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Introduction

This report presents what constituents of the International Land Coalition (ILC) say about the performance of its network and the value that they get from participating in it.

In 2009, a group of 9 transnational social change networks worked with iScale and Keystone to conduct a comparative survey of all their constituents. The same survey instrument was simultaneously administered to their constituents all over the world. In 2012 and 2014, ILC decided to repeat the same survey as they had grown significantly from 84 members in 2009, to 116 in 2012 and 152 in 2014. In this report we present the results of the 2014 survey in comparison to those of the 2012 and 2009 survey.

This survey is not an evaluation. Rather, it holds up a mirror to show ILC how its constituents see its performance. It provides ILC with information for deliberation and dialogue with constituents, in order to identify specific opportunities for improvement.

The process provides two ways to help interpret the data:

- comparative analysis, showing how ILC’s performance has varied in the last 5 years. This makes it easier to identify areas of relatively strong and weak performance, and pinpoint potential areas for improvement.
- ILC may continue to use the data to identify priority areas where it wants to see improvement over the next couple of years and measure progress by repeating the survey again in the future.

Constituents’ responses are grouped into six separate sections as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>Feedback areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure and function of the network</td>
<td>Network model, support or active agent function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of relationships with the network’s bodies</td>
<td>Meeting constituents’ needs, quality of communications, responsiveness to feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network vibrancy</td>
<td>New relationships established, their value, adequacy of network’s size and diversity, extent of participation in the network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of synergy within the network</td>
<td>Sharing of common interests and concerns, participation in network’s strategy and decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value added for constituents</td>
<td>Network effectiveness, meeting of expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network’s impact</td>
<td>Impact on constituents’ work, influence in the field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constituents’ perceptions should be interpreted in light of your network’s unique strategy and priorities.

- The survey covers many areas in which constituents’ perceptions may be very important to ILC
- Low ratings in an area that is not central to ILC’s strategy may not be a concern.

At the end of this report we have included a series of conclusions and points for follow-up.

- Annex 1 includes the responses given to a set of customised questions. For those questions that were also used in the 2009 and 2012 questionnaires, a crosstime comparison is provided.
- Annex 2 includes all the raw data for the 2014 survey. Responses given to the open ended questions of the survey have been edited to protect the anonymity of respondents.
- Annex 3 is the questionnaire that was used for the survey.
Introduction

Methodology

In this survey, data was collected through an anonymous questionnaire independently administered by Keystone in October 2014.1

ILC was asked to supply the names and contact details of all its current constituents, defined as:
- Organisations and individuals
- that consider themselves to be part of the network; and
- for which email contact details are available.

The survey was conducted using an interactive pdf format that could be filled in offline and sent as an email attachment.

The survey questionnaire was for the most part identical to the one used for the 2009 and 2012 survey. Some new variables were added in 2012, for which no comparisons to the 2009 results are provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2 RESPONSE RATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILC 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILC 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILC 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2014 ILC questionnaire was administered in 3 languages - English, French and Spanish - and it was received by 980 individuals, which represented 213 constituent organisations (150 member, 55 partner and 8 donor organisations). 63 responses were received which represented 61 organisations who returned either a completed or partially completed questionnaire, representing a response rate of 29%. 65% of the responses were received in English, 25% in Spanish and 10% in French. The 2012 survey percentages were very similar at 58%, 28% and 14%. That same year, 166 individuals were invited which represented 133 different organisations. All 43 responses represented a different organisation. In relation to 2012 the total response rate has decreased by 3%.

54% of 2014 survey respondents report that either they or their organisation participated also in the 2012 survey. 8 of those 33 respondents also participated in the 2009 survey.

It is important to keep in mind that the sample of respondents cannot be considered as representative of the whole membership of ILC. The sample was not designed, rather the questionnaire was sent to all members of ILC who decided if they wanted to participate or not in the survey. Survey results are able however to show general trends within the membership and changes over time.

Answers to open ended questions were coded and quantified when relevant.

1 The design and execution of this feedback survey follows Keystone’s ethical framework for conducting feedback exercises, available here: http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/sites/default/files/Keystone%20ethical%20framework%20Aug09%20web.pdf
Key findings

**FIGURE 1: KEY FINDINGS**

- **How well does the Secretariat meet your needs in general?**
- **Value of new relationships Index**
- **Synergy Index**
- **Participation has met expectations**
- **General impact on constituents’ work**
Key findings

This dashboard shows constituents’ satisfaction ratings for five key areas of network performance. Each one converts responses to a number of questions into a single rating of 0 to 20.

- On average, respondents give ILC a rating of 16 out of 20 for how well the Secretariat meets their needs in general. This rating is significantly higher than the one received in the 2012 and 2009 surveys.

  “The ILC’s Secretariat staff are very effective in response to our urgent needs.”

- The overall value of relationships established as a result of participating in ILC is rated 12 out of 20. This is a lower rating than in 2012.

  “The ILC should encourage deeper relationships between the partner institutions as well as foster greater involvement in thematic groups”

- The level of synergy (sharing of common interests, similar concerns and participating in the network’s strategy) within the ILC network is rated 17 out of 20. This is a slightly higher rating than in 2012.

  “We have little experience within the platform, but we noticed high levels of participation and democracy for decision making. We hope to be more active in discussions and dialogues against decisions.”

- Respondents give a rating of 15.5 out of 20 on the extent to which their participation in the ILC network has met their expectations. This is a significantly higher rating than in 2012.

  “The value derived by my organisation in participating in ILC events or activities are learning exchanges and new ideas on how to tackle challenges in the land sector which are often not unique from experiences in other parts of the world or regions.”

- In terms of general impact on constituents’ work, respondents give ILC a score of 14 out of 20. This rating is higher than 2012.

  “Membership with ILC has promoted partnership/alliance building, knowledge generation for learning and new advocacy strategies for addressing the needs of the beneficiaries of our work.”

In summary, ILC’s constituents rate the value they get from ILC higher than in the 2012 survey, in four out of five major areas of satisfaction. While this is a significant improvement from its 2009 scores, in various aspects there is still scope for improving the value that members gain from their involvement in the network.
Respondents’ profile

- We asked respondents 5 questions on their profile (type of organisation, position in the organisation, type and length of relationship with ILC and country of work).
- 60% of respondents are in the civil society organisation category. This category includes non-governmental organisations, women’s associations, farmers’ organisations, and community based organisations. 13% percent of respondents are at academic institutions, research teams or think tanks. There are also 8% that are funders, grantmakers or foundations.
- 27% of respondents hold the position of Executive Director in their organisation; about 29% are Managers or Team leaders and 25% are Officers or Researchers. Other positions mentioned by respondents are advisor and lawyer.
- As shown above, the majority of respondents (66%) are ILC members; 50% are currently implementing or have in the past implemented a project/initiative with ILC; and, 21% receive funding from ILC. Another 23% is made up of organisations that provide funding to ILC or have some other type of collaboration with the network. In the 2014 survey, there was a significantly higher proportion of respondents identifying themselves as implementing partners than in 2012. These values were in response to the question on “I am/my organisation is implementing a project/programme/initiative in partnership with the ILC.”
- 35% have been part of ILC for three years or less, 14% from 3 to 5 years and 40% for more than 5 years.
- The largest concentrations of respondents are in Africa (28%), Europe (25%) and Latin America and the Caribbean (23%). There are 8% of respondents in South-Eastern Asia and South Asia respectively.

2 Countries were grouped following the UN macro regions categorisation: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm.
Section 1
Structure and function of the ILC network
Structure and function of the ILC network

Unlike previous years, respondents’ perceptions about the structure of the network were not as dispersed.

Almost half (48%) of respondents see ILC as a network that has a clear centre but with interactions that don’t always go through it. In relation to previous years, perceptions of respondents are of a less centralised network with only 10% choosing the Hub & Spoke model and 22% considering it to be decentralised.

It is worth noticing, that 80% of the Asian respondents perceived the ILC as a decentralised network - Multi-hub model and many newer members between 1 to 3 years of membership perceived the ILC as a centralised network.
Structure and function of the ILC network

- On average, respondents rated their perception of how much ILC’s role is to support its constituents in performing certain activities at 3.8 out of 5. 81% of respondents feel that ILC’s role should be to support its constituents in performing activities (average rating of 4.2 out of 5).

- The rating given on whether its current role is to be an active agent undertaking activities on behalf of its members was 3.3 out of 5. This equates to about 50% of respondents stating that the ILC is currently an active agent. 57% percent of respondents feel that ILC’s role should be to be an active agent on their behalf (average rating of 3.5 out of 5).

- It is interesting to note that in relation to 2012, ILC’s support role seems to be reinforced while there is less focus on its role as an active agent. It also seems that ILC has been able to close the gap between what its role should be and actually is as a supporter of its members.

- South Asian respondents tend to perceive more the ILC’s role as a supporter, while significantly more respondents from Latin America and the Caribbean feel that the ILC should be to support its members. Africans tend to feel that the ILC is not at all an active agent.
Section 2
Quality of relationships with ILC’s Secretariat
Quality of relationships with ILC’s Secretariat

On average, respondents give ILC a rating of 3.9 out of 5 for how well the Secretariat meets their needs in general.

The next chart analyses respondents’ satisfaction with the Secretariat in more detail.
Quality of relationships with ILC’s Secretariat

In 8 out of 9 areas ILC is rated above its 2012 scores. The highest rated areas are the provision of timely information on network events and a timely response to queries (4.3 and 4.2 out of 5). The following percentages of respondents feel that ILC’s Secretariat meets these needs either “well” or “very well”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timely information on network events</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely information on the network’s results</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick response to queries</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative follow up</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of high quality, relevant services</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of high quality, relevant coordination</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling transparent and efficient flow of information</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating contacts between constituents</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating contacts with key allies or policy makers</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality of relationships with ILC’s Secretariat

Asked about the quality (i.e. timeliness, openness, relevance, accuracy) of communications that they have with the Secretariat, respondents give ILC an average rating of 3.7 out of 5. This rating is slightly below the one given by respondents in 2012.

- 48% of respondents give it a high or very high rating.
Quality of relationships with ILC’s Secretariat

- Respondents give the Secretariat a rating of 3.8 out of 5. This is an improvement on the ILC’s score. The highest rating was given by respondents in Africa with an average of 4.5.
- We also asked questions about the quality of communications and improvement on the basis of feedback about other bodies within the network (governance boards, councils, committees and task/theme related workgroups or committees). For the quality of communications the average score given was 3.3 while 21% of respondents chose the “Don’t know” option (up from 9% in 2012). Respondents in Africa provided a significantly lower score at an average of 2.7.
- The quality of communications within regional coordination units was rated at 3.9 a significant improvement from the score obtained (3.1) in 2012 when the question was introduced. The highest rating was found in South Eastern Asia with an average score of 4.2. The lowest score was found in Africa with an average of 2.9.
Quality of relationships with ILC’s Secretariat

About half (52%) of comments made by respondents regarding the quality of their relationships with the network’s bodies make suggestions for improvement and 19% identify problems. Illustrative examples include:

“There is a need to increase the frequency and quality of interaction between [our organisation], ILC Secretariat and the ILC Regional Coordination Units for strengthening country level engagement.”

“The ILC’s Secretariat staff are very effective in response to our urgent needs.”

“My impression is that the council is rather heterogeneous in terms of engagement and capacity and might need to work on that, for instance with the help of facilitators.”

3 The quantitative analysis of comments provided by respondents is based on the coding of their responses. Hence, percentages presented here should not be seen as precise measurements but rather as providing a reliable general indication.
Section 3
Network vibrancy
The “Value of new relationships Index” summarises the value that respondents give to the new relationships that they have established with different kinds of actors as a result of participating in ILC’s network.

Respondents’ overall value of relationships established was rated 3 out of 5. This result has decreased in relation to 2012.
Network vibrancy

**Figure 10A: Value of Relationships by Type of Organisation**

**With CSOs**
- 2014: 5% no relationships established, 10% not or rarely valuable, 84% at least half or more valuable
- 2012: 12% no relationships established, 7% not or rarely valuable, 81% at least half or more valuable
- 2009: 3% no relationships established, 25% not or rarely valuable, 72% at least half or more valuable

**With Academic Institutions/Think Tanks**
- 2014: 18% no relationships established, 20% not or rarely valuable, 62% at least half or more valuable
- 2012: 29% no relationships established, 10% not or rarely valuable, 61% at least half or more valuable
- 2009: 17% no relationships established, 33% not or rarely valuable, 49% at least half or more valuable

**With Regional or International Intergovernmental Organisations**
- 2014: 19% no relationships established, 25% not or rarely valuable, 56% at least half or more valuable
- 2012: 29% no relationships established, 13% not or rarely valuable, 58% at least half or more valuable
- 2009: 25% no relationships established, 28% not or rarely valuable, 47% at least half or more valuable

**With National Governments**
- 2014: 36% no relationships established, 27% not or rarely valuable, 37% at least half or more valuable
- 2012: 33% no relationships established, 14% not or rarely valuable, 52% at least half or more valuable
- 2009: 40% no relationships established, 31% not or rarely valuable, 29% at least half or more valuable

Legend:
- Blue: No relationships established
- Green: Not or rarely valuable
- Yellow: At least half or more valuable

**Comprehensive Survey Report: International Land Coalition 2012**
Network vibrancy

**FIGURE 10B: VALUE OF RELATIONSHIPS BY TYPE OF ORGANISATION**

**With funders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No relationships established</th>
<th>Not or rarely valuable</th>
<th>At least half or more valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With independent consultants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No relationships established</th>
<th>Not or rarely valuable</th>
<th>At least half or more valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With local or sub-national authorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No relationships established</th>
<th>Not or rarely valuable</th>
<th>At least half or more valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With private sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No relationships established</th>
<th>Not or rarely valuable</th>
<th>At least half or more valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Blue: No relationships established
- Green: Not or rarely valuable
- Yellow: At least half or more valuable
Network vibrancy

- As a result of their participation in the ILC network, constituents find their relationships with CSOs to be largely valuable (84%).
- Ratings regarding the value of relationships with the private sector have shifted with a large majority of respondents having made no new relationships.
- Again, most commonly relationships were initiated by respondents meeting each other at an event organised by ILC (average of 21%).
- On average 31% (35% in 2012) of respondents claimed not to have created relationships with the type of organisations listed in the questionnaire.
- Further analysis shows a correlation between the type of respondent and the value of the relationship initiated by the ILC. Interestingly, CSOs often found relationships with funders not very valuable whereas International NGOs primarily found them of high value.
Network vibrancy

The adequacy of the diversity and the size of the ILC network are rated 4.2 and 4.1 out of 5 respectively. These are the highest scores achieved by the ILC between the 3 iterations of the survey.
Network vibrancy

58% of respondents consider themselves as being active or very active participants in the ILC network, while 19% see themselves as not or rarely active. In relation to 2012, while there was a slight improvement in the amount of active members, there was a significant increase in the amount of non and rarely active members.
Network vibrancy

In this section, 45% of comments received are suggestions for improvement and 21% are positive. Some illustrative examples of comments are:

“The ILC should encourage deeper relationships between the partner institutions as well as foster greater involvement in thematic groups.”

“The ILC has taken a lead role in fostering partnerships amongst organisations especially with formation of thematic work groups and sub-regional committees. ILC has also supported lead organisations in implementing different activities/projects.”

“We have little experience within the platform, but we noticed high levels of participation and democracy for decision making. We hope to be more active in discussions and dialogues against decisions.”
Section 4

Level of synergy within the ILC network
Level of synergy within the ILC network

**Figure 14: Synergy in the Network**

- **Share Common Interests**
  - ILC 2014: 4.4
  - ILC 2012: 4.4
  - ILC 2009: 3.9

- **Participate in Strategy**
  - ILC 2014: 3.7
  - ILC 2012: 3.6
  - ILC 2009: 3.2

- **Share Similar Issues and Concerns**
  - ILC 2014: 4.3
  - ILC 2012: 4.3
  - ILC 2009: 4.0
Level of synergy within the ILC network

- In this section we asked ILC’s constituents about the level of synergy in the network, and specifically about the extent to which constituents share common interests with the network, participate in its strategy and have similar issues and concerns with other participants. ILC is rated 4.4, 3.7 and 4.3 in these three areas.
- ILC, in two of the three areas, performed better than 2012. These scores are a significant improvement from those achieved in the first survey in 2009.
- Survey respondents who were in academia felt they had the most synergies within the network because the members shared common interests. Asian respondents and funders also felt more that network members faced similar issues.
- When rating the most important moments during which the ILC advances and builds its common vision, respondents rated declarations and decisions of Regional Assemblies and of the Steering Committee as the most important followed closely by Coalition Council meeting decisions. This contrasts with 2012 results in which declarations of the Assembly of Members was followed by declarations and decisions of Regional Assemblies in importance.
7% of respondents feel that either most or all key decisions are made by the Secretariat; another 27% that decisions are equally distributed between the Secretariat and being constituent driven and 65% that either most or all key decisions are constituent driven. In 2012 the percentage of respondents considering that decisions are mainly constituent driven was 40%.

Those that have been members over 5 years as well as all Asian respondents feel that decisions are made in a more participatory way with average ratings of 3.8 and 4.2.

Half of the comments received in this section make suggestions for improvement, 40% are positive and none are negative. Some illustrative examples of comments are:

“Synergy occurs if work is done with specific and clear leadership in network activities. The generation of trust is key and that should play a key role. They must be convinced that belonging to a network powers what you do individually, and that what you accomplish as part of the network you would not be able to achieve individually. Without this clear concept, it is not possible to talk of synergy and much less of an articulated work.”

“We have little experience within the platform, but we noticed high levels of participation and democracy for decision making. We hope to be more active in discussions and dialogues against decisions.”

“The establishment of the African Regional Coordination office is going to instantly deliver in terms of mobilisation, organisation and coordination for a stronger voice and space in the demand for good land governance.”
Section 5
Value added for constituents
Value added for constituents

- Respondents give a rating of 3.9 out of 5 on the extent to which their participation in the ILC network has met their expectations.
- 69% of respondents say that ILC met their expectations either very much or absolutely, 22% give a medium rating, while 9% say that it didn’t meet their expectations.
- Further analysis shows that respondents who have been members for less than a year gave a significantly lower rating at an average of 2.5 whereas those who have been members for over 5 years gave a significantly higher rating at an average of 4.1. Similarly, CSOs and members in academia believed that the ILC met or exceeded their expectations with averages of 4 and 3.8 respectively.
The graph shows the average ratings given by respondents on ILC’s performance in a series of areas in relation to ILC’s effectiveness.

In 6 out of 9 areas ILC receives higher ratings than in 2012. These differences are somewhat significant in the areas of ‘partnership facilitation’, ‘knowledge sharing’, ‘financial support’, and ‘enhancing resource-mobilisation capacities’.

Respondents report that ILC is either “very” or “extremely” effective in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating networking and brokering partnerships between constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating advocacy actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating new knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating knowledge sharing between constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing technical assistance and capacity building to constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing financial support to constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting its constituents in furthering their goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the work of constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing constituents’ capacity to mobilise resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Value added for constituents

- ILC’s ratings in these areas (3.8 out of 5) are significantly higher than the prior two surveys.
- The only areas in which ILC scores below average are knowledge creation, technical assistance and support in furthering goals.

In this section 68% of the comments received are positive, and 23% make suggestions for improvements, while 9% express dissatisfaction. Illustrative examples of comments include:

“The value derived by my organisation in participating in ILC events or activities are learning exchanges and new ideas on how to tackle challenges in the land sector which are often not unique from experiences in other parts of the world or regions”.

“To us, ILC provides important sources of information and helps us to build our own competence and positions on the subject matters.”

“ILC could add more value to [country] or other countries on land governance issues by addressing at the UN’s conferences or ASEAN Conferences.”
Section 6
The impact of the International Land Coalition
In terms of general impact on constituents’ work, respondents give ILC a score of 3.6 out of 5, giving it the highest score in 5 years.
The impact of the International Land Coalition

The graph shows the average ratings given by respondents on ILC’s impact on a series of areas relative to the work of its constituents.

In relation to previous years, ILC was given higher ratings in all areas except for impact on visibility and ideas in which it scored slightly lower than 2012.

It is worth noticing that African respondents as well as CSOs expressed significantly higher scores for general impact. Respondents who have been members between 1 and 3 years expressed significantly lower scores for impact on strategy.

The following percentages of respondents feel that ILC has had either a “big” or “massive” positive impact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On their capacity</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their strategies</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the way they work and their practices</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the visibility of their work</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the reach of their work</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the sources of knowledge that they have available for their work</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their ideas and the way they communicate them</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their values and the way they apply them</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like in 2012, across all areas, an average of 9% (9% in 2012) of respondents said that their participation in ILC has had “no positive or negative impact at all” on their work.
The impact of the International Land Coalition

ILC receives an average rating of 4.1 out of 5 in its perception by respondents as a major influencer in its area of work. This rating is slightly higher than the one received in 2012.

ILC is seen as a major influencer in its area of work by 65% of respondents (25% give it a neutral rating in this area and 11% feel it isn’t a major influencer).

African respondents give a significantly higher rating than the rest (4.8). The lowest scores are primarily provided by respondents in Latin America and the Caribbean.

In this section, more than half of comments are positive, the rest are suggestions about improving the network’s impact, including a few that express respondents’ dissatisfaction with the impacts of the network. Some illustrative examples of comments are:

“Membership with ILC has promoted partnership/alliance building, knowledge generation for learning and new advocacy strategies for addressing the needs of the beneficiaries of our work.”

“ILC has promoted the visibility of our organisation and work in general especially after organizing for the successful Indigenous Peoples’ Conference in Africa.”

“In the advocacy for increasing women’s land rights and gender equality in land, the partnership with ILC had been very positive. Other areas for improvement are: a) other tools that are in development or for implementation b) emerging themes c) regional and country level engagement of civil society organisations”
“So far all we received from ILC were reports and briefs. While they may be useful to some members, they provided no answers to the problems our poor farmers face. Some areas which could conduct to a greater impact are: assist with resources for education of poor farmers about their rights and ways to further them, education of governments on how to counter land grabbing and land degradation promoted by corrupt officials, greedy transnational and national companies and personalities, supporting legal assistance to some real life poor farmer whose land related rights are endangered, helping in development of international guidance on land tenure issues, etc.”
Section 7

Conclusions
Conclusions

The findings from this survey present independently gathered data about the value that ILC’s members and other constituents gain from participating in ILC’s network. They are a basis for deliberation and dialogue with constituents in views of driving improvements in the network. The feedback from this survey provides an opportunity for ILC to discuss these issues with its constituents and consider how it can improve the value generated by its network.

Our analysis is based exclusively on the survey data collected. As stated in the introduction, this data cannot be treated as representative of the whole of the ILC membership. Differences between ratings given to ILC in 2009, 2012 and those given in 2014 may be due to a number of reasons. Certainly, in some cases they are due to specific effort and focus produced by ILC after the 2012 and 2009 results. In other cases, they will be related to the specific characteristics of the sample of respondents that took part in each survey. It is up to ILC to deepen this analysis by bringing in elements such as investments produced in certain areas since 2012, variations in the context that affect ILC’s work or specific events that took place in the last 2 years and affect membership. This analysis should be enriched by open conversations with members and other constituents on the survey results.

The findings from this survey suggest that ILC is meeting constituents’ expectations in general, although there is still significant room for improvement.

General recommendations

Our general recommendations do not vary a lot from those provided in previous years. We suggest that ILC could:

- Report this survey’s findings back to its constituents, along with initial responses to the feedback received. This could be done via its website, newsletter and/or at the next members’ assembly.
- Identify specific actions for improvements, guided by the highest priority findings in this report. We suggest this might include increasing discussion and clarity around the role of the Secretariat and regional platforms of the network.
- Continue to monitor progress in the areas requiring improvement, by repeating the survey in 2 years’ time.
- Consider other ways for collecting feedback, triggered by specific events or interactions with constituents that would be useful for monitoring performance. For instance, ILC could ask constituents a few short questions at the end of a meeting or through its newsletter. This sort of data collection - using a carefully designed mechanism ensuring independence and anonymity - would provide ILC with actionable, real time data.
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Recommendations: Structure and function of the network

The ILC network is seen by most respondents as having mainly a clear centre but with interactions that may or not go through it. However, the tendency for Asian respondents to perceive a more decentralised structure should be investigated for identifying how different ways of engaging with the network affect outcomes for constituents. Additionally, there is a contrast in the perception of ILCs role between regions and membership lengths.

We suggest that the ILC could:
- Further focus on certain regions and their reasons behind their perception of the network structure.
- Investigate a different level and type of support for long-term members.

Recommendations: Quality of relationships with the network’s bodies

While the ILC has generally improved on its quality of relationships, more attention needs to be paid to the regional bodies as many expressed a disconnect not only between the regions but also within. In particular, there were mentions of a need for a separate Caribbean region due to the lack of communication between them and Latin America.

We suggest that the ILC could:
- Work on the Secretariat’s ability to connect members with policy makers and other constituents.
- Investigate the need for a separate English speaking regional body in the Caribbean.

Recommendations: Network vibrancy

The ILC respondents gave a significantly lower score for the value of relationships for all partner types except CSOs. The largest difference is seen in the lack of value found when building relationships with the private sector and between certain members and funders.

We suggest that the ILC could:
- Develop innovative partnership strategies with the private sector to increase their value to members.
- Determine the needs of International NGO members as there is a high value found in the relationships established with funders.
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Recommendations: Level of synergy within the network

The greatest improvements were seen within the amount of constituents who know how key decisions are made.

We suggest that the ILC could:

- Pay particular attention to whether constituents feel that they can share similar issues and concerns with others. In particular, Caribbean members may feel disassociated from the larger Spanish speaking Latin American region and may not feel connected to the group. Additionally, member’s perceptions of the network model may mean that each spoke is disconnected.

Recommendations: Value added for constituents

Our findings show that constituents have indeed found much more value added to being a member of the ILC than in previous years. The most value was found among those who have been members between 3 and over 5 years and those members in academia.

We suggest that the ILC could:

- Ensure that additional attention is paid to newer members who may find it hard to navigate the network’s resources.
- Work with CSOs to ensure that they are receiving an adequate level of support.

Recommendations: Network’s impact

The ILC has increased its network’s impact significantly from both the 2009 and 2012 surveys. However, further attention should be paid to the network’s impact on the member’s visibility and idea generation.

We suggest that the ILC could:

- Increase its efforts in regards to its impact on member visibility and idea generation as those scores have decreased slightly from 2012.
- Provide additional support to newer members in regards to the network’s impact on their strategy, practices, knowledge creation and overall value as this group consistently provided lower scores for all categories.
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