



Report on Training Event

“Monitoring Land Governance and Land Tenure Security in the Arab Region” (Middle East sub-region)

December 14-16, 2020

Content

Introduction	3
Outcomes of the Training	4
Training Sessions.....	4
<i>Opening</i>	4
<i>Module 1. Introduction to Land Governance</i>	4
<i>Module 2. SDGS and VGGTS as Umbrella Frameworks</i>	5
<i>Module 3. Tool Box</i>	7
<i>Module 4. Knowledge Exchange</i>	8
<i>Module 4. Summing-Up Session and Future Steps</i>	11
<i>Closing</i>	12
Key Inputs and Suggestions	12
<i>Annex 1: Evaluation</i>	14
<i>Annex 2: List of Contacts</i>	16
<i>Annex 3. Additional Information</i>	23

Introduction

The intensive training on Monitoring Land Governance and Land Tenure Security was held online and took place from 14th to 16th December 2020. The event was hosted by the Rasheed (Transparency International - Jordan) in collaboration with GLTN and UN-Habitat.

The meeting was attended by 54 participants - over half female - from Rasheed TI-JO, GLTN, UN-Habitat, the World Bank, International Land Coalition, Global Land Alliance; from the Arab Land Initiative partners (ISTIDAMA - Sudan, Lebanese Center for Policy Studies - Lebanon, Urban Training & studies Institute (UTI) - Egypt, Arab Group for the Protection of Nature - Jordan, and the International Youth Council - Yemen). The training was attended by number of different NGOs and CSOs as well as representatives from the governmental sector (Department of Lands and Survey - Jordan, Informal Settlement Development Fund (ISDF), Egyptian Cabinet - Egypt, Department of Statistics - Jordan, Ministry of Public Works & Highways - Yemen, Palestinian Land Authority - Palestine), in addition to individual professionals, researchers and academia. The more detailed information is provided in the chart below:



**Note: trainees are comprised of the external audience and do not include experts/speakers. For Rasheed TI-JO and GLTN/UN-Habitat teams this training was an internal capacity building, and hence they are also excluded from the number of trainees.*

Outcomes of the Training

1. Built and expanded capacities of stakeholders in collecting, analyzing and evaluating land governance-related data;
2. Developed understanding of monitoring the progress of land governance and land tenure security in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals and beyond;
3. Developed knowledge and capacities in regards to collecting data and reporting on the land governance-related SDG indicators;
4. Held strategic discussions on different aspects of land governance in the Arab region based on sharing the experiences and knowledge along with the conducted training modules;
5. Gathered key stakeholders to build and expand network of experts working within different dimensions of land governance;
6. Defined key issues, challenges, and needs that are faced in the represented states and the region.

Training Sessions

The training on Monitoring Land Governance and Land Tenure Security in the Arab region (Middle East sub region) was held from 14th to 16th December 2020. It aimed to serve as a stocktaking, analytical and capacity building exercise as well as an opportunity to discuss the means of implementation of improved monitoring of tenure security and good land governance issues within the region. The training sessions were delivered by experts from the GLTN/UN-Habitat, the International Land Coalition (ILC), the Global Land Alliance, the World Bank and FAO.

Each day was started with a quick recap of the previous day and agenda setting. Recaps also took place after each presentation delivered and in the end of each training day briefly summarizing the topics covered.

Opening

The opening session was started by Eng. Abeer Mdanat from Rasheed TI-JO, Ombretta Tempra (GLTN/UN-Habitat) and Ward Anseeuw from ILC, where they highlighted the importance of the land sphere and necessity of sharing the experiences both from the global level and within the different countries of the region that can be adapted to meet the particular needs. During this session, it was also emphasized on the importance of the coordination between different experts and stakeholders in bringing together and aligning the established initiatives and developed methodology within the area of land governance in order to upscale the land monitoring and work together on the solid global monitoring system.

Module 1. Introduction to Land Governance

Following the opening session, the first module aimed to provide the opportunity for participants to introduce themselves and share their expectations of the training. All participants are working in different areas related to land, that made it opportune to have inputs from various perspectives and develop the discussion taking into account different aspects based on their experience.

This was followed by the presentation on *“Land Governance in the Arab Region”* done by El Habib Benmokhtar (GLTN/UN-Habitat), starting from some land-related definitions that were referred to throughout three days, and defining the major challenges that the region is facing. He also discussed approaches and recommendations for improving the land governance and establishing a solid monitoring system. It was followed by emphasizing on the importance of establishing new and enlarging already-

existing networks in terms of promoting cooperation and collaboration, developing and sharing knowledge, developing the capacities as well as supporting the implementation of existing land-related programs and interventions, mentioning the role of the Arab Land Initiative, First and Second Arab Land Conferences, and setting up future steps.

After the presentation, participants had a chance to engage in the discussion, where they shared their inputs and raised the following questions:

- What is the role of transparency and accountability in land governance monitoring?
- Considering the specificities of every country, how would it be impactful to work at sub-national and local levels?
- How to make informal actors at local level more inclusive in the process of monitoring land governance?
- Is it reasonable to develop monitoring indicators for each particular country, or the already existing ones are feasible for this?
- Is there a unified strategy for land governance in the region, as it could help to set up the same priorities and visions, and develop action plans and monitor the work in easier way?

Module 2. SDGS and VGGTS as Umbrella Frameworks

This module started with the presentation on ***“SDGs frameworks and Reporting: Background, Overview and Relevance to Land Monitoring”*** conducted by Everlyne Nairesiae (GLTN/UN-Habitat), focusing on SDG indicators 1.4.2, 5.a.1, 5.a.2 in addition to other SDG targets/indicators related to land. Within the presentation it was also discussed why land and tenure security are important, what is the role of land rights approach and land data, and briefly explained the framework of Global Land Indicators Initiative (GLII) and four categories of its globally comparable and nationally applicable indicators.

It was immediately followed up by the presentation on ***“VGGTs: Chapters and Principles”*** prepared by Ward Anseeuw (ILC). During the presentation he contextualized the VGGTs as the international mechanism that is considered as a soft law, detailed on their aims, objectives, principles and structure, and explained the four pillars of VGGTs (promotion, implementation, monitoring and evaluation), emphasizing on the monitoring part and the challenges, like legitimacy and lack of capacities in terms of human resources, methodologies, and data, that it faces.

After this, participants had an opportunity to reflect on both presentations as they are complementing each other, and engage in the discussions. Participants have shared number of comments, mostly highlighting that land is a key issue when talking about economic development, access to food, and ensuring peace and stability. They have also emphasized that there is a lack of data and information within the region that are much needed in order to build future strategies and action plans effectively, and to ensure that efficient policies and decisions are put in place. In addition, they have shared their concerns in regards to the necessity to support the development of the unified and comprehensive methodology for data collection in the region, which can be adopted by different countries with minimal amendments in order to be adapted within their national contexts, and to engage the effective advocacy movement. They have also addressed the following question:

- When generally speaking about SDGs reporting, the framework for 17 SDGs and 169 of their targets are a bit wide and overwhelming, prioritization at the country level and giving due

attention to the land sector could be more efficient and productive, couldn't it? It could help to better facilitate the data collection and reporting process, for instance.

- Is there a possibility for developing new indicators for measuring tenure rights and ownership, particularly of internally displaced people and refugees? How disaggregating data as such – giving them visibility – could support programmatic interventions on protection and livelihoods of these people?
- Establishment of the “land information system” in the region could help to overcome the lack of data, or more precisely quality data. But is there a way for this? Or what are other ways to overcome this problem?
- How to make the government be more committed to collect land data and report to land-related SGDs?
- What is the role of the extra-legal concept ¹ within the land rights continuum?

The next session consisted of two parts. The first one was on **“Inter-agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators: Harmonizing data collection for indicators 1.4.2 and 5.a.1”**. This session was conducted by Donatien Beguy (GLTN/UN-Habitat) and Sydney Gourlay (World Bank). The presentation covered the importance of harmonizing Indicators 1.4.2 that measures the “Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, (a) with legally recognized documentation, and (b) who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and type of tenure”² and 5.a.1 – measures the “(a) Proportion of total agricultural population with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land, by sex; and (b) share of women among owners or rights-bearers of agricultural land, by type of tenure”³. They discussed in detail the data collection strategies for the joint module that was designed for integration into national household surveys. It also explained the nature of the joint module and different versions of questionnaire that can be used for data collection, guiding on how to define the applicable questioning instrument to use for particular objectives and providing relevant examples.

The second part of the session was on the **“Integrated approach to data collection for SDG indicator 5.a.2”** conducted by Clinton Omusula (GLTN/UN-Habitat), contextualizing indicator 5.a.2 in the SDGs agenda that measures the “Proportion of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women’s equal rights to land ownership and/or control”. During the presentation, he also discussed six proxies for computing indicator 5.a.2 and processes of monitoring and reporting.

The session was concluded by guided discussions around the following questions:

1. What challenges do you expect to face when trying to integrate this questionnaire into an existing survey? How can these challenges be addressed?
2. What advantages do you see in collecting data at the parcel level? What are the disadvantages?

¹ It referred to the legal aspect on land ownership or right to use specific land, when people do have a titled right to use land, but not necessarily within legally recognized documentation, i.e. indigenous communities living on particular pieces of land with whatever document they have, even probably acquired from the government, that can be challenged by, for instance, perceiving it as semi-regulated or unregulated usage of land, so not governed or regulated by the law, and bringing it to the dimension of extra-legal situation.

² Legally recognized documentation includes titles, leaseholds, use rights certificates, rental agreements etc. The criteria is fulfilled if the individuals or groups have access to the land under a tenure arrangement identified and legally recognized and if their name is listed on the legal document.

³ This sub-indicator is based on the fear of the questioned person of involuntary loss of the land within the next five years.

3. What challenges do you see in collecting data using the self-respondent approach? How can these challenges be addressed?
4. Which custodians and national partners could be helpful in successfully collecting data for SDG Indicators 1.4.2 and 5.a.1? What kind of support would they provide?
5. Do you think the national surveys have captured the female population sufficiently in the past? If not, what are the challenges and how could procedures be improved to better collect data on women? If yes, what are the practices that have best in your context?

In addition, some trainees have contributed to the discussion by raising the following additional questions and addressing them to all experts of this session:

- What about the countries, where there is a parallel system of documentation that people consider as legal, although it is not? In post-conflict countries, there is an overlapping in documentation (customization) process due to the multiple displacement or dual system, which results in insecurities. How can you address that?
- Was there any experience in training any ministries or other relevant governmental institutions to the presented methodologies and strategies?
- Is there a plan or strategy in engaging Arab states more in data collection and reporting on indicators 1.4.2, 5.a.1 and 5.a.2?
- How to build trust between government and civil society and ensure that the collected data and information are reliable?
- How to collect data and information in the countries that have unstable situations? Could people work with the non-profit organizations to collect it? Or are there any contingency plans for data collection in such contexts?
- Taking into consideration that some indicators do not align with religious belief of the countries in the region ⁴, hence, advocating for equal share to inheritance does not only require changes in laws, but also Islamic law (Shari`a), which obviously cannot be changed, - so how these indicators could be adopted to meet at least an equal access to inheritance rights in countries within the given context?

Module 3. Tool Box

This module started with a presentation on “**Landex: Centralizer of Initiatives, People-Centered, Diverse Sources**” conducted by Eva Hershaw (ILC), focusing on Landex as a global land governance index that intends to capture a number of elements of land governance, and puts people in the center of land data. She also covered in details Landex objectives and contribution to the SDGs, VGGTs and other monitoring tools and approaches, as well as its indicators and methodology. In addition, during the presentation particular examples on the results and products were provided.

⁴ It was referred to the issue of women`s access to land, in particular the alignment of the international best practice/standards with the Islamic religious beliefs that are reflected in the Shari`a law, which is the main law, i.e. according to the Shari`s law, men are entitled to inherit double of the share of women in some cases, which is part of religious beliefs and religious law. Although, Shari`a law is not a supreme legislation in (most) Arab states, but is treated as such and referred to in most cases, as it is not a “man-made”, which makes it hard, if not impossible, to bring up new rules or amend it.

This question also brought a bit tension between the representatives of CSO and government institution, so it was mediated and neutrally resolved.

This module proceeded with a presentation on **“Land Matrix: Focusing on Large-Scale Land Acquisition and Investments”** conducted by Ward Anseeuw (ILC), introducing Land Matrix as an open online tool to collect and visualize information about large-scale land acquisition focusing on land investments. He also briefly discussed the indicators and variables of this thematic tool, and its potentials for VGGT monitoring.

This was followed by small discussion, where participants have addressed following questions:

- How Landex and Land Matrix information and data can provide support to the victims of land rights violations?
- In terms of data collection, is it more efficient to collect data within mixed groups or separately, like men/women or government/civil society?
- How can we balance between the confidentiality and transparency of the data, especially in relation to national programs?
- Do you think that 200 hectares criteria of Land Matrix neglects some cases of land grabbing, which happens in small area countries?

The next session of the module was dedicated to the presentation on **“PRIndex: Global Survey Focused on Property Rights and Perceptions of Tenure Security”** conducted by Shahd Mustafa (Prindex), introducing Prindex as a tool that focuses on the of people’s perception of their own land tenure security, highlighting its main objectives. She also discussed the challenges, like lack of information and documentation, limited civil society interaction, obstructed implementation of law, reliance on traditions and social norms, limited access of women to land, refugees and foreign workers, etc., that the MENA region faces when it comes to tenure security and data collection. In addition, she also highlighted the role of perception in the process of collecting data, introduced the methodology that can be adapted within different contexts, shared some key findings with examples and highlighted the alignment of the tool with SDGs and VGGTs along with the next steps within the region.

The last session of the module was presented by Everlyne Nairesiae (GLTN/UN-Habitat) on **“GLII and Partners Tools, Role, Achievements, Lessons Learnt and Opportunities in the Arab Region”**. After contextualizing Global Land Indicators Initiative, she highlighted the developed and related tools, and progress in capacity building, establishing partnerships and initiating process for the development of the Global Land Governance Report. In addition to that, her presentation also covered key achievements and progress made on the indicators 1.4.2, 5.a.1 and 5.a.2⁵, and mentioning the work on SDGs 11 and 15.3.1. The session was concluded by providing an overview of policy implications for the development process and sharing lessons learnt.

Module 4. Knowledge Exchange

As this training serves as a platform for capacity building and knowledge exchange, the last day provided grounds for defining commonalities and complexities in land governance across countries within the sub-

⁵ **Indicator 1.4.2:** a) Approximately 15 NSO collected data through HH surveys in 2020 (WAEMU survey, LSMS, LFS) most in Africa; b) DHS data (wave 7/8) are available for about 20 - 30 countries – some overlap with WAEMU/LSMS; c) About 50 other countries reported complete administrative data needed for indicator 1.4.2; d) Estimated number of countries reporting on 1.4.2 by end of 2021 – 70 countries.

Indicator 5.a.1: a) 10 countries have provided relevant data for this indicator via FAO; b) More countries expected in 2021 – linked to the joint module with indicator 1.4.2; c) UN Women and FAO collaboration in gender statistics.

Indicator 5.a.2: a) 34 countries reached and reported to UNSD with support of FAO; b) 15 countries reported in 2020; c) More countries receiving support to report on this indicator.

region. Therefore 8 participants from various Middle-East sub-region countries delivered presentations on the importance of effective land governance, the status quo of the monitoring land governance in their countries as well as the challenges they are facing. In addition, participants shared their ideas and opinions regarding common ownership and land-related disputes, women's accessibility to land, real-estate sector as well as ways of developing knowledge on land governance and tenure security.

Presentations were delivered as follows:

- Reham Ali/UTI/Egypt – ***“The Status of Land Governance in Egypt”*** – explaining the land-property structure in Egypt, briefly mentioning the history of the land governance and management in the country that provided better understanding of the available challenges, like rigid and complex legal and institutional framework, informality and securing land tenure. The presentation also covered the current reforms and recommendations for the interventions to improve the situation, like establishing land governance institutional framework, initiating coordination and collaboration between local, national and international organizations, developing national strategy for land governance and clear monitoring system, enhancing education and capacity building in this topic, etc.
- Marwa Soliman/Informal Settlements Development Fund/Egypt – ***“Informal Settlement and Land Issues”*** – briefly introduced the notion of informal settlements and defined the role of Informal Settlements Development Fund, followed by the detailed overview of the issues of informal areas on national level, like unsafe and unplanned areas as well as informal markets. It also highlighted government initiatives aiming to overcome the defined existing challenges, like lack of data, multiple ownerships and intersection of property, lack of unified body for land management, rapid change in urban dynamics, lack of monitoring, and insufficiency of qualified human resources.
- Salah Al-Abdali/International Youth Council/Yemen – ***“Land Governance in Yemen and Role of Civil Society in This Sector”*** – discussing the main threats and challenges in the land sphere within the Yemenis context both on local and national levels, among which are lack of clarity and understanding of the land governance concept, absence of a clear system for land registration, lack of quality data, raise of land conflicts and disputes, gender inequality within access to land, etc. After discussing the obstacles, he highlighted the points of strength and opportunities for improving land governance, in particular, and the land sector in general, which include raised interest of civil society organizations, their willingness and readiness to act, government's support and existence of customary rules for renting land, allowing poor access land.
- Sahar Al-Jallad/Birzeit University/Palestine – ***“Land Tenure and Governance – Case of Palestine”*** – starting from defining the concepts of land tenure and land governance, and their compliance with the Palestinian context, and continuing by discussing the Oslo Accords 1993-1995. She also discussed the issues within the area of land registration, providing some statistical evidence and describing land tenure practices in Palestine. In addition, she also defined the existing risks, with particular focus on social dimension, that comprise of lack of coherent plan towards sustainable land use and management, lack of quality and unified data as well as insufficient coordination and poorly aligned efforts among the stakeholders in land use and land management.
- Mohammad Khalaf/Department of Statistic/Jordan – ***“SDG Indicators in Jordan”*** – highlighted the role of the National Statistical Office in collecting data in order to support policy change, and its close cooperation with representatives from each ministry that reports on SDGs. The presentation also covered Jordanian reporting on SDG indicators related to poverty, health, education, agriculture and gender equality, and addressed some recommendations and needs in

this regards, particularly the need for capacity buildings and for sustainable funding for countries reporting the SDGs.

- May Hadaya/NRC/Syria – **“Place of HLP in the Framework of Good Land Governance in Syria”**⁶ – covering the status quo of land governance and tenure security in Syria, giving a particular attention to the HLP. It was followed by pointing out the issue of availability of quality data, in addition to presenting the information on existing challenges, including establishment of informal sites without proper due diligence and camps with no consideration of impact on land use, multiple legal frameworks imposed on people providing rights over other rights, presence of conflict and the need for new updates to laws, as well as women’s unequal access to land and lack of civil documentation. The presentation was briefly concluded by highlighting the accomplishments and needs in regards to land governance in Syria.
- Fawaz Abu Hijleh/Department of Land and Survey/Jordan – **“Land Registration System in Jordan”** – covering the vision of the Land and Survey Department and their contribution to the SDGs, explaining its responsibilities within real estate related issues, like public land ownership and legal documentation of land ownership. He also highlighted the lack of understanding of tenure security and land governance as well as the existence of legal loopholes as key challenges that the real estate sector in Jordan is currently facing.
- Raed Ghareeb/Seeds/Jordan – **“The Governance of Land and Natural Resources in Jordan”** – presenting the outcomes of SWOT analysis of the land sphere in Jordan based on the documented information, like Jordanian land laws and regulations, researches, studies and reports issued by local, regional and international bodies in addition to field visits and observations. The findings were structured between strengths and opportunities, and challenges and weaknesses giving particular examples and references.

Each presentation was followed by small discussions, where participants could raise their questions and share their comments and inputs. Although, it should be mentioned that the discussions after presentations sometimes were going beyond the focus around land indicators, and were not directly related to land governance or tenure security. However, participants raised them in order to close the gaps in understanding particular national contexts and defining commonalities between their countries in order to point out the issues that can be adapted or taken into consideration for improving the situation in their states. It shows that there is a need to provide the floor for more general discussions around land in the region, which at the same time leads to the necessity of creating stronger ties and exchange between different land stakeholders. The following are the questions raised during attendees’ presentations with names to whom they were addressed, which can serve as the grounds for future work as well as basis for cooperation and expertise exchange:

- Which stakeholders are working closely with the government in terms of improving land governance in Egypt? (Reham Ali)
- Considering the Egyptian population boom, how the national plan is preventing IDPs from development, what may create a catch-22 situation?⁷ (Reham Ali)
- Is the slum problem concentrated only in Cairo? (Reham Ali)

⁶ It was requested by the presenter to pause the recording for the time of her intervention, and not to share the PPT files, as internal regulations and security measures of the organization she represented limit the information that can be shared externally. Hence, this presentation and its recording was excluded from the shared materials after the training.

⁷ A catch-22 is a paradoxical situation from which an individual cannot escape because of contradictory rules or limitations. The term was coined by Joseph Heller, who used it in his 1961 novel Catch-22.

- Is there a cooperation between government institutions, research centers and other bodies in terms of applying monitoring of land governance and defining the types of tenure for Egyptians? And how developed is it? (Marwa Soliman)
- Is there a consideration for economic and social impact assessment for the relocation plans? (Marwa Soliman)
- What is the method used to collect data? Do you interview the owner of residents only in the case of ownership documents absence? Do you use one of the methods explained in the first day of training? (Marwa Soliman)
- How does political unrest affect land related issues? Are there any “reconstruction” plans after war? Is there a governmental body who is responsible for informal settlements? (Salah Al-Abdali)
- Is there any work done in Yemen by any organization concerning land management, especially during the ongoing conflict? (Salah Al-Abdali)
- It would be very interesting to touch upon the IDPs situation, considering that 1 every 10 Yemeni is currently displaced (OCHA), is there any plan for land facilitating the proof of title deeds and compensation, if the case? (Salah Al-Abdali)
- Talking about the West Bank and understanding the complexity of Palestinian-Israeli conflict, how Gaza is included? (Sahar Al Jallad)
- How to determine the indicators that are the priority for Jordan? (Mohammad Khalaf)
- What is the position of Jordan towards the tenure security and women’s access to land? (Mohammad Khalaf)
- Are there any documentations and registration for ownerships like properties and land especially for families that left Syria? (May Hadaya)
- Regarding documentation, people living in the Northeast who have documents issued by Syrian Democratic Forces, how to fulfill HLP without putting them at further risk before the central government? (May Hadaya)
- Is there any compensation system implemented by the local authorities for the one that have lost their parcels? (May Hadaya)
- Is the private sector involved in any way in the re-construction of the affected areas? (May Hadaya)
- According to the World Bank's Business Performance Report, what are the most important reasons that improved Jordan's position in implementing business-climate-improving measures? (Fawaz Abu Hijleh)
- Is Department of Land and Survey in Jordan a source of data and the part of the proposed national committee? (Fawaz Abu Hijleh)
- Is there any information on the national strategy of land governance in Jordan? (Raed Gharib)

Module 4. Summing-Up Session and Future Steps

The last module started with the presentation on ***“The Role of Member States and National Statistical Offices in Monitoring the Land Agenda and How to Support them”*** conducted by Clinton Omusula (GLTN/UN-Habitat) discussing leveraging land agenda to achieve the SDGs, role of member states and national statistical offices in monitoring the land agenda and support from the custodian agencies. He also highlighted the UN-Habitat country support and the role of UNESCWA in supporting the monitoring land agenda and data collection. It was followed by the discussion involving all panelists and attendees around the following questions:

1. What are some of the existing initiatives that have previously been used to collect data for monitoring of the land agenda at country/ regional level?
2. What are some of the challenges that have been faced in the process of data collection for monitoring land agenda? What are your proposals on how to overcome these challenges?
3. What opportunities do you see that can be leveraged to collect data for the monitoring land agenda at country and/or regional level?
4. Which custodians and national /regional partners could be helpful in successfully collecting data for the monitoring land agenda? What kind of support would they provide?
5. Do you think the national surveys and initiatives have captured the female population sufficiently in the past? If not, what are the challenges and how could procedures be improved to better collect data on women? If yes, what are the best practices in your context?

The last presentation of the module was ***“Towards a Coordinated Effort of Land Governance Monitoring”***, where Ward Anseeuw (ILC) summed-up all the previous sessions and presented a multi-layer approach to monitor land governance that includes 3 layers: 1) official data (like SDGs), 2) data centralizing and generating initiatives (like LANDex or PRIndex), and monitoring tools (like GLII or MELA). He discussed the broad potential of this approach to cover all aspects related to land, allowing for standardization within regional or global levels and specification on country level, highlighting the assurance of broad alignment and possibility of integration of large number of indicators, monitoring initiatives and data, which allows comparability and complementarity. He also highlighted the need to formalize and legitimize this data ecosystem within states statutory bodies.

Closing

The workshop was concluded with a brainstorming session where participants and experts agreed on several actions to be important for effective land governance. These include creating sufficient knowledge about the land governance sector, promoting clear understanding of available land monitoring tools and mechanisms, and spreading awareness about land monitoring, land governance, and tenure security. Another point highlighted at the training was the need for drawing the attention of policymakers to the land sector and the importance of placing it on par with other vital sectors.

Key Inputs and Suggestions

After the training participants shared their reflections on the training, proving both broad and particular inputs and suggestions:

1. Urgent development and implementation of Indicators that may reflect the rights of refugees and asylum-seekers, under the SDGs framework (1.4.2), considering the host country and country of origin - considering the last legal consideration on climate refugee issued by UNHCR it would be important to incorporate triggers of forced displacement;
2. It would be relevant to find a floor to discuss such a sensitive topic as principle of the social function of property within the contexts of development indicators, level of social inequalities, housing insecurity, and even climate change. In addition, it may be also relevant to think about developing an indicator regarding social function.

3. Building new cities to hinder urban sprawl is a good opportunity to start strong enforcement of law at new cities - this serious step of redistributing population over land might help in decreasing the burden over the deteriorating cores of old cities giving breathe to their infrastructure to recover with less population densities;

4. Land monitoring is a mainstream for better land governance in the era of information revolution. Getting updated databases, understanding current land situation, filling the gap between theories and application tools are the areas which need more investigations to achieve the aims in the field of land management, governance and monitoring;

5. It is important to change the mindset of all the stakeholder that Land Indicators are not only about auditing, controlling or holding accountability for gaps or weaknesses in the system, but convince them that they aim to find opportunities for enhancement and development;

6. Define the possibilities and ways on how to customize and adapt the indicators to particular states/sub-regions, by unifying the main points from the available monitoring tools and approaches to meet the states/sub-region needs and areas of concern;

7. Coordinate efforts between different stakeholders between states and within the region as a whole, based on, for instance, the similarities in the history of land administration, legal frameworks or procedures, which will save time and cost avoiding doing the same mistakes and go toward the best practice based on mutual exchange of experiences and support.

Based on the 3-day training and discussions the following points were defined as needs for the land governance sphere:

1. Sufficient knowledge about land sphere and land governance;
2. Clear understanding of monitoring tools and mechanisms available for land monitoring, and capacities developed to use them effectively;
3. Sufficient awareness about land monitoring, land governance, tenure security, and their importance;
4. Bringing land issues out of the shadow for policy-makers, and place them in line with other sectors;
5. Strong collaborations within the created network of experts and professionals, both in terms of organizations and individuals;
6. Last, but not least, - clear strategies for data collection and reporting on SDG indicators related to land, as well as effective strategic pathway for land governance to be synergized with other sectors, and be reflected and integrated to different policies, strategies, programs and budgets.

Annex 1: Evaluation

After the end of the training, Rasheed TI-JO has shared a questionnaire with the participants in order to collect their evaluation and feedback on the training event that can help to spot areas for improvements and measure the overall effectiveness. It also allowed participants to raise their voices and share their “outbox” inputs and comments that will be incorporated in the future events and serve as the basis for developing the lessons learnt.

The following table is the analysis of the distributed questionnaire that includes data and information obtained from the conducted evaluation by participants:

	Question	Yes	No	Partly
1.	The content of the training was organized and easy to follow	80%	10%	10%
2.	The training length was appropriate	90%	0%	10%
2.	The discussions were helpful and relevant	100%	0%	0%
3.	The objectives of the training were met	80%	0%	20%
4.	The presentation materials were relevant	100%	0%	0%
5.	The trainers were well prepared and able to answer any questions	100%	0%	0%
6.	As a result of this training, I gained new knowledge applicable to my work	100%	0%	0%
7.	The training delivered the information I expected to receive	70%	0%	30%
8.	All raised questions were responded	70%	10%	20%
9.	The duration of the training was sufficient for the material covered	80%	0%	20%
10.	The translation was good	60%	0%	40%
11.	All information was provided in advance	80%	10%	10%
12.	I feel like I now understand the topic much better	100%	0%	0%
13.	I would recommend others to watch the recorded version of this training	100%	0%	0%
14.	I am interested in attending future trainings and webinars offered by organizers and experts	100%	0%	0%
15.	This training enabled to get valuable connections with different experts and organizations:	100%	0%	0%
16.	What did you like MOST about the training?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Land law enforcement; ● UN Reporting; ● Discussing tools to apply the concept in real life; ● The possibility of listening to local experiences, challenges, and windows of opportunities; ● The discussion which increase more understanding of the topic; ● The variety of experts and trainees make it more valuable; ● Organization; ● Well organized, start point for good network for very important and urgent topic; ● Gathering many experts from all over the world; ● The diversity of the participants and trainers. 		
17.	What did you like LEAST about the training?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Maybe more info customized to Arab Region to ease the application of the tools; 		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It is a really sensitive subject that touches upon political interest and therefore having at the same room representatives of governments may embarrass participants, perhaps re-defining the audience to deliver targeted sessions; ● Some presentations were too long with a lot of information.
18.	Any other comments?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Very good recaps after each presentation; all in all it was well organized and professional as an online workshop; ● I appreciated how the training was mediated, my only questions not replied were those directed to Ms. May, NRC; ● Perhaps it would be valuable to have UN-Habitat/GLTN colleagues presenting the subject in an inclusive manner, highlighting the role of CSO and individuals, particularly because of localization and the impact at the local level of what has been discussed a bit at a high level. However, I appreciated the interventions of Mr. El Habib, incorporating what he has explained would be so valuable; ● Well prepared webinar; ● Given the importance of the topic “Land Governance in the Arab Region”, it should be built on this good start and continuing fruitful discussions in this alarming topic in the Arab region

After receiving the feedback and reviewing the answers, it is decided to provide more options for the feedback, and add the place after each question to explain the categories “no” and “partly”, if chosen. The feedback from the participants will be taken into consideration and reflected when preparing for the second training and Expert Group Meeting.