the
**TENURE
FACILITY**

FOURTH LEARNING EXCHANGE REPORT[1]

OCTOBER 1, 2017

SCANDIC CONTINENTAL

Stockholm, Sweden

---

[1] Based on notes compiled during the Learning Exchange - see Annex 5, and a summary report prepared by

Learning Event facilitator Alicia Korten, The Culture Company.

Learning Exchange Objectives

The Fourth Tenure Facility (TF) Learning Exchange was held in Stockholm, Sweden, on October 1, 2017. The agenda can be found in Annex 1.

The meeting was designed to generate recommendations for refining the Tenure Facility's Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) system, to be shared with the Tenure Facility (TF) Board on October 2, 2017. The meeting also provided an opportunity to celebrate the achievements of the Tenure Facility and the pilot initiatives, and prepare participants[2] for the launch of the Tenure Facility at Sida Headquarters on October 3, 2017.

Grounding the Learning Exchange Conversation

Each country delegation updated the group on their recent challenges and achievements. This grounded the discussions with respect to monitoring and evaluation experiences during the pilot projects, and built on the group´s continuing conversations about the pilot experiences during the previous three Learning Exchanges (February 2016, October 2016, February 2017). Summaries of the country pilot teams´ presentations can be found in Annex 3.

Learning from Different Perspectives

As donor representatives stressed in the First Learning Exchange (London, February 2016), agreement on what is meant by "secure tenure" is essential for communicating the TF´s mission and niche, and for measuring progress toward achieving the TF´s objectives. In the First Learning Exchange, the pilot country delegations rejected the MEL framework proposed by expert consultants and challenged the Tenure Facility to develop an MEL framework that met their needs as well as donor needs.

---

[2] Annex 4 contains the list of participants.

Recalling that challenge, and seeking to continue to build an improved MEL system grounded in lessons from the pilot experiences, the TF secretariat experience, and the donor "milestone process", this Learning Exchange explored two broad questions:

- What is the definition of secure tenure, and what are the main strategies being used for achieving secure tenure?

- How can the TF MEL system and the five TF MEL tools be improved to capture and measure advances toward achieving secure tenure?

> **The Five MEL Tools Piloted**
> - Country focal points
> - Semiannual learning exchanges
> - Periodic facilitated reflection and learning visits
> - Narrative grant reports
> - Amplifying partners' communications

Three separate Working Groups addressed these key questions from three different perspectives. Group 1 was comprised of pilot teams from Indonesia, Peru and Panama, where pilots focused on advancing the tenure security of Indigenous Peoples. Group 2 was comprised of pilot teams from Mali, Liberia and Cameroon, where pilots focused on advancing the tenure security of local communities. Group 3 was comprised of donor representatives and international consultants. Guidance to the Working Groups can be found in Annex 2.

After their working sessions, each Working Group presented its conclusions about what is needed for an effective MEL system that would both facilitate learning and track progress toward tenure security for Indigenous Peoples and local communities. A plenary discussion followed.

Highlights from that discussion in Working Groups and plenary are summarized below.

What is Tenure Security?

Rights for Whom?

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities. Those who live on and have a special cultural and historical attachment to land are most dependent on the land. They are usually the most vulnerable stakeholders.

Rights Holders vs. Stakeholders. When their lands are ancestral, communities hold prior rights that make them different from other stakeholders.

Self-Identification. Self-identification is the essential foundation for establishing the territorial rights of Indigenous Peoples[3] , and self-identification by communities is an essential element of processes for securing local communities´ tenure rights.

Why Tenure Security?

Tenure Security as Life. Livelihoods and cultural, social and spiritual meaning rest on land tenure security for Indigenous Peoples and local communities. As noted by one Indigenous leader, "Tenure security is life."

Peace and Stability. Recognizing community land rights through negotiation and consensus-building contributes to national peace and stability. Clear land rights for communities reduces migration and national conflict—which are often fueled by disputes over land.

Sustainability. Indigenous Peoples and local communities have proven they are more likely to steward land in ways that allow its sustainable use over time. Studies show that large areas of

---

[3] ILO 169, UNDRIP

the world's remaining forests are in places where Indigenous Peoples and local communities have strong organizational capacity and clear land title.

What Is Tenure Security?

Integrated Vision. Tenure security for Indigenous Peoples and local communities means secure rights to the land in all its dimensions: surface, subsoil, forests, water, minerals and other natural resources.

More than a Title. While a title is often the starting point for achieving respect and recognition, social and economic wellbeing ("*buen vivir*") and self-determination, tenure security is achieved by successful, long-term defense of tenure rights through political organization, legal actions, and economic development.

Organizational Strength. An important factor for assessing tenure security is the strength of grassroots-based organizations that represent Indigenous Peoples and local communities. To advance, secure and defend their land tenure, grassroots-based organizations must be able to effectively build consensus within their communities, address conflicts, and represent and articulate their needs in local, national and international arenas.

The strength of grassroots-based organizations[4] can be measured by two primary factors:

- Do the grassroots-based organizations have deep roots and accountabilities to the Indigenous Peoples and/or local communities they represent? Such ties ensure that the real needs and aspirations of communities are being served.
- Do grassroots-based organizations have alliances to national and international partners, and use platforms to interface with relevant decision-makers (governments, donors etc.)? Such alliances can accelerate the advancement of tenure rights.

---

[4] "Grassroots-based organization" is used as a term that covers the full range of organizations from local community Assemblies and Councils of Elders up to the subnational, national and international federations -- each level organizing themselves in accord with their cultural and legal contexts. Effective international and national federations have a strong base in local organizations, because a strong grassroots base gives these organizations legitimacy at all levels.

"Secure Tenure" (Noun) or "Securing Tenure" (Verb). Participants argued that rather than focusing on "secure tenure" (noun) as a condition or outcome that either exists or does not exist, it is more accurate to think of it as a process, as denoted by the active term "securing tenure" (verb) which emphasizes the importance of pathways towards tenure security. The emphasis on processes reflects the unique relationship of Indigenous Peoples and local communities to their lands and territory. Participants insisted that the lands that they traditionally occupy are critical to their physical, cultural and spiritual wellbeing. They also underscored that "secure tenure opens the door to economic independence, dignity, and political sovereignty"; hence it is interwoven with a host of cultural, political and historical processes that go far beyond legally recognized tenure rights.

Defined by Context and Community. The precise meaning of tenure and the conditions/pathways that make it secure are greatly dependent on local settings. Participants underscored that secure tenure "is contextual," "politically different in every country," and "means something different to different people." As such, the definition of secure tenure should be "defined by communities themselves."

Building an Effective Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) System

Why an MEL System?

Learning. An MEL system helps country initiatives and their partners learn together. The system should focus on ensuring that country initiatives effectively share challenges and discover how initiatives for securing tenure in other countries that have resolved similar challenges.

Influence and Communication. The Tenure Facility is demonstrating an innovative model for securing land rights. To gain support for this model, it is particularly important that the Tenure Facility communicate effectively why this model is important and what impact it is having. An

effective MEL system will track results that can be communicated to key stakeholders, including communities.

Accountability. Donors, the Tenure Facility, government agencies, and country initiatives all need clear indicators of progress for measuring and communicating their achievements.

What to Monitor?

Unforeseen Results. The MEL system should focus both on planned results and on actual results achieved. In particular, monitoring and reporting unforeseen results should be a key component of the MEL system.

Monitoring for Whom? International and project MEL systems tend to focus on monitoring progress against indicators required by donors. However, country initiatives also need an MEL system that leaders can use to communicate an initiative's concrete benefits to their communities and to their national government — through indicators and cases that are meaningful to communities and governments.

Beyond Hectares. Donor representatives and other participants argued that the Facility's MEL system should not primarily focus on monitoring reduced deforestation and carbon sequestration given that there are many other outcomes of tenure security that Indigenous Peoples, local communities and many donors consider equally or more important (e.g., gender equity, conflict resolution, economic development, political sovereignty, citizen security). Participants recommended more focus on tracking indicators related to these other outcomes. For example, a major factor for ensuring tenure security over time is the strength of Indigenous Peoples´ and local communities´ organizations. As such a future MEL system should capture how initiatives have strengthened organizational capacity and ties between grassroots organizations and communities. In addition, some participants also stressed the importance of assessing the *quality* of tenure secured in terms of what rights, for whom, and how equitable these rights really are.

Quality and Value. An MEL system should monitor not only quantity—such as number of hectares secured or number of events —but also quality. For example, a seemingly small win can set a precedent that opens opportunities for much larger future advances.

How to Construct an MEL System that Monitors Effectively

Unforeseen Positive Results and Spin-offs. The pilot projects generated many unexpected results and spin-offs. One example is the spontaneous peer-to-peer training between geographically-distant local parliaments in Indonesia; another is the progress toward the reunification of the Indigenous Peoples´ movement in Panama. Participants underscored that these spin-offs and unforeseen outcomes are often an initiative's most important achievements.

Reporting these outcomes is fundamental for understanding the real impact of initiatives— contributing to organizational learning, strengthening strategic communication, and identifying opportunities for further work. Capturing these outcomes ensures all relevant stakeholders can articulate and better support the continued advancement of these unintended and positive results.

Instead of simply tracking results against objectives outlined at the beginning of the project, the MEL system should include more open-ended questions that provide flexibility for country initiatives to capture unplanned results. Questions could include:
- What results have you achieved? What unexpected results were achieved?
- What did you learn that was positive and negative from this initiative?

Ways to Track Data. Data identified should be illuminated via both process indicators and stories. Process indicators demonstrate whether the groundwork for strong tenure is being built. Examples of process indicators are:
- What is the level of community participation in events?

- Have internal community governance structures been strengthened to support communities' capacity to collectively make decisions? Please explain.
- Are governments and other external actors reaching out to communities—indicating strengthened community influence? Please provide examples.
- Are tenure conflicts being resolved via traditional means? If so, how?

Telling Stories. Given that securing tenure is a process, participants observed that the MEL system should focus on telling stories about progress toward securing tenure. They underscored that there are many different stories (e.g., national stories, community stories) and that different messengers can tell different stories. Substantiating stories with evidence and photos enhances the strength, credibility and impact of the story.

Avoid Imposing Excessive Burdens. While Learning Exchange participants considered the value of new process indicators, they also warned against an MEL system that places an undue burden on project implementers. Ways to mitigate such workload include:
- Select only a few well-chosen process indicators to track.
- Bring in outsider expert consultants to support the work.
- Find ways to track and frame numerical data for a more compelling story.

Who Monitors? Whose Performance Is Monitored? Consider not only bringing in external people to monitor progress for the Tenure Facility and donors, but also training project implementers and local communities in how to do self-monitoring. In addition, it was suggested that the MEL system should not only help Indigenous and community organizations to monitor project implementation, but also improve their capacity to monitor the government´s actions during project implementation. The performance of different key actors could be measured independently.

Connect to the Bigger Picture. Another issue highlighted was the importance of connecting local impacts to global goals. MEL tools should help project proponents in documenting their

contribution to global efforts on forests, climate, gender, conflicts, poverty, and other issues of local and global importance. In order to do this, participants noted the need to "get indicators right" and "use the monitoring that others are doing more."

The Path Forward

The Learning Exchange closed with participants´ reflections and recommendations with respect to the way forward to guide future TF Learning Exchanges.

1. Take a long-term perspective on learning and sharing knowledge. Objectives could include:

- Learning how to document efforts to both communicate AND to achieve better results.
- Learning from one's own experience and from others to help identify and follow the best pathways for scaling up in particular contexts.
- Learning how to influence and engage stakeholders, including communities, governments and donors.

2. Design future Learning Exchanges around what project leaders want to learn from each other, including the pathways forward for:

- Returning land from Protected Areas to Indigenous Peoples and local communities;
- Returning land from concessions to Indigenous Peoples and local communities;
- Using the TF to strengthen grassroots based organizations and their links to each other;
- Strengthening the agency of Indigenous Peoples and local communities;
- Conflict avoidance, conflict resolution and building consensus;
- Alternative development models to counter the narrative of development through large-scale investments;
- Sustainability after the TF support ends; and
- Collaboration with government.

Annex 1. AGENDA

TENURE FACILITY LEADERS' LEARNING EXCHANGE

1 October 2017
Scandic Continental, 3rd Floor, Conference Rooms 16-17
Stockholm, Sweden

The Learning Exchange objectives are to:

- Celebrate our achievements
- Share updates on The Tenure Facility and the initiatives that piloted TF in six countries
- Guide plans for defining the Tenure Facility's Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL)
- Ensure a shared understanding of the schedule and events for the upcoming week

8:00   Registration, Coffee and Tea

9:00   Welcoming

9:35   Introducing Incoming Executive Director

9:45   News and Updates

10:45   Coffee Break

11:00   Orienting the Discussion on Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL)

11:30   Lunch

**12:30   Discussions in Working Groups on Securing Tenure and MEL
         Directions**

14:00   Coffee Break

14:30   Report Back and Plenary Discussion

16:00   Looking Back – Lessons Learned

16:40   Looking Forward

Annex 2. GUIDANCE TO WORKING GROUPS

I. Guidance for Participants in Working Groups 1 and 2

Group 1 — Indonesia, Panama and Peru delegations
Group 2 — Cameroon, Liberia and Mali delegations

Welcome to your Working Group!

Your discussion will be supported by a *resource person* (Martin Scurrah for Group 1 and Minister David Abouem for Group 2). The resource person will be the chair of the group unless otherwise decided by the group. In addition, in each group there will be a *TF note-taker* and a person responsible for documenting the main points of the discussion on a flip chart (*flip chart note-taker*).

Each working group will first need to select a **reporter** to report back the main outcomes of the discussion to the plenary session.

Your WG discussion will be divided into two sessions, to address two different questions. Each question will be considered for 30 minutes. The two questions that you are asked to address are the following:

Question 1 (with 4 sub-questions)
Defining "secure tenure"
- What is secure tenure for you? What does it mean in your country?
- What are the broader goals, or the bigger picture, that you are trying to achieve by securing tenure?
- What are the main strategies or pathways for securing tenure in your country?
- Is it possible to measure the level of secure tenure and the broader goals? How?

Question 2 (with 5 sub-questions)

How can the MEL system capture stories and results that (a) capture & convey your vision of the results achieved and (b) help you realize futur goals? We want to ensure that the MEL system captures spin-offs and unexpected results important for you, in addition to stories and data required for accurately reporting on hectares secured, emissions reduc etc.
- Who do we need to reach with your stories and results (country initiative leaders, local communities, governments, donors, public, others)?
- What stories and results are valued by each of these stakeholders?
- How do we collect and communicate stories and results that

reflect your vision of results achieved and are valued by stakeholders?
- Five TF MEL tools were piloted by your initiatives (see box below). Considering the previous questions, how can MEL tools be improved to ensure that they are able to document and communicate such stories and results?
- What other MEL tools and approaches should be envisaged and tested?

MEL tools piloted by your initiatives
1. Country focal points
2. Biannual learning exchanges
3. Periodic facilitated reflection and learning visits
4. Narrative grant reports
5. Amplifying partners' communications

II.   Guidance for Participants in Working Group 3

Group 3 — Board Members, Advisory Group Members, and Donor Representatives, and International Consultants

Welcome to your Working Group!

Your discussion will be guided by a ***chair person*** (chosen by the group), and supported by Janis Alcorn as *resource person* and note-taker. The group will also need to select a ***reporter*** to report back the main outcomes of the discussion to the plenary session.

Your WG discussion will be divided into two sessions, to address two different questions. Each question will be considered for 30 minutes. The two questions that you are asked to address are the following:

Question 1 (with 3 sub-questions)

Defining "secure tenure"
- What does secure tenure mean for you as a donor or for you as a TF advisor or Board member?
- How does your understanding of secure tenure affect the strategies and pathways that you expect the TF to use for securing tenure?
- Is it possible to measure progress toward secure tenure? How?

Question 2 (2 parts)

Ensuring TF´s Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) system is capturing the stories and specific results that donors need.

We want to ensure that the TF MEL system captures spin-offs and unexpected results important for donors, in addition to outputs and outcomes (hectares, carbon emissions, etc.) for reporting.

The box below shows the five tools TF has used for M&E to date. We are in the process of assessing the TF MEL system and strengthening it .

Tools used for MEL for gathering and sharing information
 1. Country focal points
 2. Biannual learning exchanges
 3. Periodic facilitated reflection and learning visits
 4. Narrative grant reports
 5. Amplifying partners' communications

Part one — Are you getting the information you need from our (a) reports to donors, (b) responses to specific information requirements from donors, (c) the website, (d) reports from Reflection & Learning visits, and (e) other communications directed to donors? What could be improved?

Part two — What is your recommendation for the best method/s to ensure verifiable measurements of hectares where deforestation has been reduced, and tons of carbon emissions reduction?

Some possible alternatives for assessing and reporting on deforestation and carbon targets
1. TF and RRG take the lead role in defining MRV methods and carrying out the tasks directly.
2. Lead role taken by project implementer in close collaboration with a national entity that has recognized experience in tracking carbon emissions in relation to national governments' carbon emission targets.
3. Development of a partnership with an internationally recognized entity working on climate change and carbon emissions (e.g., Woods Hole Research Center), that would be asked to take the lead role in defining methodology and doing MRV.
4. Monitor by use of more inclusive standards such as the "Landscape Standard" created by VCS, or the "Gold Standard for the Global Goals" developed by Gold Standard.

ANNEX 3. UPDATES BY DELEGATIONS FROM THE TF PILOT PROJECTS

1. Cameroon Presentation

Project Title. Community Mapping for Effective Land-Use Planning: Development of a Common Community Mapping Protocol in Cameroon

Actors. Rainbow Environment Consult (funding recipient)**;** Centre for Environment and Development (CED); Forest People's Programme (FPP); Rainforest Foundation UK (RFUK) (partners)**;** FODER; Cameroon Ecology; CEFAID; APIFED; OKANI; AJESH; CAFT; Canal de Développement (CSO coalition)

Project Start Date & Expected End Date. June 2015 – September 2017

Funding from The Tenure Facility. $750,000

Key Achievements and Updates. The Cameroon country initiative developed, tested and achieved broad support for a standard methodology for participatory community mapping across different ecosystems and cultures. The methodology was tested in twenty-five communities in five regions of the country. Over five hundred women and men helped to develop the protocol, and roughly one hundred have been trained and employed as local cartographers. The initiative's multisector strategic advisory group (which includes government officials, civil society leaders and other important stakeholders) has been instrumental in helping build a national consensus in support of this protocol and has positioned the methodology as a national standard. The work lays important groundwork for explicit recognition of community rights and reduction of land and resource conflicts in Cameroon as the country implements new land use planning. If scaled nationwide, the methodology could secure community rights over more than five million hectares within five years.

2. Indonesia Presentation

Project Title. Accelerating Legal Recognition and Protection of the Tenure Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Indonesia

Actors. Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nustantara (AMAN) (fund recipient); EPISTEMA, SAINS, HuMA (key supporting organizations)

Project Start Date & End Date. May 2015 – September 2017

Funding from The Tenure Facility. $1 million

Key Achievements and Updates. With clear constitutional rights in place with respect to land ownership, the country initiative focused on supporting the drafting and adoption of local regulations to recognize these rights. AMAN assisted legal drafting processes in 32 districts and three provinces. Six district-level regulations and one District Head Decree have already been approved, recognizing community territories covering over 150,000 hectares. Together these seven new regulations could potentially lead to securing tenure rights for 450 indigenous communities over 1.5 million hectares. This innovative model establishes procedures for recognizing indigenous lands and includes recognition of specific territories by embedding community maps directly in the legislation. The scalable model is spreading to other districts and creating bottom-up momentum for national recognition of indigenous rights. The work included support for mapping of 1.7 million hectares—a six-fold increase in the past two years. The work has helped to institutionalize new models for securing land rights throughout Indonesia, including by training more than 220 district-level government officials and civil society representatives in regulatory pathways and in processes for conducting participatory mapping.

3. Liberia Presentation

Project Title. Protecting Customary Collective Community Land Rights in Liberia

Actors. Sustainable Development Institute (SDI); Foundation Community Initiative (FCI); Parley; Development Education Network Liberia; and the Government of Liberia's Interim Land Task Force (implementation entities)

Project Start Date & End Date. December 2015 — September 2017

Funding from The Tenure Facility. $750,000

Key Achievements and Updates. The Liberia country initiative builds the foundation for the success of the Accra Peace Agreement, signed by warring parties in 2003. Peace depends in part on the country's ability to ensure a more equitable process of land reform. The country initiative brought together NGOs and the national land agency to test and refine a practical and scalable guideline to enable local communities to self-identify their lands. Under Liberia's new Land Rights Policy, self-identification is the first in a four-step process for gaining collective title to customary land. The work represents the first time in the history of Liberia that communities have led a process to define their own community boundaries. It is also contributing to the establishment of more transparent and democratic practices within village structures. The project developed and tested a draft guideline in 11 communities in diverse settings, involving 45,000 people and 150,000 hectares. In addition, the work built government and civil society capacity for implementing the guideline in preparation for national adoption and upscaling. Through the projects' Advisory Group, the country initiative raised awareness about the guideline and the process for achieving collective title to customary lands among civil society organizations, government ministries, international organizations and private sector companies.

4. Mali Presentation

Project Title. Land and Forest Tenure Support Project Benefiting Local Communities in Mali

Actors. The National Coordinating Body of Peasant Organizations and HELVETAS (funding recipients)

Project Start Date & End Date. November 2015 – July 2017

Funding from The Tenure Facility. $657,000

Key Achievements. The country initiative is helping to ensure the success of the 2015 Peace Accord, which is dependent on the country's ability to successfully resolve land conflict. The work helped to make operational 17 land commissions (8 at commune level and 9 at village level). The Land Reform Act of 2006 created the legal foundation for establishing COFO local land commissions as a viable alternative to the court system for resolving land conflict. The TF initiative strengthened and adapted the model for these commissions, helping to demonstrate their viability. This alternative to the court system is particularly important as commissions are generally respected and trusted by communities, so final decisions tend to be upheld by disputing parties. The work has drawn national attention to the possibility of applying this pioneering model in higher conflict areas with larger forest cover. The country initiative also helped establish Mali's first intercommunal forest.

5. Panama Presentation

Project Title. Strengthening the Collective Land and Territory Rights of Indigenous People

Actors. Coordinadora Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas de Panamá (COONAPIP) (implementation entity); PRODESO (funding recipient)

Project Start Date & End Date. June 2015 – April 2017

Funding from The Tenure Facility. $825,000

Key Achievements and Updates. The country initiative has helped to consolidate the National Coordinating Body of Indigenous Peoples of Panama (COONAPIP), creating stronger unity among Indigenous Congresses in Panama (regional representative bodies of Indigenous Peoples), strengthening COONAPIP's ability to influence and collaborate with the government and building its international ties. A productive recent meeting attended by many Indigenous Congresses from across Panama is testimony to the success achieved in this area. Work included the creation of a legal clinic within COONAPIP, which has helped to secure land rights wins and mediate sixteen land dispute claims (1,240 hectares of land). The initiative has also significantly moved forward efforts to secure collective legal titles to over 233,000 hectares. The titling process has reached its final stages. It is currently blocked by the Ministry of the Environment because the territories overlap with protected areas. To resolve this issue, the Panamanian government has established a technical and legal commission for dialogue, which includes participation by Indigenous leaders.

5. Peru Presentation

Project Title. Advancing Legal Tenure Security for the Indigenous Territories of Madre de Dios and Cusco

Actors. Federación Nativa del Rio Madre de Dios y Afluentes (FENAMAD) (implementation entity); Sociedad Peruana de Derecho Ambiental (SPDA) (funding recipient and technical support)

Project Start Date & End Date. October 2015 — March 2017

Funding from The Tenure Facility. $749,000

Key Achievements and Updates. With strong national legislation in place supporting Indigenous Peoples' right to land, the country initiative focused on implementing legislation at

the district level. The work supported the development of an innovative partnership between an indigenous federation (FENAMED), a Peruvian NGO (SPDA) and a Peruvian regional government (the Regional Government of Madre de Dios—GOREMAD). This partnership resulted in securing titles for five indigenous communities covering over 50,000 hectares. This model of a partnership between the voluntary sector and the government represents an innovative and scalable model for resolving longstanding land tenure conflicts in other areas of Peru. The initiative also helped develop and formalize a system to support the territorial rights of Indigenous Peoples in Voluntary Isolation or Initial Contact (PIAVCI). Work included helping to formalize this system, which affects more than 800,000 hectares of land, through a signed agreement with the Ministry of Culture. In addition, the project improved the management of 27,000 hectares of titled forest and trained 121 indigenous community members in forest monitoring and protection.

Annex 4. LEARNING EXCHANGE PARTICIPANTS

Samuel Nguiffo (CED, Cameroon; and The Tenure Facility Board)
Timothee Fomete (Rainbow, Cameroon)
Minister David Abouem (Tenure Facility Focal Point, Cameroon)
Dr. Daouda Diarra (Ministry of Agriculture, Mali)
Professor Moussa Djire (Tenure Facility Focal Point, Mali)
Boubacar Diarra (Helvetas, Mali)
Ali Kaba (SDI, Liberia)
Silvana Baldovino (SPDA, Peru)
Luisa Rios (SPDA, Peru)
Julio Cusurichi (FENAMED, Peru)
Martin Scurrah (Tenure Facility Focal Point, Peru)
Jorge Ventocilla (Tenure Facility Focal Point, Panama)
Marcelo Guerra (COONAPIP, Panama)
Christine Halvorson (RF-US, Panama)
Rukka Sombolinggi (AMAN, Indonesia)
Muhammad Arman (AMAN, Indonesia)
Chip Fay (Tenure Facility Focal Point, Indonesia)
Junaedi Jarta Sarhan (Head of Lebak Parliament, Indonesia)
Victoria Tauli Corpuz (The Tenure Facility Board)
Augusta Molnar (The Tenure Facility Board)
Andy White (The Tenure Facility Board)
Dr. Juan Manuel Torres Rojo (The Tenure Facility Board)
Omaira Bolaños (RRI)
Candido Mezua (substitute for Gustavo Sanchez, Tenure Facility Advisory Group, AMPB)
Filippo Del Gatto (Consultant to The Tenure Facility)
Lasse Krantz (University of Gottenberg)
Margareta Nilsson (Tenure Facility Advisory Group, Sida)
Penny Davies (Tenure Facility Advisory Group, Ford Foundation)
Kevin Currey (Tenure Facility Advisory Group, Climate and Land Use Alliance)
Christina Huntzinger (Consultant to The Tenure Facility)
Sandra McGuire (Consultant to The Tenure Facility)
Gerardo Segura (Tenure Facility Advisory Group, World Bank)
Edwin Vasquez (Tenure Facility Advisory Group, COICA)
Safia Aggarwal (substitute for Dominique Reeb, Tenure Facility Advisory Group, FAO)
Nonette Royo (Incoming Executive Director, The Tenure Facility)
Janis Alcorn (Interim Executive Director, The Tenure Facility)
Alicia Korten (The Culture Company, Consultant to Tenure Facility)

Annex 5. Notes/Minutes from the Fourth Tenure Facility Learning Exchange

A. Notes from entire Learning Exchange meeting [5]

1. Introductions
   Andy White offered introductions to all those assembled, expressing gratitude for their time and contributions toward the Tenure Facility. He made special mention to Nonette Royo, recalling her lifelong dedication toward the service of indigenous peoples.

Pilot Updates

1. Mali (Boubacar D.)
   TF Grant has enabled to achieve a number of results including; passage of a bill through Malian legislature securing land resources, promoted by the Minister of Land Affairs. The reform process, an ongoing process, was enabled by this pilot. Another result was the initiation of the process of recognition of nearly 485ha of forested land for indigenous peoples.
   The high Malian Council has drafted a proposal for review by the legislature.

2. Indonesia
   The project was closed on 30th September, working in 30 districts and engagement with the national parliament. We have successfully mapped 130ha of land for indigenous populations.
   (presentation includes graph)
   "The Art of Local Politics" – can be challenging, but is key to change at the local level. 13k ha of land recognized for indigenous people at the local level.
   Mapping and Recognition – the main challenge we have, for which we need further support, is for further work in local legislative recognition of indigenous land.
   Q: Is there a mechanism for recognition of those forested lands by the communities themselves? A: The critical point is the "status of the lands". Management by local municipalities can come at a later time, for the next step. First step is acknowledgment.

3. Peru

---

[5] Notes taken by Joe Bono

Project was intended to run from Oct. 2015 – March 2017: focus on engagement with isolated indigenous peoples and recognition of their lands at the national level. Two native communities n Madre de Dios have been recognized by the national government. This kind of work can be very time consuming.

4. Panama
Project began in 2015 as a follow up project on collective titling.

   …

M&E and Theory of Change

Janis recalled that during the meeting in London, that the M&E system feedback was that it was too project specific. A Theory of Change was revised by the secretariat which was better linked to lessons learned. The new structure was divided into five tools (country focal points; biannual learning exchanges; periodic facilitated reflection & learning visits; 4th; 5th, see WG guidance).

Filippo Del Gatto – recounted comments made by Margareta Nilsson in London, "Before we work toward securing tenure we need to define what secured tenure means". We have created two milestones to better define tenure security – ppt slides of milestones…

During the two sessions this afternoon we'd like to identify how we are trying to achieve these milestones.

   Q 1: Defining "secure tenure"
   Q 2: How can the MEL system capture stories and results important to you?
   Q 3: (only for Donors, Resource Persons group) – Feedback and suggestions on how we can measure deforestation and associated emissions

Breakout Sessions - Group 3

Q1: How do we define 'secure tenure'.

Gerardo Segura explained that definition of tenure security (through recognition of land rights) need to be delineated between collective or individual. VTC went into further detail, stating that "tenure rights" have a cultural component as well – differing from region to region. Creating a global baseline will be a challenge, as some pilot countries will have more difficulty

identifying successful outcomes. Kevin Currey suggested the countries themselves made suggestions on what kind of achievable outcomes should be involved in projects.

Security in land rights, for long term recognition to be realized, have to be considered legitimate.

Penny Davies explained that the TF needs to identify itself as a facilitator for change by local communities, as opposed to being mistaken for a land administer. It cannot guarantee, as organizations like the WB, land security without local governing authority. This point is especially important to be explained to donor networks.

> Q2:How can the M&E system capture stories and results for effective reporting

Kevin Currey explained that a narrative told from the personal level is of the utmost importance. Penny Davies reiterated his point. The larger outcomes may not be as defined or commensurate across other pilot programs. However, the logframe agreement needs to be adopted at a global level. The report then needs to take into account how this individual change can be applied to other countries as well (in a replicative sense). How can the individual proponent (facilitator or otherwise) apply what has happened toward a global perspective?

Augusta Molnar explained that country reporting will be an effective tool toward subsequent country engagement (lessons learned). Further, we should report in a way in which positive private sector actors will want to engage.

Janis and Filippo explained how learning experiences could also be expanded to not only share between pilot countries but to learn from other programs and countries in which we are not currently engaged.

Kevin Currey said that the CLUA questionnaire includes an inquiry, "What did you learn that you hadn't expected from this project?", which gets people thinking about what kind of unexpected lessons might arise as result of the grant / project.

Q3: Donor reporting should include clear and quantified details as well. Penny explained that, the higher the official reviewing your report the simpler the report needs to be. Janis iterated this as the responsibility of the Communications team. Learning Exchanges, on the other hand, should involve …

Two Points for Presentation

1. Q1 – Definition of "Secure Tenure"
   a. Tenure Security is Contextual
   b. Helpful to think of as a process, as opposed to an outcome

       c. Beyond the legal concept of tenure security, many other issues need to be addressed in order to establish true tenure security.

2. Q2 – Designing an effective M&E System

       a. Importance of telling different kinds of stories

       b. Differentiating between goals and indicators of impact

       c. Structuring results between what people want to learn, as opposed to what they want to share

Reporting Back from Breakout Sessions

Group 1
Defining security needs to focus on the individual, but should be approached in a participatory fashion – scaling up effectiveness. Further, even if we define the technical requirements of these secure systems, those can be undone by the national governments. To that end we need to further educate ourselves on potential political challenges.
Regarding M&E, flexibility to changes is essential toward an effective monitoring strategy. The TF highlights the importance of personal improvement above all other necessities. That requires a subjective and flexible structure towards goals assessment.

Group 2
We concluded that tenure security is the governing structure which ensures enjoyment and usage of resources by local communities.   Also, sustainable and inclusive development are essential toward actual ensure security.
Regarding M&E, the implementation of tools need to take into account further follow up and evaluation following the conclusion of a project or grant. The MEL program may be the best opportunity to collate multi-program outcomes to get a more global perspective.

Plenary discussions after Reporting Back

VTC – on IP is the principal of self-identification. On the basis of violated rights, as identified by the UN declaration on IP, definition of tenure security should take into account those who self-identify in addition to those designated by the government.

With respect to Vicky's point, Moussa Djire iterated the importance to review definition by region to region and culture to culture. In northern Africa, for example, there is such historical change-up from region to region being identified as several different populations. It is important to realize identity can be hyper-local or regional.

Monitoring and Evaluation: How can we benefit from experiences beyond current programs and projects? To that end, we need to take into account differences in the audiences to which we are reporting. The Tenure Facility happens to be a very unique project. But there are

lessons to be learned across other NGOs and organizations. Samuel N. suggests we focus on identifying those universal lessons, to be applied to other internal and external programs. We should be monitoring two things, essentially: what are our immediate outcomes, and what are the long-term impacts (beyond the reporting period). Those issues, especially the latter, should serve to generate useful reporting.

Silvana believes that recognition is difficult in terms of specific land mass (ha, number of titles, et al), or quantification in general. Strength in the type of change as the result of programing is a more effective result and should be included in the results.

Rukka suggests that language barriers should be addressed as well, in order to use reporting for long-term impact. But, we shouldn't rely on quantified reporting as a short-hand approach toward multi-lingual targeting communications.

Candido Mezua echoed that quantified results may be effective as a cross-cultural definition of change, but tend to fall short of accurately capturing program outcomes.

B. Notes from open discussion during Learning Exchange plenary session[6]

Stockholm, Sweden
October 1, 2017

CM: El sistema de gobernanza garantiza la vida de las personas. El plan de vida establece como se van a distribuir los beneficios. Eso debe ser definido por los pueblos indígenas.

EV: Seguridad territorial es el respeto de los derechos indígenas, no solo de los territorios.

SN: Monitoring should not be done by outsiders, but by IPs and LCs themselves. We have done this monitoring with the local communities, and it was really empowering. What are the mechanisms for helping local people to do the monitoring?

KC: What do you want to learn? What do you think that your successors could learn in the future?

CM: Es clave monitorear la seguridad jurídica, que corresponde a como las comunidades locales establecen la seguridad jurídica que permite asegurar la vida de la población.

AK: Very competitive context, so we need to make sure that information reaches also communities with which we don't work.

---

[6] Notes taken by Filippo Del Gatto

JA: Kevin's question was not only about what we want to learn from each other, but also what we think we can share with others that we have learned.

SN: We forget that we have not planned to learn – we forget it. It is important to develop mechanisms that help to remember what we have not planned to learn.

AK: How to capture unexpected results?

??: Internal governance is key for tenure security. We need indicators of change at community level, such as development of internal protocols and rules.

JC: Los indicadores pueden ser perversos cuando son muy cuantitativos. Es importante tomar en cuenta impactos diferenciados a según del contexto. Titular 1,000 hectáreas en Madre de Dios es más difícil que titular 10,000 hectáreas en otra región.

RS: More indicators imply more work. Maps made in the past 2 years represent 20% of all the maps made in the last 20 years.

CM: Los indicadores numéricos son importantes. Cuando la gallina pone huevos cacarea, así nosotros también tenemos que comunicar lo bueno que hacemos.

C. Notes from final plenary[7]

1) be more strategic
2) document better
3) influence others

1) long-term perspective - …- sharing-knowledge
2) how to document - communicate challenge to get better results, accompaniment, feedback to projects
3) influence others – bring them in
    a. support project managers – connect to donors and policy measures
    b. invite government functionaries to meetings

---

[7] Notes by Martin Scurrah

AW
- organize and design learning events focused on what project leaders want to learn (their list)
- two topics
    o experience in getting land back to indigenous communities from ANPs (Parque Manu)
    o restitute land from extractive concessions (lote 192)

KC
- monitoring of deforestation, ecosystem monitoring
- commitment of projects to Tenure Facility

VT
- important inside monitoring
- strengthen agency of local peoples
- conflicts over overlapping rights to land

MC
- negotiations and consensus building over land → learning event with policy makers
- restitution of land from national parks
- story-telling capacity – looking at themselves
- conflict reduction combined with land rights

GS
- basic principles to measure progress (SDGs)

SB
- experience with resolution of conflicts, mechanisms of "convivencia" (living together)
- inequality in negotiations
- scaling up

JV
- agrees with Silvana
-

CH
- balance between change movements and long-term development
-

EV
- channel support to IPs involved in conflicts with NGO
- invites Vicky

RS
- mapping to avoid conflicts between communities (internal mechanisms)
- defending rights is not being conflictive

AK
- challenge of counter-narratives (large-scale investments)
- need for long-term studies of collective titles
- youth participation in process (Africa), loss of identity

CM
- how to achieve sustainability over time with support from TF

BD
- rights of IPs need to be validated at government level

DM
- armed conflict in Mali – population displacement – peace agreement – population return – land commission – negotiation mechanism (collaboration TF – government of Mali)
- flexibility of TF team – collaboration with central government a success; TF as a model to rebuild confidence