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Abstract
According to Transparency International’s research (Transparency International TI, 2013), around the world, one in five people report that they have paid a bribe for land services during the last years; in Africa, every second client of land administration services was affected. At the same time, land developers and speculators specifically target countries with weak governance, and together with local elites they can contribute to illicit and corrupt land transactions and increasing state capture. This marginalizes local populations further and as a consequence results in poverty, hunger, and conflict. However, only little evidence exists on land-corruption and its manifestations. TI’s Land and Corruption in Africa programme aims to fill this gap, and with this paper presents findings from TI’s empirical and desk-based baseline survey (2015) on land corruption in Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. Moreover, the paper will discuss challenges in unearthing evidence, and demonstrate where TI’s interventions can trigger change.
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BACKGROUND
Transparency International (TI) is a global movement with one vision: a world in which government, business, civil society and the daily lives of people are free of corruption. Through more than 100 chapters worldwide and an International Secretariat (TI-S) in Berlin, we are leading the fight against corruption to turn this vision into reality. Since 1993, we have campaigned for greater transparency and accountability in government and business. Independent and politically non-partisan, we work with partners in government, business and civil society to stop corruption. Every year we provide free legal support to thousands of victims of corruption and conduct in-depth research to uncover how corruption affects a particular country or sector.

According to Transparency International’s Global Corruption Barometer every fifth person globally has paid a bribe to access land services in the recent years (TI GCB 2013). Zeroed in on Sub-Saharan Africa, where agriculture still dominates the economy and provides livelihoods to the majority of the population, the GCB reveals an even more appalling situation where every second interviewed person, who has sought out land administration services reports she or he has been affected by corruption (TI GCB 2013).
Food Security, Agriculture, and Corruption remain among the top concerns in Africa as a survey on citizens’ priorities in 34 African countries conducted by Afrobarometer in 2015 shows, with 28% of respondents citing Food and Agriculture among their top 3 concerns and 13% citing Corruption as a top 3 concern. Political corruption is reported to be on the rise as large-scale commercial projects and new redistribution tools have been introduced in many countries of the continent in the past decade. A qualitative study by Owen, Van Mulken and Duale of the London School of Economics in 2015 shows that three governance challenges consistently go hand in hand with political corruption in the land sector: convoluted and intransparent land tenure regimes, low recognition and application of the existing rules, and weak accountability mechanisms.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Through its empirical and desk-based baseline survey (2015-2016) on land corruption in Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, TI has identified a number of issues that would have to be tackled to increase a nation’s capacity to counteract land corruption:

- Inadequate access to information, which allows citizens to knowing their rights and how to make use of them;
- Complex laws and procedures regulating land ownership and insufficient access to justice (multiple laws, gaps in legislation, traditional versus formal laws and institutions, uncertain law-enforcement);
- Deficient citizen participation in decision making and monitoring on land transactions, so that there is free, prior, informed consent;
- Unaccountable land management and urban land planning in the context of rapid urbanization that deprives the public purse of essential revenues and makes tenure and shelter security for the urban poor unobtainable;
- Absence of efficient anti-corruption oversight and restriction mechanisms, with grievance mechanisms, in the land sector;
Insufficient capacity in local administration and traditional institutions to support good land governance;

Perceived lack of incentives / win-win-situations for different stakeholders to act with integrity in land governance;

Opacity of private sector / government land deals and the resulting difficulties in investigating and understanding the drivers behind these deals.

To address these identified issues and to create a foundation for dialogue with relevant stakeholders from civil society, the public and private sectors, TI initiated in 2015 its Land and Corruption in Africa Programme.

**TI's LAND AND CORRUPTION IN AFRICA PROGRAMME**

The programme is guided by the vision of guaranteeing the maintenance and development of land and tenure-based prosperity for men and women of all generations equally, respecting the dimensions of stewardship and socio-cultural relationships to land, and taking into consideration the special needs and rights of ethnic minorities, for sustainable and inclusive development and growth. The programme operates along the three components research, evidence based advocacy, and relevant solutions, and based on the hypotheses that well-informed and empowered citizens hold their duty bearers accountable and counteract corruption. The programme is presently implemented in ten countries by the local TI National Chapters (the members of the TI Movement in a country); the countries are Cameroon, Ghana, Liberia, Kenya, Madagascar, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

**TI'S LAND AND CORRUPTION IN AFRICA IMPACT MONITORING APPROACH**

Advocacy processes are usually complex, fast-paced, and dynamic, making data collection challenging. Additionally, advocacy efforts often aim for outcomes for which a contribution by the advocate is difficult to assign (e.g. to what extent did the government adopt a specific policy due to TI’s advocacy on it?). Even more challenging are changes in behavior.
Capturing these types of changes, the impact that it has on those involved, can be daunting. More traditional approaches to monitoring, by design, tend to focus on monitoring quantitative indicators - in advocacy outreach indicators more specifically. Data regarding impact is seldom collected and anecdotal case studies or ‘stories’ are often put forward as the qualitative impact data that evidences progress and achievement.

The Land and Corruption project from its inception has made a conscious effort to ensure that policy and behavior changes would be captured. A MEL framework was worked on and agreed by project stakeholders. It comprises of seven indicators that attempt to go beyond quantitative information. They are based on TI’s impact monitoring matrix. The matrix is an analytical lens that is used regularly and systematically in projects and initiatives to monitor their progress in achieving change that leads to a reduction in corruption, in order to understand how we can increase the effectiveness of our work and maximise impact.

The following seven indicators measure LCA project progress against the three project result areas:

Result 1: A strong and engaged citizenry of men and women of different generations and social and cultural backgrounds is informed of their land and tenure rights, legally empowered to defend their rights, aware of solution mechanisms, and able to demand transparency and accountability and citizen participation and oversight from their governments to end corruption in the land sector.

# and description of communities challenging land rights violation attempts (ranging from official complaints to actual legal challenges)

Result 2: Stakeholders from civil society, private sector and government are engaged in land related anti-corruption initiatives, systematically act to promote good land governance, and prevent corruption in the land sector nationally, regionally and globally.

# and description of instances of information related to land being made publicly available

# and description of instances of communities being part of multi-stakeholder initiatives on land adjudication/management

Result 3: Intergovernmental institutions, governments, and businesses have strong, equitable, and just procedures in place to prevent and redress corruption in land distribution, land acquisition, and land dispute management, as well as to sanction infractions.
# and description of instances of legal and policy gaps related to land rights being addressed by TI National Chapters’ targets

# and description of instances of customary laws being made fairer and more transparent

# and descriptions of instances of dynamic public/private relationships in the land sector being addressed, made fairer and more transparent

# and descriptions of instances of institutions that start to address the lack of grievance mechanisms to increase opportunities for redress

The impact matrix outlines the two main areas of change Transparency International is aiming to achieve:

- **Policy and institutional change.** The ultimate aim is to ensure that intergovernmental institutions, governments, political parties and businesses have all the necessary mechanisms, policies or laws in place to redress and prevent corruption, sanction corrupt behaviour, and promote good governance.

- **Behaviour change.** The ultimate aim is that individuals, communities, civil society organisations and social movements act systematically to promote global good governance and prevent corruption.

The impact matrix describes the various components that together create the pathways to achieve change and the desired impact in the two aforementioned change areas. However, context matters: in some cases raising awareness is a big achievement in itself, but in others it falls short of the impact that could be possible given the context. Additionally, the various components are interconnected and build on each other. This means that there can be different ways of achieving change that do not necessarily follow a straight and ordinal path.
The monitoring for the land project therefore focused on advances in both impact areas: policy and institutional; and behavior. The baseline provided collected data for the status quo also on both and across the 10 countries participating in the project.

Assessing progress and impact on the behaviour dimension was always seen as the most challenging in the monitoring with the matrix. Therefore – and with this monitoring purpose in mind – a few methods were developed to collect the relevant data.
THE BASELINE AND METHODLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The aim of the baseline was to monitor whether communities and individual stakeholders reached by the project move from a state of not knowing – their rights, their ownership status, their duty bearers; to a state of being informed about their rights and acting whenever these are not uphold. This transformational approach to behaviour that looks at the project’s impact via increasing levels of empowerment of its stakeholders is inspired by Longwe’ Women’s Empowerment Framework (1995).

In this context, and to capture the different empowerment trajectories, the team developed a questionnaire which was applied in the different countries participating in this project. The findings set the baseline, and will influence the targets thereafter. This baseline is already showing interesting relationships. It is important to note however, before getting into the discussion of the data, that the survey was implemented in different countries with varying degrees of success.

Additionally, capturing the views and perceptions of women respondents through the survey was incredibly challenging. Some countries reported that in many cases to be able to run the survey teams had to ask permission to the women’s families/ spouses, and in many situations the husband would sit next to the woman throughout the survey interview. In some instances, traditional leaders and community counsellors were used to attract the participation of women but this may have also had an influencing effect as these individuals often stayed present for the interview. This may explain why, in the analysis of the findings, the statistical differences between female and male responses is not significant. Likewise, results at gender level are hardly supportive of the wealth of well-founded literature on women and land.

This significance however increases when the analysis is refined to capturing only the views of single women and female widowers. In sum, whilst the survey findings for the male sample can be considered robust, the same cannot be said for the case of the female sample. Finally, results point towards men – overall – being quite low in the empowerment scale. If this is the case, and if the findings for women were to be aligned with the literature as one would expect, then one can only conclude that women must be at an even and much lower level.
The Methodology

The survey generates information on the present situation of land corruption. In 2015, across sub-Sahara Africa, several TI National Chapters conducted desk-based and empirical research which aims for a political analysis and risk mapping with respect to (a) examining land corruption issues, (b) identifying the gaps and loopholes which nurture it, and (c) providing recommendations based on facts. The political analysis looks at all land-related public policy and laws in the countries concerned and their effectiveness in implementation and enforcement. The mapping examines the different stakeholders’ concerns and attitudes towards land corruption (citizens, private sector, government institutions). The template for the mapping is attached as annex 2. The empirical baseline survey based on feedback from household questionnaires, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions reflects on citizens’ perceptions of land corruption, their access to information, possibilities for participation and empowerment. It takes into consideration especially women and young people. Empirical quantitative data was captured through a questionnaire and mainly in the programme’s intervention locations. The questionnaire template is attached as annex 1. Overall, the 2015 survey analysis identifies trends and areas for interventions.

Learning from the Data Collection

All participating TI National Chapters reported certain challenges in collecting the data:

Corruption Issues:

- Questions directly related to corruption issues are overlaid by a strong cultural taboo and the feedback on those questions was very hesitant in all countries, so the data gathered and juxtaposed in these instances has to be cautiously regarded. The dark figure of corruption instances is estimated to be high, even if respondents were constantly assured of their guaranteed anonymity.

- Open-ended questions may be more successful in encouraging respondents to overcome the secretive nature of corruption and be more open about discussing the multiple facets of corruption (such as nepotism, grand scale corruption or sextortion) instead to concentrate only on bribe instances.

- TI National Chapters recommend the use of more neutral terms and language in future monitoring interventions (for example using the terms Transparency and Accountability Challenges as opposed to Corruption and Bribe).
• The cooperation and validation of the corruption related data through community based organizations and traditional leaders was also recommended but presents a risk in itself as the stronger involvement of third parties may bias the responses interviewees provide.

Multiple response options

• For the question on land ownership, another confusing element was added: in many of the surveyed countries, more than one model of land ownership is known: actual land ownership but also symbolic or legal land custodianship (for traditional leaders, community and family chiefs but also public institutions or public figures, such as the President etc) or a more or less legalized right to influence the land management and distribution (for traditional, religious or family leaders or certain public institutions). This has meant that the multiple responses may actually bias the results of the survey as the participants themselves may have definitions of ownership that have no legal implications or the overlapping legislation regimes of customary law may introduce a level of uncertainty over actual ownership.

• Additionally, interviewers report a confusion in respondents as to what ranking should be given to their different responses; in practice, this has led to very few responses being given for the second and subsequent options.

Make-up of questionnaire

• Some of the TI National Chapters have reported that the questionnaire was deemed by many participants to be too lengthy, which led to a fatigue and higher proportions of “null” or “other” answers towards the end of the interviews.

• Contexts in the countries participating in the Land and Corruption Project differ and not all questions were deemed by TI National Chapters to be contextually relevant to their domestic issues. This is inevitable if a regional comparison is to be made but it may have contributed to some effect of resignation in respondents confronted with irrelevant for their situation questions and/or response options.

The participation of women in the survey:

Another reported challenge linked to the collection of the data was assuring the active participation of women.
Interviewers report that women would often not dare participate in the survey without the permission of a male family member, usually the spouse and may only agree to participating in the presence of such a figure.

In some instances, traditional leaders and community counsellors were used to attract the participation of women but this may have also had an influencing effect as these individuals often stayed present for the interview.

Mobilization and incentives

As many NGOs in Sub-Saharan Africa aim to expand their knowledge on social justice issues, communities are regularly confronted with the demand for their opinions and experiences and a certain knowledge competition arises.

However, such demands could be averted by engaging with a stable community partner, who would first informally measure and expand the community’s sensitivity for the issues of land governance and land corruption and will introduce the interviewers in the community.

Risk of engaging in research linked to politicized issues and possible political pressure

In some countries like Kenya, Uganda or Zimbabwe, existing regulations relevant to all community gatherings risked to thwart mobilization efforts.

In cases as these the cooperation with community-based organizations to gather data was highly conducive to improving the sample size.

An interest in land governance issue by the government or other public institutions as in Uganda may also be helpful in acquiring permissions to engage with the population.

However, conducting a baseline survey or other monitoring activities in countries or regions where land governance and land corruption are already highly politicized issues may prove to be a risk as access to certain communities may be denied. Respondents are also very conscious of the political implications of their answers and this may bias the answers they provide.

Infrastructural, technological and budgetary constraints

The conducting of large-scale surveys is a costly intervention that includes human resources costs, the costs of acquiring statistical software to conduct the subsequent analysis and travel costs for accessing the targeted areas.
• Conducting a representative survey is a time-costly intervention. The same is true in terms of financial costs, not only as it applies to the recruitment of interviewers but also to infrastructural challenges (possession of a field car, ability to access remote locations).
• Certain areas may be very hardly accessible and yet be of great interest to engage in communities where the land integrity issues are the direst.

To respond to some of the presented challenges, some learning was captured in principles for research processes (TI, 2017):

For research to yield useful results, it is important to combine (‘triangulate’) diverse perspectives and diverse data collection instruments, in ways that fully respect the participants’ rights and safety.

➤ **Ensure people are equal partners in research:** To ensure the research captures the full range of people’s experiences, make sure that male and female researchers design and implement the research together. Consultations with women and men of different backgrounds before data collection, and validation meetings upon completion of the analysis help make your conclusions more accurate. It is important to give equal respect to women and men of all social classes – grassroots women with little formal education are fully capable of providing useful information. *Never assume grassroots women are ignorant!*

➤ **Get multiple perspectives:** More than half of the world’s population is female. Therefore, any representative sample of respondents should include about as many male as female respondents from a wide range of social classes and situations. Do not send away women who come to a meeting with babies – young mothers, too, have a right to be heard. **Participatory** methods, which create a dialogue between the researchers and the people they conduct research on, are useful to find out about people’s different perspectives.

➤ **Use complementary research instruments:** Use different instruments to get the most out of your research. It is advisable to start with a literature review, so as to assess what is already known and what needs more research. Then, key informant interviews and focus group discussions help you understand how women and men experience corruption and what they do about it. On the basis of those findings, you can design standardised survey questionnaires that reflect people’s realities; the survey will give an idea of the scope of the issue. If you want to find out more about the ‘why’ and ‘how’ to better interpret survey findings, you can again use interviews and focus group discussions.
Find out about differences: Corruption is often experienced differently by women and men; some forms of corruption, such as sexual extortion, mainly affect women and girls. Also, women face different issues depending on their individual circumstances – for instance, marital status, age, physical ability, social class and ethnicity can make big differences. It is recommended to include research questions and to analyse data in ways that reveal such differences.

Follow research ethics and deal with sensitive issues respectfully: Research must be conducted in ways to maximise the use of the research and minimise potential harm to the participants. Some forms of corruption, such as sexual extortion, are forms of gender-based violence which may have caused trauma among your participants. Researchers – including all data collection assistants – should be trained in gender- and trauma-sensitive data collection, for instance using the time-tested WHO/PATHT guide (Ellsberg and Heise 2005). Contact details of service providers (for instance, counselling services) should be shared with respondents who ask for support. Be careful with incentives for research participants: they should be limited to what is necessary (such as transport and refreshments) and distributed transparently.

COMMON FINDINGS FROM THE 2015 / 2016 BASELINE

TI National Chapters (NCs) in Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe commenced an analysis of the initial situation to establish a project baseline in 2015. NCs collected empirical data mainly in their project intervention areas. Household interviews with a questionnaire were done in Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Uganda and Zimbabwe. The analysis presented here is based entirely on data collected by TI National Chapters in Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. A baseline report exists as a TI internal document and excerpts will be published in 2017.

In 2017, a follow-up to the initial baseline research is planned to collect data mapping the changes in the project implementation areas.

The qualitative baseline findings based on desk-based research, focus group discussions, and key informant interviews, demonstrate the following observations against the seven indicators:

1. Legal and Policy Gaps relating to land rights: Overlapping responsibilities and a large number of laws regulating land rights and land management, which make the law hard to navigate and
expose the public to a higher number of public actors. The dependence on a high number of duty bearers opens potential for nepotism and bribery.

2. **Customary Laws and Regulations:** Conflicts between the state legislation and customary laws under which traditional leaders are often custodians of the land (as in Ghana, Kenya, Uganda, Zambia) even where individual ownership is recognized. The recognition of customary law can be empowering for communities but it becomes a source of confusion and frustration in cases where state law and customary laws are contradictory. Limited accountability of traditional leaders is a corruption risk with potential for systematic intimidation, bribery, extortion or nepotism.

3. **The Dynamics of Public Private Relations:** Grand corruption in the land sector is a specific case of political corruption as it does not only stipulate the loss of state resources and the misappropriation of public and private resources but directly impacts the population through a dramatic loss of stability for those affected. Resettlement policies and the danger of land-grabbing and eviction from owned or cultivated properties is the most feared consequence of opaque public-private dynamics.

4. **Grievance Mechanisms:** The biggest problem relating to complaint mechanisms seems to be the lack of awareness of the population on what means are available to them to combat rights violations linked to land issues. Grievance mechanisms and cycles of judiciary appeal exist in almost all countries but are largely inefficient because they are too costly or too specialized. In some countries, for example Ghana, Madagascar and Sierra Leone, recent land reforms offer opportunities to better address people’s concerns. The low accountability of traditional leaders is problematic as customary laws do not always have the same complaint mechanisms and grievance provisions as state legislation.

5. **Publicly Available Information related to Land:** Information on land issues, especially land deals, is made available in most countries through government channels but fails to reach the population. Different channels of communication exist in different countries but all have in common their inaccessibility to the populations. The by far most often cited lack of publicly available information concerns land planning and land management issues, for example in Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe. Here the communities are not sufficiently aware of the land acquisition projects that concern them and often remain unaware of the risks linked to new land planning schemes. They may not be informed at all until large scale land transactions or new land allocations have taken place or they may not be
informed in a time frame that would allow to oppose any such plans through official channels. The environmental risks and the risks to the sustainability of land use, which emerge when agro-businesses, cooperatives or other exploitation plans are introduced, are rarely discussed with the ones most affected by them.

6. **Communities and Individuals being part of Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives on Land Adjudication and Management:** Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and Community Based Organisations (CBOs) actively engage in multi-stakeholder initiatives on land adjudication and land management, but only a small number of individuals directly affected by land corruption or legal problems do. In countries where land management issues are highly politicized (e.g. Cameroon, Kenya, and Zimbabwe) CSOs and CBOs rarely engage in actual management issues fearing retribution or political opposition.

7. **Communities and Individuals challenging Land Rights Violations:** Communities and individuals hardly challenge attempts of land rights violations. Lack of awareness and empowerment seem to be the causes, with fear of negative consequences playing a specific role in some countries (Kenya, Zimbabwe). In some countries, community and individuals’ action to fight land governance issues and corruption have shown some results as the cases of the Kribi community in Cameroon, the Tiwi Aggrieved Farmers lobby group in Kenya or the efforts of the Land Equity Movement Uganda (LEMU) illustrate. But even these initiatives, which attracted the public’s attention, suffer from the small scale on which these actions have been undertaken and the low number of individuals actually engaged. Farmer organisations often lack the skills and resources to address rights violations and the support of the larger community remains elusive. Community support is notoriously hard to obtain because of the long and often fruitless legal contestation procedures that need to be undertaken.

Household surveys using the questionnaire were realised in Ghana, Kenya, Uganda, and Zimbabwe, looking into knowledge, participation, empowerment, and actual land corruption. The following excerpt of quantitative findings was generated:

1. **Knowledge of Rights and Duty-bearers:** Only around 29% of respondents stated that they themselves owned the land, with relatives, private companies, community leaders, public institutions and NGOs being cited as sharing the rest of the ownership rights. In all of the surveyed countries, however, more than one model of land ownership is known: actual land ownership certified through a land title and also symbolic or legal land custodianship (for
traditional leaders, community and family chiefs but also public institutions or public figures, such as the President etc.) or a more or less legalized right to influence land management and distribution (for traditional, religious or family leaders or certain public institutions). This means that the multiple responses may actually bias the results of the survey as the participants themselves may have definitions of ownership that have no legal implications. The overlapping legislation regimes of customary law may also introduce a level of uncertainty over actual ownership. This situation mirrors the qualitative findings on overlapping state legal regimes and customary law provisions and illustrates what practical difficulties this opaque legal context can introduce. People that do not own the land themselves, whose land belongs primarily to community leaders or family, were the ones that predominantly expressed the need for more land. This specific finding, when linked with the presented available qualitative data, underlines the importance of customary laws, which often regulate community and family relationships. Most people interviewed for the regional baseline, who fear they may lose their land, own the land themselves. Public officials, along with private investors/companies are the most feared. This is true for both genders but women feel even more insecurity than men in this regard. These findings point to the importance not only of policy and legal provisions to protect owners and users of land but also to the very real implications of grand political corruption and opaque relationships between public officials and private investors.

2. **Participation in Decision Making:** Only very small proportions of the interviewed were involved in any kind of community group linked to land (land management or land distribution initiatives). This is true for both genders (6% of the women are members of community groups compared to 10% of the men) as shown in the graph below. Additionally, only very few (5%) of the interviewed had the opportunity to engage in land discussions or consultations on land allocation or other land issues that concern them in the past 12 months. Despite these very dismal opportunities for community participation described by the quantitative data, the interviewed rated the significance of such participation measures in decision-making.

3. **Empowerment and Taking Action:** When preliminary participation in decision-making may be denied or not thoroughly realized, empowerment through legal means and the ability to take action to protect one’s land rights become all the more important. The most common way of enforcing one’s rights is through a land title protecting private property in legal settings. However, among the interviewed, who stated that they own the land they use, as many as 48% did not have a land title. When directly confronted with rights violations, respondents hesitate to
counteract or involve themselves in any action to prevent violations from happening in the future. The most often cited reason for not taking action against rights violations is that the interviewed do not know what actions to take, followed by the perceived lack of opportunities to do so and the fear of discrimination. Even for the very small part of active citizens, in cases where participation and empowered action against rights violations were linked in the survey, the most recurring form of participation was attendance of community meetings.

4. **Corruption in Land Services**: The quantitative data underlines the need to deal with the opaque legal context described earlier. Public officials were by far the most cited institution to ask for or accept a bribe in the past 12 months leading to the survey. The need to avoid eviction was stated as the most recurring reason for paying a bribe. The leading reasons for engaging in corruption give us an overview of the way individuals react to rights violations. People are driven to accept violations of the system in order to avoid eviction, in order to secure land titles and or to speed up land transactions.

The following info-graphics (figure 1 to 13) stem from the baseline household survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Male Respondents</th>
<th>Female Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings expressed in Figure 1 show the diverging vulnerabilities of men and women as to losing one’s land. Most people interviewed for the regional baseline, who fear they may lose their land, own the land themselves. Public officials, along with private investors/companies are the most feared. This is true for both genders but women feel even more insecurity than men in this regard.

These findings point to the importance not only of policy and legal provisions to protect owners and users of land but also to the very real implications of grand political corruption and the opaque relationship between public officials and private investors.
When asked who they would turn to for help, the top response given by the interviewed was a lawyer or legal organisation, followed by community leaders. However, only ca. 21% thought of turning to a legal representative. Community leaders were trusted by around 13% of respondents to protect their interests. Almost half of the respondents don’t give a definite answer (45%) and the rest grant their trust to family members, influential acquaintances and diverse public institutions.
The dimension of knowledge of rights and duty bearers is also measured through the need for information and its availability. Availability of land was the area respondents were most interested in (ca. 37%), with access and conditions to loans and general regulations (15%) and conditions of land ownership and land use coming in as pressing as well.

Our regional survey shows that people do use diverse ways to gather information but face to face interactions and personal connections are by far the most used: advice and information come from community leaders and public officials but also often from relatives, legal personnel and neighbours. Different media also play a role, albeit not a very important one.

![Figure 3: Type of information needed by respondents](image-url)
Participation in decision making was measured through questions about respondents’ perception on who decides on land issues that concern them in their community, means of direct participation that they have engaged in and the rating of the meaningfulness and influence they award to such an engagement.

Public officials (named by 19%) and community leaders (named by 16%) are perceived to be the ones in control of land use in the community. Also mentioned as having an influence are cooperatives (11%) and local NGOs (9%). The diverging opinions and the large number of respondents who don’t have a definite answer to this question suggest that respondents were not well oriented as to whom to turn to in cases, in which they would need assistance.

Figure 4: Who makes the decisions on land use in your community?
Only very small proportions of the interviewed were involved in any kind of community group linked to land (land management or land distribution initiatives). This is true for both genders (6% of the women are members of community groups against 10% for the men) as shown in the graph below.

Additionally, only very few (5%) of the interviewed had the opportunity to engage in land discussions or consultations on land allocation or other land issues that concern them in the past 12 months.
Despite these very dismal opportunities for community participation described by the quantitative data, the interviewed rated the significance of such participation measures in decision-making as high as Figure 7 illustrates.

When directly confronted with rights violations, respondents hesitate to counteract or involve themselves in any action to prevent violations from happening in the future. Figure 8 shows that the most often cited reason for not taking action against rights violations is that the interviewed do not know what actions to take, followed by the perceived lack of opportunities to do so and the fear of discrimination.
Even for the very small part of active citizens, in cases where participation and empowered action against rights violations were linked in the survey, the most recurring participation was attendance of community meetings. All other participative and accountability actions surveyed were not being used. Such participatory methods could include getting help from an NGO or the media, organising or attending demonstrations, organising or signing a petition, lobbying with local businesses, traditional leaders or political representatives, filing a complaint or requesting access to information from an institution.

Figure 9: Respondents' Top 3 answers on what action they have undertaken to combat rights violations in relation to land

The quantitative data underlines the need to deal with the opaque legal context so as to reduce corruption. Figure 10 and Figure 12 illustrate that the public sector is the one most clearly affected. Public officials were by far the most cited institution to ask for or accept a bribe in the past 12 months leading to the survey. Although a comparison with numbers from the 2013 GCB suggests that the dark number could be much higher, 28% (340) of respondents in the regional quantitative database report that they have been asked for a bribe in the last 12 months.
Threats to lose land are linked to grand political corruption but they can also fuel petty corruption as Figure 11 shows. One can see that the need to avoid eviction was stated as the most recurring reason for paying a bribe in the regional quantitative database. The leading reasons for engaging in corruption also give us an overview of the way individuals react to rights violations. As Figure 11 shows people are
driven to accept violations of the system in order to avoid eviction, in order to secure land titles and or to speed up land transactions. The collective action nature of the problem becomes apparent as "Everyone does it" is a recurring answer even if not stated as primary but as a secondary preoccupation.

Figure 12: Top 5 Institutions having received a bribe
The interviewed face a number of challenges when they answer questions on corruption with which they may have been faced. These include risks of engaging in research linked to the highly politicized issues of land allocation or the “tabooization” of certain elements of corruption like sexual extortion. Respondents are very conscious of the political implications of their answers and this may bias the answers they provide.

As for sexual extortion or sextortion that mostly affects women, uncompromised data is very hard to obtain. Even in countries, such as Zimbabwe, where the effort was made to specifically address women as can be seen by the high numbers of women interviewed, interviewers report that women would often not dare participate in the survey without the permission of a male family member, usually the spouse, and may only agree to participate in the presence of such a figure.

Rights violations linked to corruption according to the survey data were predominantly the extortion of money, with gifts in kind coming in second place. However, sexual extortion is an issue in a number of countries, which does not become apparent in the results of this survey because of the assumed tabooization and stigmatization. Sexual extortion as a form of corruption suffered by women seeking to access land and land management services will have to be explored in a more sensitive and gender-responsive manner in the future.
We realized that land-related issues experienced by women differ from land-related issues experienced by men. Therefore, our responses and interventions need to be gender responsive.

Source: TI, 2017

In Zimbabwe, for example, Transparency International’s gender-sensitive research highlighted the vital contribution of women farmers towards household food security. Based on those findings, we have connected our work on land integrity with national and international efforts towards the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)1, thus providing a common ground for engagement with local and national authorities in a highly politicised space. On the whole, the government is more willing to address what is perceived as ‘women’s issues’ – for example, food security and child mortality – than corruption as such.

1 On the SDG agenda, see http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/
Land-related issues as experienced by men

Poverty and marginal social status

Land corruption

* It is acknowledged that men, too, may experience sexual violence. However, the vast majority of cases are perpetrated against women and girls.

Source: TI, 2017
IMPACT – EVIDENCE LEADING TO CHANGE

The findings coming from the baseline survey allows TI to come to conclusions on how to and which interventions to design to counteract land corruption and achieving the three Land and Corruption in Africa programme’s results.

The following conclusions constitute the main regional recommendations on how to orientate and prioritize project activities as suggested by the data evaluation:

- Overall, comparing the need for action indicated by the quantitative and qualitative data, Result Area 1 and Result Area 2 emerge as offering the possibility to make the biggest impact as the level of access to information, participation and engagement of communities proves to be very low at the moment. Through introducing and supporting participative measures and educating the population on options to combat rights violations linked to land issues, TI National Chapters can bring sustainable and clear change.

- In the framework of Result Area 3, the fear of eviction emerges as the biggest preoccupation and corruption risk, repeatedly underlined by the surveyed communities and recognized by the scoping.
  - To address this and other corruption concerns identified in the report, Policy and Legal Gaps, specifically the complexity of national legal contexts needs to be tackled through advocacy. This is supported by the finding that the most instances of land-related corruption occurred in relation to public officials and public institutions.
  - Customary Law and Regulations is a very important area of influence as traditional leaders were clearly identified as very powerful actors linked to all kinds of decision-making processes, with a lot of discretion and very few accountability loops. The customary legislation also holds a lot of importance because of its regulation of family and community relations, as well as its role in inheritance regulations.
  - As eviction risks are closely linked to opaque dynamics between public and private actors, this area of intervention also holds a lot of importance. Access to information and more participation in land planning and land allocation is the key to influencing these dynamics.
Grievance Mechanisms exist in all countries but the necessity to familiarize the population with their use and to make them more accessible needs to be discussed in an urgent manner.

- Adequate, culture-sensitive measures should be taken for tackling gender-specific problems identified by the baseline report. This applies specifically to enabling women to participate and take actions against right violations, particularly facilitating their access to formal and informal grievance and complaint mechanisms.

The data indicates certain desired positive changes that the TI National Chapters now identified as desired targets. Some of these will here be presented in relation to the seven Impact Monitoring Indicators under the respective Result Areas as defined in the project:

**Result 1:** A strong citizenship of men and women of different generations and social and cultural backgrounds is informed of their land and tenure rights, legally empowered to defend their rights, aware of solution mechanisms, and demands transparency and accountability, citizen participation and oversight from their governments to end corruption in the land sector.

Impact Monitoring Indicator 1: **# and description of communities challenging land rights violations’ attempts (from official complaints to actual legal challenges)**

The need for information can be addressed through the following positive changes:

- Accessible and simplified Information on active legislation is disseminated
- Maps and archives are reviewed and are accessible to the public for consultation
- CSOs cooperate with authorities to inform the population on rights/duties and major projects affecting their capacity to use land (including contextual threats)
- Populations have a sustainable plan of tenure on the land they use and are informed about investments and their possibilities to engage with new land owners
- The communities are informed about land transactions and allocations that directly concern them and are participate in regards to land planning and use
Communities are informed about new legislation plans while they are being introduced in legislative forums.

Individuals are made aware of whom to turn to if they need more information.

Result 2: Stakeholders from civil society, private sector and government are engaged in land related anti-corruption initiatives, systematically act to promote good land governance, and prevent corruption in the land sector nationally, regionally and globally.

Impact Monitoring Indicator 2: # and description of instances of information related to land being made publicly available

Impact Monitoring Indicator 3: # and description of instances of communities being part of multi-stakeholders’ initiatives on land adjudication/management

The lack of information on land planning and management is directly linked to the currently poor engagement of the communities and individuals in initiatives on land adjudication and management.

The positive changes envisioned by the TI National Chapters that could markedly improve the participation of communities are:

- CBOs and CSOs cooperate with the populations and the duty bearers so that the community engages more deeply with issues of planning and use of the land

- Community engagement and participation in land planning and use is more widespread, Consultative Commissions take into account communities' concerns, compensation processes run smoothly and expropriation claims are thoroughly documented

- Good Practices are encouraged and extended:
  - Coalition networks of CSOs + CBOs are created

- Communities are empowered to show interest and consult on land planning and management

- Information is easier to come by and is regularly shared through traditional channels (local council leaders/elders), which are sensitized on policies and legislation
• Engagement of community based structures is encouraged and tenure security is improved to allow for such engagement

The positive change envisioned hereby is strongly linked with Impact Monitoring Indicator 7 on grievance mechanisms and features the following components:

• Complaints and land dispute processes are more quickly dealt with, legal representation is made accessible to disadvantaged populations

• CSOs capacity to engage with a broader network of stakeholders (including both authorities and communities) is improved

• CSOs target specifically vulnerable groups and empower them to demand their rights in front of the authorities/courts

• Community organizations are aware of risks and possibilities to engage meaningfully as a group to receive compensation

• CBOs target women specifically and develop overall community support for their needs

• Community members report abuse to the authorities, complaint mechanisms exist that address people's fear of retaliation (f.ex. anonymising the rapporteur)

Result 3: Intergovernmental institutions, governments, and businesses have strong, equitable, and just procedures in place to prevent and redress corruption in land distribution, land acquisition, and land dispute management, as well as to sanction infractions.

Impact Monitoring Indicator 4: # and description of instances of legal and policy gaps related to land rights being addressed by Chapters’ targets

Impact Monitoring Indicator 5: # and description of instances of customary laws being made fairer and more transparent

Impact Monitoring Indicator 6: # and descriptions of instances of the dynamic public/private in the land sector being addressed, made fairer and more transparent
Impact Monitoring Indicator 7: # and descriptions of instances of institutions that start to address the lack of grievance mechanisms to increase opportunities for redress

The need to address overbearing legal regimes and irregularities can be expressed through a number of actions with the following changes in mind:

- Existing legislation is harmonized and parallel functions and responsibilities are clarified
- Smoother procedures are established to simplify land registration and land use/tenure formalities and the two are meaningfully linked to ensure that compulsory registration does not result in evictions
- Standards and timelines are introduced for the procedures in place, so that artificial delays can be brought to a minimum
- Simplified information on legislation, rights and duties is distributed to the population to encourage tenure security
- Better tools are suggested to officials for the management of land registration and land planning
- Topography plans are actualized
- Imposters and criminals pretending to hold official functions are judicially persecuted

Ways to positively affect the relationships between traditional custodians of the land and the communities feature:

- Traditional leaders and communities are sensitized to gender issues
- Women are empowered to question the authority in a constructive way and take action in case of right violations, relating back to the land legislation and the succession laws
- Traditional leaders who act as representatives of the community interests are sensitized to protecting the rights of disadvantaged parts of the population (the poor or vulnerable ethnicities)
- Chiefs are held up to internal integrity standards: a good practice could be established in cooperation with regionalized bodies as in Cameroon through the National Council of the Traditional Chiefs of Cameroon/Conseil National des Chefs Traditionnels du Cameroun (CNCTC)

- Traditional authorities are sensitized to finding sustainable solutions and compensating families according to needs and not market price and investor interests

- Communities have the opportunity to use customary laws to resolve disputes: in case of discriminatory practices they can dispute those decisions

- Overlapping responsibilities are clarified

The management of land and the vulnerability of the local population towards investors and companies can be vastly improved through the following measures:

- Transparent and publicly discussed land allocation processes

- Sensitization of communities on environmental issues and land use/planning issues and their empowerment to report and take action against illegal attribution of parcels

- Further involvement of communities in planning and in advance of exploitation schemes

- Effective complaint mechanisms put in place to assure compensation

- Public information about the costs and benefits of land acquisitions

- Land acquisition deals discussed in community meetings

- Authorities trained to respond to people's concerns, more transparent structures in regards to land acquisition and land transactions

- Women, chiefs and men in the community sensitized to the discrimination and empowered to oppose it

- Information on big/influential transactions disseminated to all intergovernmental agencies
RECOMMENDATIONS

As a recommendation, the TI global movement calls for corruption-free land governance worldwide.

We call on:

1. All governments, businesses, civil society and the public to recognize that land corruption is a serious threat to all livelihoods.
2. All governments to identify weaknesses in administration systems that facilitate land corruption and seek solutions to support good land governance.
3. Businesses in the land sector to act responsibly, transparently and fairly when entering into deals with governments and traditional authorities. This must include public disclosure of beneficial ownership information.
4. Civil society and media to ensure the public are informed of their land rights; to expose wrongdoing; and to monitor government and business’s conduct in the land sector.
5. All governments and businesses to protect land corruption whistleblowers. This should include setting up or support for dedicated channels through which whistleblowers can report land corruption anonymously.
6. All citizens to be vigilant and report land corruption, resist paying bribes for land services, and demand accountability from political and traditional leaders in land affairs.
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Appendix 1: TI Land and Corruption Baseline Survey Questionnaire

Introduction

[Quick description of project and argument as to why monitoring is important for this project]

Part I Demographics

1. What is your gender?
   a. Female
   b. Male

2. Town & district

3. Is your locality an urban, rural or a mixed one?
   c. Urban
   d. Rural
   e. Mixed

4. How old are you?
   a. 15-19 years old
   b. 20-29 years old
   c. 30-39 years old
   d. 40-49 years old
   e. 50-59
   f. Older than 60 years old

5. What’s your marital status?
   a. Married (recognised document)
   b. Cohabitation (living together without recognised document)
   c. Divorced
   d. Single
   e. Widow
   f. Other

6. For how many years did you attend school?
   a. 2-5
   b. 6-9
   c. 10-13
13. I have never been to school

7. How does your family make a living?

8. What is the most valuable item your family owns?
   a. Car
   b. Computer
   c. TV
   d. Bicycle
   e. Radio
   f. Nothing as valuable
   g. Other – please specify ....

9. How many people depend on you (financially and in kind = food items, for example)?

Part II Knowledge of rights and duty bearers

10. Who owns the land that you currently use? Please select all options that apply.
    a. A private investor/ company
    b. I do
    c. My spouse
    d. Relatives / family members like parents, children, uncles ....
    e. Community leaders/ traditional leaders
    f. I don’t know
    g. Others. Please specify ....

11. If you need more land, do you know how to get it?
    a. Yes
    b. No

12. Where would you go for this information? Please select up to 3 most important options.
    a. A lawyer / legal advice organisation
    b. Relatives / family members like spouse, parents, children, ...
    c. The bank/ financial institution
    d. Community leaders/ traditional leaders
    e. The county government / public institutions [if this option is selected ask respondents to specify which institutions]
    f. I don’t know
13. What type of information related to land do you most often need to know about? Please select up to 3 most important options.
   a. Access and conditions of loans
   b. Availability of land
   c. Regulations related to Evictions
   d. Land inheritance rights
   e. Land titling/ registration regulations
   f. I don’t often need to know about these issues
   g. Other. Please specify ...

14. Can the land you currently use be taken away from you at any time?
   a. Yes
   b. No [jump to question 16]
   c. I don’t know [jump to question 16]

15. By whom?
   a. A private investor/ company
   b. Relatives / family members like spouse, parents, children, ...
   c. Public officials/ public institutions [ask respondents to specify which institutions]
   d. The community leaders/ traditional leaders
   e. The cooperative/ farmers’ association
   f. I don’t know
   g. Others. Please specify ....

16. If you felt that your ability to use your land was being threatened, where would you go for help? Please select up to 3 most important options.
   a. A lawyer/ legal advice organisation
   b. Community leaders/ traditional leaders
   c. Relatives / family members like spouse, parents, children, ...
   d. Police
   e. Public officials/ public institutions [if this option is selected ask respondents to specify which institutions]
   f. There is nowhere I can go to for help
   g. Others. Please specify ....
Part III Perception of land value

17. How important is land for you, on a scale of 1 to 4 with 1 being not important at all and 4 being very important.

1 2 3 4

18. Why is land important for you? Please select up to 3 most important options.
   a. As an investment
   b. For respect, influence and status in my community
   c. Housing
   d. To grow food for my family’s consumption
   e. To grow products for sale
   f. I don’t know
   g. Other. Please specify ....

Part IV Corruption in land services

19. In the last 12 months, were you asked to give out anything to facilitate the process of trying to resolve land related issues?
   a. Yes
   b. No (jump to question 21)

20. Who asked? Please select all options that apply.
   a. Community leaders/ traditional leaders
   b. Cooperatives/ farmers’ associations
   c. Local non-governmental organisations
   d. Private investors/ company
   e. Public officials/ public institutions [if this option is selected ask respondents to specify which institutions]
   f. I don’t know
   g. Others. Please specify ....
21. In the last 12 months, did you actually give out anything to facilitate a process of trying to resolve land related issues?
   a. Yes
   b. No (jump to question 24)

22. Why did you give a bribe? Please select all options that apply.
   a. To access relevant information
   b. To avoid eviction
   c. To secure a land title
   d. To speed up a land transaction
   e. Everyone does it
   f. I don’t know
   g. Other. Please specify ....

23. What was expected from you? Please select all options that apply.
   a. Gifts in kind
   b. Free labour (e.g. domestic work, agricultural work)
   c. Transfer of property deeds
   d. Money
   e. Other. Please specify

24. Do you know anyone who has been asked to give a sexual favour?
   a. Yes, I know someone
   b. No, I don’t know anybody

Part V Participation in decision making

25. In your community who decides how the community land is used? Please select up to 3 most important options.
   a. Cooperatives/ farmers’ associations
   b. Local non-governmental organisations
   c. My relatives / family members like spouse, parents, children, ...
   d. Public officials/ public institutions [if this option is selected ask respondents to specify which institutions]
26. Are you a member of any community group involved in land issues?
   a. Yes
   b. No

27. In the last 12 months have you participated in community discussions/consultations regarding land and associated land issues (e.g. land rights, land use, land allocation, and all other issues listed under question 15 above)?
   a. Yes
   b. No (jump to question 29)

28. Who organised these discussions/consultations? Please select all options that apply.
   a. Cooperatives/ farmers’ associations
   b. Local non-governmental organisations
   c. My relatives / family members like spouse, parents, children, …
   d. Public officials/ public institutions [if this option is selected ask respondents to specify which institutions]
   e. Community leaders/ traditional leaders
   f. I don’t know
   g. Others. Please specify

29. How would you rate the meaningfulness of your participation in processes of decision making related to land issues on a scale of 1 to 4, 1 being not meaningful at all because concerns were neither voiced nor taken into consideration and 4 being very meaningful because concerns were listened to and taken into consideration.

   1
   2
   3
   4

Part VI Empowerment and taking action

30. Is your name in any written document for land ownership?
   a. Yes (jump to question 32)
   b. No
c. I do not own any land (jump to question 32)
d. I don’t know (jump to question 32)

31. Why is your name not in a written document for land ownership?
   a. I do not own any land
   b. I do not think I have the right to have my name on a land title
   c. My relatives (parents, children, uncles, ...) do not allow it
   d. My spouse does not allow it
   e. It is in my investment group’s / association’s / cooperative’s name
   f. I don’t know
   g. Other. Please specify ...

32. On a scale of 1 to 4 how important it is for you to have your name in a written document for land ownership, 1 being not important at all and 4 being very important.

   1
   ![Scale from 1 to 4]
   2
   3
   4

33. In the last 12 months have you taken action regarding land related issues (e.g. land rights, land use, land allocation, and all other issues listed under question 15 above)? Please select up to 3 most important options.
   a. I have asked my local non-governmental organisation to take action on my behalf (end here)
   b. I have attended community meetings (end here)
   c. I have contacted a lawyer/ legal organisation (end here)
   d. I have joined a community group (end here)
   e. I have organised community meetings (end here)
   f. I have put in a complaint (end here)
   g. I have requested access to information [if this option is selected ask respondents to specify what information they requested] (end here)
   h. I have not taken any action
   i. Others. Please specify ((end here)

34. Why have you not taken any action? Please select up to 3 most important options.
   a. Because I am scared of retaliation
   b. Because I do not know what actions to take
c. Because my community leaders/ traditional leaders advised me against it

d. Because my family / relatives (spouse, parents, children, ...) advised me against it

e. Because of the lack of opportunities to take actions

f. I don’t know

g. Other. Please specify ....
Appendix 2: TI Land and Corruption in Africa Baseline Template for Desk-based Mapping and Political Analysis

Please answer the following questions – it is important to substantiate your findings with references and links to evidence and documentation. If there are no sources / evidence, please note that, too, because it might be an area for further investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Background information on land governance and the legal framework</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Please provide a Background / overview on the land sector in your country, including historical and current economic importance (not more than 1 page):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Please provide an overview of the critical issues around land governance in your country (not more than 1 page):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Which are the existing state laws and regulations around land and tenure in your country (please include laws and regulations around individual / communal / … land rights as well as the acquisition of land, besides others)? Briefly describe the legal provisions for acquisition/formalization of land tenure. Please provide reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Which are the customary (= traditional) rights around land and tenure in your country?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are “user rights” (e.g. pastoralists) acknowledged as secure tenure rights (versus individual land titles / land registration processes)? Please provide reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Which are the existing anti-corruption laws and policies that can also be relevant to land related work? (e.g. anti-corruption, whistleblower protection, access to information, protection of human rights, freedom of the press ….). Please provide reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Who are civil society (and other) actors advocating for good land governance in your country (NGOs, CBOs, and academia, media)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Which are the (a) government and (b) traditional institutions and (c) informal groups / other groups involved in managing the access to land and what are their roles?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do multi-stakeholder initiatives on land adjudication and land management exist? Which are these and who are the stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Information on Land Deals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
10. Which are large investments made by (a) multi-laterals, (b) bi-laterals, (c) private sector in land in your country in the last 10 years and what was the objective (e.g.: agriculture, tourism, environmental initiatives, foreign direct aid, resource acquisition)? *Please provide links to documentation of these deals.*

11. Who (a) is more likely to profit from the investments and (b) is negatively affected? Is any particular group eg women/ indigenous communities more susceptible to effects? *Provide evidence / examples with links if available.*

12. Please describe the situation of land security in urban areas and any cases of investments / land deals in urban areas leading to demographic changes. *Please provide links to documentation / evidence where possible.*

13. Does the government in your country publish (a) large scale land deals / land investments and (b) tax / revenue it might gain from these investments? *Can you give examples (references)?*

14. Which role do a) traditional leaders, and b) local elites play in land deals? *Can you give examples (references)?*

### C. Corruption in the Land Sector

15. What in your perception are the main corruption risks in the land sector? *Where possible, provide concrete examples, references, evidence.*

16. Which are the gaps in the national legal system and land governance system opening the door to corrupt practices? *Please provide reference.*

17. Are principles of no-tolerance-to-corruption, whistleblower protection, access to information, human rights embedded in land legislation or other accepted and applied land related mechanisms in your country? *Please provide reference.*

18. Does the media investigate and cover land-corruption cases in your country? *Please provide links to examples where possible.*

### D. Land Governance Processes and Redress Mechanisms

19. Are there any land governance reforms going on at national level in your country at the moment?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Are there any examples of best practices in land governance / people centered land governance mechanisms in your country?</td>
<td>(please provide links to documentation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Is the principle of “free, prior, informed community consent” embedded in land legislation or other accepted and applied land governance mechanisms in your country?</td>
<td>Please provide reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Which social accountability mechanisms exist for citizens to participate in land governance at (a) local and (b) national level?</td>
<td>Please provide reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Which educational mechanisms exist that inform people about a) all procedures related to land acquisition and the governing legislation, and b) social accountability mechanisms which allow for citizen participation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. What are the existing redress mechanisms for land issues in your country?</td>
<td>(please describe institutions, processes as well as legal provisions available for redress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Are there any examples for Information Communication Technology solutions used in your country to make land governance transparent and accountable and participative?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Impact on people**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Can you provide examples (if possible, with links to documented evidence) of how people in your country were affected by land deals either at small or large scale, urban or rural?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. How are communities informed and consulted about land deals and resulting displacement?</td>
<td>Please provide reference to documentation where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. In your country, how are land displacement social impact assessments conducted and what is covered by them?</td>
<td>Please provide reference and documentation where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. How are communities (men and women) compensated after being displaced and resulted?</td>
<td>Please provide reference and documentation where possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. Are there any groups in society especially affected (e.g. indigenous communities, women) and if yes, how? *Please provide reference and documentation where possible.*

### F. Gender, Minority Groups and Young people

31. Are there differences in land administration / management practices for men and women, minority groups and young people? If yes, please describe the different customs and legal regulations that govern inheritance, access to tenure and the rights of men and women. *Please provide reference and documentation where possible.*

32. How different is the (a) economic (b) social and (c) spiritual importance of land to men and women of different generations? *Please provide reference and documentation where possible.*

33. Which forms of corruption are men more likely to face in the land sector and which forms of corruption are women more likely to face in the land sector? *Please provide reference and documentation where possible.*

34. Which forms of corruption are young people more likely to face in the land sector? *Please provide reference and documentation where possible.*

### G. TI National Chapter involvement

35. Has your organization carried out projects / activities on integrity in the land sector? If yes, please provide details.

36. Has your organization developed any partnerships on the land topic?

37. What are your current capacities to develop projects/ activities on the topic: a) please list relevant key staff and their expertise which can contribute to the project at national level
and regional level; b) please list whether you receive funding for land activities from any other donors (not channeled through TI-S).