



**ILC Asia Regional Meeting
12-14 October 2006
Subic, Philippines**

Meeting Report and Framework for Action

Rationale for the Regional Meeting

The ILC is a global alliance of civil-society and intergovernmental organizations, which works with development partners to empower poor households to gain and maintain secure access to natural resources, especially land. As a network institution, ILC's vision is for natural resources, especially land, to be used to ensure that all people can exercise their fundamental right to be free from hunger and poverty, and that access to natural resources is based on serving the public good by providing livelihood opportunities on the basis of equity and respect for the dignity and identity of rural people.

During the ILC's last global assembly in March 2005 in Bolivia, as well as through informal exchanges among Asian members and partners of ILC, network members have expressed an interest to organize a regional workshop to bring the discussion on land issues closer to home, and increase the regional specificity of ILC's analysis of key land-related issues. Discussions during ILC's Governing Council likewise indicated the need to strengthen on-the-ground activities of the coalition, in order to enhance its relevance and impact.

In addition, ILC members and partners expressed a desire to explore greater collaboration through the ILC network at regional levels. Providing such opportunity could help catalyze networking and solidarity actions among the different organizations. As such, there was a need to concretize ILC's role in the Asian region by identifying key objectives and areas of work for the next few years. The regional meeting was also a timely activity to provide a "regional lens" to the coalition's overall institutional development, as there is a process currently underway to revise the ILC global strategic plan for 2007-2010, and begin preparation for the next global assembly in April 2007. The analysis generated through the meeting will be an important element for ILC to refine its institutional strategies and identify more clearly its comparative advantage/niches of work.

The meeting was thus organized both to improve collective understanding of land trends in Asia, and identify collective actions that could be taken via ILC and other mechanisms. In preparatory work led by ANGOC and KPA to develop the meeting agenda, participants identified three goals for the activity:

- Analysis of emerging issues and trends as well as challenges and opportunities in the area of access to land by the rural poor (on a per country sharing basis first, and then on a regional clustering basis);
- Positioning of ILC in Asia context;
- Formulation of a 2- to 3-year action plan focusing on: (i) capacity building and coalition strengthening area and (ii) policy, and (iii) monitoring and advocacy areas.

Overview of Participants and Program

Participants were among ILC network member and partner organizations, as well as ANGOC network members. Representatives of organizations from nine countries took part:

Country (no. participants)	Organizations
Bangladesh (2)	Association for Land Reform and Development (ALRD) Association for Realisation of Basic Needs (ARBAN)
Cambodia (2)	Cambodia NGO Alliance for Cooperation (CNAC) STAR Kampuchea
China (1)	China Association for NGO Cooperation (CANGO)
India (5)	Association of Voluntary Agencies for Rural Development (AVARD) Chirtakoot Sewa Ashram (CSA) South Asia Rural Reconstruction Association (SARRA) Society for the Development of Drought Prone Area (SDDPA) Social Development Foundation (SDF)
Indonesia (5)	Bina Desa Consortium for Agrarian Reform (KPA) Indonesian Institute for Forests and Environment (RMI) Community-Based Forest Management Program (PPSHK) Free Land Institute (YTM)
Nepal (2)	Mobilization and Development (MODE) Nepal NGO Federation (NFN)
Pakistan (1)	Rural Development Foundation of Pakistan (RDF)
Philippines (7)	Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ANGOC) People's Campaign for Agrarian Reform (AR Now!) Center for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (CARRD) Federation of Free Farmers (FFF) Philippine Association for Intercultural Development, Inc. (PAFID) PAKISAMA SEARSOLIN
Sri Lanka (1)	National NGO Council of Sri Lanka (NNGOC)

Based on input from participants to planning over the course of 2006, the meeting agenda included three main components:

- Visit and discussion with indigenous Aeta community, which succeeded in 2005 to gain control of a portion of ancestral territory, including forest land and coastal area, under provisions of the national Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act (IPRA)
- Presentations of country reports and case studies, and group discussion on emerging trends and challenges on access to land in Asia
- Group work to identify and prioritize major access to land issues, and develop regional action plan

Regional Context

This overview reflects country reports and case studies prepared by participants from the nine countries and open discussion during the regional meeting. (See also Appendix A for outputs from workshop groups that identified priority issues following the country report presentations.)

As the reports highlighted, the countries of South and Southeast Asia have predominantly feudal and traditional rural systems, including both production systems and socio-political structures. The agrarian context is characterized by skewed distribution of private land ownership, with large areas of lands (as high as 80%) owned by minorities (from 5 to 20%) of the population. In many countries, this situation is a carry-over from colonial experiences, which are slowly being redressed by land access policies. A few countries, notably China and Cambodia, also experienced collectivization of agricultural lands in their recent history, but now have policies through which these lands have been or are being distributed.

In all these countries, land is the main source of livelihood and employment among rural communities. A large portion of the population is involved in agriculture, and many livelihoods remain dependent on subsistence farming. Land reform initiatives have been developed in many Asian countries, but the implementation of these has generally been wanting because of corruption, changing political leadership and priorities, and a lack of political will.

In most countries, even if there are agrarian reform efforts underway, there are significant sectors that do not benefit in these programs such as rural women, indigenous peoples' communities, and youth. Particularly in South Asia, the marginalization of women and Dalits is a key factor, as land access is often impeded by class/caste dynamics and gender discrimination; discrimination against indigenous peoples is also a concern throughout the region. This suggests that land rights campaigns need to be linked to broader social empowerment efforts, in order for marginalized groups to benefit.

The gains in agrarian reform are also being reversed by the vulnerability of smallholder agriculture in the face of threats from the global marketplace. The high cost of agricultural inputs, low prices of agricultural products, dumping of cheap and subsidized products from abroad, and rising land values are driving land-owners to sell their land or convert the land for other uses (e.g., shrimp farms, housing, plantations, etc.) which yield greater profits. Land conversion – including both from smallholder to commercial farming and from agricultural to non-agricultural use – is being encouraged by trade liberalization, international financial institutions and other anti-people policies.

Laws that support land and agrarian reform often remain unimplemented and their targets underachieved. Landed government officials, the military and powerful commercial interests actively block and harass land access efforts, including actions to suppress organizing among rural communities that violate people's basic human rights. Ideologically, land access initiatives are still associated with leftist or communist movements by governments, military leaders, some religious groups and other critics, which generate a negative connotation of land and agrarian reform in the minds of political leaders and the public.

In all the struggles with land issues, rural communities and civil society partners are often motivated not only by the importance of land and resource to rural livelihoods, but also the value of land distribution in increasing social justice, and the link between more equitable land redistribution and bringing about democratic changes to existing power relations. Through investments in capacity-building, participatory processes and use of sustainable agriculture, land and agrarian reform remains a tool for people's empowerment of the people and the preservation of the environment. In some cases, progressive elements in the government have also increased support for land policies that are favorable for the land redistribution and provision of rural support services.

The success of civil society efforts in land reform advocacy has also been very much influenced by strong grassroots movements. In some countries, such as Indonesia and the Philippines, social movements and rural people's organizations

are very strong and mobilize members to exert pressure on their governments to reform land and agrarian policies. Grassroots movements are also pursuing land reform “from below” where possible, by leveraging local strength so that members may gain land access. In other countries, such as Cambodia, the political environment does not leave much space for rural people’s organizing; in these cases, the role of international organizations is often much more significant than social movements, in terms of negotiating with or putting pressure on governments for land and agrarian reforms.

Strategic Objectives for ILC in Asia

After the presentation and discussion of country reports and case studies, and consideration of priority issues and key actors, participants discussed what should be ILC’s main objectives in three of its existing work areas: (a) capacity-building and coalition strengthening, (b) policy and (c) advocacy and monitoring. This discussion, in the Workshop 2 session, yielded two main strategic areas in which ILC should focus efforts with the network in Asia.

Strategic Area 1: Capacity Building and Coalition Strengthening

Main objectives:

- Strengthen the capacity of members and partners, and the organizations they work with (CBOs, POs and local NGOs) to improve people’s land access and linking this to land- and resource-based development (linking rights with improving livelihoods)
- Enhance abilities to engage with other land stakeholders at national and regional levels
- Build capacity for members and partners to be more involved in policy work and advocacy
- Increase capacity of ILC as network to engage with global institutions and intergovernmental system

Strategic Area 2: Policy, Advocacy and Monitoring

Main objectives:

- Influence formulation of laws and policies that can support land access; resist those which are hostile to people’s land rights and agrarian reform
- Increase effectiveness of implementation, where laws and policies provide for more secure land rights
- Build support for land access at multiple levels (i.e., linking national-regional-global efforts) and among multiple stakeholders
- Develop interactive tools for monitoring policy implementation, laws, international commitments, projects and programs, etc., that are related to land access

- Link land access and agrarian issues to human rights monitoring, especially where there are violation of rights occurring
- Mainstream gender equity in regional land agenda (South Asia)

Proposed Areas and Levels of Action

Along with proposing main objectives for ILC's work with Asian members and partners, participants also identified action areas in which activities should be developed. This report has summarized and grouped together these action areas, and proposes levels at which there would need to be related efforts. This is intended to be a starting point for developing a workplan for 2007.

ACTION AREA	Local	National	Regional	Global
Capacity-building: community empowerment				
Training and skills-building with community groups, on both land access (land literacy, community organizing and local advocacy) and its links to livelihoods (sustainable agriculture, production capacity, etc.)				
Documenting methodologies and approaches for community empowerment; dissemination among networks				
Capacity-building: knowledge and action networks				
Regular network meetings and other efforts to exchange knowledge (e.g., case studies, smart practices) via ICTs				
Network mapping (CSO and multi-stakeholder networks) and building alliances across sectors				
Exchange programs / study visits				
Capacity-building: from grassroots lessons to policy impact				
Stakeholder analysis / institutional mapping				
Review of laws and policies (policy mapping)				
Engaging policy actors – e.g., national and local governments, other sectors, parliaments, regional bodies (e.g., ASEAN, SAARC)				

Policy, advocacy and monitoring: influencing terms of debate around land rights				
Developing issue briefs or statements on areas of key concern (e.g., women's rights to land and resources, access to the commons, link between water and land policies)				
Increase public awareness (e.g., via media campaigns)				
Increase visibility of land issues among development community				
Link country and regional work to international forums and processes (e.g., ECOSOC)				
Mainstream gender equity in regional land agenda (South Asia specifically)				
Policy, advocacy and monitoring: influencing policy and legislation				
Strengthen the argument for land rights – livelihood link as a key development concern (e.g., via case studies, action research)				
Assess interaction between international trends and actors and national policy processes; make comparisons across countries				
Develop national policy recommendations based on local realities through (a) data collection and analysis, including case studies, and (b) building policy recommendations				
Develop open-access database of land-related laws, policies, projects and programs, and international commitments				
Increase links between land access and human rights monitoring (e.g., conflict mapping and monitoring land-related HR violations)				

For some action areas, workshop groups developed more detailed recommendations on specific activities, including a sketch of institutions that could be involved, timing for activities, and the resources available or needed. These details will need to be developed further in ILC's workplan for 2007, also considering whether there are other existing efforts in these action areas with which Asian organizations could connect.

ILC Niche

In considering these objectives that participants identified and moving forward the strategic areas, there are two areas where ILC has comparative advantages. First, ILC is a “glocal” network (“glocal” = local + global) that is able to link land-related actors working from the local level, through national processes and into regional and global forums. This provides channels both to support community-based efforts to increase the security of land rights and to bring the lessons from this work to bear on national policy and international commitments; and subsequently to ensure that such commitments are made relevant to improving the lives of rural communities via their implementation. Second, the range of working approaches used by organizations in the ILC network allow it to bridge rights-based and livelihoods approaches, and identify how the two are complementary and reinforcing.

Appendix A

Results of Workshop 1: Identifying Priority Issues

Priority issues – South East Asia Group

LOCAL

1. MIGRATION (including migrants' occupation of indigenous peoples' lands)
2. Illiteracy of the people in the community (opportunities for exploitation)
3. Ecosystem degradation
4. Land-related conflicts (including internal, e.g., between farmers & indigenous peoples)
5. Second-generation farmers (shift in preference of young people)
6. Weak local organizations (lack of resources for community strengthening & organizing)

TRENDS

1. Community-based organic farming for poverty reduction
2. Tendency to convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, which will not solve poverty problems
3. Communal lands of indigenous peoples are being privatized
4. Growing scarcity of land-based resources'
5. Growing push for market commoditization of land & its resources (land as commodity)
6. Employment generation focus, instead of equity (e.g., pursuit of external investors)
7. Influence of WTO
8. Economic gap (e.g., rise in price of gasoline & drop in price of agricultural crops)
9. Promotion of industrial tree plantations in upland areas.
10. Tenurial restriction due to environmental conservation.

OPPORTUNITIES

1. Neo-liberal economy has failed to address poverty, resulting to greater demand for land access; persistence of poverty is being coupled with social unrest
2. Strong relations between NGOs and communities
3. High regard for traditional resource management system.
4. Strong demand for bio diversity conservation & environmental integrity.
5. Existence/availability of traditional knowledge to be passed on the next generation
6. Increasing cost of petroleum leads to high cost of production inputs.

ROLES

1. GOVERNMENT

- Enact and implement resource-access laws

2. COMMUNITY (including peoples' organizations)

- Intensify mass actions
- Lobbying
- Develop & document successful Agrarian Reform initiatives

3. NGOs & CSOs

- Maximize media for advocacy
- Conflict resolution /mediation.
- Capacity-building for communities
- Linkaging

4. International Agencies (WB, etc.)

- Paradigm shift (access its development paradigm)
- improve its mechanism in engaging with CSOs

5. ILC

- Lobby at the global level
- Become amplifier for local and national struggles
- Continue strategic engagements with governments
- Promote agrarian reform initiatives through global media
- Strengthen member and partner collaboration for everything (strategic intervention)
- Develop data base for impact & success stories

6. Private sectors

- Go beyond providing infrastructure in corporate social responsibility (CSR), e.g., also provide land access & environmental conservation.

Priority issues – South Asia Group

LEVEL	LOCAL	NATIONAL	REGIONAL	GLOBAL
PRIORITY ISSUES				
1. Re-distribution of land	√	√	--	
2. Access to land and water	√	√	√	
3. End to discrimination in cluding gender	√	√	√	√
4. Politicians/bureaucrats interference in land distribution	√	√	√	
5. Lack of financial resources	√			√
6. Titling for indigenous community	√	√		
7. Change/reforms/monitor/ Anti -people laws and policies (caste, creed, color and religion)		√		
8. Interventions of IFIs, WB, ADB, National corporation on land legislation		√	√	√
9. Awareness at community level	√			
10. Lack of knowledge and skills at local level	√			
11. CSO/NGOs- lack of concrete initiatives on land.	√	√		
12. Divorce between land rights and human rights			√	√
GOVT ROLES				
1. Legislation	√	√		
2. Administration	√	√		
3. Protection	√	√		
COMMUNITY/ PO ROLES/NGOS/CBOs (including social movements and communities.				
1. Awareness building	√	√		
2. Networking	√	√		
3. Advocacy	√	√	√	

4. Capacity building	√	√		
5. Community mobilization				
6. Training	√	√	√	
	√	√		
Role of UN IFI, BILATERAL AGENCIES		Do not interfere in govt. legislation		Respect and recognition of National Laws Following of democratic principles; Collaboration With other Stakeholders
MNC/TNC	Do not play the role of NGOs and respect of human rights.	Do not interfere in govt. legislation Respect of human rights		Collaboration with other Stakeholders w/ respect to Int'l Conventions
ILC ROLES	Capacity- building programme on land rights and land management	Advocacy Facilitating/influencing policies	Networking Exchange of knowledge	Advocacy Policy level
OTHER ACTORS (e.g., parliaments, commercial sectors, etc.)	X	X	X	X

Appendix B: Summary of Country Reports and Case Studies

Country	Issues/Case Presented	Status and Trends	Gains and Challenges of CSO's Advocacy and Action for Land Access	Recommendations
Bangladesh (ALRD, ARBAN)	Agrarian reform of <i>Khas</i> (state) lands, vested, and communal lands	<p>Government developed program of reform to <i>khas</i>, vested land and communal lands, but this was not fully implemented.</p> <p>Other key trends include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steep increase in landlessness in past 30 years (32% to 69%) • Population pressure • Unplanned development process, contributing to land degradation and decrease in arable land • Rural-to-urban migration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are laws but not fully implemented because of lack of political will and corruption, but a land commission is now set up to attend to land issues. • Illegal occupation of <i>khas</i> lands is a widespread phenomenon, amounting to elite capture; rural communities and NGOs are harassed by land grabbers. • Control of land is key element in power structure; skewed distribution of land rights reinforces wide gap in socio-political power between elites and poor majority. • Campaign for justice in vested lands policy succeeded in 2001, with prior law being repealed. But there is a gap with implementation, meaning further analysis and advocacy is needed. • No state recognition of indigenous peoples' rights • Women face discrimination in almost all areas, e.g., law on inheritance. There has been some success to provide wives (i.e., as well as husbands) rights to redistributed land, though it is slow in coming. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue the fight for constitutional guarantees to access to land; and for the law of inheritance to be equitable to women • Need for advocacy, lobbying, research, and mass mobilization for land access. Government should recognize and respect the role of civil society organizations. • Increase the government's compliance with its own policy commitments, e.g., distribution of <i>khas</i> land and water as is included in PSRP. • Regional and global platforms for land access should be created or become more active, including cross-border advocacy campaigns, exposure programs to other ILC partners, trainings and linkages • ILC regional secretariat with focus on regional monitoring and operational framework

Country	Issues/Case Presented	Status and Trends	Gains and Challenges of CSO's Advocacy and Action for Land Access	Recommendations
<p>Nepal (MODE, NFN)</p>	<p>History of Land and Agrarian Reform laws since 1916, and potential for reform in current reform moment</p>	<p>Several laws have been enacted since 1916, including the Land Reform Acts of 1964, and several Five Year Plans have components on agrarian reform. Still, distribution of land rights is highly skewed; addressing this challenge is critical for resolving national and local conflict.</p> <p>Other key trends include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landless rate near 25% • More than 80% of population relies on land access for livelihood, either as smallholder or farm laborer; few alternative livelihood options in rural areas • Women, Dalits and indigenous peoples have virtually no control over land or natural resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laws to improve land access were never fully implemented, or did not result in changing distribution of rights, e.g., via 1964 Land Reform Act, only 5% of people resettled were genuinely landless. • Land ceiling records have not been updated; informal tenancy limits ability of tillers to document their claims. Land Reform Commission was established in 1995 with mandate to review land ceiling, but its report was never implemented. • Without land access, rural people are also denied access to basic services (water, electricity) and citizenship rights (e.g., schooling, birth certificates) • 72% of court cases involve land – the presence of conflict related to land and resources is very high, and has fueled broader national conflict and armed movements. • Current 20-year plan for agricultural development focuses on technological change, chemical fertilizer and access to global market; does not include land / agrarian reform components. • Previous government proposed land bank concept, but this was not seen as viable option (too costly and unlikely to resolve landlessness) • Mass movements, e.g., Kamaiya (bonded laborers) and mobilization of rural peoples have increased the leverage of landless and land-poor and give encouragement and hope for success. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for civil society to increase skills in research and lobbying, peoples' campaigns, and mobilize more NGOs to work on land issues • Review national land access policies and strengthen NGOs or CSOs involved in land struggle, and national and regional networks of organizations campaigning for land and agrarian reform • Identify fuller range of policy alternatives that could be possible, e.g., leasehold model in forest areas • Review the state's international commitments, e.g., via World Food Summit, regarding land access • Links between land reform and peace dialogue should be established for either to succeed • Strengthen Revive popular campaign of "land to the tiller"

Country	Issues/Case Presented	Status and Trends	Gains and Challenges of CSO's Advocacy and Action for Land Access	Recommendations
Sri Lanka (NNGOC)	AR laws and implementation	There were several reforms to distribute colonial lands for green revolution and for the distribution of stateland to individuals (Golden Land Scheme).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The gains in land ownership have been supported by programs in irrigation and support to green revolution and implementation of community forestry • Post-tsunami, there is challenge of making land available to those who lost access in coastal areas; an estimated 60% did not have other land access and are now landless. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity-building of CSOs working on land issues • Link national land issues into a global platform via ILC
Pakistan (RDF)	Access to land issues in Pakistan	Half-hearted implementation of agrarian reform resulting in less than 50% distribution of AR programmed lands.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level of absentee land ownership exacerbating skewed distribution of land rights. Landowners are strong in parliament, and have various options to maintain possession legally. • Less than half the land distributed via past land reform initiatives was accessed by tenants or landless; many were put to other (non-agricultural) uses, or left undistributed. • Access to land is linked to productivity and food security to make government provide support services such as irrigation and capacity building for land development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSOs are not active in land issues; these issues should be brought up on the UN and Intergovernmental level for attention and action. • Monitor the implementation of int'l commitments related to land access, e.g., WFS. These efforts need leadership from the UN-system.

<p>China (CANGO)</p>	<p>Participatory Urban Governance in China</p>	<p>National land policy has moved from collective farming to household tenure, but agricultural productivity still low to support the household, contributing to rural-to-urban migration. Push factors include resource degradation, land access lost to urbanization (land use change), and household land lost by widows despite laws that provide for gender equality. Rise in the cost of basic services in rural areas is also a push factor. Pull factors include the greater economic opportunities found in urban areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Registration system denies basic citizenship rights to rural migrants; some cities now have more migrants than registered urban residents. Discrimination against migrants, particularly within local governance institutions. • Initiatives (e.g., by CANGO) to push for participatory governance practices to integrate rural migrants into to urban support system. • Development of social entrepreneur sector and emergence of civil society voices in social policy areas also create new opportunities to advocate for migrants' rights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote participatory processes that are acceptable to stakeholders. • Need for mature CSOs that can facilitate the process; capacity-building to promote participatory processes that can enable rural migrants to be integrated in the urban programs. • Provide opportunities for migrants and established urban residents to identify visions for local development.
--	--	---	---	--

Country	Issues/Case Presented	Status and Trends	Gains and Challenges of CSO's Advocacy and Action for Land Access	Recommendations
India (CSA, SARRA, SDF, SSDPA)	AR and access to land in Uttar Pradesh; SDDPA and AR-related activities; SARRA and land development technologies.	<p>Nationally, the majority of workforce is directly related to agriculture in some way, thus land access and agrarian reform remain key issues. Each state has its own land policies; only some have experience with AR successes. Three cases were shared by participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Uttar Pradesh, land reform is rarely implemented. Many cases go to court system, e.g., illegal manipulation of land papers, land grabs, problems in cadastre and measuring land area. • In Andhra Pradesh, 70% of irrigated land is owned by just 5% of the population. Distribution to landless is made difficult because of lack of documentation and demarcation; lands that are distributed are marginal, and unproductive in the state's arid climate. • In southern Indian states, socio-economic power structures and agro-ecological challenges combine to marginalize poor farmers; family enterprise based on sustainable agriculture model has taken land rehabilitation as basis for reviving local livelihoods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rights of Dalits and tribal communities are still unresolved; this challenge is related to broader social structure and social change process. Women's rights to land are also an important policy area that needs to be addressed further. • Focus of NGO work tends to be land development after land acquisition; successful initiatives in sustainable agriculture exist and are documented. • There is active implementation and promotion of sustainable agriculture technologies (vermi composting, use of beneficial insects, light traps, seed production, etc); as well as rehabilitation of marginal lands, including in drylands areas. These can be linked more closely with efforts to increase land access, to improve livelihoods post-acquisition. • There have been efforts to employ participatory community processes to develop land acquired through access-to-land programs of the government. • Land literacy and land rehabilitation campaigns are being linked to state efforts to computerize updates of land records, to increase accessibility of cadastre information to farmers and landless. This is particularly needed in cases where land rights are in dispute. • While the state-level plays a leading role in land and agrarian policy, there are also overlaps with both local institutions and the federal bureaucracy and policies; thus, networks that focus on state-level reform must also make efforts to link both to grassroots organizations and national policy campaigns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to form and strengthen networks community-based groups, grassroots movements and other Voluntary Organization at the local, national, and international levels. • Networks should also bridge movements, e.g., agrarian reform, Dalit rights and women's rights, and link land reform with access to water, forests and other resources, in order to increase visibility and impact • Women's rights in particular need to be placed on national policy agenda • Use of multidimensional approach in advocating and implementing land access programs. • ILC can support the use of ICT in land access and land development initiatives • At the community level, land access campaigns can be linked to sustainable agriculture, an area in which many successes exist (thus "ILC" can also stand for "Integrating Livelihood Concerns"). These successful cases need to be documented and publicized, and linked more closely to land rights campaigns. • Continue partnerships of ILC with other NGOs but the partnership should be in framework of longer-term arrangements (e.g., 5-7 years instead of 1-2 years), because of the long-term nature of advocating for change to land and agrarian policies.

Country	Issues/Case Presented	Status and Trends	Gains and Challenges of CSO's Advocacy and Action for Land Access	Recommendations
Cambodia (CNAC, STAR Kampuchea)	Legal and socio-economic frameworks for land access in Cambodia	<p>Government approved new Land Law in 2001, but does not yet have the capacity and resources to implement it. Even to develop this law, it was dependent on foreign-sponsored consultants.</p> <p>Other key trends include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land grabbing by more powerful people or institutions, including for non-agricultural uses (contributing to land use change). • High involvement by military, provincial officials in cases of land expropriation. • Landlessness is 21% among female-headed HHs. • Indigenous peoples' communities facing increasing human rights emergency, losing access to forest lands and resources linked to livelihood and cultural identify. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are land laws in place and regulation of state lands, but potential for effective implementation is limited by authoritarian structure that is in place. Without broader democratic reform, change to • National commission on land disputes has been established; but civil society groups are not participating, because of concerns that the government will exploit this mechanism. • There is a stark power imbalance between government on one hand, and civil society and community groups on the other. Role of military is crucial in addressing land-related problems. • International agencies may be in position to mediate this power imbalance – there is funding support from WB and other agencies, e.g., for Land Management and Land Tenure improvement - but in the end tend to support implementation of projects, even if negative consequences (e.g., deforestation) become known. • Social concession policy (i.e., land distributed to landless, instead of being made available for commercial investment) was written into land laws, but potential for implementation for real effect still a question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to generate political will to provide land access to the landless farmers. Government should also be pushed to work with NGOs in terms of increasing community participation and public awareness about the new land policies. • There is a need for CSO and NGO cooperation, e.g., between NGOs and community-based organizations. • Need to review system of cadastre commissions that has been established • Assist or facilitate multi-agency planning for cooperation on land issues.

Country	Issues/Case Presented	Status and Trends	Gains and Challenges of CSO's Advocacy and Action for Land Access	Recommendations
<p>Indonesia</p> <p>(Bina Desa, KPA, PPSHK, RMI, YTM)</p>	<p>Historical background and recent developments in AR Initiatives in Indonesia; Dayak Rights to NRM; Land Procurement for development projects; roles of women in tenurial conflicts</p>	<p>The Indonesian government failed to implement AR (set forth in 1960 agrarian law) and instead commoditized land and natural resources for sectoral investment and as rewards for military. Current government initially prioritized infrastructure projects over land reform, but is now developing new policies for increased land access in response to strong rural people's movement.</p> <p>Other key trends include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production systems are still largely agricultural or based on natural resources; the country's industrial base is still under-developed. Landlessness and lack of access to natural resources thus remains key challenge in addressing poverty. • Effects of commercial globalization have been P increase in inputs, P decrease in agricultural products and increase in resource depletion. This has hit poor farmers, landless and fishers the hardest. • A weak and overlapping institutional framework allows sectoral interests to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial investment, e.g., palm oil plantations, is not only creating land loss but also contributing to conflict and related HR violations, e.g., loss of cultural rights by indigenous peoples. • There has been an increase in tenurial conflicts in recent years. This not only reflects an increase in number of concessions, but also disputes between different government agencies – administration is split between National Land Agency (about 40% of land area) and Department of Forestry (about 60%) – and non-recognition of local NRM practice and customary rights. The National Land Agency recently created a new committee to address agrarian conflicts. • While there was marginalization of AR effort under the New Order, now there is strong rural movement. Land reform by leverage is possible because of increasing power of farmers' movement and rural peoples' associations, which are now in stronger position to negotiate with government. Recent proposal to revise Basic Agrarian Law, weakening the framework for land distribution, were blocked by popular movement and CSOs. • There is an allocation of 9 million hectares for distribution 60% for farmers, 40% for companies, but the implementation plan is not very transparent or well defined; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen rural mass movements to increase leverage of agrarian reform movement • Protect and increase understanding of the diversity of local tenure systems that exist in Indonesia. There should be cooperation among women, youth, and indigenous peoples for collective action around communal rights. • Carry out international campaigns for land issue in behalf of Indonesia. • Find alternative markets with ecological labels in other countries, especially with Asian neighbors. • Increasing understanding of women's rights to land and resources, not only among women but also male community leaders, local government and other key institutions. • Identify alternative approaches to economic development that are based on secure rights to land and resources by people and communities, not on commercial exploitation. • Increase exchange of information and lessons across countries, via both organizational and people-to-people exchanges.

		<p>dictate actual land access; 43% landless rate reflects this. Decision-making remains largely centralized.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been an increase in rural food insecurity, despite the green revolution, because these underlying structural problems were never addressed. • Land and sectoral NRM policies have resulted in massive deforestation, and prioritized commercial exploitation over the rights of the indigenous peoples (e.g., Dayak communities) to their ancestral land. • Now with decentralization underway, there are incentives for regional authorities to solicit commercial NR-based investments (e.g., forestry, plantation sector) to generate local revenues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In late 2006 the government announced 8.15 million hectares would be distributed to farmers via land reform program. But there remains a tendency of the government to favor infrastructure and energy-related initiatives in land use and access, reflected by 2005 regulation on takings (No 36/2005). • Women's participation is still curtailed by traditional beliefs, depriving agrarian implementation and NRM of the benefits of gendered knowledge and gendered participation. Women's access to land and natural resources is under threat. • Indonesia's ecological- and biodiversity, and its ethno-cultural diversity, makes land tenure a multi-dimensional issue – this diversity in local contexts is what has created the many different local tenure systems that exist. Documentation of these systems and accompanying NRM practices is increasing. 	
--	--	---	---	--

Country	Issues/Case Presented	Status and Trends	Gains and Challenges of CSO's Advocacy and Action for Land Access	Recommendations
<p>Philippines</p> <p>(AR Now!, CARRD, FFF, Pakisama, PAFID)</p>	<p>CARP 2008 and Beyond, Land Reform in the Philippines- the FFF Experience, Case Studies of PAKISAMA and CARRD Campaign for Agrarian Reform</p>	<p>CARP, after 20 years, has only achieved 75% of its targets for land distribution, and less than half of participating farmers are receiving adequate support services. Despite this, the current government's priority is to develop growth zone areas instead of pursuing AR further.</p> <p>Other trends include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing number of cases of land reconsolidation via leaseback, sectoral policies (e.g., mining) that are contrary to AR principles. • Corruption and confusion in land acquisition remains; involvement of multiple government agencies poses a challenge. • Farmers organizations, networks and federations (e.g., PAKISAMA, FFF, CARRD) are active in AR campaigns and implementation • Indigenous peoples' communities now have IPRA law as basis for claims and management of ancestral domains 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are already 2.12 million agrarian reform beneficiaries, but only a minority receives full benefit of comprehensive agrarian reform benefits. Only 41 % of all farmers who have received AR lands are part of ARCs (state-supported agrarian reform communities); 27% are receiving support services funded through ODA. • There is a challenge to keep reformed lands in the hands of the farmers, especially those without support services; many are enticed by lucrative offers to sell, despite 10-year sales ban under CARP. An estimated 20% of land distributed is being pawned or resold, via loan sharks and other local systems. • Without a comprehensive land use policy, there is much unplanned land use change, including taking out of agricultural uses. • Thousands of agrarian dispute cases remain unresolved, including many involving violence and HR-violations; land access and local power dynamics remain closely linked. • In uplands areas, indigenous peoples' communities are losing access to forests because they lack titles, despite the provisions of IPRA. In this context, people or commercial interests with more physical power are able to gain control over IP lands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document and promote agrarian reform cases that show success • Progressive taxation to discourage idle and abandoned lands. • Policy advocacy, particularly to extend funding for AR at least through completion of CARP. • Review of leaseback, SDO and VLT agreements • Increased participation by rural communities at all levels; paralegal assistance and capacity-building for people's organizations involved in land issues. • Democratize the allocation of support services; capacity-building and improved coordination / cooperation among institutions involved. • Share international studies, and engage governments, in land issues. • Collaboration on technical aspects of policy research

