

**DPRN Expert seminar**  
***Commercial Pressures on Land: Rethinking Policies and Practice for Development***  
Utrecht, 8 July 2009  
Final report (prepared by ILC and Oxfam Novib)

**Background and introduction**

Over the past few years the demand for land has been boosted by global economic trends - among which energy and food needs are playing major roles - that significantly increased its commercial value. Profit opportunities, as well as food security concerns, are attracting the interest of different stakeholders, both private and public, in obtaining land rights over large tracts of land worldwide. Such phenomenon, which is involving a wide range of actors, is dramatically increasing competition for land and natural resources, thus putting at risk the livelihoods of those with weaker tenure rights and economic power.

As part of their commitment in addressing the issue, the Universities of Utrecht and Groningen, Oxfam-Novib, the Sustainable Economic Development Department of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the International Land Coalition, co-organized an international expert seminar on '*Commercial Pressures on Land: Rethinking Policy and Practice for Development*' as part of the Development Policy Review Network.

As a way to address the phenomenon from all relevant perspectives, facilitate the communication, exchange and debate on analysis of land rights problems, approaches and policies and to explore possible ways forward, the initiative brought together government officials, academics, private sector, Northern and Southern civil society organisations, intergovernmental organisations such as the UN Food and Agriculture Organization and the UN International Fund for Agricultural Development, as well as the World Bank in order to identify approaches that can maximise benefits to the poor, whilst also remaining attractive to investors.

**Opening statements and keynote addresses**

The seminar was opened by Mr Jan Donner, Chair of the Development Policy Review Network Taskforce and president of the Royal Tropical Institute. He was followed by Mr Marteen Brouwer, Ambassador for Development Cooperation of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Hendrik Westerbeek from the Dutch Cadastre Land Registry and mapping Agency and Mrs Wei Suying, Director General of the Ministry of Land Resources of China. After these introductory speeches, Prof. Ho presented his book *Development Dilemmas and the concept of Credibility in Land Governance*.

Points emerging during these speeches included:

1. The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs defines access to land as a key strategy in poverty reduction and equitable growth, reflected in increasing support to this sector (Maarten Brouwer)
2. The importance of learning from the divergent development trajectories of Africa and Asia There is a striking difference between the rural priority that has

always existed in Asia, and the emphasis on industry instead of agriculture as has been the case in Africa. (Maarten Brouwer)

3. “Land is a key asset for the rural poor”. The Dutch Cadastre is working with Non Governmental Organizations to set out pilots for land registration in developing countries. Land administration in this respect can be described as a peaceful weapon to combat poverty by empowering the communities as well as building capacity at the government level. (Hendrik Westerbeek)

## **Overviews on Commercial Pressures on Land**

### **Reframing Global Land Issues and Struggles in the context of Commercial Pressures on Land**

*Jun Borras, Research Professor, Saint Mary's University, Canada.*

The issue ‘Land Grab’ has proved an effective way to bring onto global agendas the links between the food/fuel crisis and land. Yet, practitioners should broaden and deepen the discussion as a narrow focus on land grabbing for offshore food production ignores many related dynamics of demand for land. Prof. Borras accordingly made a first attempt to analytically frame the land grab issue.

[http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/borras\\_utrecht\\_july\\_2009\\_presentation.pdf](http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/borras_utrecht_july_2009_presentation.pdf)

### **Large-scale land acquisitions and leases: A set of core principles and measures to address the human rights challenge**

*Gaëtan Vanloqueren, Representative of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food.*

Mr Vanloqueren addressed the 11 principles issued by the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food. These principles are aimed at inhibiting large-scale land acquisitions from infringing on the right to food. Mr Vanloqueren briefly summarized the obligations for a State to implement the Right to Food by protecting, respecting and fulfilling the Right to Food. The principles should not be seen as a constraint to investment, but as an important opportunity for sustainable investment and development that could be of benefit to the local population.

<http://www.srfood.org/images/stories/pdf/otherdocuments/22-srftlarge-scalelandacquisitions-hrprinciples-9.6.09-2.pdf>

### **Taking stock: responding to the global rush for land**

*Michael Taylor, International Land Coalition Secretariat.*

The presentation outlined key current initiatives to engage with commercial pressures on land. Based on our current knowledge, it presented ten myths that are commonly associated with ‘land grabbing’. It also puts forward some key considerations and questions for building a coordinated response to ensure the adequate inclusion of local stakeholders. Based on strong evidence, various stakeholders should work to solutions in the form of codes of conduct, guidelines for decision-making, alternative models

for agricultural investment, securing land rights of the poor and building capacity for collective action.

[http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/09\\_07\\_ilc\\_presentation\\_dprn.pdf](http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/09_07_ilc_presentation_dprn.pdf)

## **Q&A Session**

---

During the discussion, the importance of the concept of Land Sovereignty (the control of local communities over land, resources and territory) was raised as a cultural concept going beyond the idea of land reform. Another aspect that has been highlighted is the fact that the reality at the grassroots level is not well captured and thus not sufficiently taken into consideration. Finally, the discussion addressed possible ways to integrate obligations of the Right to Food, which although newly-developed as a universal human right, has been integrated in the Constitution of 20 countries already.

### **PANEL 1: Southern Stakeholder perspective: promoting socially and environmentally responsible land-related investments.**

#### **Les pressions commerciales sur les terres rurales dans les pays sahéliens: cas du Niger**

---

*Abdoul Karim Mamalo, Permanent Secretary Code Rural, Niger.*

Niger's poverty situation is serious and food insecurity in the country is high. This makes Niger extremely vulnerable to foreign investments in agriculture which, at the same time, are highly needed. There are considerable risks in quick liberalization of the land market and attention is needed for the social, economic and environmental effects of land-related investments, particularly at the household level.

[http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/communication\\_spcr.pdf](http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/communication_spcr.pdf)

#### **Peasants and Indigenous Social Movements for Rights of Land in Bolivia**

*Pamela Cartagena, Centro de Investigación y Promoción del Campesinado (CIPCA), Bolivia.*

---

Bolivia has undergone several agrarian reforms since 1953. Legislation on the sale of land in Bolivia has been enacted with special attention to indigenous communities and women. Nonetheless, increasing land markets still creates considerable risk at the local community level. The current constitution still favours large landholdings, and intense corporate interests in natural resources may pose a threat to community land property.

[http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/Presentacion\\_CIPCA\\_Utrecht.pptx](http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/Presentacion_CIPCA_Utrecht.pptx)

#### **A brief on industrialization, urbanization and land conflicts in Vietnam**

---

*Le Quang Binh, Institute of Studies of Society, Economy and Environment (ISEE), Vietnam*

Increasing industrialization and urbanization are putting considerable pressure on agricultural lands in Vietnam, creating landlessness and massive unemployment in rural areas. Conflicts further develop as compensation for lost lands is lower than the market price. Possible solutions can be found in a reform of the land law, the securing of land rights for the local populations, as well as participatory mechanisms in which farmers can have a say in commercial investment and the future of their livelihoods with investors and government authorities.

[http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/land\\_cso\\_state\\_isee1.pdf](http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/land_cso_state_isee1.pdf)

---

### **Assessing the issue of land acquisition through Human Rights perspective**

*Vidya Bhushan Rawat, Social Development Foundation, India.*

In 2005 the Indian Parliament passed the Special Economic Zones Act with the declared objective of, among others, pursuing the generation of additional economic activity, promoting the export of goods and services as well as domestic and foreign investment. This has led to a situation where very large tracts of agricultural land are being allocated without prior consent of local communities.

<http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/presentationutrect.pdf>

---

### **Q&A Session**

A short discussion focused on the crucial importance of local peasants' organizations to overcome the land grabbing and on the inability of tribal people to be organized in India due to the fact they are not politicized.

---

### **Closing remarks by Chair Nathaniel Don Marquez, ANGOC, Philippines**

In closing the panel Mr Marquez highlighted some of the key points that arose during the discussions and integrated them with other reflections, including the following:

- We should not forget that the majority of southern governments have not exerted the necessary political will to enforce redistributive land and asset reforms, as well as environmental laws
- In most cases, the economic development agendas set by national governments favor the granting of land concessions, the expansion of mono-crop plantations, operations of large scale mining, contract/corporate farming especially of agrofuels crops; establishment of economic zones and unregulated conversion of agricultural lands
- In a sense, the current dominant framework has reduced land to a pure economic asset, valued for bringing profit rather than for ensuring the country's food security and promoting a people-centered sustainable development agenda

- Land grabbing has led to: displacement of communities, hunger and poverty, destruction of the environment and violation of human rights
- Social and environmental costs, together with the costs of rehabilitation and restoration are not internalized or included in the equation

He then suggested some proposals touching upon the following cultural, policy and legal aspects of commercial pressures on land:

- The international community should recognize that land is NOT just an economic commodity BUT a necessary instrument of equity for the poor. Access to land contributes to peace and social justice, enhances food security and leads to sustainable management of resources
- In the hierarchy of policies, the highest consideration should be given to domestic staple food production
- There is a need to suspend and review the conversion of agricultural lands to other uses
- There is a need to uphold the right to food and stop human rights abuses. Governments and corporations can be held accountable through international agreements (e.g., voluntary guidelines on the right to food; ILO Convention 169)
- Trans-National Companies and investors should be required to adhere to best practice and international standards and full respect for national legislation and food sovereignty
- Governments should establish effective legal mechanisms to hold companies/investors to account for environmental damage, human rights violations and all practices involving any form of bribery and corruption
- The international community should uphold the right to self-determination and the right to free and prior informed consent. It should ensure that the right to self-determination and priority rights to ancestral domains is given precedence over economic interests
- The international community should challenge inappropriate and non-participatory environmental and social impact assessment processes. We need to raise the concern for transparency and a more inclusive process, with strong emphasis for women's participation, be instituted
- The international community should empower communities, social movements and Civil Society Organizations for common action and joint negotiation towards food sovereignty and sustainable livelihoods. At all times the diversity within these stakeholders should be recognized and their differences respected.

**PANEL 2: Corporate codes and multi stakeholder initiatives: redressing social and ecological effects caused by foreign corporate activity in Southern Countries.**

**Multi stakeholder initiatives: the case of Indonesia**

*Abetnego Tarigan, Sawit Watch, Indonesia.*

The palm oil sector has experienced a significant amount of regulation through codes and legal frameworks, particularly the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil. The plans

of the Indonesian Government for palm oil production are ambitious: it wants to become the “best sustainable palm oil industrial country in the world”. In order to achieve this sustainability the sector is driven by various multi stakeholder mechanisms. Yet, their effectiveness is compromised by their voluntary nature as well as their inability to change existing legal and policy frameworks. Concerns also exist about the limits of the multi stakeholder initiatives in improving local sustainable land use and in mitigating food insecurity.

[http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/sawit\\_presentation\\_nego\\_corporate\\_codes\\_and\\_multi\\_stakeholder\\_initiatives.pdf](http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/sawit_presentation_nego_corporate_codes_and_multi_stakeholder_initiatives.pdf)

### **Mali Biocarburant SA, making core business of sustainability**

---

*Walter Hetterschijt, Annona Sustainable Investment Fund.*

Mali Biocarburant SA enables sustainable jatropha production in Mali through close collaboration with farmers and local communities that are encouraged to become shareholders of the company. According to MBSA, this way of cultivating jatropha promotes local governance, increases registration of farmers and ensures responsible land management, while generating income opportunities without competing with local food security.

[http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/Mali\\_Biocarburant.pdf](http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/Mali_Biocarburant.pdf)

### **Ensuring sustainable production and basic human rights of the local peoples**

---

*Marieke Leegwater, Productschap MVO*

Productschap MVO is a foundation bringing together several corporations mainly in the palm oil sector. It provides space for dialogue to all stakeholders, focusing on investors and communities, in the context of palm oil production. Conflicts taking place around many plantation areas are a problem, but free prior and informed consent, increased production standards and performance levels could be vital in reducing them. Another crucial factor in promoting sustainable and responsible investments is the EU market standards.

### **Some policy and practical lessons from an evolving biofuels industry in Tanzania**

---

*Yefred Myenzi, LARRRI/Hakiardhi, Tanzania.*

Commercial pressures on land in Tanzania are rapidly increasing, and mainly related to biofuel production. In this respect, the absence of clear policy and institutional frameworks to guide land acquisitions undermines local communities’ rights. It is therefore important to find collective ways to mitigate negative effects. Next to global initiatives to codes of conduct or voluntary guidelines, practical mitigation strategies can also be found in alternatives to the ruling Estate Model in Tanzania. Examples of

these alternative business models are joint ventures, outgrower schemes, contract farming and community-based cooperatives.

[http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/yefred\\_myenzi.pdf](http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/yefred_myenzi.pdf)

### **Q&A Session**

---

The need for adequately taking into consideration all relevant land-users groups (pastoralists, farmers, etc) when planning land investments was clearly stressed during this session. A lack of such a comprehensive approach would foster conflict among different communities.

In addition, it was mentioned that some existing initiatives like RSPO (Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil) need further improvement in order not to represent the interests of buyers and consumers only and beyond that, the utility of drafting more and more codes of conduct was questioned in a context where there is a clear lack of implementation, monitoring and dialogue among the stakeholders.

### **Closing remarks by Chair Ujjaini Halim, Institute for Motivating Self Employment (IMSE), India**

---

*The key areas of concerns* raised by the speakers included the failure of the national government to address the structural causes of inequality in land distribution and malfunctioning in land administration. Plantation farming has further intensified in southern countries, which replaces production of food crops and threatens food security of poor and vulnerable groups. Regulations to control investments are often weak and implementation lacking. The existing codes of conduct related to land governance are mostly developed by northern actors with little consultation of southern actors/partners. Moreover, these codes of conduct remain almost unknown and unimplemented. Regulations developed by the corporate sector are voluntary and self regulatory in nature with very limited impact on mitigating conflicts.

*Besides concerns about land-related investment, several presentations also highlighted opportunities.* Various models of partnership were discussed by Mr. Walter Hetterschijt and Mr. Yefred Myenzi. These models stressed the need for development based on notions of food security, participation of communities in decision-making and transparency at all levels. A good model would ensure civil society's role as a 'Watch Dog' to provide accountability against abuses. The presentations by investors indicated a desire for socially and environmentally sustainable solutions to investment as one ingredient in ensuring a long term good production environment. Participants noted the positive role of global actors such as IGOs in ensuring sound investments in land.

*Finally from all the presentations a few needs became evident.* These were the need for: ensuring participation of grassroots actors in any policy development (or development of code of conduct); developing regulatory frameworks for implementation and monitoring of investments including an enhanced role for civil society; prioritizing food security and food sovereignty in national/international policies; and the need for ensuring basic human rights standards at all levels.

**PANEL 3: Role of the international community: working towards socio-economically and environmentally responsible investments in natural resources for crop production.**

**Land grabbing: responses of the international community**

---

*Klaus Deininger, Lead Economist, World Bank.*

The rural sector is of significant importance for reducing poverty. Governments should play a key role in this. The international reaction to the ‘global land grab’ should encompass passing reliable information and support to governments in improving land institutions. Other main preliminary points of attention that follow from the WB’s investigation on the issue are the key roles of good governance as well as a good definition of rights.

[http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/wb\\_policy\\_utrecht2.pdf](http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/wb_policy_utrecht2.pdf)

**Responding to the increased demand for land: possible roles of Inter Governmental Organizations**

---

*a) Harold Liversage, IFAD Land Tenure Advisor.*

There are important possible actions the international community in general and IFAD in particular should undertake. These are, among others, the recognition of the centrality of land tenure security for economic growth and poverty reduction, the promotion of community-investor partnerships, and the development of accessible, affordable as well as transparent land administration systems.

[http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/role\\_of\\_igos-liversage.pdf](http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/role_of_igos-liversage.pdf)

*b) Paul Mathieu, FAO Land Tenure Section.*

The FAO is developing some mechanisms to address increasing commercial pressures on land. First of all, the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on Land and Natural Resource Tenure are forthcoming. To this effect technical public meetings will be organized and will include – without being limited to – the ‘land grabbing’ phenomenon as a discussion item. Other FAO instruments upon which the guidelines will be built are also important. Examples are technical guidelines on land tenure and compulsory guidelines on compensation. It is important to note that the focus must be on consensus. There is no need for too many instruments to be used. Two other aspects of FAO’s response is its support to national civil society organizations and its role of producing technical and neutral information to be used by all actors to inform policies and negotiations.

**The role of the international community: an NGO perspective**

---

*Gine Zwart, Oxfam Novib, Netherlands.*

There are significant differences between the civil society organizations approach to land issues and the intergovernmental organizations solution. Oxfam Novib sees land not only as an economic asset. It is a basic human right, which also serves a social, cultural and spiritual cause. This means that attention should not only be given to an individual's property, but also to the use of land as well as the return on labour. The bigger picture of the livelihoods of the people should be taken into account when discussing the effects of commercial pressures on land. Large-scale land acquisitions have more negative effects than merely displacing people. To develop appropriate solutions to this will take time, patience and a lot of research. It is necessary to put recent evidence and findings at the core of Government's and large institution's practice, which is currently not the case.

[http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/dprn-conference-input-juli-09-3 .pdf](http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/dprn-conference-input-juli-09-3.pdf)

### **Q&A Session**

Two main arguments emerged from this session. The first one regards the difference between Inter-governmental Organizations and Civil Society Organizations in addressing conflicting interests in land-based investments. CSO representatives stressed that where compromises or win-win situations are not possible, the Right to Food must be prioritized in defining solutions, whereas IGOs preferred a more 'neutral' stance. The second argument related to the role played by Northern consumers. It was stressed that the role of consumer pressure in influencing multi-national corporations investing in land should not be ignored, and that this level of engagement may be more fruitful than promoting regulations that may be burdensome and impossible to enforce.

After panel 3 was finished, a short session on land governance in China took place and included a presentation by Prof Gao Guiying of the Ningxia University, China Western Development Centre, on '[Land Circulation in Ningxia of China: Phenomena and Major Progresses](#)'. Furthermore, Hans Molenaar of the Volkskrant (a Dutch journal) showed a video on the Chinese Railway and Construction Company.

### **Closing remarks by Madiodio Niase, Director of ILC Secretariat**

In closing the event, Mr Niase stressed that although the phenomenon we are currently facing cannot be labeled as 'new', its magnitude and dynamics are bringing to light the unpreparedness of the international community, and particularly of recipient countries, to deal with the phenomenon.

Antagonistic views are characterizing the current debate on large-scale land transactions, which are seen as risks by some and as opportunities by others – each of these views being generally based on a solid internal rationale. The contradictory truths and several other myths surrounding the current large-scale land transactions lead to a simple remark: we need to get more evidence on the table. Previous experience with the World Commissions on Dams (which had a broker role building

consensus on basic guiding principles between pro- and anti-dam parties) illustrates the critical role of a shared evidence and knowledge base.

How many land deals are actually being implemented? Are investors more private or more public ones? Are they national or international? What is the nature and level of consultation with people living in or depending on the land being traded? What are the tested win-win-win options and what kind of alternative models are more suitable for agricultural investments? These are some of the fundamental questions that need responses, which will hopefully come from the many evidence gathering processes that are currently underway.

There seems to a sense of urgency, a rush to have a code of conduct, so as not to break the current momentum while maybe disciplining it. A good code of conduct should not be a mere legal/technical document, but should also be built on solid knowledge, experience, evidence and be formulated in a higher participatory manner. It will therefore take time to formulate such a code of conduct, especially in the current context where the basic evidence on land transactions is still being gathered.

Two scenarios present themselves. A first scenario would be that a Code of Conduct is hastily engineered, with minimal involvement, endorsement and ownership from relevant stakeholders. A second scenario would be to ensure that the Code of Conduct builds on the knowledge and lessons generated by the many evidence-gathering processes that are underway, and is negotiated with all relevant parties. The latter would ideally require a sort of ‘moratorium’ on land transactions, which seems to be unlikely in the current context.

In either scenario, it is important that all parties immediately agree to abide to key basic principles such as the need for transparency, the need to avoid the conversion of food producing farmland into non-food productive uses, the need to recognize and protect existing land, etc. These principles could be an interim solution in the event that a longer term process of formulating an evidence-based and a participatory Code of Conduct is followed.

Finally, the concept of ‘prior and informed consent’ needs to be further clarified and that very critical concepts, such as “land sovereignty” and the “right to self determination” (which were also covered in the presentations made during the day) have to be included in the debate, and that this debate will need to be further pursued through a multi stakeholder approach.

## **Annex I – Participants**

Abdoul Karim Mamalo	Code Rural Niger
Abetnego Tarigan	Sawit Watch
Ali de Jong	International Development Studies Group, University of Utrecht
Alois Clemens	WWF-Netherlands
Andrea Fiorenza	International Land Coalition (ILC)
Andrea Ries	Global Programme Food Security, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
Anirban Dasgupta	Institute of Social Studies, The Hague
Anna Schulze	Sustainable Management of Natural Resources of the DG Development and Relations, EU
Annelies Zoomers	International Development Studies Group, University of Utrecht
Anni Arial	Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO)
Babette Wehrmann	Free lance
Bo Zhao	Faculty of Law (RUG)
Brenda Floors	MA student, University of Amsterdam
Cécile Famerée	Institute of Development Policy and Management (IOB) University of Antwerp
Chen Huiguang	College of Land Administration, Nanjing Agricultural University
Chigurupati Ramachandraiah	India – Hyderabad
Daphne Roodhuyzen	Law and Governance Department, Wageningen University
Derk Byvanck	Oxfam Novib
Dicky de Morée	Cordaid
Bob van Dillen	Cordaid
Ding Weimin	Department of Land Protection, Wuxi Bureau of Land Resources, Jiangsu Province
Nathaniel Don Marquez	Asian NGO Coalition (ANGOC)
Dorith von Behaim	Sector Project Land Management, GTZ
Ujjaini Halim	Institute for Motivating Self Employment (IMSE)
Duncan Pruett	Oxfam Novib
Elly Rijnierse	Cordaid
Emilie Pelerin	GRET
Evert de Boer	Filippijnengroep Nederland (FGN)
Fan Yu	Department of Land Planning, Nanjing Bureau of Land Resources, Jiangsu province
Femke van Noorloos	Costa Rica
Franca Roiatti	Panorama weekly newsmagazine
Fred Zaal	Amsterdam institute for Metropolitan and International Development Studies
Frits van der Wal	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, DDE
Gaetan Vanloqueren	UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food Representative
Gao Guiying	Ningxia University
Gemma van der Haar	Wageningen University and Research Centre

Gine Zwart	Oxfam Novib
Gong Jingwen	Department of Science and Technology, International Cooperation, Ministry of Land Resources (MLR)
Gu Zijing	Ningxia Bank, China
Guus van Westen	International Development Studies Group, University of Utrecht
Hans Moleman	Oxfam-Novib
Harold Liversage	The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
Henk Peters	Oxfam Novib
Henri A.L. Dekker	
Hossein Azadi	Center for Development Studies, University of Groningen
Huo Yanjuan	Division of Finance, China Land Survey and Planning Institute (CLSPI)
Ines Possemeyer	GEO
Isolina Boto	Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation ACP-EU - CTA
Jaap Zevenbergen	International Institute for Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation (ITC)
Jacqueline Vel	Van Vollenhoven Institute, Leiden University
Jan Donner	DPRN Task Force
Janine Ubink	Van Vollenhoven Institute, Leiden University
Jan-Michiël Otto	Van Vollenhoven Institute, Leiden University
Joost Nelen	SNV Netherlands Development Organisation
Joris van de Sandt	
Jozias Block	European Commission
Julia Szanton	Niza, Amsterdam
Jun Borrás	Saint Mary's University, Canada
Karen Mingelers	South Research
Khadijat Azeez	University of Hohenheim, Germany
Klaus Deininger	World Bank
Lasse Krantz	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)
Laurent Bossard	Sahel and West Africa Club / OECD
Le Quang Binh	Institute of Studies of Society, Economy and Environment (ISEE)
Lena Wimmer	Project Officer, Sector Project Land Management (GTZ)
Louis Pautrizel	GRET
Lucia Goldfarb	Transnational Institute, Amsterdam
Lucy Royal-Dawson	Equalinrights
Lü Chunyan	Division of Key Laboratory of Land Use, CLSPI
Maarten Brouwer	Ambassador for Development Cooperation, Netherlands
Madiodio Niasse	International Land Coalition (ILC)
Marcel Rutten	African Studies Centre (ASC)
Marja Spierenburg	South Africa
Meine Pieter van Dijk	Costa Rica
Michael Taylor	International Land Coalition (ILC)

Michel Merlet	Association pour l'Amélioration de la Gouvernance de la Terre, de l'Eau et des Ressources Naturelles (AGTER)
Michiel Köhne	Wageningen University
Murat Arsel	Institute of Social Studies, The Hague
Niu Xinping	Dept of Cadastral Management, Ministry of Land Resources
Pamela Cartagena	Centro de Investigación y Promoción del Campesinado (CIPCA)
Paul Burgers	International Development Studies Group, University of Utrecht
Paul Mathieu	Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO)
Peter Ho	Center for Development Studies, University of Groningen
Ramesh Sharma	Ekta Parishad
Ruerd Ruben	CIDIN, Nijmegen
Salvador Roig Coll	International Development Studies at Wageningen University
Sander van Bennekom	Oxfam Novib
Sonja Vermeulen	International Institute for Environment and Development
Srinivasam Ramasamy	Madras
Sun Xiaoli	Department of Planning, MLR
Thea Hilhorst	Royal Tropical Institute (KIT), Netherlands
VB Rawat	Social Development Foundation
Vera Köppen	Project Officer, Sector Project Land Management (GTZ)
Verie Aarts	Oxfam Novib
Walter Hetterschijt	Annona Sustainable Investment Fund
Wang Baiyuan	Land Policy Research Center, CLSPI
Ward Anseeuw	Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche pour le Développement
Wei Suying	Ministry of Land Resources of China
Wilbert Kolkman	Faculty of Law (RUG)
Willem J. Assies	Independent consultant
Xenia von Lilien Waldau	The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) North America Liaison Office
Yefred Myenzi	LARRRI (Hakiardhi)
Yongjun Zhao	Center for Development Studies, University of Groningen
Zoe Goodman	3D