provide a summary of the research results to serve as a common basis for workshop discussions.
4. RESULTS OF THE WORKSHOP

The results of the workshop are presented by session as a summary of panelists' and participants' deliberations.

4.1 - The Governance and Impacts of LSLAs on Populations and their Rights

The objective of this session was to provide an overview of the LSLA issue, particularly in relation to questions of good governance, legal frameworks, the rule of law, and the opportunities available to and impacts on communities.

Moderator: Cheikh Oumar Ba, IPAR

Panelists:

- Ruth Hall, Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS), South Africa
- Stephan Loroux, INADES Formation, Ivory Coast
- Philippine Sutz, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), United Kingdom

This session centred on an observation emerging across the series of research projects. Preliminary results seem to confirm the sense that LSLAs can induce unjust and inequitable effects for local populations with weak governance systems. LSLAs can also create additional negative pressure on those governance systems. Panelists were encouraged to discuss specific questions to guide the discussion. Do LSLAs only generate negative repercussions for communities? What useful strategies and tools can rise to the challenges presented by LSLAs? Do the Food and Agriculture Organization's Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VG) have a role to play? What unique problems, information, or methodological challenges arose out of researching and exploring these issues? What conclusions can be drawn and lessons, learned in relation to gender, whether it be in terms of the impacts of LSLAs, the effectiveness of tools and strategies, or the methodology used?

Summary of panelists' deliberations

Ms. Hall focused on 10 discussion points. Generally, there is inadequate compensation for lost land rights. The loss of these land rights disconnects a segment of the population from its economic activity. Land loss affects not only the individual, but also the community identity and social capital of the concerned group. The impacts of LSLAs are geographically widespread. Land privatization also affects access to water. Small-scale land acquisitions are also a major concern. The notion that large-scale projects create jobs is a myth: the production method is not labour-intensive or production has not started. Land dispossession occurs according to complex and partial terms and conditions that affect gender and generation issues differently. The impacts of LSLAs are shaped by existing alternatives. Some of the elite can benefit from LSLAs if they have political ties. Differential impacts
also provoke distinct responses that vary between acceptance, participation and resistance. Although projects stray from business plans when they are actually carried out, the consequences for communities remain the same.

Mr. Loroux began by stating that based on INADES’s research, compared to foreign investors, local stakeholders and the national government play a more significant role in LSLAs in Ivory Coast than initially was thought. The win-win notion propelled by companies proved false. Populations are not involved in the land acquisition process and are not sufficiently organized to defend their rights. Because of LSLAs, less land is available for food production, there is labour force competition for food crops, the environment is polluted by mine production and fertilizer use, and land conflicts affect women especially because they are barred from land management. To overcome these issues, his team helped to implement an LSLA monitoring committee, organized role playing with communities and produced a document on land management for the government, and most of those suggestions were taken into consideration.

Ms. Sutz then called attention to the need to establish a strategy to defend land rights in support of local communities that also targets government policies. Legal frameworks have to be developed to promote accountable investment. Business models that on paper appear to be beneficial to communities are often deceiving, notably for women who are generally inadequately compensated because of their low level of involvement in the negotiation process. LSLAs also often increase women's workload. In addition, Ms. Sutz noted that communities do not necessarily speak with a single voice because of the varying interests that divide them, which poses significant methodological issues. The short time period typically designated for empirical research is not necessarily conducive to fully gaining communities' trust.

Summary of participants' deliberations and further discussions

Panelists mentioned the role of African States and the political elite in LSLAs several times. Some participants indicated that the State is not a uniform institution but rather is made up of stakeholders with varying positions and motivations. Some speakers noted that there is a disparity between the investment projects that are announced and those that are actually carried out. Lawless areas exist. Poor governance also exposes investors to risks. Several participants reiterated the fact that various social groups and interests coexist within communities, and that the impacts of LSLAs are consequently multifaceted. The role of women in LSLAs provoked several reactions. Most participants acknowledged that customary practices are not permanent and evolve according to the circumstances. Customary law is seen by some to help protect communities, while others consider that it contributes to further marginalizing women. How to go about scaling up advocacy was a recurring theme in discussions. The same can be said about the need for synergy at the continental level, because there is a lot of pressure to adopt land laws within African political institutions. How to carry out impact studies was also debated. The idea of collaborating with doctoral students or using interns who work closely with national researchers also among the ideas put forward and noted by participants.

Recommendations

Following the presentations, Mr. Ba summarized what had been discussed. In relation to the political elite, he noted that African governments are not uniform. Some State officials may be allies against LSLAs, while others may support them. Mr. Ba also noted that the leading recipients of investments are middlemen, while the entire community generally suffers because of land transfers. Private investors are also occasionally losing out, even though they sometimes have good intentions to engage in win-win processes. Mr. Ba identified two remaining questions that require further exploration over the two-day workshop: Beyond job loss, how do LSLAs impact different social groups? What business models can be created to ensure that lands are transferred to future generations? Lastly, Mr. Ba made some recommendations to policy-makers for peaceful land management. Among other things, he suggested implementing a forum for multiparty dialogue to define more transparent procedures and standards, ensuring that customary laws are respected while avoiding falling into "ethnicism,” as well as developing a regional partnership framework for LSLA issues.
4.2 - Promoting Procedural Rights: Towards Greater Community Awareness and Participation and more Equitable and Inclusive Governance

The objective of this session was to understand how to promote improved participation of communities and more equitable and inclusive natural resource and land governance, especially as this relates to customary rights, in the face of LSLAs.

**Moderator:** Mutuso Dhliwayo, Zimbabwe Environmental Law Association (ZELA)

**Panelists:**
- Mamadou Fall, IED Afrique (Innovation, Environnement, Développement Afrique), Senegal
- Robert Kibugi, Land Development Governance Institute (LDGI), Kenya

Panelists were asked to discuss the following questions: What is the research saying, positive and negative, about the awareness of local populations and their ability to participate in decision-making processes about LSLAs? What have been notable strategies, useful tools and conditions in place to be successful in ensuring populations are involved in land governance? What are the gender impacts?

**Summary of panelists’ deliberations**

Based on Mr. Fall's commentary, populations do not necessarily take issue with LSLAs as such, but are opposed to the decision-making processes, which often take place behind closed doors. Furthermore, populations lack proper knowledge of the rules that govern natural resources and the limits of those resources. Communities continue to have limited access to information. And when they are wronged, they do not know the redress processes to contest decisions. Tools were tested to reinforce the local populations’ abilities to familiarize themselves with laws and participate in debates. Those tools included recruiting young legal experts to educate populations. They also included public hearings to find a forum for populations and decision-makers to congregate. Institutionalizing these forums should be explored. Lastly, they included local agreements and charters between local authorities and populations to look ahead to the settlement of investors.

Professor Kibugi emphasized that in Kenya, it is fairly commonplace to allot the same plot of land several people. There is a formal justice system in place, but it does not work properly. In response to this institutional vacuum, populations have developed informal land allotment mechanisms. Some individuals, notably customary chiefs, have appointed themselves land managers and administer public land allocation. Those lands are now being appropriated by the Kenyan government, which has undertaken several infrastructure projects. Populations—and sometimes even State officials themselves—have no information on State land-use projects. As a result, there has been a rise in land speculation and violent conflict.

**Summary of participants' presentations and further discussions**

The participants’ discussions can be summarized as follows. Local governments, which should be institutions that enforce communities' rights, are sometimes complicit with investors and the State in land transfers. In addition to engaging with communities, action should be taken to try to influence political authorities. Participation should be considered a governance tool. The democracy of the land requires community participation. It is essential that those who have coveted land provide a social licence and their free consent. It is noted, however, that consent is often biased because of the asymmetry of information revealed to populations. Furthermore, participation cannot be considered an end in itself. A number of factors must be taken into consideration to be better equipped to evaluate participation, such as the level of participation, who is participating and who is making the decision. A participant in the audience described the situation in Liberia, where an emergency telephone line was set up and mobile phones were distributed so that communities could alert NGOs of potential land-grabbing cases. The moderator concluded the session by asking whether populations, when taking part in consultation processes, truly have the option to reject the projects in question.
Recommendations

The participants' discussions resulted in the following recommendations:

- Mechanisms need to be implemented to promote and strengthen the participation and capacity of populations (public hearings, local agreements and charters, etc.);
- How to move from action-research to advocacy needs to be explored.
- Strategies should be defined to influence political authorities.

4.3 - Towards more Just and Equitable Investments: Valuation of Resources, Benefit-Sharing and Compensation

The objective of this session was to gain a better understanding of how communities affected by LSLAs can become better equipped to be equal partners in investments and reap equitable benefits, given that communities are made up of diverse groups that may be driven by competing interests.

**Moderator:** Betty Akumatey, University of Ghana, Ghana

**Panelists:**

- Marena Brinkhurst, Namati, United States
- Mark Kakraba Ampeh, Land Resources Management Centre, Ghana
- Mwenda Nakathimo, LDGI, Kenya

Panelists were asked to discuss the following questions: What conclusions have been drawn from the research on land evaluation in relation to LSLAs? What negotiating capabilities do communities have in order to obtain fair and equitable conditions or ensure that established conditions are respected? Based on the research and results concerning gender, what are the challenges and lessons learned in relation to methodology?

**Summary of panelists' presentations**

Mark Kakraba Ampeh said that in Ghana, people who lost their lands did not receive adequate compensation because of a lack of land evaluation mechanisms that account for the true market value of land. Furthermore, all stakeholders within the same community are not necessarily profiled on an individual basis in order to be compensated. Mr. Ampeh also noted that investors have a specific idea of the risks they will incur and the various negotiation phases that they must go through, unlike communities who have more limited risk assessment abilities. This begs the question: what players are at the discussion table and how are they engaging in the negotiation process? Mr. Ampeh described one case where populations exercised a legal clause that allowed them to renegotiate the terms of their contract. Communities became informed and realized that the compensation they had received was insufficient. They demanded renegotiation with the company concerned, and were successful.

Mweda Makathimo said that in Kenya, people can receive compensation only for lands recorded in the land registry. Conventional evaluation methods also do not take account of the benefits that could be traded in markets or authorized land uses. As a result, those with collective land rights often lose out. In some cases, leaders emerge from within communities to benefit from newly established private land titles to the detriment of the community. Individuals recognized as owners, however, are not necessarily the ones who enhance the land. Seeing as land titles are held by men only, women do not receive compensation either, and the youth are at risk of losing access to their livelihoods. There is no legal framework that defines how benefits must be shared or any information on the compensation costs since investors are not required to divulge that information. In closing, Mr. Mwenda said that we need to go beyond market-based evaluations to take stock of all the resources given up in land transfers.
Marena Brinkhurst insisted on the fact that most communities do not generally have a specific idea of the monetary value of the land and the associated natural resources. Populations know that the land is important for their livelihoods but cannot attribute a dollar figure to it. They consequently are not compensated adequately when their lands are ceded. Ms. Brinkhurst briefly described her organization's work: they have formulated a step-by-step guide to help communities identify and evaluate all the resources they lose when their lands are ceded. After holding a meeting for a few hours, communities can determine the value of their lands and the associated resources so that they can engage in "empowered negotiations" with investors. After completing that exercise, communities are generally astonished at the actual value of their lands, which is a powerful motivating factor for them to negotiate or renegotiate their agreement with investors. Ms. Brinkhurst made a few comments about methodology, notably related to how difficult it is to use one single tool in different contexts. She also noted that although women participate in meetings, men tend to dominate discussions. Nevertheless, the evaluation process can help bolster the role of women, seeing as most land resources are gathered by women.

Summary of participants' presentations and further discussions

Participants touched on additional factors to those identified by panelists, which also generated several animated discussions, on whether it is appropriate to evaluate the monetary value of lands and on the criteria that should be used to do so. Although land valuation is generally viewed as a technical matter, it is can be very political and entails a wide range potential conflicts that are ultimately at the core of the main accountability and good governance issues related to LSLA. Some participants drew attention to the fact that broad-based land valuation could potentially worsen instances of acquisitions or “grabbing” if it is assumed that communities are willing to give up their lands. Communities, however, are only responding to pressures from the international environment. The valuation process leads to land being treated as a commodity. Other audience members wondered what basis should be used to determine the actual value of land where that value could also change over time. Some also suggested that compensation should be provided over time rather than in a lump sum. One-time compensation provided for a crop season is in line with a formal interpretation of land rights. According to that way of thinking, affected communities must be compensated for no longer being able to the use the lands that they have no formal legal right to. That said, populations are demanding more extensive rights based on an interpretation that takes greater consideration of land use and their longstanding customary rights to these lands. Although the resources are an economic asset, it is important to take account of the negative external effects of dismantling a lifestyle and livelihood, since land valuation does not take that or the cultural value of the land into consideration. One participant indicated that we need to rethink our approach and ensure that populations use the land to participate in these investments, rather than ceding their lands to the benefit of investors. Land valuation must also take account of the inter-generational sharing of benefits to ensure that future generations can capitalize on these investments. In short, resources should be taken into consideration in the valuation process, and compensation methods continue to be highly controversial.

Recommendations

The moderator concluded the discussion session with the following comments:

- Land valuation cannot be considered a purely technical process. Above all, it is a socio-political and cultural issue, often with controversial terms of debate.

- It would be appropriate to implement mechanisms to evaluate the substantive value of the land, compared to its so-called "economic" value. We need to unite a formalist perspective on land that takes account of its economic assets with a substantive view of land from an anthropological perspective. Both aspects need to be taken into consideration to prevent communities from being exploited because of a lack of knowledge.
4. 4 - Land & Natural Resources Rights and Dispute Resolution: Within Communities and With External Actors

The purpose of this session was to gain a better understanding of the challenges and opportunities in promoting secure and equitable land and natural resource governance rights, especially in respect to customary rights, and in the face of different types of disputes and conflicts.

Moderator: Godwin Ojo, Environmental Rights Action/Friends of the Earth, Nigeria

Panelists:
- Judy Adoko, Land Equity Movement Uganda (LEMU), Uganda
- Chantal Jacovetti, National Coordination of Peasants’ Organizations (CNOP), Mali
- Téodyl Nkuintchua, Centre for Environment and Development (CED), Cameroon

Panelists were asked to comment on the following questions: What are the tools, success stories and challenges related to current research methodologies? How can gender issues be taken into account in research? What are the variety of ways gender plays a role in dispute resolution? What are the impacts or pressures on communities stemming from insecure land rights, especially in relation to the various types of conflicts? What has research revealed in terms of the ability to guarantee secure land rights and rights to natural resources, both in general and in relation to LSLA?

Summary of panelists' presentations

Ms. Adoko emphasized family land rights and the fact that vulnerabilities and power relationships between the sexes need to be taken into consideration to understand land rights. Using a methodology that takes account of life stories, her research team noted several cases where the husband's family takes over the wife's lands after her spouse dies. Conflicts stem from confusion surrounding customary laws that men wrongly exploit. In response, LEMU encourages women to plant trees while their husbands are alive to mark their plots of land and avoid land disputes.

Mr. Nkuintchua distinguished between different types of land conflicts: those related to benefits sharing, to land access, to impacts and to land titles. Governments sometimes cede the same lands to different investors unbeknownst to communities, which leads to confusion and injustice. A lack of knowledge of customary laws coupled with the State's inability to enforce the law is often the source of conflicts. Communities are also claiming rights to areas of land that are not recognized by substantive law. Mr. Nkuintchua believed that the most significant conflicts arise between the elite and populations, rather than between men and women. Women who form part of
the elite are sometimes involved in LSLAs themselves. Mr. Nkuintchua proposed five solutions to these problems: implementing a monitoring system to record land acquisitions; educating populations on the legal framework so that they can use the law to combat injustice; documenting land rights and mapping plots of land; helping communities to reflect on the injustices caused by the village elite and the destabilizing effect of money; and turning to young law experts to educate populations.

Ms. Jacovetti noted that the IDRC's research project is part of the fight against land grabbing, which can take a variety of forms. In addition to LSLAs, several small- or medium-scale transactions are conducted in both rural and suburban areas. She explained how her organization was able to apply VGs in Malian land reform. Although the final version of Malian legislation varied significantly from the initial document, populations' concerns were included thanks to the VGs. Ms. Jacovetti emphasized the State's role in land grabbing and that communities are criminalized by stakeholders who are violating land rights themselves. As a result, her organization tried to provide education within communities and establish a political dialogue with authorities to ensure that vital spaces are protected. As for gender issues, Ms. Jacovetti considered that communities are first and foremost fighting to have their collective land rights recognized. Everyone, both men and women, plays a part in this initial battle. Once lands are secure, each person's place can be recognized. Ms. Jacovetti concluded by stating that the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) is in the process of preparing supranational land laws, and that strategies should be defined to influence how those laws are created.

Summary of participants' presentations and further discussions

The moderator noted that it appeared necessary to clarify the difference between land grabbing and LSLA, and that feeling was shared by certain participants. Large-scale investments can be useful, but must be monitored. Action research models are therefore needed not only to denounce bad practices but also to propose alternative solutions for rural development. It is important to know how to manage government, investors' and communities' interests to ensure that development occurs in a way that is fair to all of them. Participants also noted that particular attention should be paid to taking account of collective rights to shared resources in action research. Some audience members, however, mentioned that conflicts occur between communities and investors, between families and interest groups within the same communities (e.g. between shepherds and farmers), as well as between husbands and wives. That said, the audience was not unanimous on this point; some found that women's rights do not conflict with communities' rights.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made based on panelists' and participants discussions:

- Gaps in research on community rights need to be addressed.
- The scope of analyses needs to be broadened to examine conflicts between a wider array of stakeholders in agricultural areas.
- We need to consider what the best strategies are to integrate a differentiated approach (e.g. in relation to women and the youth) in combatting land grabbing.

4.5 - Women and Land: Their Key Roles in the Face of a Double-Burden of Exclusion

The objective of this session was to share and gain a better understanding of the specific challenges facing women as well as their specific role in effecting positive change.

Moderator: Navsharan Singh, IDRC Delhi, India

Panelists:
Although women are excluded at various levels in the home and community, they are also able to effect positive change. With that in mind, each panelist was asked to comment on the following questions: What notable tools and strategies have women been able to use to claim their rights in relation to LSLAs? How can the impacts on women be tackled while bridging socio-cultural norms and existing governance frameworks? What are the mechanics of female exclusion?

Summary of panelists' presentations

Ms. Sama-Lang began by noting that from the standpoint of customary laws, women are "pilgrims," migrants who move from their family to their husband's. They become their spouse's property and as such, part of the family estate. That said, respecting women's land rights is fundamental for ensuring development in communities. Rural women in Cameroon are not involved in land transfers and are excluded from negotiations, even though their lives are dependent on the land. NGOs lobbied for negotiations to take place at the village level. However, even when allowed to speak, women still cannot really express themselves because LSLAs are already a done deal. Institutions and land laws do not protect women or provide mechanisms to exercise their rights. Women are deprived physically, economically and socially by LSLAs, which influences their productive roles. They are no longer able to feed their families because they have no land or jobs.

In Ms. Akihire's opinion, we tend to talk about women as a by-product of the land acquisition process. The primary source of female exclusion stems from the way we view the LSLA issue. The association that is often made between women and youth is overly simplistic and treats women like children. Women and youth are two distinct analytical categories. The sources of their vulnerabilities are different in that young men will become adults and have access to land. Ms. Akihire also said that the empowerment process cannot be used as a colonial project, assuming that people are ignorant. Rather, it must come from within. Researchers can only facilitate this process. Since government institutions are inadequate, populations have to deal with the particular interests within the government. As a result of the individualization of institutions, it is difficult for communities to achieve justice because they have to be on the "right" political side to be heard. LSLAs also complicate the already elusive land issue. Gender dynamics evolve; they are not static. A new dynamic emerges when women are deprived, although this is not a matter of men vs. women.

Mr. Tankar said that Mozambican law stipulates that men and women have the same formal rights, but that it also recognizes customary institutions to resolve land issues if they comply with the basis of the Constitution. Community members, however, do not have a strong grasp of the Constitution, and as a result those legal provisions are violated. The main challenge is not the fact that women and men are not legally recognized as equals, but rather that gender equality is not respected when land rights are implemented. For example, very few women sit on consultative committees. Mr. Tankar concluded by stating that patrilineal and matrilineal systems coexist.

Summary of participants' deliberations and further discussions

The opinions of audience members were rather divided: some considered that women's rights need to be reinforced, others found that they will change more or less on their own, while others considered that the current status quo must be maintained.

For some, land security must be the primary concern. Legislation stipulates that women have access to land. In reality, however, arid lands are given to Burkinabe women, for example. They then need to find new land that can be cultivated. The problem is therefore secure access to land.
Others mentioned the changing nature of customary law. In West Africa, for example, the institutional situation has changed significantly, and legislation now provides for women's access to land. The problem therefore does not lie in legislation. The tendency to view customary regimes as immovable must be reviewed, seeing as there are many local dynamics that allow women to seize new opportunities to have more substantial control over the land. With that mindset, why would we want to impose change if customary law is already changing? Some noted that the situation is evolving quickly as researchers conduct their studies. Conclusions reached and solutions proposed at the end of a research project may no longer fit with the situation that was initially examined.

Some people considered that research tends to create problems rather than respond to real challenges, or that researchers begin their studies with pre-determined conclusions. In Africa, men have no individual land rights. Consequently, promoting women's land rights is also a strategy to transform communal lands into private property that can be traded on the market. A distinction should also be made between access to and control over land. Women can access land if they want to cultivate it. That said, it is pointless to divide small family plots of land and distribute them to women when the land provides food security for the family unit.

Given that the law is not adequately enforced, all stakeholders agree that we need to go beyond purely legal solutions to ensure women's land rights and make men aware of this issue. The moderator concluded the session by noting that views on women's land rights need to evolve. That said, legal and social practices take time to change. Women cannot wait for their rights to be recognized. Aspects of customary law that protect women must remain intact in a context where they are greatly deprived of their rights.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations were made:

- Socio-cultural realities must be taken into consideration, because the issue of women's access to land does not lie solely in legislation.

- More importance has to be placed on processes, mechanisms and tools in the way that land issues are viewed so that gender issues are given greater consideration.

**4.6 - Dissemination Strategies: Promoting Local, Regional and Global Change**

The objective of this session was to identify a program of collective, collaborative action to support projects' existing efforts to influence land-related policies and practices.

**Facilitators:**

- Sofia Monsalve, FIAN International, Germany
- Bara Guèye, IED Afrique, Senegal
- Eric Chaurette, Inter Pares, Canada

Before working groups were formed, facilitators provided reference material to guide the discussion. These guidelines were centred on the following questions:

- How can we work together to share tools and knowledge?
- How can we join forces for advocacy and research activities, especially to influence regional and international policies and practices?
- How can we coordinate local efforts and support them with research results?
What knowledge gaps merit further research?

Feedback from working groups

Each working group presents ideas that could be included in the action program. The main concepts that emerged from discussions are summarized below.

Some recommendations involved using tools designed to support communities affected by LSLAs. A suggestion was made to make it easier to build alliances between urban and rural communities affected by LSLAs. The group was also encouraged to support the organization of the Global Convergence of Land and Water Struggles’ West African caravan, which is scheduled to set out in March 2016. It would be appropriate to organize an activity to capitalize on the tools that work (mapping community plots of land, alert and identification systems for at-risk areas, negotiation skills training). Exchange trips between rural areas of different countries could be organized to see how tools have been concretely implemented in other contexts. Responsible investment models also need to be developed that take account of the land’s true value, not only its market value. Guides could be developed that can be shared easily and be used for comparative analysis. Lastly, people should be encouraged to share the knowledge acquired through community and NGO research groups.

Other proposals focused on developing advocacy aimed at decision-makers. An idea was put forward to prepare joint statements on key messages. This would require pressuring donor countries to make changes. A platform could be created to reflect on scaling up results in order to influence changes to public policy. Greater focus should be placed on promoting laws to protect agricultural lands. The land issue could be brought to regional and international forums, such as the African Union and World Bank. That said, different messages need to be tailored according to the levels of governance, and strategies targeted for a variety of audiences (local, national, regional, international).

Several suggestions were made about the community of researchers itself in order to deepen the analysis and coordinate research. They included implementing a virtual platform to share publications and encourage other groups to attend events. Draft documents could also be shared to include comments from others in the final versions. It was suggested that everyone should meet again to share final research results. The Land Policy Initiative (LPI) summit in fall 2016 could be a good opportunity for this. Thematic clusters that unite researches from different countries could be created to continue the dialogue after the workshop. The proposed themes include: land rights and gender, alert systems, land valuation, and community land rights.

Certain knowledge gaps that require further research were also identified. They included the influence of global capitalism on local economies and livelihoods; the characteristics of traditional agricultural systems compared to agribusiness systems; the commercial agricultural development paradigm; the measures made for communities to avoid the undue disadvantages of LSLA (notably through corporate social responsibility, substantive land rights vs. procedural rights, and reconciling substantive law and customary law); migrants’ land rights (with the current focus currently being on foreign customary rules); the gender issue; land valuation and negotiation methods; the connections between land governance and land use planning; and the measure of the success of community support tools. Participants also recognized the need to clarify concepts and come to a consensus on terminology: are we dealing with land grabbing or LSLAs?

After each group presented in turn, Mr. Di Giovanni and Ms. Thioune made a few comments. They considered that everything does not necessarily need to be formalized, but instead that the focus should be on issues where consensus exists. For example, it is not essential to agree on the land-grabbing/LSLA debate. Several tools exist to defend land rights. The innovative aspect of the IDRC program is that it combines tools with research results.
We need to capitalize on this. The success of a platform depends on the efforts that participants agree to put into it. Several platforms already exist that could potentially be put to use. A good idea might be to prepare a series of blogs. A regional rating system could also be created to evaluate States' performance. Some additional IDRC funds are available to organize knowledge sharing events on the organizations' initiative.

The IDRC recently updated and defined its research priorities. The Governance & Justice program has identified land governance issues as a priority for the next five years. An event could be planned to share and compare experiences in Africa in Asia. That said, IDRC cannot determine alone the research themes groups should work on. These themes fall within the IDRC's defined research priorities, so for the time being, there is great scope to consolidate the results of programs underway and, moving forward, to identify relevant issues, within that set of priorities, that address research gaps and respond to emerging local needs.

4.7 - Next steps...

The objective of this session was to determine new research priorities and potential responses to LSLAs.

Moderators: Ramata Thioune and Adrian Di Giovanni, IDRC

Participants had the opportunity to comment on whether their objectives for the workshop were met, and to share their final observations. Certain points that were raised in previous sessions were revisited in this session, and future opportunities were identified. The need to work together to influence policies and practices was underscored. One participant indicated that there are no ready-made or definitive solutions to land acquisition problems. We therefore need to partake in an iterative process and consider that the IDRC projects will have spillover effects. Research groups and organizations should not depend on this program alone, but rather explore other opportunities as well. It would also be appropriate to reflect on a mobilization strategy for stakeholders (private sector, the State, legislators).

Another participant indicated that his primary expectation was to know what organizations were involved and identify experts with whom he could continue a dialogue. This objective was met. His secondary expectation was to understand how other groups are using international instruments, such as the VGs. He obtained partial information and would like to continue that discussion.

A concern was reiterated surrounding improving the dialogue between researchers and field workers, as well as demystifying scientific research for a wider audience. Thought should be given to a pedagogical method of sharing results with populations. Others indicated that the next step is putting the tools presented in the workshop to the test. One audience member mentioned the difficulty related to how to address land grabbing by local elites, seeing as they are strongly rooted in the fabric of local society.

Ms. Thioune indicated that the IDRC would be willing to support participants' collective advocacy efforts and to disseminate research results insomuch as possible, and that ideas should first and foremost come from the group. As for how research results are used, notably publications, the guiding question to ask is who will use this knowledge and for what purposes, since the publication is not an end in and of itself. One of the IDRC's strategic objectives is for research results to generate large-scale positive change. Several interesting ideas were put forward during the last session, but it is up to participants to uncover more and discuss them amongst themselves and with the IDRC. Mr. Di Giovanni ended the session on a positive note in stating that the most exciting stage was yet to come. He foresees interesting discussions on final research results and the way to turn them into concrete action.
5. STRATEGIC DIALOGUE: FOR RESPONSIBLE LAND GOVERNANCE

November 26 was dedicated to a strategic dialogue session. The session was more widely attended and aimed at encouraging a dialogue between participants about West African land policies. Representatives from private businesses, public institutions in several African countries, and Senegal's Commission Nationale de Réforme Foncière (CNRF, the national land reform commission) joined participants from the first two days of the workshop. The strategic dialogue day included three sessions: (1) opening ceremony; (2) status of research for responsible land governance; and (3) experiences and lessons learned for responsible land governance.

5.1 - Session 1 - Opening ceremony

The opening ceremony was presided by His Excellency Mr. Phillippe Beaulne, Canadian Ambassador to Senegal, with assistance from Cam Do from the IDRC and Professor Moustapha Sourang, President of Senegal’s CNRF. Ms. Do began by thanking the Canadian Embassy for organizing this meeting. Ms. Do reiterated the IDRC’s support for five projects in 10 countries which are studying how to improve accountability around LSLAs. She said that the IDRC’s objective is to support research that is relevant to the reform of public policies. Professor Sourang then took the stage to inform the audience about the land work underway in Senegal. He described the CNRF’s mission before indicating that the Commission has adopted an inclusive process which seeks to harmonize stakeholder views. He concluded by stating that he hoped that the conclusions from the workshop would be made available to the CNRF.

The Canadian Ambassador to Senegal, Phillippe Beaulne said that it was his pleasure to preside over the meeting’s opening ceremony with Ms. Do and Professor Sourang. He said that the day’s strategic dialogue would focus on important issues, such as agriculture modernization, safeguarding family farms, and food security. In his opinion, Africa’s rise will depend on a modernized agriculture that continues to serve its populations, while contributing to global growth. Investors should be allowed to come in, but all while ensuring communities' interests are protected. For the Ambassador, the purpose of the day's dialogue was to help make the move from research to action, as well as identify good practices and challenges related to responsible land development.

5.2 - Session 2 - Status of Research on Responsible Land Governance

Chairperson: Bara Guèye, IED Afrique, Senegal

Moderators: Adrian Di Giovanni and Ramata Thioune, IDRC

Update on Research in relation to LSLAs in Africa
The moderators began by setting out the main points that the dialogue would touch on. Mr. Di Giovanni indicated that land governance issues pose considerable challenges and that LSLAs create heightened pressures on land. All IDRC-supported projects have adopted a participatory approach with the ultimate goal of contributing to policy processes. When knowledge comes from local stakeholders, impacts are more sustainable.

Ms. Thioune then presented five cross-cutting themes that have emerged from research carried out through the IDRC's projects. (i) LSLAs have a disproportionate impact on communities. LSLAs do not have the same repercussions in all cases. There are generally more negative effects on women, youth and the most marginalized people. (ii) Communities are typically ill-informed about land decisions involving them. Decision-makers are sometimes not even known to communities. (iii) Population displacements and disposessions are part of LSLAs. That said, the compensation provided is not sufficiently fair or equitable for affected populations. (iv) Clear and protected land rights are important. Communal lands are often more vulnerable when laws do not provide sufficient protection for customary rights. Reliable mechanisms also need to be created so that disputes can eventually be settled fairly. (v) Women's participation is limited, and they are systematically excluded from land management.

**Expert panel**

Researchers and research coordinators were then given the floor to present their preliminary research results.

IED Afrique's Mamadou Fall opened the discussions. Mr. Fall is coordinating a collaborative action research project in Senegal, Ghana and Cameroon with scientific support from IED Afrique. The goal of the project is to promote mechanisms and test accountability tools. The project has tackled methodological challenges, such as implementing sustainable tools to promote citizenship of the land, as well as identifying bridges between local, national and international levels. Research results indicate that land transactions are often carried out behind closed doors. The legal framework does not stipulate any policy that can guarantee quality participation, transparency and accountability. To compensate for these shortcomings, young law experts have given advice to populations in Cameroon to improve their negotiation skills. Protocols between communities and investors were tested in Ghana, while in Senegal local charters were established. Mr. Fall mentioned various lessons learned from this research. Various success factors are at play to improve the participation of populations, such as the institutional context that maintains access to reliable information, local stakeholders' skills, reinforcing the State's abilities to respond to societal requirements, and encouraging dialogue with the private sector.

Professor Robert Kibugi from Kenya was then invited to speak. Research results indicate that there is rigorous institutional and constitutional protection for land rights. That said, there is a considerable disparity between law and practice, especially in a patriarchal society. Several types of rights also coexist for the same plots of land, which makes it more difficult to identify major players in consultations. Customary systems protect communities' rights and provide land security. That said, when they do not work properly they compromise those rights. Codifying customary rights could potentially lead to standards being imposed that are not part of customary systems, and create a foreign land tenure system. Professor Kibugi raised the question of how to identify individual
landholders to be recorded in the land register so that land is managed on a community-wide basis. Simplifying land administration procedures is very important.

Professor Josephine Akihire from Uganda then addressed the issue of women's land rights. Research results show that there are differences between the three countries being studied (Ghana, Cameroon and Uganda) in terms of land acquisition methods and land tenure systems. Women are a very diverse group that includes spouses, daughters, sisters, mothers and grandmothers. Those categories have different ways of accessing land. Clear and explicit guidelines need to be established to reinforce the land rights of women and other invisible groups. Grouping women with youth should also be avoided. They are two different categories, in that youth will become adults. Customary rights include possible ways to ensure gender equity that are often ignored. It is simply a matter of making use of them to allow women to develop a new narrative. The government's role must also be amplified to guarantee women's land rights.

Ali Kaba from Liberia's Sustainable Development Institute (SDI) was then given the floor. His institute's research project began in 2010. At that time, about 50% of the land had been promised or allocated to private investors, even though several projects remained at a standstill. In Liberia, the customary elite had been co-opted into the political system in a way that made it difficult for them to oppose State-supported projects. Under those circumstances, his organization set about implementing a governance system that helps communities to effectively negotiate with investors and turn down projects that they deem undesirable. They also implemented an early warning system. SDI is taking an approach that is proactive (communities are educated on negotiation techniques), interactive (when a community is approached, they can reach the organization for immediate advice) and responsive (communities work with legal experts to get their advice on specific contracts after they are entered into). Lastly, his organization supports identifying community plots of land and their corresponding resources. Although these are worthwhile measures, Mr. Kaba considers that they will continue to be useless if a national land governance system is not introduced.

Sofia Monsalve of German's FIAN then briefly discussed her organization's strategies to develop accountability mechanisms from the ground up. She noted that local governance is deeply affected by the emergence of new stakeholders and the restructuring of the economic environment. Impacts vary according to social class, generation, gender and ethnicity. Ms. Monsalve noted that local stakeholders embraced the VGs in several cases. For example, in Mali, NGOs have established a working group with ministers to review land laws from the perspective of the VGs.

The researchers' interventions were followed by rich debates. Several people remarked that populations need to acquire negotiation skills to demand policies from governments that can protect rural areas, and not be educated so that they can sell of their lands. Others suggested that a consultation framework be established to prevent the State or local authorities from making unilateral land decisions without consulting populations. Problems will persist so long as local elected officials are not educated about land procedures and policies. Some people noted that large-scale land transfers are also public authorities' responsibility. Research helped reinforce populations' skills, but what measures can be used to educate public authorities? Whether customary law is useful was also brought up several times. Some find that there is some good in traditional law. In the field, customary law is not immovable; it is changing in relation to the somewhat conservative modern law. Rural areas are trying to adapt to invest in the land, even if it falls outside of what is formally legal. Other people find that these customs are a barrier to development and do not seem to protect women's rights.

The Chairperson of the session summarized the audience's remarks. He noted that there is a need to clarify the semantic distinction between land-grabbing and LSLAs, and that tools are needed to understand the dynamics between political stakeholders and their influence on decisions made locally. The land evaluation issue also requires particular attention: an economist does not necessarily have the same perspective on the value of the land as an anthropologist does. The rights of future generations also need to be included in the evaluation process. It would also be appropriate to give thought to whether customary law can reinforce the rights of all individuals within a family. Mr. Gueye also asked how the technological tools used by the community can reinforce land governance. The discussions concluded that private investors cannot be entirely excluded from African agriculture. This begs the question of how to establish a win-win partnership between the investor and the community.
5.3 - Session 3 - Experiences and lessons learned for responsible land governance

Moderator: Cheikh Oumar Ba, IPAR

Professeur Moustapha Sourang, President of the CNRF, discussed Senegal's land reform process. He began by explaining how issues raised in the earlier session are being addressed by the CNRF. In terms of land rights, the CNRF is alive to the need to ensure consistency between the Loi sur le Domaine National (LDN), which provides usage rights through allocation, and the Loi d'Orientation Agro-Sylvo-Pastorale (LOASP), which provides assignable and transferable land rights. These two regimes coexist, thus there is a need to find a compromise, so that the community remains a stakeholder in authorizing the establishment of real land rights to spur investment. That would allow for long-term leases, which give the rural community the option of renewing them and ensure that investors deliver on their commitments.

As for the transparency of procedures, the CNRF plans on introducing a land registry. Management, security and land information system tools are needed for these leases to be properly administered. Randomly delimited and overlapping lands create problems. The CNRF would like to promote conflict resolution by creating nearby courts and village councils. The CNRF also plans to create charters so that the approval authority (sub-prefect, prefect) can determine whether the various parties delivered on their commitments.

The legislation was preceded by the 30-year preparation of a land policy document. One of the most important commitments is supporting and empowering communities to improve their negotiating power. The CNRF also finds that land royalties should be paid to rural communities so that they have a way to subsidize their development activities. According to Professor Sourang, modern law can formalize customary rights. The Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) allowed local communities to agree to such a dynamic compromise. It is important to avoid calculated land-grabbing from people who sometimes have thousands of hectares of unvalued land based on the argument that it belongs to the family. Lastly, Professor Sourang underscored that the ultimate goal of land reform is to create a peaceful climate in a situation with multiple rural stakeholders.

Bertrand Nicolas, Deputy Administrator for the Compagnie Agricole de Saint Louis (CASL), then spoke to his experience. CASL is dedicated to producing rice for the local market. Its vision is to lower food costs and food insecurity in Senegal; to be a driving force of rice industry modernization; to implement a win-win-land strategy (for populations, the company and the State); to maintain a low environmental footprint; and lastly to be profitable and bankable. Mr. Nicolas said that CASL initially tried to negotiate for lands in the Fouta region. However, although the needs of populations were taken into great consideration, CASL was unable to establish itself in that area. After learning from its experience in Fouta, CASL established itself in Saloum Delta while respecting principles like providing farmers living around the river with access to the company's hydro-agricultural infrastructures, creating local jobs, establishing clusters of 500-600 ha each (rather than 2000 ha), discussing with villagers and obtaining social consensus by signing a convention. These practices allowed the company to achieve significant production levels while respecting populations.
Babacar Diop, from the Conseil National de Concertation et de Coopération des Ruraux (CNCR), then shared his experience. He focused on civil society's actions for responsible land governance as part of the Sustainable and Inclusive Agribusiness Development Project of Senegal (PDIDAS). After briefly presenting PDIDAS, he went on to review the three strands of civil society action: (i) multi-stakeholder awareness, mobilization and dialogue; (ii) skills development; and (iii) consultations and knowledge building. The challenge lies in securing land rights for family farms, which are the base units for agriculture in Senegal. To do this, the CNCR organized a tour of nine local communities involved in PDIDAS to inform populations. Elected officials decided to implement a consultation framework for decision-making. PDIDAS officials were also there for the launch of the Observatoire national de la gouvernance foncière. Furthermore, the land distribution plan was renegotiated. All of these results represent significant advancements that take populations into consideration.

Kader Fanta Ngom from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) then spoke. He discussed the status of the VG implementation in Senegal and the subregion. He initially reviewed the inclusive process to establish the VG, before reiterating the nature and objectives of the VGs. He then discussed the general VG principles for the States, for non-State stakeholders and for everyone. He mentioned the following results of operationalizing the VGs in Senegal, among others: (i) implementing a multi-stakeholder dialogue platform on VGs; (ii) establishing a VG steering committee; (iii) using the VGs as a working basis for land reform position papers. Mr. Ngom stressed that the innovative aspect of the VGs lies in the fact that civil society organizations themselves are leading efforts to raise awareness about this instrument.

Those different accounts were followed by a very rich and constructive debate. The role of private investors in agriculture was mentioned several times. Some participants found that the speakers trivialized land grabbing. Certain audience members considered that family farms need to be equipped with a financing, education and skills development system so that they can become entrepreneurs themselves. No one is against private investments, but it would be best to take advantage of complementarities and encourage businesses to conduct activities that farmers cannot take on. Several participants insisted on the fact that the land is vital for populations' livelihoods and community identity. A PDIDAS representative was adamant that the model put forward by this project was appropriate and warmly welcomed by populations.

The long-term leases promoted by the CNRF were also discussed. Several people considered this option to be inappropriate because farmers have a different understanding of real land rights. They cannot conceive that land rights would be time bound. It is essential to make legislation based on the mindset of populations. In farmers' opinion, the land is inherited from their ancestors and will be passed on to future generations. Several participants from other African countries also noted that established land laws mostly go unenforced. The following conclusions were drawn. The workshop report needs to be shared with the CNRF. Land reform is not only a legal matter. There are many factors that need to be agreed upon. A workshop should be organized to share experiences on land reform processes within ECOWAS; PDIDAS is not yet an operational project and as a result cannot yet serve as a model. Small- and large-scale farmers can coexist. The State needs to arbitrate between the two models.

6. CLOSING REMARKS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

Mr. Di Giovanni and Ms. Thioune thanked participants for their stimulating discussions. They reiterated the fact that land is a fundamental issue for African societies, since many are centred on agriculture. Under those circumstances, African development demands that land resources be valued in an inclusive, transparent and responsible way. The purpose of this event was to encourage discussion and dialogue among researchers, policy makers and civil society stakeholders, as well as to find mechanisms to concretely implement conclusions drawn from research. Some pertinent questions remained unanswered in the workshop, which urges the various groups that came together on this day of dialogue to continue their reflection in their respective countries and across
Africa. We must continue the discussion with the same open-mindedness and spirit of cooperation to identify solutions that are sustainable, fair and equitable for all.
# 7. APPENDIX

## Appendix 1: Workshop Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Tuesday, November 24, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:30 – 10:30 | **1. Framing the Discussion: Introduction**  
Moderators: Adrian Di Giovanni & Ramata Thioune, International Development Research Centre (IDRC)  
Introductory Remarks  
Overview and Objectives of workshop (with “tour de table’’ of participants)  
Brief presentation of the synthesis of results emerging from the research projects  
- Dr. Anna Russell, independent consultant, Canada  
Objective: introduction of participants; understand and define workshop goals & expected outcomes. |
| 10:30 – 10:45 | Health Break                                                                                                         |
| 10:45 – 12:30 | **2. The Governance and Impacts of LSLAs on Populations and their Rights**  
Moderator: Cheikh Oumar Ba, Initiative prospective agricole et rurale (IPAR), Senegal  
Panelists:  
- Ruth Hall, PLAAS (Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies), South Africa  
- Stephan Loroux, INADES-Formation, Côte d’Ivoire  
- Philippine Sutz, International Institute for Environment and Development, UK  
Objective: an overview of the problem especially as relates to questions of good governance, legal frameworks, rule of law and opportunities and impacts for. |
| 12:30 – 13:30 | Lunch                                                                                                                |
Moderator: Mutuso Dhlawayo, Zimbabwe Environmental Law Association (ZELA), Zimbabwe  
Panelists:  
- Mamadou Fall, Innovations, environnement et développement (IED) Afrique, Senegal  
- Robert Kibugi, Land Development Governance Institute, Kenya  
Objective: to better understand how to promote improved participation of communities and a more inclusive and equitable governance of natural resources and land, especially customary rights, and in the face of large-scale land acquisitions. |
| 15:15 – 15:30 | Pause-santé                                                                                                          |
| 15:30 – 17:45 | **4. Towards more Just and Equitable Investments: Valuation of Resources, Benefit-Sharing and Compensation**  
Moderator: Betty Akumatey, University of Ghana, Ghana  
Panelists:  
- Marena Brinkhurst, Namati, USA  
- Mark Kakraba Ampeh, Land Resources Management Centre, Ghana  
- Mwenda Makathimo, LDGI, Kenya  
Objective: to better understand how affected communities can be equal partners in investments and derive equitable benefits across diverse groups and their possibly competing short- and long-term interests. |
### Wednesday, November 25, 2015

| Time         | 5. Land & Natural Resources Rights and Dispute Resolution: Within Communities and With External Actors  
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8:30 – 10:15 | Moderator: Godwin Ojo, Environmental Rights Action/Friends of the Earth Nigeria  
|              | Panelists:  
|              | - Judy Adoko, Land Equity Movement Uganda (LEMU), Uganda  
|              | - Chantal Jacovetti, Coordination Nationale des Organisations Paysannes, Mali  
|              | - Téodyl Nkuintchua, Centre pour l’environnement et le développement (CED), Cameroon  
|              | Objective: to better understand the challenges and opportunities in promoting secure and equitable land and natural resource governance rights, especially in respect to customary rights, and in the face of different types of disputes and conflicts. |
| 10:15 – 10:30| Health Break |
| 10:30 – 12:15| 6. Women and Land: Their Key Roles in the Face of a Double-Burden of Exclusion  
|              | Moderator: Navsharan Singh, IDRC Delhi, India  
|              | Panelists:  
|              | - Irene Sama-Lang, University of Buea, Cameroon  
|              | - Josephine Akihire, Centre for Basic Research, Uganda  
|              | - Issufo Tankar, Centro Terra Viva, Mozambique  
|              | Objective: to share and better understand the specific challenges that women face, as well as their specific roles as agents of positive change and in seeking accountability. |
| 12:15 – 13:30| Lunch |
|              | Facilitators:  
|              | - Sofia Monsalve, Food Information Action Network, Germany  
|              | - Bara Gueye, IED Afrique, Senegal  
|              | - Eric Chaurette, Inter-Pares, Canada  
|              | Objective: identify as a group a collective program of action or collaboration to support existing project efforts to influence policies and practices. |
| 15:15 – 15:30| Health Break |
| 15:30 – 17:00| 8. Next Steps...  
|              | Moderators: Ramata Thioune & Adrian Di Giovanni, IDRC  
|              | - Synthesis of discussions  
|              | - Revisiting the objectives  
|              | - Next steps for the research program  
|              | Objective: identify potential new research priorities and interventions in respect to LSLAs. |
|              | Cocktail |
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Agenda

Wednesday, 25 November 2015

15 :30 – 17 :30 Registration

18 :30 – 20 :30 Cocktail at the Official Residence of Canada

Thursday, 26 November 2015

8 :00 – 8 :30 Registration

8 :30 – 9 :00 Opening remarks

- HE Mr. Philippe Beaulne, Ambassador of Canada in Senegal
- Professor Moustapha Sourang, President of the National Commission on Land Reform (NCLR)

9 :00 – 10 :00 Research update on Responsible Land Tenure Governance

- Progress and perspectives of research on large scale land acquisition in Africa
- Panel of experts

10 :00 – 10 :30 Health Break

10 :30 – 12 :30 Discussion

12 :30 – 14 :00 Lunch Break

14 :00 – 15 :00 Experiences and lessons learned for Responsible Land Tenure Governance

- Land Reform in Senegal (Professor Moustapha Sourang, President of the NCLR)

- Testimony from “Conseil National de Concertation des Ruraux”
- Testimony from “Compagnie Agricole du Sénégal”

15 :00 – 16 :30 Discussion

16 :30 – 17 :00 Health Break

17 :00 – 17 :30 Conclusion and recommendations

17 :30 Closing remarks