



*An external evaluation of the Community Lands Initiative found that the formalization of community land rights led to increased private investment, as theory predicts. Interestingly, the bulk of this investment was internal, by community members or groups themselves.*

## iTC and Investments in Community Land and Natural Resources

The Community Land Initiative (iTC) has worked since 2006 to prepare communities for engaging in negotiations with investors for their access to community lands. iTC efforts have aimed at: social preparation of communities as to the meaning of the Land Law and other legislation and regulations; the delimitation of community land; organization of Community Committees for Natural Resource Management (CGRNs); resolution of land conflicts; preparation of community plans for community development. This promotion of community assets as envisioned in the Land Law and other legislation should provide a positive environment for fair and sustainable investments in community lands and natural resources.

An evaluation<sup>1</sup> of the iTC project produced some data as to the validity of this expectation.

The fieldwork in May, 2013 for the evaluation involved a study of 52 communities and associations sampled from lists of projects assisted by the iTC in three provinces (Cabo Delgado, Manica, and Zambezia). That data from that study show that the iTC through its service providers in combination with government (especially the SPGC and SDAE as well as units of local government) and traditional leaders did in fact influence changes in community and association behaviors and relationships in the above outlined ways as documented in 156 outcomes collected using the Outcome Harvest tool in a sample of 52 communities and associations.



Vegetable production in Manica

Moreover, community members who we interviewed perceived that these iTC influenced changes contributed to identified investments made in their communities *after* the iTC completed its work in 35 of the 52 sites studied (just over 67% the iTC intervention sites).


The evaluation also found that in those communities where iTC influenced outcomes were judged to have influenced the launching of subsequent private investments. The importance of internal community investors exceeded external investors. Forty-six percent (46%) of the all sites have internal investments which have occurred since the iTC did its community promotion work, whereas 27% of the sampled communities and associations have experienced external investment projects since the iTC worked at the sites.

These sites with at least one investment project divided into one group of 24 sites (11 communities and 13 associations) with internal investments, that is, projects predominantly being done by local people, and another composed of 14 sites (seven communities and seven associations) with investment projects done by outside investors.

Of course not all investment projects succeed. Figure 1 shows that a higher proportion of internal investment projects fail than the external ones. Overall, just over 50% of all the iTC communities and associations have investment projects which have had a degree of success, at least as of mid 2013. The frequently encountered opinion that the iTC has not encouraged investments is probably not correct, at least as shown in the evaluation data.

<sup>1</sup> DfID sponsored an evaluation of the iTC using Outcome Harvesting and other tools in mid 2013. See: Effective Development Group, "Evaluation of the Mozambique Community Land Use Fund—Final Report", January, 2014, requested by the Department for International Development, UK.

**Figure 1: Investment projects in iTC-assisted communities and associations**



\* Some sites have internal and external investments.

We recognize that investments from local people probably are of limited size, and sometimes fail. Also the data used come only from iTC assisted communities and associations, so that it is possible that similar investments are occurring in communities which have not received iTC assistance. The data also do not show the amounts of capital, labor and technology being invested, nor whether investments have been beneficial to community members or are environmentally sustainable.

Nonetheless, the data suggest that iTC interventions have, in fact, contributed significantly to subsequent private investments in the communities where iTC has worked, particularly to encourage small scale investment by local investors. In the short term, at least, one implication of these findings is that government and/or NGO support to investments emerging from within communities may have more immediate payoff than putting hope primarily in trying to bring in large outside investors.

Of course, given the historic low levels of past investments in rural communities, there is a need for very significant numbers of investments. Certainly more effort is needed to encourage local as well as outside investors, including state investors, into dialogues which result in fair and sustainable agreements to provide the overall levels of investments

needed for improving agricultural/forestry productivity and family enterprises.

In terms of state investments in communities, the DfID study found relatively few examples of communities receiving the legally provided portions of forest and tourism licensing fees. There are also very few instances of community CGRNs receiving District Development Funds (FDD).

Community level resource management capacities are just emerging. These funds at small scales and carefully monitored can provide financial management training to CGRNs and could be the catalyst for strengthening community administrative capacities while helping to meet real community needs. With experience and training, capacities could be developed for application in other community development activities, such as the administration of larger scale agreements with investors, private and state.

While limited in scope the evaluation data is indicative of positive iTC contributions to investments. More complete and focused data would help confirm or qualify these initial findings.

—David Stanfield, Terra Institute

## Land Notes

[ Este primeiro conjunto de Land Notes foi desenvolvido como exemplos de uma série de publicações que poderiam ser lançados por diversos atores envolvidos nos debates em curso sobre a política fundiária e a governação de terras em Moçambique. O texto final só será desenvolvido uma vez que a série é acordado, e a sua instituição de acolhimento identificada. ]

## Contact

David Stanfield, Terra Institute, jdstanfi@wisc.edu

Other Evaluation Team Members: Joseph F. Dorsey, jeffdorsey@yaho.com; Ingrid Nelson, nelson.ingrid@gmail.com; Esme Joaquim, yebomoz@gmail.com

© 2014. This Land Note is produced by Lexterra, Maputo.

Design and layout: Jeff Walker Design Cover icons: The Noun Project