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A dual objective

Methodological / conceptual: From a database to instrument of inclusive governance

Results: Understanding / transparency re land deals
PHASE 1 – A GLOBAL DATABASE PROMOTING...

- Open data: Making the data visible and understandable
- Transparency in decision-making over land and investment, as a step towards greater accountability

Launched in April 2012
A global database...

* Land deals in the database - criteria
  - Entail a transfer sale, lease or concession (often change of tenure)
  - Initiated since 2000
  - 200 hectares or more
  - Change of use (extensive or ecosystem service provision to commercial use)
For **agricultural** production, timber extraction, carbon trading, mineral extraction, industry, renewable energy production, conservation, and tourism

* Information on investor (origin, type), deal (production intention, size), target region (former land use), & attempt to capture dynamics (Negotiation status, Implementation status)

* Sourcing:
  - Data entry/checking through LM partners/networks based on research/policy reports, official government records, company websites, media reports and personal information
  - Crowd sourcing
# Land deals globally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># deals</th>
<th>ha intended</th>
<th>ha under contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral agreement</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract signed</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>concluded deals</strong></td>
<td>870</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of interest</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under negotiation</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intended deals</strong></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations failed</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract cancelled</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Failed deals</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
African countries are the most affected in the world
An important concentration per country ...

- Important concentration – top 20 countries, 74% deals, 80% size
- Top 20 – 9 African countries
... as well as according to NR, infrastructure, ...

[Map image showing commercial pressure on land in the Nile Basin with annotations for various countries including Egypt, Sudan, Ethiopia, Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Mali, Côte d’Ivoire, Benin, and Cameroon.]
Investor countries in Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Very little effective production

AFRICA

- Unknown
- Project abandoned
- In operation (production)
- Project not started
- Startup phase (no production)

1.7%
Towards a normalisation …?

Reasons: Credit crunch, high failures, less media focus, civil awareness, countries are getting better prepared
## LSLA globally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th># deals</th>
<th>ha intended</th>
<th>ha under contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral agreement</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract signed</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concluded deals</strong></td>
<td>870</td>
<td><strong>54.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of interest</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under negotiation</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intended deals</strong></td>
<td>186</td>
<td><strong>14.6</strong></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations failed</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract cancelled</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Failed deals</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td><strong>6.9</strong></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different LSLBI with different outcomes

| Independent farmer model | Associative farmer model | Cooperative farmer model | Speculative 1000-day model | Asset management and Investment funds model | Nucleus estate model | Agribusiness Estate model |
**Different LSLBI with different outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent farmer model</td>
<td>Associative farmer model</td>
<td>Cooperative farmer model</td>
<td>Speculative 1000-day model</td>
<td>Asset management and Investment funds model</td>
<td>Nucleus estate model</td>
<td>Agribusiness Estate model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Uncertain institutional environments and the difficulty of doing business
- Technicality of the projects
- The lack of markets
- Lack of financial services
- High settling and transaction costs

High failures
New strategies 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent farmer model</th>
<th>Associative farmer model</th>
<th>Cooperative farmer model</th>
<th>Speculative 1000-day model</th>
<th>Asset management and Investment funds model</th>
<th>Nucleus estate model</th>
<th>Agribusiness Estate model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **High failures**
- **Increased integration**
- **Few inclusive models**

- To overcome *high risks related to settlement in less developed agrarian economies*
- Focus on core business
New strategies 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent farmer model</th>
<th>Associative farmer model</th>
<th>Cooperative farmer model</th>
<th>Speculative 1000-day model</th>
<th>Asset management and Investment funds model</th>
<th>Nucleus estate model</th>
<th>Agribusiness Estate model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

High failures

Less risky activities

- Increased focus on stable countries, with well-developed property rights
- Other investment strategies (equity)

Less visible but at least as important in terms of volume and impact on agrarian structures in host countries
### New strategies 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent farmer model</th>
<th>Associative farmer model</th>
<th>Cooperative farmer model</th>
<th>Speculative 1000-day model</th>
<th>Asset management and Investment funds model</th>
<th>Nucleus estate model</th>
<th>Agribusiness Estate model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### High failures

**A more organised second generation of investments**

- Going beyond individual settlements
- More coherent/structured support
  - Private sector (service providers, …)
  - Governments (one stop shops, …)
  - International community (VGs, RAIs, F&Gs)
- Broader agricultural environments are developing
Some thoughts

• Agrarian change ... slow, partial, tipping point?

• Lack of LT reflection on development trajectories
Land Matrix - Challenges

- DATA
  - Data availability and reliability
  - Dynamic (status of deals)
  - Specificities of countries/deals
  - Processes

- POLICY
  - Policy debate
  - National jurisdictions
  - Transparency / accountability

Need/necessity to decentralise
PHASE 2 - PROMOTING OPEN GOVERNANCE

• Open data: Making the data visible and understandable

• Transparency in decision-making over land and investment, as a step towards greater accountability

• Feeding the policy debate and public participation in building a constantly evolving database on large-scale land deals

Launched in April 2013 … on-going
TOWARDS OPEN SOURCE & GOVERNANCE…

- Decentralisation

- Twin goals:
  - Improving the quality, dynamics, and “automatic generation” of data
  - Involving stakeholders in the dialogue and decision-making processes through active participation

  Ownership, participation, inclusion

- Sourcing:
  - Network of stakeholders/informants
  - Establishment of Land Observatories that concentrate on a specific area of interest (geographical/Thematic)
Land Matrix Initiative

Land Observatories
• Each Observatory – Independent, managed by own interest group
• Based on multi-stakeholder platforms

Software
• Adapted to local needs

Land Matrix Global Observatory
• LM partnership provides development support, linking to the global database
Context matters for LSLAs
Context matters for land deals

- Patronage, corruption
- Top-down granting
- Land allocation
- “Available land”
- Tenure security
- Land cover
- Poverty
- Lack of capital
- Economic growth strategies
- Origin of investor
- Type of crop
- Accessibility
- Historical ties

Land Governance

Agrarian context
Context matters for LSLAs
Towards …

Contextualising land deals

- From static data on land deals to in-depth information on processes, types of flows, …
- Establishing links between flows, actors, and places
- Focusing on competing claims, trade-offs, equity

More effective and inclusive land governance

- Ex of linking technical and social innovation
- Socio-political conditions determine involvement of actors
- National ownership vs. cross-scale connectedness