Background, Framework, and Methodology of the 2020 Land Conflict Monitoring Initiative
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Background
Land conflicts over time have increased in number, coverage, and intensity – threatening livelihoods and lives of communities and rights defenders.
Why monitor land and resource conflicts?

- Land conflicts provide an observable indicator of unjust access to, control, or ownership of resources.
- Land conflicts may result in violence and violations of human rights.
- Land conflicts signal an urgency for government and other stakeholders to act.
Previous efforts, limitations

- KPA (Indonesia) has been consistently monitoring land conflicts and attacks against defenders since 2003
- Other LWA WG LRHR* members also produced conflict monitoring reports in 2018, using their own methodologies
- Varied scopes, definitions, methodologies, limited the regional consolidation, comparison and analysis of data

*LWA Working Group on Land Rights as Human Rights
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2020 Land and Resource Conflict Monitoring Initiative
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Objectives of 2020 Land Conflict Monitoring Report

To implement a *common yet flexible system* for collecting data and information on land conflicts

- To describe the *prevalence and types* of land and natural resource conflicts;
- To examine the *nature and causes* of land and resource conflicts;
- To discuss the *impacts and outcomes* of land and natural resource conflicts on communities, as well as on land rights defenders; and,
- To draw up *recommendations* based on the study findings and consultations in each country.
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Planning Meetings + Training
- KPA, ANGOC meeting
- WG regional planning meeting
- Regional conflict monitoring training + bilateral mentoring

Data-gathering + consultations
- Monitoring of media news reports + case reports from CSOs & partner-communities
- Consultations with CSOs and communities
- Bilateral consultations between countries and ANGOC

Report production + validation
- Validation workshops and dialogues with CSOs, communities, NHRI, government
- Bilateral consultations between countries and ANGOC

Regional consolidation, dissemination
- Regional summary
- Regional conference

FEB-MAR 2020
- Planning Meetings + Training

MAR-DEC 2020
- Data-gathering + consultations

JAN-JUL 2021
- Report production + validation

AUG 2021-onw.
- Regional consolidation, dissemination

Follow-up work
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## Focal Organizations for the 2020 Land Conflict Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Focal Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>CDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>STAR Kampuchea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>CLRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>KPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>CSRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>ANGOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>ANGOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Commonalities in Methods

01. Definitions
02. Scope
03. Data sources
04. Data validation
05. Perspective
06. Database
07. Indicators and analysis
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WG agreed on key definitions. A glossary was prepared. Definitions used are mostly from official/international sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Land conflict</strong></th>
<th>A situation wherein two or more stakeholders compete for control over land and/or resources, including decision-making and truth. Also called ‘structural conflicts’ wherein the conflicts emanate from: a) loopholes and contradictions in law, b) difference in paradigms of competing tenure systems, and/or, c) weak enforcement of legal and customary tenure systems.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict incident</strong></td>
<td>An event or string of events that indicate an ongoing conflict. All manifest conflicts have conflict incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land rights holder</strong></td>
<td>A stakeholder whose rights to the land under contestation are held under law, tenure reform/s, or custom, and whose relationship to the land is inherent to their survival and identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land rights defender</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholders who may be Land Rights Holders or support groups assisting Land Rights Holders to defend their land rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressor</strong></td>
<td>A stakeholder whose claim over land under contestation is not inherent to their survival and identity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scope

● Information covered by the monitoring
  ○ **CASES** – basic information about the conflict (ex. type of land/resource contested, size of contested area, location)
  ○ **RELATIONSHIPS** – stakeholders involved (affected communities, aggressors) and their actions
  ○ **INCIDENTS** – violence, victims and perpetrators, their effects
Scope

● Information covered by the monitoring
  ○ *Cases with reported incidents* – primary focus of the monitoring; ex. a contested mining application case that led to the criminalization of indigenous leader opposing the project
  ○ *Cases without incidents* – ex. ongoing opposition from fisherfolk community on planned reclamation activities, without manifestations of violence towards the community in 2020
  ○ *Incidents not tied to a specific case* – ex. slaying of an activist working with a peasant’s organization
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Coverage

- One calendar year (1 January to 31 December 2020)
- *Structural* land conflicts ongoing in 2020
- Incidents that occurred within the time frame
- Conflicts and incidents in rural areas

*conflicts that emanate from: a) loopholes and contradictions in law, b) difference in paradigms of competing tenure systems, and/or, c) weak enforcement of legal and customary tenure systems.

© Rappler
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Data Sources

- Mostly secondary data from publicly available sources and other NGOs
- Some primary data from community reports and field visits
## Key Differences in Scope & Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Cases Covered</th>
<th>Main sources of data, approaches to data-gathering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Collected available information from 36 mainstream media reports (ex. newspapers, news sites) (mostly secondary sources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Gathered conflict cases from partner-communities, mainstream media (primary and secondary data). Used at least 94 sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>36* (776 in LCW)</td>
<td>Selected and qualitatively analyzed 36 cases from Land Conflict Watch’s database of 776 cases (secondary data from landconflictwatch.org)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Collected reports of ongoing conflicts with violent incidents from national network of partner-communities (primary data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Gathered conflict cases from partner-communities (mostly primary data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Sought and collected reports from publicly-accessible online sources (mostly secondary sources). Used at least 388 sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Validation

- For secondary data*
  - At least 2 independent sources, or
  - On-ground validation, or
  - Reports from CSOs considered validated at community level.

- For primary data
  - On-ground validation, following incident reports

* Due to data-gathering difficulties because of COVID, some reports with only one source available were still included in the database.
Perspective

- Perspectives and narratives of communities and rightsholders are prioritized and given more weight, considering that their experiences are often overlooked. (ex. in recording the instigators of conflict and perpetrators of violence; in instances wherein a rights defender is tagged as a “rebel” or “communist”)
A common Excel template was used by Bangladesh, Cambodia, Nepal and Philippines to record data – this database was initiated and refined by WG members, considering KPA’s experiences and the results of the 2018 monitoring.

Database captures: cases, sectors/institutions involved, and incidents of violence or attacks.
Indicators and Analysis

- Common outline for country reports
- Common indicators included in country reports (ex. size of areas affected by conflicts, typology of conflicts, victims disaggregated by sex, etc.)
- Common summary table templates used by Bangladesh, Cambodia, Nepal, Philippines
- Therefore, some level of aggregation of data across countries has been made possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>BD</th>
<th>KH</th>
<th>INDO</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified/Don't Know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Some Differences

01. KPA (Indonesia) continued to use their own format for data recording and analysis. Since the monitoring of other countries took inspiration from KPA, some key data are still aggregable at regional level.

02. CLRA (India) analyzed select cases from Land Conflict Watch. LCW is a network of researchers and journalists in India, consistently monitoring conflicts in all Indian states. The regional summaries extracted data from LCW.
Reflections 03
Limitations

• Not all land and resource conflicts are reported or documented

• Disparity in the number of conflicts and incidents reported may skew the regional summary – contextualization is a must

• Methods were *common* but not *uniform* – question of how much flexibility in methods is acceptable to produce sound results
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Areas for Improvement

- Uniform understanding of concepts
- Further simplification of concepts and tools
- Maximizing and expanding in-country network for monitoring
- Research capacities of CSOs (quantitative)
- Digital security
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Thank You.

Questions? Feedback?

www.angoc.org
angoc@angoc.org
facebook.com/AsianNGOCoalition
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