

TOWARDS A YOUTH AGENDA FOR THE GLOBAL LAND TOOL NETWORK

A SCOPING STUDY



Towards a Youth Agenda for the Global Land Tool Network:
A Scoping Study

Copyright © United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), 2011

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT)
P.O. Box 30030, Nairobi 00100, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 762 3120
Fax: +254 20 762 3477
www.unhabitat.org

Cover photos © UN-HABITAT, Sarah Bryce, Eirik Sorlie

Principal author: Siraj Sait

Contributors: Asa Jonsson, Britta Peters and Eirik Sorlie

Editing: Asa Jonsson and Eirik Sorlie

Sponsors: Norwegian Government and Swedish International Development Cooperation

Contents

ACRONYMS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	7
1.1 About the Scoping Study	7
1.2 Context	7
1.3 Defining “Youth”	8
1.4 Methodology	9
1.5 Key Questions on Youth and Land	10
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.1 Material on Urban Youth	11
2.2 Gaps in Literature on Youth and Land	11
2.3 Key Findings of Literature Review	12
2.4 Chapter Conclusions	16
CHAPTER 3: THE INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR GLTN’S YOUTH AGENDA....	17
3.1 GLTN’s Youth Agenda	17
3.2 GLTN’s Objectives and Values	17
3.3 The Global Youth and Land Agenda	18
3.4 GLTN’s Mandate under MDGs, Habitat Agenda and MTSIP	19
3.5 UN-HABITAT’s Youth Strategy	20
3.6 The Youth Section and its Tools	20
3.7 PYB’s Partnership Proposal with GLTN	22
3.8 Chapter Conclusions	23
CHAPTER 4: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	24
4.1 Youth responses	24
4.2 GLTN partner responses	28
4.3 UN-HABITAT/GLTN staff responses	31
4.4 Consultation with YAB Members	32
4.5 Chapter Conclusions	32
CHAPTER 5: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GLTN’S YOUTH AGENDA	34
5.1 Rationale for GLTN Engaging with Youth and Land	34
5.2 Risks of GLTN not Addressing Youth Explicitly	35
5.3 Strategic Entry Points for GLTN’s Youth Agenda	36
CHAPTER 6: OPERATIONALIZING GLTN’S YOUTH AGENDA	43
6.1 Suggested activities for GLTN’s Youth Agenda	44
BIBLIOGRAPHY	47

ACRONYMS

AYC African Youth Charter, 2006
CBO Community Based Organisations
CFC Child Friendly Cities
CRC Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989
CSO Civil society organisation
CYEC Commonwealth Youth Exchange Council
CYP Commonwealth Youth Programme
DFID UK Department for International Development
ECOSOC Economic and Social Council
ENOF Enhanced Normative and Operational Framework
IDPs Internally Displaced Persons
GDP Gross Domestic Product
GLTN Global Land Tool Network
GTZ German Technical Co-operation
HAPs Habitat Agenda Partners
HPU Habitat Partner Universities
IADB Inter-American Development Bank
IDPs Internally displaced persons
ILO International Labour Organisation
LTPAS Land Tenure Property Administration Section, UN-HABITAT
MRD Monitoring and Research Division, UN-HABITAT
NGO Non-governmental Organisation
NORAD Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation
MTSIP Medium Term Strategic and Institutional Plan 2008-2013, UN-HABITAT
LDYPP Lisbon Declaration on Youth Policies and Programmes 1998
MDGs Millennium Development Goals
PAYE Commonwealth Plan of Action for Youth Empowerment 2007-2015
PLWHA People living with HIV/AIDS
PRSP Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
PYB Partners and Youth Branch
RBA Rights Based Approach
RTI Right to Information
UNDESA UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO United Nations Economic, Social and Cultural Organisation
UNFPA United Nations Populations Fund
UNICEF United Nations Children's Fund
UN-HABITAT United Nations Human Settlement Programme
WHO World Health Organisation
WPAY World Programme of Action for Youth
WSC World Summit for Children 1990
WUYA World Urban Youth Assembly
WUF World Urban Forum
USD US Dollars
YAB Youth Advisory Board, UN-HABITAT
YEP Youth Empowerment Programme
YEN Youth Employment Network
YLD Youth-Led Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Despite the increasing visibility of youth in the sustainable development and urbanisation discourse, their role within the land sector is unclear. While property rights and economic opportunities are expanding for youth, land is largely seen as an adult privilege. Part of the resistance to improving youth access to land stems from the construction of ‘youth’ as a problematic, transitional and ill-defined category. Dominant attitudes expect youth to wait until adulthood before asserting their land rights. Alternatively, youth are expected to access land through adults or compete in the skewed land markets. This scoping study identifies a series of ‘hard questions’ which query the need for special measures for youth beyond flexible generic tools. Though the literature is sparse on tenure security for youth specifically, youth demographics and the centrality of youth wellbeing to overall development are part of a rationale for intervention with risks of not doing so. This study considers the context and options for the Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) in pursuing youth-responsive tools.

While the Government of Norway has requested GLTN to increase its focus on youth, and earmarked funds to that effect, no formal demands have been made by network members. GLTN’s mandate does not explicitly require a youth focus but mainstreaming youth could make GLTN efforts more successful. Its core values and objectives certainly do not restrain a more proactive youth approach. A review of GLTN’s guiding documents encourages GLTN to do more with and for youth. This study explores UN-HABITAT’s youth strategy and the potential of the Partners and Youth Branch (PYB) of UN-HABITAT to partner with GLTN in its youth outreach through the Youth Fund, Youth Centres, and the World Urban Youth Assembly (WUYA) as potential models for youth mainstreaming. Partnerships are needed to mainstream youth in land and land in youth.

A key feature of this scoping study is consultations within UN-HABITAT, with youth constituencies, the UN-HABITAT Youth Advisory Board (YAB) and GLTN partners. The positive and practical issues raised by UN-HABITAT have influenced this study. The survey of 22 active youth organisations with thematic, gender and geographical diversity provide a thorough understanding of the relationship between youth and land. Youth representatives argue that land is not only central to their livelihoods, quality of life and opportunities but also constitutive of their broader security, identity and rights. A key finding is that it is not the shortage of land but attitudinal biases against youth that undermine their rights. The study summarises youth perspectives on why land is important for youth, what obstacles they face in accessing land, what they think needs to be done, how they would like to be involved in developing land tools and what are successful examples of youth interventions on land.

The study also involves an overview of the rich and diverse work of GLTN partners in relation to youth. While several partners lobby for GLTN to push for greater youth focus, none question the need for GLTN to do so. The study deals with some of the key gaps in our understanding of youth and land – what tenure means for youth, how youth mainstreaming on land can take place, why youth indicators are critical and most importantly how youth can partner with GLTN. Youth are a key stakeholder and a separate category for land policy as their relationship and experiences on land are distinctive in nature and scope and require targeted and innovative responses.

Box 1: Ten recommendations for GLTN's Youth Agenda

1. Promote a global youth and land agenda to mainstream youth issues in the land sector
2. Support land policy development for youth by carrying out youth audits of existing policies and programmes and provide technical assistance to governments and other stakeholders
3. Revisit land for youth perspectives and review the extent to which existing tools and models accommodate youth land needs
4. Develop a multi-pronged youth strategy acknowledging the complex links between land and other development issues by involving a variety of development actors with specific youth mandates
5. Adopt an intergenerational approach to youth land rights while recognising youth as claimants and stakeholders in their own right
6. Promote the inclusion of youth as beneficiaries, partners and leaders in the land sector, encourage 'youth organisations' to join GLTN and facilitate youth participation in GLTN activities
7. Build the capacities of youth to realise their land rights by making youth a key target group for GLTN training activities, developing and delivering dedicated training modules on youth land rights, as well as encouraging youth participation in general land training programmes
8. Carry out an inventory of youth tools to assess demands and gaps for tools and develop a youth mechanism which can provide a framework of youth dimensions, objectives, processes and methodologies in GLTN
9. Identify priority youth target groups for land tools and programmes through based on tool gaps, youth demands, available expertise and potential impact.
10. Determine youth tooling areas by prioritizing adaptation of existing tools and identifying areas where partners are active and tool kits can be integrated.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Youth are increasingly seen as partners, rather than as merely beneficiaries, in poverty reduction interventions and within the sustainable urbanisation discourse. However, their visibility within the land sector is limited. While young people seek more economic opportunities and claim further property rights, there appears to be a lack of understanding and specific responses to youth land needs. Young people who are able to own land are invariably from privileged backgrounds, while the majority of middle class and poor youth's access to land is mediated through family and community.

The debate over how, even whether, to promote youth land rights is at early stages. A leading question is whether youth automatically and sufficiently benefit from existing generic land tools and interventions or whether the tools have to be specifically designed or adapted to youth needs. Equally, policy makers ponder over how to negotiate the challenges of enhancing land rights during the 'transitory' youth phase. In this context, the GLTN commissioned this scoping study to explore how the network could enhance its youth dimensions and add value to the efforts to strengthen land access and security for youth. This introductory chapter provides the context, assumptions and methodology of the study and introduces some key questions on youth and land.

1.1 About the Scoping Study

This scoping study explores the information, inputs and options that confront GLTN in its quest to build a sustainable youth and land agenda. It presents the context, a literature review and discussions, inputs from stakeholders including youth, a quick review of GLTN's work on youth and makes recommendations. It does so by considering GLTN priorities, recognising its comparative advantage and exploring opportunities to further its 'youth and land' agenda towards achieving its objectives.

The overall objective of this study is to delineate a normative and operational Youth and Land framework aligned with GLTN values and its work programme, UN-HABITAT vision and MTSIP, and the universal standards such as the Millennium Development Goals.

This document is primarily intended as a discussion paper for UN-HABITAT staff, particularly in GLTN and PYB, but it could also be used for wider consultations and in further integrating and promoting a youth and land agenda. It assumes knowledge of the context of UN-HABITAT's mission and GLTN's work related to developing land tools, but elaborates the agency's youth strategy and activities as starting points for developing youth and land policies.

This scoping study has six chapters. The introduction chapter outlines the context, scope, methodology, definitions and key issues. The second chapter provides a literature review and discussion. The third chapter reviews GLTN's mandate and strategy within UN-HABITAT, the Habitat Agenda, MTSIP and MDG framework. The fourth chapter narrates the dialogue with youth representatives, GLTN partners and UN-HABITAT staff. The fifth chapter focuses on findings and recommendations, and the sixth chapter on suggested activities for GLTN to consider.

1.2 Context

Youth account for up to 70% of the population in many developing countries, and make up a large proportion of slum-dwellers in the urban centres of the developing world. The youth population worldwide (those aged 15–24 years) is estimated to be around 1.3 billion, prompting the reference to an "age of youth", with demand for greater youth focus stakeholders in all aspects of development¹. Despite the declining fertility rates, and corresponding increase in the number of older persons, youth numbers will remain high². In Africa (particularly Sub Saharan Africa) an increase in youth population is expected for decades. Thus youth numerically represent a critical constituency population-wise, which needs to be considered by GLTN.

¹ Barker G (2005) *Dying to be Men: Youth, Masculinity and Social Exclusion* London and New York: Routledge

² Hope K (1998) 'Urbanization and Urban Growth in Africa' 33:4 *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 345-358

Studies also show that youth, particularly young women and minorities, faces significant obstacles. The international community has recognised the need to address youth issues at least since the 1995 World Programme of Action for Youth (WPAY) with increasing normative clarity, budgets and political will. The Commonwealth Youth Programme (CYP), the 2010 Caribbean Ministerial Declaration on Youth and UNICEF's embrace of youth alongside children are all indications of the momentum towards recognising youth as not just beneficiaries but partners in development. National governments have set up ministries dedicated to youth welfare or development, enhancing youth participation and increased budgetary allocations for youth programmes. There is universally greater acceptance of the proposition that global poverty, improved governance, human rights protection or the achievement the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) would not possible without targeting and engaging youth³.

From the HABITAT-II Conference in 1996 to successive Governing Council resolutions and the MTSIP, urban youth are becoming a more conscious focus of the Agency's work. This is not surprising given that youth are the vanguard of rapid urbanisation, the visible face of slums and stereotyped as the cause of urban instability and problems. Yet, systematic engagement with youth as partners in sustainable urbanisation is recent and concepts such as youth land rights, secure tenure for youth or youth-responsive land tools are yet to be followed up by concrete plans. While there are important political resolutions such as the 2009 African Union *Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy* which expressly refer to equitable access to land for youth, there is little understanding of how this may be strengthened. It is in this context of the demographic challenge, increasing focus on youth and lack of land tools for youth that GLTN may seek to build a youth and land agenda.

1.3 Defining “Youth”

The United Nations definition of youth as individuals between the ages of 15 and 24 years is often used as a working definition also by other development actors⁴. However, this definition is not legally binding and the age range differs across regions, countries and cultures. For example the Commonwealth youth definition covers individuals from 15 to 29 years and the African Youth Charter includes those between the ages of 15 and 35⁵. National definitions of “youth” can range from 18 up to 24 or even 35 years of age (for example in Rwanda and South Africa). The *Convention on the Rights of the Child* defines a “child” as anyone under the age of 18. As the terminology of children (up to 18 years) and youth (15-24 years) overlap (14-18 being older children/younger adults), several reports use both terms together, also because a common set of approaches often applies (for example child and youth participation).

Youth is often used interchangeable with ‘young people’, though that age group can be even more flexible. A debate exists between those who welcome the age flexibility and those who insist on strict application of UN definition. There are concerns that elastic deployment of the term youth for wider age cohorts marginalises youth by privileging better positioned older adults. Several other terms for youth are used– ‘adolescents’ by sociologists, ‘juvenile’ by criminologists, ‘teenager’ by cultural scientists and ‘students’ by educationists. As will be seen in this study, youth are a heterogeneous group, and their social, cultural, economic and educational status can be diverse.

Another critique is the view that youth as a particular age range is a “Western concept and a political construct [...] which is problematic, intermediary and ambivalent category”⁶. Instead, experts argue that those who work with youth must pay heed to cultural and political contexts. Conceptions of maturity, rites of passage, identity formation and relative independence construct youth socio-

³ World Bank (2006) *World Development Report 2007: Development and the Next Generation*. Washington, DC: The World Bank

⁴ World Youth Report 2005, Report of the Secretary-General (A/60/61)

⁵ The 2006 charter is the AU's basic and legal instrument for youth empowerment and provides a framework for youth development programming across member states. The Charter entered into force on August 2009.

⁶ De Waal, A. (2002), ‘Realizing Child Rights in Africa: Children, Young People and Leadership’, in De Waal/Argenti (eds.), *Young Africa: Realizing the Rights of Children and Youth*, Africa World Press.

culturally, rather than chronologically. For example, early marriage or becoming a parent (particularly women) may oust an individual from consideration as youth. A dominant theme in the debate over how to define youth is that female youth are most likely to be invisible, or excluded, even when male youth are recognised. In several situations, child labourers, child soldiers or youth headed households may encounter resistance to be recognised as children and youth given their adult roles. As is often the case with refugee children, it could simply be whether you look “youthful” enough.

This ambivalence over the definition and status of youth has implications for their land rights. Where children and youth are subsumed within the family category, young people are considered to possess only subsidiary land rights at best, because they are seen as not having attained “maturity” or independence. Where youth are able to overcome obstacles, they access these rights as part of the adult category. On the other hand, ideas about youth being a transitory phase (from childhood to adulthood) have been cited as reasons to defer, for example, discussions on what secure tenure means for youth. Thus, youth are mostly neglected within the land, housing and property discourse.

UN-HABITAT takes a pragmatic approach to the definition debate and identifies youth as being of an age range of 15-32 years, but where appropriate including those who are “young at heart” or “relatively young” as in the example of One Stop Youth Centres. The youth responsive tools GLTN would consider must keep in mind this wide age range. Obviously, it is much more difficult to talk of land rights for teenagers who are children than it is to advocate those in their 20s and early 30s who have full-fledged legal rights to land. The use of the term ‘youth’ throughout this study – in keeping with the UN-HABITAT definition- acknowledges the different implications to the varied age groups with the broader youth definitions, and also for women and other special categories. Youth are not simply a fixed category but are evolving and diverse group with overlaps with other age groups which prompt a life course and intergenerational awareness.

1.4 Methodology

This scoping study uses a multi-source and multi-stage methodology. Chapters two, three and four indicate this approach. In the first phase of the scoping study, a literature review on youth and land and related issues was carried out, as seen in chapter two. This is not an academic or thematic study and its aim is primarily to clarify conceptual issues and identify entry points for GLTN’s work. The second stage was a desk review of GLTN documents with a view to understanding its mandate and vision on youth, which is contained in chapter three. This includes a review of GLTN Project documents (including the logical framework and work programme); UN-HABITAT policy documents and reports relating to youth (for example its youth engagement strategy), the Habitat Agenda, MTSIP etc. the normative framework (including UNGA and UN-HABITAT GC resolutions) and the role of PYB (Partners and Youth Branch).

The third stage was consultations with GLTN and UN-HABITAT staff, GLTN partners and youth representatives which is presented in chapter four. GLTN facilitated the meetings, while PYB was instrumental in facilitating exchanges with youth representatives on land issues. GLTN also provided contact with the different stakeholder groups in the network. While most of the youth and GLTN partner consultations were carried out through email questionnaires (with some phone calls and meetings), most of the dialogue with UN-HABITAT staff were through meetings. This continuing dialogue with different stakeholders allowed cross perspectives where questions generated within one group could be put to another.

The fourth stage was consultation with relevant UN-HABITAT staff based on preliminary findings and a draft strategy discussion document, in particular GLTN and Youth Section staff. The results of these consultations are found in chapters five and six which contain the findings, recommendations and suggested activities.

The literature review, review of GLTN documents and stakeholder dialogue is not intended to be a conceptual study, a complete GLTN strategy or a comprehensive assessment of GLTN stakeholder or

youth portfolios, activities or perspectives. This scoping study merely provides a brief and indicative overview of different approaches presented by various sources and stakeholder voices to inform GLTN of the trends and options relating to youth engagement.

Key inputs were sought from relevant UN-HABITAT staff on all aspects of this paper, particularly in developing strategies.

1.5 Key Questions on Youth and Land

The commissioning of this study indicates GLTN interest in enhancing its engagement in youth and land issues. At the same time, several ‘hard questions’ about engaging in this area has arisen from the literature review and consultations with UN-HABITAT staff and youth. These questions are flagged as they are likely to keep resurfacing during the quest for a cohesive, comprehensive and persuasive youth and land strategy. However, they have to be read alongside other lines of argument, such as the risks and costs of not engaging in youth-related land concerns.

The questions below interrogate the assumptions which are based on limited evidence on youth and land. They seek to develop robust justifications for youth and land approaches, and anticipate resistance to a youth focus.

1. *Are youth a distinct “social category” whose specific needs should be addressed through targeted interventions on land?*
 - a. What are the distinctive youth experiences that cannot be accommodated within the generic mainstream approach?
 - b. Why would the generic land interventions and tools not work for youth as they presumably do for other age and population groups?
 - c. Would a youth focus disadvantage other population groups?
2. *How can youth in a ‘transition phase’ expect better opportunities than adults who struggle to access land?*
 - a. Is giving land to youth the solution when they are often unable to manage or retain it?
 - b. Why is ownership for youth better than renting, leasing or using?
 - c. Is granting land to youth an efficient option, keeping in mind the need for sustainable, environmental friendly and productive use?
 - d. Is it not better to provide youth with cash or livelihood resources which would give them flexibility in pursuing their future?
3. *Is it viable to have youth as partners in the technical field of tool development when their commitment, capacity and expertise are in doubt?*
 - a. What are the comparative advantages of programs working with youth, or rather what are the opportunity costs of not involving them?
 - b. Would involving youth in tool development be ‘cost’ effective, or is their participation more of a political correctness?
 - c. How to ensure that proposals such as ‘youth led’ and ‘change design’ do not undermine the quality and consensus on which land tools are built?
4. *Given the competing agendas and the limited precedent in the sector, is youth and land really a priority for GLTN?*
 - a. Is it possible to ‘solve’ the myriad obstacles to youth access to land when most issues such as lack of finance to cultural barriers are beyond the land sector?
 - b. How can we lobby governments to do more to support pro-poor youth land policies, on what basis, and what would these policies entail?
 - c. How would a youth analysis differ from the methodology for gender analysis, mainstreaming and responses?

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This Chapter offers an overview of the material reviewed on youth and land as well as broader dimensions. Its purpose is not to discuss thematic issues but merely to identify trends in the field, existing resources as well as gaps and possible entry points for working on youth and land. The key finding that material on youth and land is sparse was anticipated. The chapter looks at the implications for urban youth being neglected in research, policy, tools and programming which has led to “lost decades for youth”⁷. It considers the reasons for the gap and some key themes.

2.1 Material on Urban Youth

The materials on youth and development, and urban youth, tend to be wide-ranging and often reflect inter-disciplinary analysis and joined up thinking. In framing development issues, there is recognition that land issues for youth are inter-related and multi-dimensional and must be approached holistically as the MDGs refer to “improvement in living conditions”. Theoretical, analytical, as well as policy and practice-oriented contributions relating to youth generally are found to be considerable and growing. There is some material on youth and urbanisation, though the editorial of the 2010 October volume of *Environment & Urbanization* bemoans the gaps “for perhaps the first time ever in (this journal), we have fewer themed papers... We are disappointed and not a little chagrined at our failure to produce the bumper number on urban youth that was contemplated”⁸. Worse, there is negligible thinking on the issues of youth access to land, youth slum upgrading, youth land governance or youth land rights in general.

The urban youth literature can be organised under different youth subjects loosely related to youth and development, including categories of youth (gender, diversity, disability, street kids, displaced) themes (conflict, crime, HIV AIDS) and process issues (age data, indicators, participation, monitoring). The material on youth from more developed sectors (such as youth health, education, employment, post conflict or environment), particularly methodologies and best practices, could be useful in developing the youth and land agenda. Several tested protocols such as youth in governance, empowerment, planning, and monitoring would broadly apply to the processes of youth land rights.

2.2 Gaps in Literature on Youth and Land

The literature review on youth, land and related themes netted a wide range of material including monographs, journal articles, magazine pieces, UN reports and policy papers and contributions from civil society, land professionals and researchers. There is an upsurge of interest in youth and development issues generally, including issues relating to youth and urbanisation. However, credible research or discussion on urban land— at theoretical, policy or practical level— is virtually non-existent. Youth access to urban land remains conspicuously unexplored. There is some treatment of rural land issues with regard to youth, but not urban. The complexity and multiple dimensions of land are mostly ignored, with land being mentioned primarily as a component of the right to shelter. The negligible interest in land rights for youth is because the case for land as a fulcrum for better opportunities and quality of life has not been made out. As such, generic models of secure tenure and ‘continuum of rights’ are rarely interrogated for youth responsiveness.

There are several demonstrations of this knowledge gap in youth land rights. The pioneering 2007 World Bank Report on the next generation makes little reference to land. Within its extensive bibliography on youth with over a thousand entries, less than a handful relate directly to land. The 2010 DFID document which provides guidance on engaging youth in development similarly does not explore land rights. This is a missing dimension even in otherwise comprehensive bibliographies or literature reviews.

⁷ Mc Carney R and Suave S (2003) *The Case for Street Youth: The Lost Decade* in Ruble B, Tulchin J, Varat D and Hanley L *Youth Explosion in Developing World Cities: Approaches to Reducing Poverty and Conflict in an Urban Age* (Washington DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars) 91

⁸ Bartlett S (2010) ‘Editorial: Responding to urban youth’s own perspectives’ 22 *Environment and Urbanization October* 307-316

This scoping study finds that even within UN-HABITAT reports and activities, youth and land theme has limited traction. The 2010 UN-HABITAT State of the Urban Youth report is perhaps an exception as it considers the wider aspects of urban youth experiences and explores inequalities and discrimination in five major cities across the world. The Report calls, *inter alia*, for better access to income, housing, services and land, and calls upon policy makers to involve youth in decision making on land and housing. Access to land and safe urban space are flagged as important for the protection, voice and empowerment of young people. However, no detail is offered on how this can be pursued.

Another exception is a study initiated by UN-HABITAT's Housing Section which explores youth access to land under the framework of the right to shelter. It argues that "the right to adequate shelter also encompasses the right to land" since land is one of the five inputs into national housing processes. Access to land is also relevant for youth renting, owning or establishing adequate housing, recreation and training facilities, worksites and markets. It concludes that this right has not as yet been widely acknowledged or demanded. There is therefore a strong case for GLTN to catalyse research and case studies in this area.

2.3 Key Findings of Literature Review

2.3.1 Do Youth need Land?

Unlike the obvious link between youth, shelter and need for improving living conditions, the connection between youth and land is not easily seen. The limited treatment of youth with land perspectives is likely based on doubts over whether a sufficient case for land for youth has or can be made out. From the assumptions in research and youth responses, one can hypothesise why gaps exist. Three dominant youth and land models serve to discount youth claims on land.

The 'Eventually' Hypothesis: The conventional model assumes that youth (in 'transition phase') can and should wait until they acquire land in due course from inheritance or purchase of land through accumulated savings.

Critique: Several factors undermine this thesis. One, that youth are unwilling to wait and want access now. Two, deteriorating economic conditions increasingly force poor parents to sell their land otherwise intended for their children. Three, poor wages of child/youth labour are falling far behind spiralling land prices⁹. Waiting only adds other threats such as increasing privatisation, poor access to loans and encroachments of community lands. The missing rungs on the property ladder are rarely acknowledged, or compensated, in land policies. The overwhelmed land systems perpetuate land as an exclusive adult privilege; and do not cater to the potential, informal or secondary youth rights during this 'threats' phase that can prepare them for fuller enjoyment of their rights. Deferred youth access to land, in turn, leads to 'lack of experience', idleness, frustration and crime.

The 'Adults Only' Hypothesis: Despite youth possessing legal status and capacity to access and own land, customary and even modern state systems infantilise youth and expect them to be satisfied with secondary rights or seek land rights through adults or their families.

Critique: Attitudinal biases – from state, family and society – often undermine youth rights. Many youth do exercise land rights, formally and informally. Young people from wealthier backgrounds often own and manage land. Youth outside formal land systems enjoy land rights. For example youth headed households, young migrants and displaced, young single mothers and divorcees, street kids and youth gang members. Studies of AIDS/HIV orphans provide important understandings of the relationship between youth and land, for example evidence suggests that one important motivation for the formation of child-headed households is "to retain access to, and ownership of, the family's land

⁹ Andvig JC (2001) 'Family-Controlled Child Labour in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Survey Research. Social Protection' World Bank Discussion Paper No. 122. Washington DC: World Bank

and other property”¹⁰. Rather than insist that youth can only access rights through adults, several communities, for example in Swaziland, have distributed inheritance rights to children and youth¹¹. If categories of ‘youth at risk’ can be given or assume their land rights, the land system should recognise potential independent youth agency in land at all times.

The ‘Market Realities’ approach: A casual view is that scarce land cannot be prioritised for youth who must pursue their land rights by competing in the market and play by adult rules.

Critique: The counter argument is that land is indeed vital for youth and markets are skewed against youth or inaccessible. More than scarcity of land, it is cultural barriers, policy bias and lack of awareness and land tools are the main hurdles to the realisation of their land rights. The adult hierarchical model that youth are lower and later in the land pecking order is also constructed on premise that youth will somehow cope by staying or working longer with their parents or at breaking point will migrate. Dealing with legitimate youth aspirations relating to land helps avoid the pressures of urbanisation where land is the issue. There is broad research that there are systemic biases against youth accessing land and opportunities are limited. As such, youth are seeking proactive and affirmative policies to make land markets and systems an even playing field.

The gulf between the legitimate land aspirations of youth and the denial in the policy domain could not be more striking. There should be no debate because older youth do have legal ‘capacity’ and land rights, unlike children. However, the research indicates that discrimination and marginalisation of youth in their access to land is extensive and their tenure is often tenuous. Social and customary attitudes construct land as adult issue. Paradoxically, even if land is not formally on the table while discussing youth livelihoods, employment and empowerment; it remains a key aspiration and guarantor of youth development. A government may strengthen livelihoods through youth employment and other measures but there is no escaping the “moral duty and responsibility to redress gross inequalities in land ownership”¹².

2.3.2 What does Secure Tenure Mean for Youth?

There is scant conceptualisation of tenure security, access to land and land rights as applicable to youth. This is a corollary of land being treated as an ‘adult’ matter and youth as largely a ‘transition’ stage. Youth do have an interest in a broad formulation of land rights, not just land ownership. Land, particularly for youth, is mostly addressed as a component of access to shelter rather through the wider and complex socio-cultural, economic and political meanings of land. The correlation between youth poverty and access to land, as well as youth unemployment and insecurity is not always clear. The link between land ownership of parents and education, self-esteem and health/mortality have been explored, but not with regard to land rights of youth themselves. Inter-generational aspects of land rights, including inheritance and guardianship, as well as gender dimensions, also lag behind¹³. Access to land of rural youth is more widely discussed than urban, for example from a livelihood perspective under the right to food¹⁴. Here the emphasis is also on improving youth land productivity or disincentivising youth migration to rural areas. How youth have fared under land reform has not been under the radar, and little consideration on how to further youth land rights. In addition to the legal content, reviews suggest that socio-cultural components of the tools may also be relevant to address youth. Different conceptions of land and youth rights, for example under customary, Hindu or

¹⁰ Subbarao K and Coury D (2003) *Reaching Out to Africa’s Orphans A Framework for Public Action* (Washington DC: World Bank) at 29.

¹¹ FM&G. 2002. Consultancy for Community-Based Assessment and Review of Best Practice in Community Responses to Meet the Needs of Vulnerable Children, Including Orphans. Draft report submitted to the Poverty Reduction Task Team, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, Swaziland.

¹² J Lind and K Sturman (2002) *Scarcity and Surfeit: The ecology of Africa’s conflicts* (Pretoria/Nairobi: ISS/ACTS)

¹³ Besteman C (1995) ‘Polygyny, Women’s Land Tenure, and the “Mother-Son Partnership” in Southern Somalia’ 51:3 *Journal of Anthropological Research* 193-213

¹⁴ See *Towards Earth Summit II: Recommendations for Actions and Commitments at Earth Summit II* Special Session of the General Assembly, 23 June 1997, ES2/1997/CSDNGO/1 (See Chapter 14 of Agenda 21)

Islamic law also blur an already complex field. Youth have often to be addressed within their communities and social milieu.

In order to develop youth responsive tools, or to test existing land tools, a clearer conceptual understanding of what works for youth would be needed. Would co-ownership (as proposed by Youth Section's partnership proposal with GLTN) be workable, could group youth and communal rights be more pragmatic as suggested elsewhere? Youth land management and governance issues with respect to youth also need further attention. Would a youth orientation imply more technological approaches while acknowledging the digital divide? GLTN promotion of continuum of land rights is conducive to exploring land rights of poor youth who often possess informal and secondary rights. Understanding the needs, experiences and perspectives of youth in relation to land is a precondition to embarking on a youth and land programme. GLTN would need to address this research gap first.

2.3.3 Can Youth be Partners in Tool development?

Youth participatory rights are well established from the *Habitat Agenda*¹⁵ to the 1989 *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (CRC) for under 18s (Article 12). Earlier objections to youth participation as unnecessary, expensive, complicated or adding another layer to complex developmental efforts have been roundly discredited. 'Youth-led' approach is a key principle of UN-HABITAT youth strategy and theme in its recent flagship report. Participation means work with and by youth, not merely work for them. Youth are neither problems to be solved nor passive beneficiaries. Instead, the research shows youth to be a valuable resource, experts in their own field. Consultations involve more than just listening to young people; it means acting upon their advice. Young people can be successfully involved in decisions, e.g., budgeting, programme design and management, monitoring and evaluation that go far beyond consultation. Youth participation connotes the "active, informed and voluntary involvement of people in decision-making and the life of their communities (both locally and globally)"¹⁶. GLTN needs to consider the long term processes of including youth in all stages and levels as equal partners.

Youth and child participation is a huge industry, with a trove of participation tools specific to their sector. Some of it are generic and transferable practices and are reflected in UN-HABITAT practice (Youth Advisory Board, for example) but there is no precedent for developing technical land tools with youth, or testing youth responsiveness of land tools. A recent DFID report catalogues a number of models of youth as partners, trainers, experts, advisors, and consultants in a number of agencies¹⁷. GLTN has a choice among the working youth engagement models, or a combination that works. While child and youth participation appears to require significant resources and skills¹⁸, systematically approached (with key principles) it need not be any more exhausting or difficult than regular adult engagement. With the partnership of PYB, GLTN needs to calibrate the activities, outputs, expectations¹⁹ and costing to make the process sustainable. A priority tool for GLTN to consider would be a Guide for Youth Participation for Tool Development, as part of a Youth Mechanism (see chapter 6).

2.3.4 Do we Need Youth Indicators?

The literature points to the infancy of youth development indicators and lack of land rights for youth yet to be addressed. The MTSIP FA3 theme paper notes that GLTN partners will also contribute to collect, analyse, disseminate, and mainstream land indicators. A number of GLTN partners are already working to support the African Union/UNECA and African Development Bank development

¹⁵ See for example paragraphs 13, 45, 113, 120, 123 and 213 on youth participation.

¹⁶ See DFID 2010

¹⁷ Malley K (2005) 'Children and Young People Participating in PRSP Processes – Lessons from Save the Children's Experience'. London: Save the Children.

¹⁸ Lansdown G (2002) The participation of children. In: Montgomery, Heather, Rachel Burr, Martin Woodhead *Changing Childhoods: local and global*. The Open University and John Wiley & Sons, Milton Keynes,

¹⁹ DFID (2010) argues that involving young people in policy, planning or situation analysis creates an obligation to involve them in implementation, and to deliver concrete assistance.

of guidelines for land policy in Africa, as well as indicators²⁰. Though disaggregation by sex is referred to in the MTSIP FA3 paper, there is no mention of age-differentiated data or indicators. Data on youth is best captured on employment, education and health but usually does not differentiate rural and urban populations²¹. Youth development indicators are intended to impact governance, the economy and service delivery in all sectors²², and vital too to measure impact on MDGs.

In 2009, several UN agencies and organisations reaffirmed their commitment to youth indicators in response to UN (WPAY) proposed goals and targets²³. By 2012, four Commonwealth countries will have piloted revised youth indicators. CYP is working with UNICEF and others to mainstream youth participation in development initiatives (Youth Development Indicators). Indicators will focus on three key areas: political empowerment, social empowerment and economic empowerment. Youth development indicators are intended to employ participatory as well as statistical approaches. Best practice from other sectors shows that young people can be creative and design more appropriate indicators and methodology. Given the importance of youth indicators, GLTN would have to consider whether contributing in this area is a priority recognising the level of resources required. As it stands, land for youth analysis is far too speculative and based on assumptions.

2.3.5 How can we Mainstream and Build Capacity on Youth?

UN-HABITAT has long championed youth mainstreaming and has, through the PYB, formulated proposals for Youth Empowerment Mainstreaming. Like gender mainstreaming, youth mainstreaming has emerged as an imperative for inclusive and effective organisations. Such is its importance that the Commonwealth PAYE asks “All sectors/ministries to allocate at least 25% of their total annual budget in support of youth development mainstreaming”. It is recognition of youth as a cross-cutting theme which needs more systematic and conscious attention²⁴. Beyond merely the participation of youth, it posits the active consideration of youth concerns by all stakeholders, particularly the agency, organisation, partner or government being mainstreamed. The institutionalisation of youth in land policy and programming across all levels of strategy and implementation of GLTN work plan could be envisaged.

Box 2: Youth Mainstreaming

“The process of assessing the implications (for youth) of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making (youth) concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes, in all political, economic and social spheres so that (youth) benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated.”

Source: ECOSOC - Agreed Conclusions 1997/2

DFID finds that youth mainstreaming helps identify and overcome barriers faced by youth²⁵. There are different stages and levels of youth mainstreaming. It starts with the organisation or unit initiating mainstream (GLTN secretariat here), before being rolled out to partners, other parts of the

²⁰ Partners include SDI, the World Bank, FAO, IFAD, and International Land Coalition.

²¹ See research based approach to goal-setting, monitoring and evaluation in youth programming (Youth Development Index).

²² Commonwealth PAYE

²³ See also High-level discussion on youth development indicators at the 47th UN Commission on Social Development.

²⁴ See Stein-Erik Kruse and D. Okpala *Review of the Cooperation between UN-Habitat and the Government of Norway* August 2007.

²⁵ DFID p.38

organisation and the sector at large. The ultimate target is the government/local authority and national/local actors, with youth mainstreaming impacting implementation²⁶. Though youth mainstreaming is a learning experience, it is not meant to reinvent the policy or project wheel. It is not the diversion of funds or staff time into a new fluffy political fad, but the reassessment of how to blend youth priorities into overall strategies and work plans where necessary. UN-HABITAT's Youth Empowerment Programme (YEP) prescribes "targeted interventions of capacity building, financial support and advocacy to enable country-level youth organizations, national governments and partners to be more sensitive to and address youth issues in an integrated manner".

Youth mainstreaming employs a variety of approaches and catalyses new tools. Youth mainstreaming on youth and land itself needs to be developed as a tool. Developing capacity through the youth and land mainstreaming training programme enhances knowledge and dialogue among its multi-age participants. It is a collaborative initiative which mobilises a variety of stakeholders, including grassroots, gender and youth groups. This breaks down silos by integrating youth consciousness across the policy and programming spectrum (or ministries/stakeholders at the national level. Mainstreaming could also be through thematic meetings, to discuss for example 'secure tenure', also inviting youth representatives. Youth mainstreaming could also contribute to a set of youth indicators and pave the way for young people to participate in specific monitoring and evaluation activities, as envisaged in the YEP proposal. From GLTN's perspective, the youth mainstreaming should focus on land and related matters, designed to further a better understanding of youth and their issues.

2.4 Chapter Conclusions

The findings of the literature view (correlated with other consultations) are presented in Chapter 5 alongside recommendations. Broadly, two general observations on the themes and gaps in youth and development discourse can be made. Researchers warn us that the expectations, needs and demands of urban youth cannot be assumed to be identical or similar to adult perceptions or experiences²⁷. Where youth are invisible, policies are likely missing something. A leading youth researcher points out "Urban youth life tends to take place in worlds that are largely separate from the rest of society. The pressures and dangers facing male and female youth can be extreme, yet at the same time cities are exceptionally stimulating places that provide opportunities for re-invention for many urban youth"²⁸.

Another common concern is the implication of social exclusion and denial of the benefits of urban life to youth, especially young women. As cities around the world are being re-shaped by urban renewal interventions or slum upgrading models, "tensions inevitably arise about whose quality of life is enhanced, and at whose expense?"²⁹ Researchers and experts are concerned that most references to urban youth descriptive, portray them either as helpless in squalid conditions or as threats to stability and safety. Instead youth are potentially active and resilient change agents and innovators. As urbanization directly impacts the lives of young people, their perceptions of a good city and the factors stimulate their active participation in making their urban environment youth-friendly. Practical examples of youth participation in transforming urban environments³⁰ as well as good practices in youth responsive national initiatives³¹ are available. The positives of literature review are the generic youth tools and best practices from other sectors which can be used to develop a youth and land inventory of tools and programme.

²⁶ See African Youth Charter. Articles 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 20 of the charter respectively advocate youth participation and mainstreaming in development issues.

²⁷ Chawla, L (2002), *Insight, Creativity and Thoughts on the Environment: Integrating children and youth into human development* 14 Environment and Urbanization, Vol. 14, IIED, London, 2002.

²⁸ Sommers M (2010) Urban youth in Africa *22 Environment and Urbanization* 317-332

²⁹ Rogers, P. and Coaffee, J. Moral panics and urban renaissance.9:3 *City* 321-340.

³⁰ Hardoy J et al (2010) Learning from young people and from our own experiences in Barrio San Jorge 22 *Environment and Urbanization* 371-387

³¹ Wilhjelm H (1995) 'Children and Planning- A Recent Norwegian Reform to Improve the Physical Environment of Children and Adolescents' 12:4 *Children's Environments* 49-65; R Gilbert, C O'Brien (2009) *Child and youth friendly land use and transport planning guidelines for Ontario* savewanup.com

CHAPTER 3: THE INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR GLTN'S YOUTH AGENDA

While GLTN is interested in furthering its youth and land agenda, it will have to consider its multiple demands and limited resources, based on its mandate and work plan. To consider the gaps and expectations in the youth and land global discourse, this chapter revisits the global normative framework on youth and land, MDGs, Habitat Agenda and MTSIP which inspire GLTN activities as well as internal GLTN documents. GLTN's own objectives, core values and mission are considered.

Key principles of UN-HABITAT's youth strategy are being adapted, developed and embedded by individual divisions, branches, sections and regional offices. A key element of UN-HABITAT's strategic vision on youth, as amplified through Governing Council resolutions and the work programme, is mainstreaming youth as a cross-cutting element in the design and implementation of all programmes. This chapter reviews UN-HABITAT's youth strategy and the role of the Youth Section within the Partners and Youth Branch (PYB) as a way of evaluating the intersection of youth and land. GLTN has potentially several different avenues of collaboration with PYB on mainstreaming youth within land and also land within youth.

3.1 GLTN's Youth Agenda

The Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) was officially launched at the third session of the World Urban Forum at Vancouver in June 2006 with a specific inclusive mandate of improving land rights and governance for all. A comprehensive initial consultant report as well as several preparatory stakeholder meetings generated GLTN's ambitious yet focused project design and work programme. This project design and work programme did not refer to youth. In the first phase of GLTN's work, youth (under the age of 32) were often present at stakeholder meetings, but no partner (with the exception of Norway at successive International Advisory Board meetings in 2010 and 2011) advocated youth specifically as a primary constituency, perhaps owing to the overwhelming work programme already underway. The first, and so far only, GLTN publication that refers specifically to youth is *Developing land tools for all age groups: Implementing the Land, Property and Housing Rights of Children, Youth and Older Persons* (2008). What is clear is that youth have been an implicitly important category in GLTN's inclusive land rights work, though not sufficiently visible.

The 2007 *GLTN Logframe*, the proceedings of the 2009 *GLTN Partners Meeting* and the 2010 *GLTN Medium Term Assessment* report are all silent on youth, but read constructively spell out the basis for GLTN's enhanced youth and land work. The three documents reinforce that the MDGs, the Habitat Agenda and the MTSIP are the foundation of GLTN's mandate – all of which call for youth focused strategies and results. The question for the network, as it enters the next phase of its work is whether strengthening its 'youth and land' stream would improve the effectiveness of its on-going work and substantially impact the land rights of youth. As GLTN's work becomes more detailed and advanced, and it tests its generic tools, its ability incorporate the voices, needs and experiences of youth also increases. The accompanying consideration is how GLTN's objectives, priorities, resources and work programme could systematically mainstream 'youth and land' within GLTN, UN-HABITAT and the land and related sectors at large.

3.2 GLTN's Objectives and Values

The main objective of GLTN is to contribute to "poverty alleviation and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) through land reform, improved land management and security of tenure". The Habitat Agenda drives its inclusive agenda of security of tenure for all just as the MTSIP directs its energies towards securing sustainable urbanisation. As discussed below, far from distracting GLTN from its core work, an enhanced youth and land framework would likely further strengthen commitment to its mandate and render its work programme more complete and effective in achieving its goals. The GLTN operational strategies to "increase global knowledge, awareness and tools to support pro-poor and gender sensitive land management" would fit in well with a youth responsive and sensitive approach. Equally, its youth and land portfolio would "strengthen capacity in selected countries to

apply pro-poor and gender sensitive tools to improve the security of tenure of the poor in line with the recommendations regarding UN Reform and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (“managing for results”). The three factors underpinning the GLTN initiative – lack of tools, need to move from narratives to implementation at scale and need for a rights based and pro-poor approach – provide the starting point of constructing a youth and land framework.

The core values of the GLTN are “pro poor, governance, equity, subsidiarity, affordability, and systematic large scale approach as well as gender sensitiveness”. The values are imperative for GLTN membership as well as in guiding the work programme. Transposed into a youth and land paradigm, GLTN partners would easily recognise the stark needs of poor youth, promote governance for youth, ensure intergenerational equity, facilitate subsidiarity, strive for affordable tools for youth, upscale for the millions of youth and work towards gender equality. Certainly its objectives lend to an elevated relationship on youth and land issues. A choice for GLTN, either now or several years down its work, would be whether its objectives and values should formally signal its youth or age responsiveness (for example, by adding youth/age as another cross cutting issue). In light of the Habitat Agenda, MDGs and MTSIP (discussed below) such inclusion could send an important message and is an advocacy tool. However, decisions over the extent and manner of its youth engagement would likely be taken through consultations, to create network ownership and also to focus and avoid duplication or waste.

3.3 The Global Youth and Land Agenda

GLTN is a global network which among other things contributes to and implements the global land agenda. It has for example emerged as a key player in contributing to gender and land strategies. Globally, there is limited but increasing reference to youth access to land. Some address it as a strategic asset, others as livelihood and poverty alleviation for young people. The UN has repeatedly called for specific measures to address the “juvenilization and feminization of poverty”³². It attributes poverty among youth to their general “lack of access to or loss of control over resources, including land, skills, knowledge, capital and social connections. Without those resources, young people have limited access to institutions, markets, employment and public services”. The UN World Programme of Action for Youth (WPAY)³³ specifically calls for “land grants for young people”. The 1998 *Lisbon Declaration on Youth Policies and Programmes* (LDYPP)³⁴ while discussing the “right to development of all young women and young men” calls for “promoting access of young women and young men to land, credit, technologies and information” (paragraph 18).

The 2006 *African Youth Charter* (AYC)³⁵ also calls for providing “grants of land to youth and youth organisations for socioeconomic development purposes” (Article 14:2), which was followed up in 2009 by the African Union³⁶, through the adoption of the *Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa*, which commits to “ensure that land laws provide for equitable access to land especially by the landless, women, youth, displaced persons and other vulnerable groups”. Other regional youth Charters such as *Ibero-American Convention on Rights of Youth*³⁷ do not make direct reference to

³² *World Programme Of Action For Youth*, Adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolutions A/RES/50/81 and A/RES/62/126 on 14 December 1996 and 18 December 2007

³³ The 15 WPAY priority areas of action are Education, Employment, Hunger and Poverty, Environment, Health, Drug abuse, Juvenile delinquency, Leisure-time activities, Girls and young women, Participation, Globalisation, Information and Communication Technologies, HIV/AIDS, Youth and Conflict prevention and Inter-Generational Relations.

³⁴ The 1998 *Lisbon Declaration on Youth Policies and Programmes*, Lisbon, Portugal, 12 August 1998 (UNESCO)

³⁵ Adopted on 2 July 2006 by the seventh ordinary session of the assembly held in Banjul, the Gambia. The 2006 charter is the AU's basic and legal instrument for youth empowerment and provides a framework for youth development programming across the member states. Following the deposit of the fifteenth instrument of ratification, the African Youth Charter entered into force on August 2009.

³⁶ African Union Heads of States and Government of the African Union, in their 13th Ordinary Session in Sirte Libya, from 01 to 03 July 2009.

³⁷ *Ibero-American Convention on Rights of Youth*, Badajoz, Spain, 10 and 11 of October of 2005

land but refer to urban conditions such as rights to work, housing and healthy environment. The *Commonwealth Plan of Action for Youth Empowerment 2007-2015* (PAYE)³⁸ calls for “development and implementation of measures to promote the economic enfranchisement of young people”. In particular, it calls on governments to provide support to young people in gaining access to land, as a means of building their economic and social base”. Each instrument is concerned that such declarations must be backed up, for example in the words of WPAY by governments “supported by financial and technical assistance and training”³⁹. However, tools to facilitate land rights for youth are conspicuous by their absence which is why GLTN needs to step in.

3.4 GLTN’s Mandate under MDGs, Habitat Agenda and MTSIP

GLTNs Secretariat location within UN-HABITAT’s Land, Tenure and Property Administration Section (LTPAS) makes it amenable to the mandate of the *Habitat Agenda*. The Habitat Agenda (paragraphs 13, 33 and 45, among others) specifically commits UN-HABITAT to work in partnership with youth in human settlements management and development and, empower them to participate in decision making in order to improve urban livelihoods and contribute to sustainable human settlements.

GLTN declares that its “main objective is to contribute to poverty alleviation and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) through land reform, improved land management and security of tenure”. There is consensus that the MDGs, including MDG 7/11, “improving living conditions” cannot be achieved without an integrated youth initiative⁴⁰, as seen in the work of Commonwealth Secretariat, UNDP, UNICEF, UNPFA and the World Bank. A paper for UN-HABITAT argues that “including the youth focus in urban land use planning is a policy issue which will greatly influence the achievement of youth related targets under the Millennium Development Goals”⁴¹.

GLTN’s work programme is aligned with UN-HABITAT’s Medium Term Strategic and Institutional Plan 2008-2013 (MTSIP)⁴², which has youth as a cross cutting issue. MTSIP specifically addresses national and local governments and Habitat Agenda partners in the adoption of pro-poor, gender and age-sensitive housing, land management and property administration towards sustainable urbanization. GLTN is primarily concerned with Focus Area Three (FA3) on pro-poor land and housing which specifically stresses the need for age sensitive housing and land tools. GLTN also contributes to Focus Area One (FA1) on Advocacy, Monitoring and Partnerships which strives enhanced engagement of civil society including youth groups in sustainable urbanization.

The MTSIP FA1 theme paper⁴³ is strong on youth but has no mention of land (except for a passing reference to GLTN on its monitoring work, and of Women’s Land Access Trusts). It recognises youth as one of the four key partners (alongside civil society, the private sector, and parliamentarians) (p.8) and with women and research institutions (p.12) without whom the “goals and results of Focus Area 1 cannot be achieved”. It also emphasises the need for more systematic use of gender- and age disaggregated urban data particularly for monitoring (p.13). The FA3 Strategy paper, which GLTN has contributed to, outlines the Agency’s normative approach and strategy. The document is noticeably strong on gender, but it does not spell out plans to meet the MTSIP expectations on age-

³⁸ Commonwealth Secretariat (2007) ‘Plan of Action for Youth Empowerment 2007-2015’; London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

³⁹ The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the International Labour Organization are invited to document and disseminate information about national experience with land-grant and settlement schemes for use by Governments. Information on this is not easily available.

⁴⁰ Ad Hoc Working Group for Youth and the MDGs (2005) *Youth And The Millennium Development Goals: Challenges and Opportunities for Implementation* Final Report, April 2005

⁴¹ Kapila 2010

⁴² Medium-term Strategic and Institutional Plan for UN-Habitat for the period 2008–2013, HSP/GC/21/5/Add.1, March 2007

⁴³ UN-HABITAT (2010) *Medium-Term Strategic and institutional Plan: Focus Area Policy and Strategy Paper Focus Area 1: Effective Advocacy, Monitoring, and Partnerships for Sustainable Urbanization* (Nairobi: UN-HABITAT)

sensitive land and housing strategies. The FA3 paper does speak of “a clear need for inclusionary efforts to secure rights for women, youth and other often vulnerable groups in access to land and housing⁴⁴ but does not elaborate. From the limited perspective of youth and land normative and operational work, FA1 and FA3 strategy papers in separate ways, provide the starting basis for a youth and land strategy.

3.5 UN-HABITAT’s Youth Strategy

UN-HABITAT has been stepping up its focus on improving the livelihoods of urban youth through innovative programs, policy and research⁴⁵. It calls for the initiation and fostering of intra and inter-agency collaborations, as well as partnerships with youth organizations, as vehicles for outreach and youth participation. The agency’s youth compass has evolved from a primary focus on partnerships and participation (though still very important) to evidence-generated and results-based approaches which are youth targeted and youth led. Youth have always been recognized as important players in the work of UN-Habitat with mandates from various resolutions (17/19 of 14 May 1999, 18/3 of 16 February 2001 and 18/8 of 16 February 2001 and 19/13 of 9 May 2003) on enhancing UN-Habitat partnership and engagement with youth.

Youth issues have subsequently been reflected in UN-Habitat’s planning instruments, the strategic framework and the work programmes and budgets (see also MTSIP above). UN-HABITAT’s youth vision and strategy is innovative, pioneering and sector-leading. The 2005 *UN-HABITAT and Youth: A Strategy for Enhanced Engagement (SEE) with Youth* states the rationale for UN-HABITAT to engage with youth:

“An integrated approach to urban youth development will mainstream a focus on youth in the normative and operational activities of UN-HABITAT and will ultimately strengthen the impact of its work in reducing urban poverty.”

This strategy provides a framework for strengthening the design and implementation of the youth empowerment programme⁴⁶. The overall goal of the Strategy is to foster youth empowerment, mainstream the work of the UN-HABITAT on engagement of young people and addressing the problems of young people for meaningful solutions to urban challenges. UN-HABITAT actively promotes the implementation of youth programmes, working directly with youth-led groups. The strategy envisages increased participation of youth in urban governance, focus on capacity-building and poverty alleviation, strengthening youth employment opportunities, and establishing an interim youth consultative mechanism. It does not refer specifically to land but a youth and land agenda could be based on the broad features enunciated in the strategy.

3.6 The Youth Section and its Tools

UN-HABITAT’s work with young people is the responsibility of the Youth Section within the Partners and Youth Branch (PYB) in the Monitoring and Research Division. PYB works closely with all divisions, branches and the regional offices in order to promote high quality and continuous engagement of partners in incorporating youth issues in the development agenda. Its mandate has expanded from youth mainstreamer and coordinator to a range of promotional, organisational, normative, facilitating and operational roles. The main functions of the PYB with respect to the youth are the following:

1. Promoting the youth strategy to all UN-HABITAT programmes, multi-lateral agencies, partner organizations, governments and donors, and negotiating opportunities and modalities for collaboration in its implementation;

⁴⁴ UN-HABITAT (2009) *Focus Area 3 Policy and Strategy Paper: Access to Land and Housing for All (preliminary)* Nairobi: UN-HABITAT p.9

⁴⁵ UN-HABITAT, *Youth Empowerment For Urban Development: Youth empowerment through knowledge based advocacy for improved quality of living (A Proposal for Partnership Support)* mainstreaming partnership proposal YEP draft2 / 11 July 2011

⁴⁶ UN-HABITAT (2005) *Strategy on Enhancing the Engagement of Youth* (2005)

2. Convening the inter-divisional task force on youth mainstreaming and serving as its secretariat;
3. Preparing annual work programmes and reports;
4. Facilitating development of tools by the normative programmes to support effective engagement of the youth in the Agency's activities, including guidelines for incorporating the youth in project design;
5. Facilitating pilot projects and developing innovative approaches to working with the youth;
6. Convening global and regional meetings of partners focused on the youth, and serving as the secretariat for the youth consultative mechanism.

Though the Youth Section has not worked on land issues specifically, PYB is a proactive and very useful partner in helping build and implement the youth and land agenda. There are several encouraging overlaps between GLTN and the youth section, including normative work and tool development. The 2011 positive evaluation of the Youth Fund however notes that while the normative activity of PYB is increasing, there appears to be more information gathering than normative contributions (p.18).

3.6.1 The UN-HABITAT Urban Youth Fund

The UN-HABITAT Urban Youth Fund is well recognised within and outside the agency, and FAI identifies the fund as “the main achievement” of PYB. Established in 2009, the annual fund, supported by Norway, awards between USD 5,000 and 25,000 to organisations led by young people (aged 15 to 32 years) over two years for youth-led urban initiatives. Access to affordable housing and secure tenure for youth is one of the funding priority areas, but a PYB report finds that interest in the theme is very limited⁴⁷. The youth fund will be a key instrument to facilitate and catalyse broader and more focused and effective engagement of youth in urban areas globally to address urban challenges. Among the 51 successful applicants in 2010 were Map Kibera which works to develop maps of informal settlements created by youth residents and Young Voices Network Zimbabwe who will carry out advocacy and engage the local government on secure tenure for youth. All Youth Fund recipients receive training from UN-HABITAT. This is a promising area of collaboration between PYB and GLTN, and GLTN has advertised the Fund among its network. The 2011 Evaluation of the Youth fund recognises its success so far but calls for selection of countries, where GLTN inputs could be useful. GLTN may also consider recommending land as a specific fund theme.

3.6.2 The One Stop Youth Centres

PYB supports One Stop Youth Information and Resource Centres which aim to provide space for youth-led initiatives and empower young people to make informed and responsible decisions about all aspects of their lives. It is a partnership of government, civil society organisations, private sector, UN Agencies and youth that creates opportunities for youth under 'one roof' to impart appropriate skills, give relevant and timely information, build networks and are meaningful engage young people in development. All of these have been established on land allocated by local municipalities or national ministries. One Stop Centres are invariably organized around five thematic areas- Employment and the Entrepreneurship; Governance and Advocacy; Drugs and Substance Use; Reproductive Health Sector and Communication and information. PYB has also developed tools such as youth centre setup guide⁴⁸ and working manual⁴⁹. The centres are not specifically designed to deal with land issues, but they could promote land rights, awareness and training.

⁴⁷ UN-HABITAT (2010) *Ideas to Action: Best Practices in Youth-led Development*

⁴⁸ UN-HABITAT (2010) *Volume 1: Urban youth centre setup guide* Nairobi: UN-HABITAT

⁴⁹ UN-HABITAT (2010) *Volume 2: Working Manual for One Stop Youth Information and Resource Centres Guidelines*, Organised and written by Oslo Youth Council in close collaboration with Nairobi *One Stop Youth Information Resource Centre*, Supported by UN-HABITAT

3.6.3 The World Urban Youth Assembly

One of the key investments of PYB is the World Urban Youth Assembly (WUYA) (formerly the World Urban Youth Forum) to “help the youth to be better placed to meet the needs of an ever changing urban world”. The recommendations from WUYAs are credited with triggering the adoption by the UN-HABITAT Governing Council of decisions important to the youth, such as resolution 21/6 which facilitated the establishment of a special fund for Urban Youth-Led Development. The next WUF could provide GLTN and PYB opportunities to work together to further the youth and land agenda with participation from youth.

3.6.3 Other PYB initiatives

Other key PYB initiatives include:

- *The Moonbeam Youth Training Centre* provides training and support for young women and men entrepreneurs from Mavoko and Kibera slums in Kenya.
- *The Messengers of Truth* promotes sustainable urbanization using music as an advocacy tool.
- *The Global Youth Helpdesk* provides up-to-date information on urban youth issues and events and aims to promote best practices, knowledge sharing and action on urban youth issues.
- *The UN-HABITAT Youth Advisory Board* allows young people to engage with UN-HABITAT and participate in key events such as the World Urban Forum and the Governing Council.

3.7 PYB’s Partnership Proposal with GLTN

PYB is developing an intra-agency partnership model titled *Youth Empowerment for Urban Development*⁵⁰ which seeks “a global initiative which aims at improving the livelihoods of urban marginalized youth”. The youth fund, youth centres and the Entrepreneurship and Employability initiative are to be the key drivers. The expected accomplishments are broad -improved livelihoods for marginalised youth in slums and improved inclusion of young women and men in governance issues at all levels, but there are a range of subsidiary results. The Youth Empowerment Programme (YEP) is built on several building blocks- respect and motivation (rights awareness), understanding youth problems (tools to monitor and analyse), problem-solving skills (planning for constructive youth-led action) and tools and resources (access to the equipment, finances, models and technical support to succeed in their action plans).

The YEP partnership proposal (draft March 2011) seeks collaboration with relevant divisions/departments, as well as external partners, in addressing youth engagement in water and sanitation, housing and infrastructure, climate change, land rights and governance. Land rights and governance is therefore highlighted a key thematic partnership, with GLTN context, objectives and work discussed. It notes that “GLTN has a strong focus on gender issues, seeking to redress traditional barriers to women’s ownership of land. This project will adapt that approach to a focus on youth, who face similar barriers”. However, the proposal is admittedly at an early stage of formulation with no clear outputs. On Rights Training, there is a reference to continuum of rights and gender mechanism (again a suggested model for youth empowerment) and testing tools with target youth groups, but no detail of training on land rights. On Baseline research/monitoring, targeted youth groups to be supported in conducting action research in their communities to survey land tenure status and existing obstacles to obtaining ownership, with a specific focus on the situation of young people.

Solution seeking and action plan development suggests ways of improving and developing “pro-poor and pro-youth land management”, as well as land tenure tools by unblocking existing initiatives; in strengthening land networks; assisting development of affordable gendered (youth?) land tools; disseminating knowledge on how to implement security of tenure. Change design: GLTN, in collaboration with PYB, will link the youth initiatives to its broader strategies of working with local governments and concerned stakeholder groups in addressing access issues through policy and

⁵⁰ See UN-HABITAT (2011) *Youth Empowerment For Urban Development: Youth empowerment through knowledge based advocacy for improved quality of living (A Proposal for Partnership Support)* mainstreaming partnership proposal YEP draft2 /

programme planning. Implementation: A whole range of interconnected tools are required in order to protect secure tenure for young people, through land management systems and flexible tenure types, for example co-tenures. The recognition of the diversity of stakeholders and their contexts, be it experiences, HIV/AIDS, domestic violence or post-conflict, requires that policies relating to spatial information, land use, planning, administration and registration are reformed.

3.8 Chapter Conclusions

Though the GLTN founding documents or subsequent logframe and review do not explicitly refer to youth, youth are in fact an implicit category, beneficiary and stakeholder in GLTN work. GLTN has a strong mandate from UN-HABITAT and the MTSIP to augment its focus on youth, indeed such an investment will be in tune with its objectives, core values and philosophy. With the exception of Norway's earmarked contribution to mainstreaming of youth in GLTN, the network has not faced any formal demands for greater focus on youth in its work from its partners. These documents indicate that there are high levels of satisfaction with the quality work and results that GLTN has already produced, but expectations in relation to using the youth lens for universal and better results are likely to arise, given global trends to acknowledge youth.

GLTN will have to pragmatically consider how youth responsive tools can be promoted within its normal programme. From its logical framework supporting ENOF, its alignment of normative, capacity building and operation makes it well placed to handle the complexity and multiple demands of the nascent youth and land agenda. Like in other areas, the network can play a coordinating as well as catalytic role in developing, promoting and facilitating the youth and land agenda.

The PYB could be a valuable ally in advancing the Youth and Land agenda. Working closely with PYB will help GLTN mainstream land into youth and youth into land. Among the particular strengths that the Youth Section is its dedicated staff, two of whom worked closely with GLTN on this scoping study. PYB have built a strong youth constituency which was apparent in their helping to facilitate the youth exchange on land. The Youth Fund and Youth Advisory Board are among its strong assets, which GLTN can turn to for support and case studies on land. The PYB as the agency coordinator on youth mainstreaming also has normative and strategic depth which is reflected in the YEP proposal for partnership with land. At the same time, the Youth section, given its ambitious mandate, is stretched and would not be able to partner with GLTN in all its youth activities; therefore there must be a selection of activities where the Youth Section can fully participate and others where it could provide oversight and support. GLTN must also consider working with agencies with strong youth focus such as UNDESA, UNICEF, UNDP, UNEP, ILO, and UNODC (all of whom partner the Youth Section) in developing multi-pronged and integrated approaches to youth land rights, including young women.

CHAPTER 4: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

This chapter records consultations on the land and youth nexus with three important stakeholders: the youth (including YAB), GLTN partners and UN-HABITAT staff (particularly GLTN and PYB). Youth were consulted for several reasons. It was intended to bridge the gap created by paucity of material and knowledge. There had been no study or survey of youth's perspectives on land. The dialogue was also a start to soliciting views and involving youth in GLTN work as partners and leaders. The dialogue led to a stimulating discourse which demonstrated not only the demand for land but ideas which suggested that youth could be important partners in tool building, a view supported by YAB. Despite the diversity in the practice among GLTN members in engaging with youth, all responses supported GLTN enhancing its youth focus. There is wide internal support for enhancing youth dimensions within GLTN.

4.1 Youth responses

With the assistance of the PYB at UN-HABITAT, GLTN identified potential youth leaders and youth led organisations who work in areas relating to land. Three categories were targeted – youth leaders on the advisory board of UN-HABITAT institutions, coordinators of One Stop Youth Centres and the broader cohort of those working with UN-HABITAT, particularly as recipients of the UN-HABITAT Youth Fund in the past two years. About 200 youth were contacted, and among the responses, 22 were actively engaged with through emails and phone calls.

The following five questions were posed to youth:⁵¹

- a) Why or how is land important to youth?
- b) Do youth face more obstacles (as compared to adults) in accessing land? If so what are these obstacles?
- c) What must be done to strengthen land rights of young people (including young women)?
- d) How can youth contribute to developing more effective land tools and strategies?
- e) Are you aware of any best practices, where youth have been successful in improving their secure tenure or land rights?

The structure of the responses in this section correlates to the questions but thematic responses to different queries were consolidated. The participants offered a wide range of expertise, philosophies, agendas and outlooks. Their working fields include poverty alleviation, youth mobilisation, gender, indigenous rights, minority rights, food security, health, education, environment and child protection. Not all of them work directly on land, but as one respondent noted, though there may be no formal focus on land issues, it does become central to work. Each respondent spoke from their local or country context but broader global dynamics and comparative developments elsewhere were referred to. Several respondents argued that without addressing fundamental issues of land rights there cannot be real development. Despite the time and resource limitations of this youth exchange, the striking feature is the consistent level of interest and engagement of youth in land issues. The level of passion and the flow of ideas were palpable all of which could not be captured here.

4.1.1 Why or how is land important to youth?

There is consensus among youth respondents that land is at least as important to youth as it is to adults. It facilitates shelter, underpins livelihoods and is a guarantor of a broad range of rights and opportunities for youth. Virtually every youth activity depends directly or indirectly on access to

⁵¹ The 22 key contributors to this section represent a broad geographical spread (excluding Europe and North America) and gender balance are Milka Muthoni Ndiritu (Kenya), Harvey Chimaliro (Cameroon), Pradyumna Kumar Samantaray (India), Chiara Lenza (Brazil), Amina Abdullahi (Nigeria), Maylin Saravia Hormazabal (Chile), Najwan Berekdar (Palestine) João Ernesto Vilanculos (Mozambique) Mohd. Rezaul Karim (Bangladesh), Masrianto Hasan (Aceh, Indonesia), Priyanka Vashishtha (India), Joel Mambara (Zimbabwe), Ngali Juliette Nsam (Cameroon), Ayorogo Adongo Bismark (Ghana), Mgesi Juma (Tanzania), Baharishi Mishra (India), Safula Abdi (Kenya), S.M.Shaikat (Bangladesh), El Hadji Ousmane (Senegal) and Dr. Joseph R. Nkurunziza (Rwanda). Participant were requested to provide their profile and interests, those who did identified themselves as youth, some in their 20s and several being students.

land. Land is a resource base for basic human needs of food, clothing and shelter. Land is seen as vital not only for shelter and prosperity but also for survival, equity and dignity. Young women living in landless households are more prone to violence, starvation and discrimination. It is asserted that in Africa, a number of challenges young people face arise primarily out of youth landlessness, such as orphans being left without land for cultivation or house. In uncertain economic times, land serves as a fixed asset and security. For many, their relationship with land is intertwined with their pursuit of identity, community and cultural expression.

The young contributors highlighted lack of security of tenure as one of the most contentious issues facing youth. Denial of land rights or land reforms bypassing youth trigger conflicts with youth in the forefront as rebels and victims. Discrimination against youth on land is cited as one of the main reasons for social crimes among youth and instability. Landlessness among rural youth is a primary cause for migration to urban areas, and in turn to urban unemployment and crime. Therefore youth calls for proactive measures for widening youth land access. Among the main reasons why youth seek land are shelter, rural livelihoods, youth spaces and business start-ups and loans.

Youth see land as a base to build or work towards a home. Lack of home affects family life and can postpone marriage and child bearing decisions. Yet there is pessimism over exorbitant land and housing prices as well as unaffordable rentals. Rural youth livelihoods, farming and food security are predicated on availability of and use of land. Youth worry that not only their exclusion jeopardises not only livelihood prospects but also productivity and sustainability of rural lands itself. Youth demand more creative, recreational and social spaces for example youth centres which provide opportunities for networking, skill development and rights awareness. As land is often a pre-requisite for starting small businesses and getting loans, young entrepreneurs complain that they are being forced into the informal land markets where exploitation of youth is rife.

4.1.2 What are the obstacles to youth land access?

A key observation made by the majority of youth respondents is that scarcity of land is not the primary constraint but rather the prejudices and social attitudes towards youth. Land is considered an adult issue, particularly under traditional systems where holders of customary land rights arrogate the right to manage all the lands to the exclusion of young people. In many African tribes the belief is that land is owned by three parties: the dead, the living and the unborn. In many communities it is a taboo for a young person to access land while his or her parents are still alive. This arises out of stereotyping of youth as a threat or incompetent to exercise land rights. In many cultures, land is considered family or communal property with a fear of fragmentation and un-viability of land. As a result, youth are often treated as farm hands or unpaid family workers without tenure security, instead of young farmers in their own right.

In addition to age there are other bases of discrimination such as sex, religion, race, class, ethnicity or nationality toward youth. For example young migrants and displaced face routine marginalisation and are mostly confined to informal markets and settlements. Several categories such as orphans, young widows and single mothers, physically and mentally challenged youths and single mothers struggle to acquire land. Among indigenous communities local practice often prohibits youth land access. Therefore, cultural barriers and social stereotypes have to be confronted while promoting youth ability to own land, especially women. For example, women are not left out of their father's property because they are seen as temporary members owing to marriage. In their husband's house a woman is often treated as a stranger not entitled to land.

The four main obstacles to youth access to land are lack of social and legal recognition of youth land rights, skewed land markets, threats to their inheritance and red tape and corruption. Youth point out that land laws and policies ignore youth land rights leading to their marginalisation. They believe that with high youth unemployment and low wages, youth do not have enough savings and purchasing power. The only way most youth (males particularly) access land is through inheritance but poverty is forcing parents to sell their lands for survival. Youth are often intimidated and do not have the influence or experience in negotiating the opaque and corrupt land administration systems.

Land reforms mostly do not benefit the poor youth as land is invariably distributed among adult investors, elites and the politically connected. Poor young people fail to buy land or lobby for get lease from any public or private authority because they do not know how to. Obtaining a land title even through youth targeted government programmes is a formidable task. Youth respondents repeatedly stressed the fragility of their tenure security. Unscrupulous land and housing agents, developers as well as mafia target youth because of they are inexperienced. Secondary, informal land rights or inherited lands with no titles are easily usurped even by the government with little prospect of compensation.

The youth respondents emphasise that the extent and gravity of obstacles faced by most youth are far greater than those encountered by adults. For women and other vulnerable categories, these are multiplied. Factors inhibiting youth access to land range from non-recognition to outright discrimination of youth to lack of recognition by legal systems and land administration. As such youth are mostly discouraged to even think about land and concentrate on more immediately and easily available movable assets. Youth respondents believe that if they develop their awareness and capacity of land markets and systems, with support, they can improve their access to land.

4.1.3 How to strengthen youth land rights?

Youth acknowledge that the youth and land discourse is embryonic and pregnant with assumptions. While positing the obvious measures, they call for further research, consultations and identification of options for youth. Many are concerned about locating youth in market-led land reforms, improved land administration, titling and registration without querying its implications. Understandably the recognition of youth land rights in land laws and policies is high on the lobbying list. Youth find the land legal, policy and institutional framework unresponsive to youth and very complex. They are also perturbed that youth are casualties in implementation of laws. Therefore, the land strategies which recognise the obstacles and respond through multi-pronged interventions are sought.

The four main recommendations for strengthening land rights are youth responsive land laws and policies, youth awareness and empowerment, economic incentives and support and capacity building for sustainable land rights. Youth want land laws and policies to be reviewed to ensure that youth rights are strengthened in practice. They argue that awareness of youth rights and youth empowerment should be part of national plans with supporting budgets and confront socio-cultural biases against youth. Specifically, women and other vulnerable categories must be included. Youth poverty and unemployment are core issues to be tabled in tackling youth homelessness and landlessness. Youth seek support and incentives in accessing land and housing, particularly through easier loans and procedures. They are also promoting the need for training in land management and sustainable use.

Youth argue that the deficit in good land governance impacts them negatively. They are discouraged that land administration is complex and unresponsive to their participation, perspectives and needs. They call for land related authorities and professionals to render their processes, measures and rules of land acquisition, registration and taxation transparent, flexible and simpler for youth. They are also concerned that land professionals do not see them as stakeholders. A major grievance for youth is corruption and fraudulent activities which disproportionately affect youth. They also seek registration and regulation of real estate agents and land dealers in order to minimise their exploitation of youth.

Conclusions: The responses cover socio-cultural, legal, political and administrative changes. The proposed measures are at several levels. At a societal level, most youth seem not to comprehend the significance of land until it is too late. Therefore, awareness is sought to be built around rights, savings culture, building credit histories and facilitating networks and capacities. Calls for legal and policy changes are accompanied by practical suggestions, for example for young women, such as co-titling, offering incentives for retaining/transferring land in the name of women family members, simplifying and standardizing procedures for land title transfers, evaluating gender responsiveness of policies and their implementers. More broadly, there are expectations that youth would be prioritised in land reform initiatives.

4.1.4 How can youth contribute to tool development?

Youth argue that the current land discourse overlooks their substantive concerns and participative rights. As future leaders they lobby to have their perspectives and voices heard. Youth insist that they can be resourceful, innovative and productive, and offer alternative policies and approaches to contemporary land challenges that work. While welcoming initiatives that target young persons as beneficiaries, youth are looking to play the roles of key stakeholders and leaders in finding solutions. In particular many recognise the gap in land tools (particularly for youth) and appreciate the importance of multi-stakeholder tooling processes.

Youth do not see land as either an adult or even a youth-driven issue. Instead they are proposing that land be seen as an intergenerational issue but providing space to youth. They welcome methodologies which include other age cohorts including children and older persons given the inter-linkages. For example, a key issue for young persons is land rights within the family. If a family sells its land to others, the consent of all members, including sons and the unmarried girls, must be obtained. Thus, youth see existing tools are valuable but need to be adapted to youth concerns.

Youth identify several ways in which they can contribute to land tool development. They bring unique experiences and perspectives to the process; contribute energies and capacities; serve as land champions and support monitoring and implementation. Youth NGOs, university forums and other associations can contribute specific knowledge and expertise to the multi-stakeholder process. Youth institutions and networks could inform, strengthen and create youth ownership of the tool development processes. Land champions among youth are needed to facilitate youth rights from design to delivery of land tools and interventions. In particular, youth can translate models into tools by testing, piloting, monitoring and scaling up of tools.

Conclusions: Not many youth are aware of land tools but are keen on being involved in processes that develop solutions to their problems. Youth already partner governments, civil society, private sector and professionals in other sectors and see no problem in being part of the land tooling process. They see it as an opportunity to contribute their particular skills as well as learn through the multi-stakeholder process. The basis of all dialogue should be mutual respect and confidence among generations and different stakeholders. At the same time, many youth are seeking training and capacity in order that they may fully participate in the dialogue. They are afraid of tokenism of youth and propose that youth be involved at all levels and in all stages of the tool development work.

4.1.5 What are the youth-led Best Practices?

While youth recognise that best practices on youth-led land initiatives or land tools were needed, these were not easily available. Several youth participants in this survey said they did not have 'youth best practices on land' at hand but nevertheless reported good ideas or projects underway, in addition to the earlier discussions. Examples include reclaiming land from corporate investors for poor, training for youth on land ownership, management and use, including, young barefoot lawyers or micro-credit schemes for youth to successfully develop their land. Examples of positive experiences cited by the youth respondents fell into five categories - Advocacy on land rights; education and training; participation in urban planning; youth entrepreneurship and land financing.

A number of youth organisations worldwide work on advocacy for youth land rights. For example Concerned Youth Organisation, UN-HABITAT in Malawi and CICOD work together with Malawi Homeless Federation to promote land rights, secure tenure and provide portable houses. Organization for Indigenous (Youth) Initiatives and Sustainability Cameroon intervenes in family land crisis among youth, young widows, through sensitization of families on the need for a change in cultural land tenure systems. HRDC India has successfully lobbied for land rights for newlyweds, reversing tribal customs in Orissa. Training and capacity building for youth on land is available through some youth agencies. In Zimbabwe, uMfelandawonye and Dialogue on Shelter organised a one-week course on GIS for youth in collaboration with the Department of Surveying and Geo-informatics at the University of Zimbabwe. The course is aimed at helping young participants to familiarise with ArcGIS, software that is used to represent and analyse spatial data. ORGIIS Cameroon is among the

organisations supporting widening of youth access to finance. Others such as AJPJ and LUPA Mozambique promote sustainable land use projects.

4.2 GLTN partner responses

The GLTN agenda and work programme is driven by its strong and diverse network of members. As such, the GLTN youth and land agenda needs to be informed by the needs, experiences and priorities of its members. A questionnaire was sent to all GLTN members requesting information and feedback on youth and land issues. The exercise was not intended as a thematic or strategic dialogue at this stage (given the limited time, and the broader focus of the study) but served merely as a preliminary indicator of member views and interests to prime the scoping study. Its modest objective was to pick up any headline issues or concerns in relation to youth and land and to have a general assessment of whether partners were interested in or opposed to a youth focus and the extent of youth dimensions in their activities. This section is not meant to describe partner activities but to deduce trends.

Requests to partners were supplemented by a basic search of their websites for youth related activities, though it is acknowledged this is not always a reliable method. For a fuller understanding of youth mainstreaming within an organisation – and best practices- a more extensive and participative exercise will be required. Within these limitations, several impressions emerge. One, partners with multiple agendas do not always highlight youth but this may be implicit in their approach and mandate depending on the thematic areas. Two, partners who are a coalition or associations could not speak for constituent, grassroots or community organisations that may have innovative or systematic approaches to youth. Three, the use of the terminology of youth, though widespread, may itself not be consistently used. Four, youth were not always a standalone category but several organisations used children and youth, youth and women, youth and family together.

All member comments have been fed into this review. The initial review of GLTN member's websites also garners ideas and good practice which feed into GLTN's vision and strategy. It also indicates the trends, gaps and needs of the sector. Equally, it informs GLTN's proposals based on convergence of interest, avoidance of duplication and development of niche areas. The following review is not a complete assessment of member's youth portfolios but rather a rapid and brief overview of different approaches, presented by stakeholder sectors. General conclusions follow.

Notwithstanding different approaches to youth among and within the sectors, there is rich expertise, experience and resources on youth focused and youth led approaches. Various organisations and parts of the land related sector are at various trajectories but it is apparent that the trend is toward commitment to youth inclusion and mainstreaming. However, despite general acceptance of youth dimensions, there is limited exploration of specifically youth and land, and within that urban land. Equally, there are youth responsive generic tools such as advocacy, capacity building and monitoring in areas such as health, education and employment but the shelf is largely empty on land tools and inventories. Thus, there appears to be a demand for youth responsive land tools and interventions.

4.2.1 Rural/Urban International Civil Society Organisations

Key stakeholders are coalitions who often operate through their members, bringing community and grassroots links. Generally, whether or not members flag youth as a primary category, most appear to work with youth though with different levels of engagement and self-consciousness. AGRA, for example, in its campaign for comprehensive change specifically targets youth training and its website notes that its youth is being developed. COHRE does not have youth as a theme nevertheless highlights the disproportionate impact of forced eviction on youth and children, and the need for greater emphasis on their housing rights in one of its publications⁵². GRET⁵³ does not directly work with youth or age issues but on intergenerational models such as family farming. FIDA has increased

⁵² COHRE (2007) *Fulfilling the Right of All Children to Adequate Housing: Problems, Solutions and the Responsibilities of States*

⁵³ GRET in 2012: *An International Player and Producer of Ideas for Sustainable Development* (2008).

its focus on child's rights⁵⁴, and calls for "all Governments to make substantial budgetary provisions for child education, health and overall welfare". FIAN uses a human rights approach on right to food, and several of its meetings include rural youth⁵⁵.

Hakijamii founded a Youth Congress in 2007 and also works with organizations on youth issues. The Huairou Commission visibly engages with and works through young women but does not appear to formally highlight age or youth in its mission statement, reports or website. This is true of both the ILC and HIC where the coalition itself does not highlight youth but members appear to often work with grassroots youth. For example, ILC includes MACOFA, NITLAPLAN, MGSA, TRALSO, FEPP, Women's Access to Land at Terra Madre and CODECA who all have projects with youth components. HIC partners also mobilised youth in a range of activities. SDI has two partners in Zimbabwe and Bolivia who provided training to youth and involved them in enumerations.

In contrast, World Vision actively promotes youth as actors and beneficiaries – and agents of change. Its programmes are specially designed for youth and are imaginative and motivating while also effective. Youth volunteers work in poorest areas and help upgrade homes, improve communities, and build lasting relationships in the process. 'Speak Out for the Poor' Youth advocacy and participation tool involves capacity building and liaison with policy-makers and community.

Box 3: Security for Girls Project through Land

Landesa (formerly Rural Development Institute) program, *Security for Girls through Land* in West Bengal, India aims to increase security and economic opportunities for girls by increasing their connection to and understanding of their rights to land of their family.

Landesa partners with the Government by creating pilot programs that improve the process for land selection, beneficiary selection, and the coordination of different government services and livelihoods support. Under a scheme called the CDPA, the Government of West Bengal is allocating small plots of land to landless and homesteadless families so that they may build a house, raise livestock and begin small kitchen gardens. Houses with daughters are prioritised for land allocations, all children of the family are listed as co-inheritors of the new homestead in the title documents. Girls are provided a land rights curriculum; explore social issues that are connected to women's ownership of land (i.e. the connection with dowry, patrilineal and patrilocal customs, early marriage, and trafficking) and sustainable land use.

4.2.2 International Training/ Research Institutions

This diverse sector undertakes a variety of roles including research, advocacy, capacity building and implementation of projects has varied levels of engagement with youth. A number of GLTN research partners provide quality outputs or studies on youth. IIED is a sector leader on research on youth and environment, with children and youth a dedicated stream in the Human Settlements Group's work. The IIED has produced pioneering research on child and youth friendly urban environments. It also publishes the leading journal *Environment and Urbanization* which in 2002 and more recently 2010 had dedicated volumes to urban youth. Several research or training bodies such as IALTA, IIUM, IRGLUS, N-AERUS and Terra Institute may be dealing with youth issues but there is no information available through their websites or reports.

⁵⁴ Resolutions Passed at the 33rd Biennial Convention of the International federation of Women Lawyers (FIDA) in Milan, Italy 12th – 16th November 2008

⁵⁵ See for example People's Food Sovereignty Forum 2009

Universities are youth hubs and are dedicated to youth learning experiences which also include the environment for youth production and implementation of ideas. IHS runs courses and research projects on urban studies where youth are a component. It has also created a platform for discussion of UN-HABITAT strategy on 'Land and Housing for all'. ITC research and training often involves youth issues and participants. Lincoln Institute research too includes references to youth, particularly through its leading journal *Land Lines*⁵⁶. Several Universities offer courses on youth studies and land separately such as TUM⁵⁷ and UWI⁵⁸. UEL is a sector leader on youth-led tools with courses on youth studies, youth and community, youth mentoring, criminology and law, development and arts, including those offered through the special program youth access. It also produces research in youth areas⁵⁹, and has initiatives on youth rights including the Empowering young women initiative.

4.2.3 International Professional bodies

The youth work of professional bodies such as CASLE, FGF, UINL, IU, Lantmateriat and Statens kartverk generally takes two forms. They improve their own professional methods so as to expand access to all groups including youth while encouraging and equipping young professionals to join the profession. Many of the professional bodies realise that they face challenges in recruiting and keeping quality young professionals who can adopt the newer pro-poor and rights based agenda. As the RICS response implies that professionals are generally aware of youth issues but often there is no particular youth outreach in their work⁶⁰.

FIG is a sector leader in involving younger professionals in all aspects of its mandate⁶¹. The FIG Young Surveyors Working Group is a response to the reality that many FIG member organizations are struggling to attract young people to the profession of surveying, and its goal is to connections between 'old' and 'young' surveyors⁶². The increasing role of young surveyors is expected to transform the profession in the medium to long term. The use of technology, science and information in the hands of today's students and young professionals is expected to benefit not only the built and urban environments, but mankind as a whole. FIG support has also led to corporate sponsorships, though challenges remain.

4.2.4 Bilateral Organizations

Organisations such as Gates Foundation and MCC in the main have a poverty alleviation thrust that uses the MDG baseline approach. This puts youth and children as a primary target particularly with the emphasis on education, health (particularly HIV AIDS), employment, environment and crime reduction. Land for youth is not a priority, though the Gates foundation prioritises funding on projects aimed at the 'well-being of children, youth and families' while separately highlighting parks, conservation & recreation (including land conservation projects). MCC, among its myriad interventions, is committed to youth development as central to a healthy, skilled and productive workforce and also invests in education and training⁶³.

⁵⁶ Smolka, Martim O. and Sabatini, Francisco (2000) The Land Market Deregulation Debate in Chile 12:1 *Land Lines*

⁵⁷ International Master's Programme Land Management and Land Tenure at TUM

⁵⁸ Diploma in Youth in Development Studies. Williams, Lincoln 2001 *The Official Discourse on Youth in St. Kitts-Nevis*

⁵⁹ Sait S (2008) *Developing land tools for all age groups: Implementing the Land, Property and Housing Rights of Children, Youth and Older Persons* (UN-HABITAT); Black L and Keith M *Making Safe - Young People, Community Safety & Racial Danger* (UEL); Briggs, D. (2008) *Evaluation RAW programme for young people from two deprived estates involved in youth crime*, London: In-Volve.

⁶⁰ John Tracey-White email exchange 9 March 2011.

⁶¹ Cemal Özgür Kivilcim, H. Ebru Colak and Chris McAlister (2009) Evaluating Next Generation of Surveyors for the Sustainable World, FIG Working Week, Eilat, Israel, 3-8 May 2009

⁶² Cemal Özgür KIVILCIM, Turkey and Chris McALISTER, Australia A Model for Integrating Generations - Young Surveyors Working Group, Article of the Month July 2008

⁶³ <http://www.mcc.gov/pages/povertyreductionblog/entry/investments-in-education-make-the-grade>

GTZ too has a keen youth enrichment outlook but says it does not explicitly work with youth in the land sector, i.e. there are no GTZ projects that focus on youth in particular⁶⁴. Youth do however (sometimes indirectly) belong to the beneficiaries of most GTZ projects. GTZ has recently published a toolkit for youth promotion and stakeholder collaboration and welcomes greater focus on youth in land projects, awareness raising and training of youth in land-related topics because youth often act as multipliers of ideas and approaches in their social environments⁶⁵. Norway and Sweden are among the global leaders in developing thinking on effective youth strategies and funding worldwide. NORAD extensively promotes the rights and improvement in the living conditions of children and young people in the poor countries of the world⁶⁶. Like NORAD, SIDA also promotes youth livelihoods, resources and assets including land.

4.2.5 Multilateral Organizations

Multilateral organisations have led on developing youth focused strategies, following the WPAY framework. The ECA has pursued the emphasis on priority areas such as education, employment, health and HIV/AIDS, young women, and youth participation and has promoted ICT for youth. Along with AU and others, it organised a conference on ‘Youth and leadership in 21st century’ (2006). FAO is a pioneer on rural land, with youth initiatives on matters of environmental and social concern, climate change, education and hunger, malnutrition and food insecurity. IFAD too promotes rural youth employment and food security. In 2010 it published a publication on rural livelihoods for youth and its 2011 annual meeting focus was on youth⁶⁷.

UN Women (formerly UNIFEM) takes up young women’s issues in its strategic areas: reducing feminized poverty; ending violence against women; reversing the spread of HIV/AIDS among women and girls; and achieving gender equality in democratic governance⁶⁸. UNEP’s TUNZA initiative focuses on awareness, capacity-building, and youth participation and also has a journal. The Children and Youth Unit manages the World Bank’s youth agenda including youth employment, youth at risk, vulnerable children and children and youth in fragile States. The World Bank has not only increased its funding for youth projects (it lent nearly USD1 billion for youth in 2005) but has also produced some key publications in the field, though limited on land⁶⁹.

Urban land is often a component in projects supported by Cities Alliance (CA) such as those relating to city development and Slum Upgrading Strategies, National Policies, and Knowledge Products. CA supports greater emphasis on youth and says it has now mainstreamed youth in its grant application criteria and is looking at how to promote the participation and role of youth in urban development. The focus is mainly on age sensitive baseline data and indicators, youth participation in project design and processes, interventions targeted at youth in cities as well as knowledge products on the area⁷⁰.

4.3 UN-HABITAT/GLTN staff responses

Though the GLTN Secretariat is committed to enhancing its youth focus, it is working on a clear case to be made for investing in youth as adding value to its on-going work, as well as recognising the implications of the default mode. GLTN staffs are optimistic that youth focused strategies would meet its core values of pro-poor, gender-responsive, governance, equity, subsidiary, affordability and a systemic large scale approach to land access. But practically, they focus on how to choose specific tools and target priority youth, such as youth-headed households, young women, out-of-school youth, etc. GLTN staff seeks a clearer understanding of the relationship between youth and land, and why

⁶⁴ Email exchange with Nike Affeld GTZ 7 March

⁶⁵ GTZ (2010). Get Youth on Board! A Toolkit for Stakeholder Collaboration and Youth promotion.

⁶⁶ NORAD (2005). ‘Three billion reasons – Norway’s development strategy for children and young people in the south’.

⁶⁷ IFAD (2010). Investing in the future – Creating livelihood opportunities for rural youth.

⁶⁸ UNIFEM (2010) Gender Justice: Key to Achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

⁶⁹ World Bank (2007) World Development Report 2007: Development and the Next Generation; World Bank (2008) Supporting Youth at Risk—A Policy Toolkit for Middle-Income Countries.

⁷⁰ Exchange with Hilde Refstie and William Cobbett, 9 March 2011.

strengthening and adapting existing GLTN inclusive approaches cannot reach poor youth. GLTN is looking to devise strategies for youth and land in niche areas where it has strengths, networks and expertise, avoiding duplication.

A Shelter Branch workshop on youth and land⁷¹ sought inputs into the youth and land agenda from UN-HABITAT's Housing and Post-Disaster sections of the Shelter Branch and the Youth Section of PYB. In designing interventions, participants noted the need to recognise the transitory nature of youth. More evidence and discussions to identify issues and bottlenecks through surveys, inventory of other organisations, etc. were proposed. Youth-friendly land information and administration services were seen as one of the primary objectives. Participants agreed that more had to be done to include youth as beneficiaries and actors. They were mindful that land is not only individual ownership, particularly in relation to youth, and wanted clearer understanding of the relationship between youth and land and multi-pronged responses. Among the priority areas flagged were youth in land governance, estate administration tools, land degradation and land fragmentation. Participants wanted youth to be consulted on the agenda and programme, as well as capacity-building of youth and youth organisations. Suggestions included partnering with international youth organisations such as the Scouting movement or YMCA/YWCA for maximum impact. PYB was enthusiastic about the youth and land agenda and pointed to the PYB-GLTN draft partnership proposal.

4.4 Consultation with YAB Members

A key youth constituency consulted on the youth and land agenda is the Youth Advisory Board (YAB) at UN-HABITAT⁷². YAB members noted that there was precious little information on land issues for youth and welcomed GLTN's scoping study. To start with youth are not aware of the importance of land for their development. It was noted that access to land is critical not only in Africa and poorer communities in emerging economies but also in the 'developed' north. Youth encounter social, legal, and economic barriers to accessing land.

The discussion centred on how to define youth given the divergent approaches. Different youth categories and age cohorts (for example 14-24 and 25-32) have varying land and property needs. GLTN being at initial stages of confronting the obstacles, the YAB agreed that GLTN would do well to narrow thematic scope and choose specific youth targets on the basis of demand and critical gaps. Among the themes suggested were "youth in informal settlements" and "youth and rural livelihoods". The GLTN scoping study needs to be in simple language and could be an important dissemination tool for youth awareness on the subject.

YAB stressed that youth should be involved in setting and implementing the youth and land agenda, alongside land professionals and other stakeholders. A workable model for engagement with youth on land strategies is to create spaces for discussions among youth and then youth as equal partners working with adults. To enable this, capacity of youth representatives must be strengthened. GLTN must bring in a range of youth voices from rural youth activists to youth members of professional organisations. The objective should be to find and support youth champions on land.

4.5 Chapter Conclusions

While adults assume and often discount the needs, experiences, and priorities of youth, a GLTN survey finds that youth have their own perspectives on land. Youth representatives are unanimous that land is fundamental to youth survival and development and the sustainability of societies themselves. The need for special land access programs for youth is constantly flagged. There is

⁷¹ Workshop on Youth, Land, Housing and Post-disaster, Friday 18 February 2011, 09 – 11 AM. Participants: Mohamed El-Sioufi, Clarissa Augustinus, Dan Lewis, Mutinta Munyati, Remy Sietchipeng, Cyprian Seleballo, Solomon Haile, Asa Jonsson, Britta Uhlig, Danilo Antonio, Mary Gachochi, Eirik Sorlie, Channe Oguzhan, Eric Luguya and Nishu Aggrawal

⁷² Meeting with YAB, Thursday 14 April 2011, 10 -11 am. YAB members Dara Parker, Joao Scarpelini, Lucinda Hartley and Philomena Modu met with Eirik Sorlie (UN-HABITAT/LTPAS) and Siraj Sait (UEL) to explore strategies on promoting the youth and land agenda

realism that higher levels of youth land ownership would require attitudinal and structural changes at numerous levels. Not just ownership but secondary and informal rights need strengthening. Options such as rent, lease, sharing and use for youth need to be revisited. They seek review of land tenure systems to accommodate short, medium and long-term and different types of land usage among youth. There are numerous recommendations on facilitating land rights. Among them, land professionals must recognise and respond to youth concerns, for example in urban planning. Tenure reform must accompany regulation of land and housing intermediaries who often prey on youth.

No GLTN partners registered disagreement with the need for GLTN to enhance its youth focus. The overview of GLTN partners' involvement with youth and their land interests provides a varied but rich narrative. Further systematic exploration would likely yield best practices on youth mainstreaming and generic youth tools. However, Cities Alliance candidly observed that 'It would be interesting to see how youth issues and participation links into these (urban land) processes' suggests that youth responsive land tools, particularly urban, are at early stages. GTZ emphasises that youth should be given the chance to participate in consultations etc. in the process of developing land tools. In this way, they are given the opportunity to express their specific concerns which could then be taken account of by GLTN when developing/adapting land tools. It is suggested that GLTN should focus on youth consultations/trainings. Among the good practices coming to the fore, Landesa's innovative approach of working with adolescent girls and their communities on land rights is encouraging as an indication how potential youth responsive land tools could be built.

The meetings with UN-HABITAT staff indicated general support for mainstreaming youth within GLTN and LTPAS, and broadly within the Shelter Branch. At the same time several questions were raised on how to prioritise and sharpen the proposed GLTN youth stream without jeopardising the successful formulae of its present continuing work. The 'hard questions' (in chapter one) were put to stakeholders and the analysis of the rationale and risks of inaction were discussed in this chapter. The dialogue with youth on land yielded fascinating perspectives. It answered several of the questions raised in strategy brainstorming sessions with UN-HABITAT personnel. Many of the arguments for intervention are compelling and the ideas promising. It lays the basis for further and direct dialogue between GLTN, its partners and youth. GLTN should also consider inviting youth organisations as GLTN members.

CHAPTER 5: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GLTN'S YOUTH AGENDA

The scoping study finds that hitherto there has been scant attention paid to youth access to land, particularly urban land. This is reflected in the gaps in literature review as well as policy driven reports and civil society discourse. Preliminary questions echo in the study– why do youth need land? Do youth have distinctive perspectives on land? Is there a need for specific youth and land interventions? What needs to be done? The research, in tandem with consultations with youth groups, GLTN partners and within UN-HABITAT, demonstrates that there is a rationale for enhanced youth focus, for example to meet MDGs, but questions persist over how to respond. A review of GLTN work, its mandate and the UN-HABITAT youth strategy indicate support for both expanded attention to youth as beneficiaries in land programmes as well as partners in tool development. Unlike the increasing resources broadly in the youth and development field, there is hardly any documented best practice in relation to youth and land. GLTN is yet again at the starting block in its quest to develop a youth and land agenda.

The recommendations that follow suggest a broad array of building blocks for GLTN to consider. They are at once obvious and ambitious. As GLTN explores these options, it will have to decide how to sequence them and slot them into the short, medium and long term plans. Some of them are easier solo activities while others multifarious operations which involve GLTN and external partners. Some are normative, others operational. GLTN works within a narrow mandate (see priority GLTN tools) and is a successful multi-stakeholder model which should not be unravelled by a disproportionate demand for a wish list of youth tools. GLTN's enhanced youth focus needs to be accommodated within its on-going multi-pronged programme and in relation to its resources, comparative advantage and added values of its activities. The recommendations do not arbitrate among GLTN's options, but flag challenges and dimensions that are to be finalised through consultations within and outside the network, and with youth. In doing so, GLTN could lead on developing a sustainable and successful youth and land agenda.

5.1 Rationale for GLTN Engaging with Youth and Land

Despite the relative infancy of youth dimensions in the land sector, the universal trend in most sectors is for augmenting youth dimensions, reminiscent of gender outreach of the earlier decade. Majority of successful civil society organisations and bilateral/multilateral agencies, as well as research and professional groupings are looking to orient their work to youth responsive programmes. Both demographic realities and strategic imperatives are driving engaging with youth. The very concept of sustainable development or a sustainable tool, as emanating from the 1992 Rio Declaration, encompasses environmental viability, economic equity, social justice and intergenerational legacy. In the context of land tools, it is increasingly recognised that involving and responding to young people makes better inclusive tools that are better owned, used and shared.

Why intervene? The literature review, survey of GLTN partners and youth responses all offer compelling reasons for a closer involvement of youth in GLTN's work. Youth do have a stake and contributions to make on land and its tools. Yet, negligible attention has been paid to the land challenges of urban youth, far less than their rural counterparts. The gap and demand is clear. Cities Alliance (which works with UN Habitat, World Bank, Slum Dwellers International and others) notes the youth mainstreaming of its own processes, but finds itself at the starting line on developing youth responsive tools. The focus on youth in urban planning or more broadly in sustainable urbanisation is not new but very little with respect to land programmes. As a World Bank report notes "evidence of what works to support young people in developing countries is still very weak, and many countries continue to spend scarce resources on programs that have no proven impact". Therefore, GLTN output and impact driven methodology is critically needed for youth land programming.

What added value? The complex youth and land conundrum calls for a combination of technical and social responses which GLTN is noted for. The frustration of youth land prospects is at once a symptom of socio-economic and political biases as well as gaps and systemic problems with land laws, policy and institutions. Finding land for individual youth may be the easier part, it is the

building capacity and other youth responsive tools for land use and management that are elusive, as seen in youth land projects countries like the Dominican Republic. GLTN would not be duplicating other land tool initiatives because there are very few, and mostly in the rural sector. GLTN niche of working on land tools, as it has with gender, is needed to materialise youth access to land.

How would a youth lens makes GLTN more effective? The demand for a youth ‘lens’ is strongest from a realisation that global objectives like the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) which have a pronouncedly youth centred formulation cannot be met without greater awareness and involvement of young people. As GLTN moves to the next phase of its work programme, it needs to engage with pioneering issues and elusive constituencies that have evaded its otherwise robust and inclusive methodologies. Youth mainstreaming will enable GLTN to reach further and deeper into its mission of equitable land access and security to land reform. With youth on board, GLTN will be better placed to achieve its objectives of improved land management and administration for all.

How would youth mainstreaming strengthen the Network? All responses from GLTN partners supported increased interfaced and targeting of youth in land strategies and programmes. The success of many common inclusive political projects, research agendas and policy initiatives such as ‘right to the city’, ‘rights based approaches’ or grassroots, community or women’s empowerment is predicated on youth participation. Several GLTN partnership clusters are facing a crisis without new young persons (for example some land professionals face diminishing new numbers) and urban professionals are also facing calls for a better focus on children and youth in their work. Youth mainstreaming is likely to benefit GLTN members many of whom work with youth but do not highlight youth as a separate category.

Box 4: Suggested Vision for GLTN’s Youth Agenda

In pursuit of its goal of improved land governance, management and administration for all, GLTN facilitates the development of flexible, adaptable and innovative pro-poor gendered land tools and interventions. Arising out of its core values, priorities-

In advocating a youth and land agenda, GLTN promotes youth responsive tools and intergenerational models as an investment toward broadly meeting the challenges of sustainable urbanization, poverty alleviation and youth empowerment.

Given that youth invariably constitute the majority among urban poor and are often disadvantaged in accessing land rights, GLTN recognizes youth (a diverse category) as a primary target group, an important resource and a key partner in its work.

Though youth are an implicit part of its work programme, GLTN seeks to more deliberately and systematically mainstream youth in its work and that of its network and generally promote the youth and land agenda within the land and related sectors.

While generic land tools developed through multi-stakeholder inputs have been assumed to be youth responsive, GLTN through enhanced youth engagement will seek to test/improve the youth responsiveness of its products in augmenting youth access to land, tenure security and land rights.

5.2 Risks of GLTN not Addressing Youth Explicitly

Business case: The argument for investing in youth development is often made as a business case. Education, health, training and empowerment are not only socially responsible but also provide long term dividend and resources. At the same time, failing to invest in children and youth triggers substantial and irreversible economic, social, and political costs, some of which may not be immediately apparent. The World Bank goes far enough to argue that in many countries the overall damage to society from lack of youth stability or positive contribution amounts to several percent of GDP per year. Without involving youth, land systems and tools and the land sector generally has a gaping hole in its preparedness and progress, surely in the long run.

Opportunity costs: There are numerous benefits that could be have been achieved by involving youth in making and using of land tools. Youth as ‘change agents’ can use their energies, fresh thinking and propensity towards newer technologies to support innovative land tools and interventions. In this research, youth identified their role as champions of environmental protection, sustainable land use and reversing migration through land rights. However, underinvestment in youth (more broadly, rather than by the land sector) has rendered them mostly voiceless in the land discourse, invisible as stakeholders in the land debates, mostly ill-equipped technically to contribute to land processes and helpless in face of violation of their land rights. Lack of awareness, opportunities and confidence among youth constituencies have led to their inability to play their potential roles.

Negative Outcomes: The implications and impact of ignoring youth could be not only on opaque and inequitable systems but also negative behaviour and responses from youth. A Canadian report argues that “when paths to, or traditional definitions of adulthood and/or prosperity (land being a traditional marker to adulthood) are hampered, undermined or rewritten altogether, the taking up of arms may provide an alternative path to security, status and adulthood”. This all too common side effect of landlessness among youth is referred to as ‘failure to launch’ characterised by ‘lost generations’ incapable or unwilling to partake in the normal life society that excludes them. Though the notion of ‘youth bulge’ (large youth populations inevitably turn disruptive) is discredited, the large cohort of landless youth no doubt undermine efforts to improve the lives of poor communities.

5.3 Strategic Entry Points for GLTN’s Youth Agenda

5.3.1 Promote a Global Youth and Land Agenda

The scoping study finds that despite the increasing spotlight on youth in development work generally limited attention has been spared for youth and land issues – particularly urban land. Sweeping references to land rights of youth are not sufficiently delineated to hone on the formidable obstacles that youth, and particularly young women, encounter in accessing land. There is no real debate or consideration of youth within on-going land debates. There is little understanding of the relationship between youth and land. However, this study demonstrates that youth do have distinctive experiences, needs and perspectives on land. GLTN’s niche work and approaches are well suited to champion youth, as GLTN has successfully done in “placing gender at the centre of the global land agenda”⁷³.

GLTN emphasis on the continuum of land rights, rather than land titling, is inclusive, youth-friendly and supports recognition of a range of options for youth. Its concentration on practical tools potentially facilitates work on improving delivery and implementation of land rights for all, including youth. Through its work, GLTN can lobby on bringing on board youth (as both stakeholders and beneficiaries) without which any real breakthrough on the MDGs and other goals are unlikely. The dividends from GLTN led work on linking land rights to land governance must extend to youth. In order for the youth and land agenda to gain critical mass, GLTN must take the lead on creating

⁷³ See UN-HABITAT (2009) Focus Area 3 Policy and Strategy Paper Access to Land and Housing for All (prelim, 2009); MTA 2010.

awareness, developing methodologies, stimulating innovation and incentives, creating networks and synergies among GLTN partners and the land sector at large.

Specific Recommendations

1. GLTN should recognise youth as a distinct category within its work and outputs.
2. GLTN should research, promote and mainstream youth in the land sectors and land in the youth sectors.

5.3.2 Support Land Policy Development for Youth

The scoping study finds that national land laws, policies and programmes mostly lack a youth dimension. At best they generate ad hoc and fragmented proposals that are not backed up by resources or institutions. GLTN, through its partners and key players in the land sector must advocate more systematic treatment of youth in national land policies and programmes. This must extend to other policy areas such as urban planning and development, employment, housing and finance which are mostly silent in face of the land aspirations of youth. Attention must be paid to the fact that budgets and social expenditure of many governments is heavily skewed toward adults.

GLTN and UN-HABITAT can also make a contribution by sharing best practices and model legislation and policy on youth, and by building capacity. GLTN can use the existing mandate from the governing council and other institutions to move towards this. Where GLTN can, it must bring youth to consultations on land policies in order that youth perspectives can be fed into the process. Land rights can be strengthened (or inserted) through a cohesive strategy which tackles urban policy and environments in its entirety such as safety, integration, transport and mobility, as well as urban-rural linkages. A few good models for this could be Child Friendly Cities (CFC) programme where UNICEF and UN-HABITAT have recently signed a MoU; and FAO which has good experience of working with children and youth on rural land rights.

Specific Recommendations

3. GLTN should carry out youth audits of national land laws, policies and programmes as well as land reforms.
4. GLTN should develop and make available technical assistance, best practices and tools to governments, local councils and other stakeholders.

5.3.3 Revisit Land for Youth Perspectives

The scoping study, particularly through youth responses, finds that land is vital for youth as gateway to youth livelihoods, shelter, assets, security, identity and several other aspects of a creative and productive transition to adulthood. Thus, land access is not an abstract youth aspiration but one that is a fulcrum of basic necessities and quality of life. At the same time, land in itself may not be priority for youth as there may be competing needs such as cash for investment or education, livestock for grazing or a vehicle for work mobility. Also evident are the diverse voices and needs among youth, and the need to particularly hear vulnerable groups such as young women, slum and street youth, displaced and minority youth whose needs vary.

Beyond private enjoyment of land (whether ownership, lease or rental), there are public and collective dimensions of land (youth centres, housing estates, sports grounds) determining community cohesion, social inclusion and participation. GLTN must promote the recognition that land may have distinct implications for youth as compared to adults, for example for recreation and cultural expression. Rather than assume that land has standardised implications for youth, GLTN must carry out research and consultations on the varied meanings of land – also in disaster and post-conflict contexts – to inform its responses and tools.

Specific Recommendations

5. GLTN should listen to youth to understand and promote how land may have different and wider meanings for youth in order that it develops appropriate responses.

6. GLTN should review whether or to what extent existing tools and tenure models accommodate youth land needs.

5.3.4 Adopt a Multi-Pronged Youth Strategy

The scoping study finds that the biggest obstacle to youth land access is not land scarcity but often social attitudes, market bias, legal gaps and institutional opaqueness. As such, GLTN would need to adopt a multi-pronged strategy through technical and governance measures but also confront the socio-economic barriers to youth land access. GLTN must recognise that ‘youth for land’ emphasis may be hard-sell for organisations and associations that have a broader mandate and view youth land as a preferable condition rather than an imperative for development. Among the ways that GLTN can acknowledge this is ensuring that land is not a standalone activity or a one off event but integrated and feeding into other campaigns and initiatives. Thus, GLTN must pursue its niche tool focused enterprise while at the same time invite the inputs of its diverse partners, incorporating a social lens along with its technical rigour.

The youth and land agenda is too broad to be shouldered by GLTN alone. Youth mainstreaming within GLTN should enable its diverse partners to strengthen the youth focus of their particular work so that their contributions put together would weave into youth access to land. Combining with others, it can develop linkages between youth employment, savings and land ownership; disseminate information to youth on land and finance markets; create land mentoring (advisory) schemes as part of youth training and empowerment and develop networks of youth, professional and civil society to create spaces responses to youth. The Youth section is a natural partner with several tools and strengths. But given its ambitious mandate, is stretched and would not be able to partner GLTN in all its youth activities, therefore there must be a selection of activities where the Youth Section can fully participate and others where it could provide oversight and support. Recently, UN-HABITAT and UNICEF discussed signing an MOU to formalize mutual intent to collaborate on Child Friendly Cities (CFC) work, a project GLTN may want to consider collaborating.

Specific Recommendations

7. While GLTN may itself pursue a focused pathway of supporting land tools for youth, it must acknowledge the links between land and development and invite other approaches.
8. Given the breadth and complexity of the land and youth agenda, GLTN should utilise the expertise and strengths of PYB, and also partner with other UN agencies working with UN-HABITAT on youth.

5.3.5 Choose an Intergenerational Approach to Youth

The scoping study finds that most GLTN partners and the land sector generally use an intergenerational approach (involving different age groups) rather than creating a parallel youth mechanism. This approach is seen as furthering youth development rather than undermining it. The UN World Programme of Action for Youth (WAPY) also highlights the need for incorporate intergenerational dynamics into youth themes. While there are distinguishing features of youth experiences with land, it is difficult to argue that there are exclusive youth issues. Youth-headed households, youth migration, youth centres, young land use or living arrangements of youth, all involve intergenerational dimensions. Youth experiences and needs must be seen alongside those of children, adults and older persons⁷⁴. It is argued that the failure to see the bigger social picture would disadvantage one age group over the other, compromising intergenerational equity which is the foundational value of sustainable development⁷⁵. In particular, many organisations approach children and youth as a composite category (given the overlaps in age groups).

Spatial, socio-cultural, economic and political manifestations of urbanisation alongside changing family structures and emerging sociologies are reconfiguring the relationships between age and land.

⁷⁴ See recommendation in Sait

⁷⁵ Frischmann, B (2005) Some Thoughts on Short-sightedness and Intergenerational Equity 36 *Loyola University Chicago Law Journal* 457

Sustainable tools would seek to meet the needs of the present without compromising those of future generations and vice versa. Youth poverty itself can be best understood through ‘intergenerational poverty trajectories’ for those growing up in poor households⁷⁶. GLTN can best address youth issues by locating them within an intergenerational context and dialogue. UN-HABITAT’s *State of the Urban Youth 2010-2011* report shows that pre-determined circumstances, such as, gender and location as well as intergenerational factors such as parents’ education and income status influence upward social mobility and equal opportunity. GLTN therefore should view youth and land matters as subject of intergenerational consultations but ensure that youth are effectively represented as equal partners.

Specific Recommendations

9. GLTN youth model must not be based on ‘youth tools by youth only’, but on inter-generational consultations and inputs which create equitable, sustainable and robust tools.
10. GLTN current inclusive approach on generic land rights (of adults, including women and families) should recognise youth as claimants and stakeholders in their own right.

5.3.6 Facilitate Different Roles of Youth

The scoping study finds that the GLTN initiative to bringing youth on board faces considerable misconceptions about the nature of change in process and outcomes it will bring. GLTN already works with young people among its partners in all or most levels of its work, though the proceedings do not classify them as youth. The initial step would be to record or acknowledge their participation as youth where appropriate. Youth can be beneficiaries, partners or leaders in GLTN initiatives depending on the nature of the task and the expertise with youth. Rather than tokenism, GLTN could harness the energies, new ideas and strengths that youth could bring. This would happen by involve youth, including young women, community and grassroots youth, in all stages, aspects and levels of GLTN’s work cycle as feasible. The quality of youth participation would depend on the space and support that GLTN provides them.

A model for youth participation with GLTN would depend on the layers of its work and entry points. For example UNESCO Strategy of Action with and for Youth identifies different functions of youth participation – the advocacy function, policy development function, governance function, programming function and the monitoring function. Ostensibly, the nature and scope of youth partnership in each one of these stages would depend on a variety of factors including demand and expertise. DFID shows how a ‘three-lens approach to youth participation’ plays out in practice. Some policies target youth as beneficiaries, others collaborate with youth while yet other let youth initiate or lead on projects. Therefore there are different models or levels of working with youth. GLTN should in its youth audit be conscious of whether it is working for youth as beneficiaries; engaging with youth as partners or supporting youth as leaders⁷⁷. ‘Youth-led’ processes and ‘youth empowerment’ objectives in UN-HABITAT strategy should inform GLTN approaches in paying attention to youth ownership, expertise and youth specific goals.

Specific Recommendations

11. GLTN should develop a transparent and systematic model for youth participation – specifying youth as beneficiaries, partners and leaders- that is understood within the secretariat, its partners and youth.
12. GLTN should consciously promote youth participation in its activities, events and meetings while encouraging ‘youth organisations’ to join its network.

⁷⁶ Overseas Development Institute (2007) *The intergenerational transmission of poverty: An overview* ODI Working Papers 286, (London: ODI)

⁷⁷ DFID (2010) *Youth Participation in Development: A Guide for Development Agencies and Policy Makers* (London: DFID)

5.3.7 Strengthen Capacities to Realise Youth Land Rights

A recurring observation during consultations, as part of this study, was that youth or youth organisations did not have the capacity to partner in the development of land tools. In fact, not just youth but a range of land stakeholders are not aware of their rights relating to youth land access and security. A Rights Based Approach to youth access to land presupposes efforts to create awareness and capacity. A starting point for GLTN would be to develop opportunities to support awareness and understanding of youth and land matters. An obvious fallacy is that there can be improvement in access for land for this group when young people, particularly young women and other disadvantaged youth have limited knowledge of their own rights. Equally, there is a need to demystify opportunities and inner workings of land, rental and finance markets, information of land processes or dispute resolution methods and awareness of special programmes to help youth. Training for youth on land could cover a range of critical areas, and also be linked to practical measures such as dealing with applications (such as loans), preparing for meetings, managing land or contributing to slum upgrading.

Land stakeholders – from civil society and researchers to urban land managers and policy makers – need to recognise youth concerns and agency. At the political level, local leaders and municipal officials need both sensitisation and training to meaningfully involve youth in strategic urban planning processes. This is equally true for land professionals and land administrators whose efforts towards inclusive, transparent and simplified procedures must respond to youth concerns. GLTN can contribute to this capacity enhancement in several ways. By bringing youth to multi-stakeholder meetings it acknowledges their voice and perspectives. GLTN can integrate youth in its on-going initiatives so as to enhance their knowledge and understanding of complex land issues. Supporting a youth and land network is an important element of enhancing youth capacities through peer to peer learning.

Specific Recommendations

13. GLTN should prioritise youth as one of the target groups in developing capacity on land, through development and delivery of dedicated training modules, as well as encouraging their participation in general land training programmes.
14. GLTN should also focus on delivery at national level by providing youth land rights (or including youth components) training for HPMs⁷⁸.

5.3.8 Develop a Youth Tools Inventory and Mechanism

The primary question raised during the scoping study was whether on-going efforts to make generic land tools flexible and inclusive would be enough if youth are recognised, or is it necessary to generate youth specific responses. GLTN's gender mechanism and Gender Evaluation Criteria are useful models in this regard. They envisage three types of actions – existing large scale land tools can be tested and gendered, local gendered tools can be upscaled or where there are gaps, gender tools can be developed. A similar systematic and multi-stakeholder approach can be adopted for youth responsive tools. A Youth and Land Tool Mechanism which incorporates youth dimensions and methodologies will be a necessary GLTN contribution to the agenda. The starting point, however, would be a draft youth tools inventory. The literature review finds that despite the paucity of branded land tools, there are numerous generic youth tools – advocacy, networking, capacity building, governance, monitoring, evaluation and participation – which can be used or converted into youth land tools.

Generic youth tools to work need several features. First and foremost, youth need the existing tools, manuals, guides and outputs to be presented in an accessible format. GLTN is already good at this but would have to self-consciously keep youth in mind as an audience. Follow up communication efforts would involve videos, power point presentations and use of new technologies, including social

⁷⁸ See Evaluation (2011) where this is a key recommendation. The Evaluation found that over half of HPMs did not think they had the capacity to deal with youth issues, pointing out the lack of resources and information as major challenges.p.18

networks (keeping in mind the digital divide). A review of successful or visible tools – whether on awareness creation to more challenging tasks of lobbying policy makers or monitoring and evaluations – reflect three striking features. One, there is clear evidence that it is a youth product, made with youth for them. Two, the information is targets youth and spells out how and when what is to be achieved- a clear plan or road map. Three, the format and dissemination is not only imaginative but innovative too. Therefore GLTN efforts will be on creating ownership, accessibility and marketability of its youth responsive tools.

Specific Recommendations

15. GLTN should facilitate an inventory of youth land tools as a precursor to assessing demand and gaps, as well as mapping strengths and avoiding duplication.
16. GLTN should develop a Youth Land Mechanism, adapted from the GLTN Gender Mechanism, which can provide a framework of youth dimensions, objectives, processes and methodologies.

5.3.9 Select Youth Beneficiaries and Contexts

The scoping study encountered apprehension from respondents on how to choose among the numerous categories and staggering numbers of global youth, even among the poor landless youth. While a potential GLTN youth mechanism will largely be universal in scope with processes, it is expected to practically focus on more identifiable themes and cohorts of young people, female and male. The GLTN task is not made easy by the literature review and responses which nominate a broad span of youth who appear both landless and tool-less. In all of this, GLTN will see that youth are not a homogenous category and often face multiple bases for discrimination. For example, UNDESA identifies vulnerable youth as:

“[young people] without adequate access to education and health services; adolescents who have dropped out of school; pregnant adolescents; young single parents; young people who are HIV-positive or at particular risk of HIV/AIDS; young refugees or displaced persons; racial, linguistic and ethnic minorities; homeless youth; young people with disabilities; girls and young women affected by gender inequalities”⁷⁹

The diversity of land needs of urban youth is staggering and no easy consensus is likely to emerge on the priority groups. Yet GLTN would need to start with specific youth themes and cohorts as pilots before scaling up. As with other tool development areas, GLTN’s selection of beneficiary youth groups should be driven (following its values and objectives) by gaps, demand, available expertise and impact potential. This prompts two overlapping consultations - with youth groups and GLTN partners. With the participation of youth GLTN would be able to identify potential participants and beneficiaries through a matrix of risk and vulnerability as well as needs and capacity (resilience). GLTN may, through consultations with its partners develop a list which reflects its comparative advantage, its on-going work and active streams such as grassroots/community youth, young women, young slum dwellers, refugee youth, minority young women (such as Muslim) and so on. These groups are likely to provide the priority categories which is preferable to plucking a few from the literature review.

Specific Recommendations

17. GLTN should consult with its partners and youth group to determine priority youth target groups based on tool gaps, demand from youth, available expertise and impact potential.
18. GLTN should, through transparent consultations, identify ‘youth champions’ among its partners and youth groups, who can lead on tool development for particular youth groups.

⁷⁹ UNDESA (2005).

5.3.10 Determine Priority Tooling Areas

Youth responses in this study emphasise the lack of tools to support youth access to urban land and security of tenure. As such, youth have a long shopping list of tools and interventions. GLTN partner proposals for youth focused interventions range from land rights records and registration to land use planning and property rights of young women. UN-HABITAT staffs suggest land rights training, estate management tools, STDM, and tools on land degradation and land fragmentation. Youth have called for more attention to youth centres, tools to prevent forced eviction and dealing with land administration and governance matters. Some existing land tools (including those relating to rural land) could be adapted to be made youth responsive, other may have to be developed. Even after the target youth category is identified, there can be no single ‘youth’ product which will transform youth land rights nor can GLTN be expected to work on all youth tools, even within the GLTN priority tools. As the GLTN Midterm Review pointed out GLTN resources and personnel are already stretched. GLTN should review its (draft) tool inventory and consider the comparative advantage and added value of pursuing a particular tool as well as the interests and strengths of its partners.

A significant context is that GLTN is upgrading its youth work as it is entering the second phase of its ambitious programme. It already has experience of the process and delivery of tools. This is an advantage since youth-responsive tool are likely to be the next generation of tools, using best practices and learning lessons from other initiatives. The choice of tools for testing youth responsive must be not only demand-based or evidence-led but supported by partners. As noted earlier, preference must be given to tools in GLTN cross cutting areas. As GLTN youth tools need to developed and implemented, it is necessary to identify countries where there is GLTN presence and on-going work. When tools are evaluated they would need to be flexible and responsive to the local economic, cultural and religious context as understood in the tool objectives.

Specific Recommendations

19. GLTN must, at least in the first phase, choose adaption of existing tools or tools under development through a process of making them youth responsive, rather than create new youth land tools from reported gaps.
20. GLTN should identify countries for youth tool development where partners are active and there is on-going tooling work in order that there is integration of tool kits rather than standalone youth tools.

CHAPTER 6: OPERATIONALIZING GLTN'S YOUTH AGENDA

The suggested activities listed here follow the findings and recommendations of this scoping study. The nature of core activities should be a continuation of and integrated within GLTN's on-going work. However, as with other aspects of GLTN's outlook, the technical side will have to be supplemented with a social lens. A holistic approach would follow the recurring theme in this study that youth and land cannot be addressed in isolation but are part of an interconnected and integrated approach which includes social, economic, political and legal dimensions.

A cohesive approach would involve a combination of mutually reinforcing elements such as advocacy, knowledge exchange, capacity building, networking and tool building. Preliminary steps needed to start the programme as well as sustained activities, held together by a 'Youth Mechanism', must be created to ensure sustainability. The general goals such as 'youth mainstreaming' or 'capacity building' are pursued through multiple activities. GLTN should develop a multi-stakeholder model of participation which specifies the various roles of youth – as beneficiaries, partners and leaders. Effective consultations in developing a youth and land agenda will ensure that it is partner driven and sustainable. In many of these activities PYB would be a natural partner and efforts should be taken to involve UN agencies such as UNICEF and youth organisations.

Box 5: Suggested strategies for GLTN's Youth and Land Activities

To further GLTN's overall effectiveness in meeting its goals for all, GLTN would more systematically address youth dimensions and build youth partnerships in various facets of its work. They include

Global agenda: To promote recognition of youth (with their diversities) as a primary target group and partners in land interventions and tool development toward addressing youth dimensions of land access and secure tenure.

Youth mainstreaming: To facilitate the integration of youth (both male and female), their concerns, expectations and expertise within the network, toward developing engagement models for wider sector use.

Empowerment through knowledge: To address knowledge gaps through age disaggregated data, concepts, case studies, tool inventories, and best practices toward devising evidence-based youth targeted responses

Strengthening the network: To promote multi-stakeholder partnerships including youth organisations, with commitment to youth-led approaches toward development and implementation of the youth and land agenda.

Capacity building: To support the enhancement of technical skills of youth organizations, as well as the capacity of other stakeholders in working with youth toward enhancing livelihood skills and strengthening the land rights of youth.

Developing youth focused methodologies: To develop inter-generational methodologies and approaches (through youth consultations) toward developing, monitoring and evaluating implementing youth responsive land tools

6.1 Suggested activities for GLTN's Youth Agenda

6.1.1 Expert Group Meeting on Youth and Land

Objective	To explore the Global Youth and Land Agenda and identify the role of GLTN
Activity	A two day multi-stakeholder EGM on land to discuss youth perspectives on land
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Discuss and adapt the scoping study ii. Develop an action plan for mainstreaming youth in land iii. Contribute to GLTN's youth and land programme with inputs into priority themes, tools, youth constituencies and methodologies (process) iv. Initiate networking on youth and land

6.1.2 Training and Dialogue on Youth at GLTN Partners Meeting

Objective	To facilitate dialogue and planning on youth and land
Activity	A half day training event on youth and land aimed at GLTN partners
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Create awareness among GLTN partners on land and youth initiative. ii. Disseminate and discuss the findings of the GLTN scoping study and EGM iii. Obtain further information on GLTN partners' work and interests on youth iv. Contribute to GLTN projects and finalisation of work programme on youth

6.1.3 Create an Inventory of Youth Land Tools

Objective	To develop an inventory on youth responsive tools, best practices and methodologies.
Activity	GLTN review or short consultancy to review information with UN-HABITAT, GLTN secretariat and partners as well as other key players in the field.
Output	<p>A short report documenting youth responsive land tools in existence or under development including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Assessment and review of material on youth responsive tools ii. A list of 10 best practices/tools, with detailed profile including compliance with GLTN core values including gender iii. Identification of key partners and resources for future work iv. Brief characteristics of the successful methodologies for youth responsive tools

6.1.4 Develop a Participation Model for Youth Engagement

Objective	To develop protocols and guidance on meaningfully involving youth in GLTN activities
Activities	To consult and work out a model for GLTN youth participation
Outputs	<p>A document which identifies key principles and standards for youth participation, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Various roles that youth could play as beneficiaries, partners and leaders in multi-stakeholder settings. ii. Kind of contributions that youth could make at various stages and types of activities iii. Rights, expectations and responsibilities of youth in GLTN work iv. Examples of key youth priorities and how these may be achieved.

6.1.5 Create New Knowledge on Youth through Case Studies

Objective	To address the knowledge gap through conceptually rigorous and methodologically sound research material on youth and land case studies
Activities	To facilitate thematic research and case studies on youth and land with the network and through short term consultancies with researchers, and arrangements with publishers
Output	Interdisciplinary quality research monograph/s, or research papers focusing on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Case studies on critical land issues for youth, such land access for youth headed households or living arrangements of multi-generational families ii. Reviews of land laws, policies and programmes and traditional norms on youth access iii. Key methodological issues including intergenerational approaches, with reference to researching and working with youth and other age groups iv. Contributions to a new research agenda, including fields of human rights, poverty alleviation and governance

6.1.6 Test Youth Responsiveness of Select Tools

Objective	To select two land tools to test their responsiveness toward youth.
Activity	This can be carried out by the GLTN secretariat, GLTN partner or a coordinator through a short term consultancy
Output	A Report or assessment on how a particular introduction of youth dimension in an on-going tooling process worked. This will involve two separate approaches documentation of how a youth responsive tool has been developed and operationalized b) how to design an age responsive tool. It will include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A description of why, how and to what extent the age tool/ mode of inquiry fits with the tool development area that was chosen (compatibility). ii. What were the resource, expertise and coordination implications, as seen by various players – and the lessons learnt iii. If the work is on-going, what further steps can be taken to overcome anticipated challenges iv. How were the voices and inputs of that age group represented, and how was this received by various partners or stakeholders.

6.1.7 Evaluate Pilot Land Tools for Youth

Objective	To pilot two age responsive tool/ mode of enquiry in one of the areas of on-going GLTN work (in an area such as gender, grassroots, governance Islamic)
Activities	From the youth land inventory consult to shortlist tools to be tested and piloted
Output	Develop a process of documenting, testing (assessing) and piloting of selected tools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. To examine whether the documented tools are sufficiently youth responsive and capable of evaluation. ii. To identify the partners supporting the tool, and the scope of the tool. iii. To develop an action plan for piloting including logistics, evaluators iv. To carry out the pilot review, and to disseminate analysis and findings.

6.1.8 Develop a Youth and Land Mainstreaming/Training Module

Objective	To enhance awareness and capacity among land stakeholders on youth land issues
Activities	GLTN secretariat, external or partner contribution of collating and developing module
Output	A training module for a two day (or shorter workshop) which includes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A Rights based approach including key international and regional rights standards ii. A Youth Participation Model indicating the role of youth in land tool interventions iii. A Review of key obstacles and responses to youth access to land iv. Case Studies of youth and land issues

6.1.9 Develop a Youth and Land Mechanism

Objective:	To develop a multi-stakeholder and systematic framework to enhance youth land rights
Activities:	GLTN consultations on youth approaches, derived from other mechanisms
Output:	The working document for GLTN consultations and work to include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A framework for youth responsive land tools through review of objectives, work programme, values, partnerships and activities ii. A review of how youth dimensions intersect and draw from on-going GLTN work iii. An outline of its multi-stakeholder and systematic process of developing land tools and participation. iv. An action plan matching partners, activities, resources and timelines.

6.1.10 Support a Network on Youth and Land

Objective	To initiative and develop a youth and land network, for the promotion and protection of the rights of youth as well as other categories.
Activity	The youth focal point could initiate and coordinate multi-stakeholder as well as inter-institutional collaborations on the field.
Outputs	Setting up and coordination of the network through <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Contacting key global players and actors working on youth issues and interested in land issues, who would be core members ii. Identifying key issues, roles and activities iii. Developing inclusive participation from diverse groups iv. Setting up of an open network with core members, web presence and defined activities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ad Hoc Working Group for Youth and the MDGs (2005) Youth and the Millennium Development Goals: Challenges and Opportunities for Implementation

Andvig JC (2001) Family-Control Labour Child Labour in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Survey Research. Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 122 (Washington DC: World Bank)

Barker G (2005) Dying to be Men: Youth, Masculinity and Social Exclusion London and New York: Routledge

Bartlett S (2010) 'Editorial: Responding to urban youth's own perspectives' 22 Environment and Urbanization 307-316

Bell L, Burtless G, Gornick J, and Smeeding T (2008) Failure to Launch: Cross-National Trends in the Transition to Economic Independence Danziger S and Rouse C (eds.) The Price of Independence: The Economics of Early Adulthood (New York: Russell Sage)

Besteman C (1995) 'Polygyny, Women's Land Tenure, and the "Mother-Son Partnership" in Southern Somalia' 51:3 Journal of Anthropological Research, 193-213

Black L and Keith M. Making Safe - Young People, Community Safety & Racial Danger (London: UEL)

Briggs D (2008) Evaluation RAW programme for young people from two deprived estates involved in youth crime, London: In-Volve.

Canadian Peace Network (2008) Emerging Issues: Youth, Gender and the Changing Nature of Armed Conflict (Ottawa: CPN)

Chawla, L (2002), Insight, Creativity and Thoughts on the Environment: Integrating children and youth into human development 14 Environment and Urbanization, Vol. 14, IIED, London, 2002.

Sommers M (2010) Urban youth in Africa 22 Environment and Urbanization 317-332

COHRE (2007) Fulfilling the Right of All Children to Adequate Housing: Problems, Solutions and the Responsibilities of States

Commemorative High-Level Plenary Meeting: A World Fit for Children + 5: Follow-up to the Outcome of the UN General Assembly Special Session on Children, 11-13 December 2007, New York.

Coulibaly K (2006) Mainstreaming of Youth UNESCO: Addis Ababa, 27 June 2006

Creating Child Friendly Cities (CCFC) Conference: Outcomes and Directions Statement, Sydney, 30 Adopted in March 2007) (Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth (ARACY) and the Urban Research Program, Griffith University (URP).

Cunningham W, Cohan L, Naudeau S, and McGinnis L (2007) *Supporting Youth at-Risk: A Policy Toolkit for Middle Income Countries* (World Bank: Washington, DC).

Deininger K., Garcia M and Subbarao K (2003) 'AIDS-Induced Orphans as Systemic Shock: Magnitude, Impact and Program Interventions in Africa' 31:7 World Development 1201-1220

De Waal, A. (2002), 'Realizing Child Rights in Africa: Children, Young People and Leadership', in

De Waal/Argenti (2002, eds.), *Young Africa: Realizing the Rights of Children and Youth*, Africa World Press.

DFID (2010) *Youth Participation in Development: A Guide for Development Agencies and Policy Makers* (London: DFID)

Eyber C and Alastair A (2004) 'Researching Young People's Experience of War: Participatory Methods and the Trauma of Discourse' in Angola in Boyden J and de Berry J (eds) *Children and Youth on the Frontline* (New York: Berghahn Books)

FIDA (2008) *Resolutions Passed at the 33rd Biennial Convention of the International federation of Women Lawyers (FIDA) in Milan, Italy 12th – 16th November 2008*

FM&G. 2002. *Consultancy for Community-Based Assessment and Review of Best Practice in Community Responses to Meet the Needs of Vulnerable Children, Including Orphans*. Draft report submitted to the Poverty Reduction Task Team, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, Swaziland.

Frischmann B (2005) *Some Thoughts on Shortsightedness and Intergenerational Equity* 36 *Loyola University Chicago Law Journal* 457

R Gilbert, C O'Brien (2009) *Child-and youth-friendly land-use and transport planning guidelines for Ontario* savewanup.com

GRET in 2012: An International Player and Producer of Ideas for Sustainable Development (2008)

Hardoy J et al (2010) *Learning from young people and from our own experiences in Barrio San Jorge* 22 *Environment and Urbanization* 371-387

Hope K (1998) 'Urbanization and Urban Growth in Africa' 33:4 *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 345-358

ILO (2009) *G20 review of 51 country studies, from the OECD document DELSA/ELSA/RD 2009* (Rome: ILO).

ILO (2010) *Global Employment Trends For Youth: Special issue on the impact of the global economic crisis on youth* (Geneva: ILO) p.22

Kapila S (2009) *Urban Youth and Access to Adequate Shelter* (Nairobi: UN-HABITAT)

Kivilcim CO, Colak HE and McAlister C (2009) *Evaluating Next Generation of Surveyors for the Sustainable World*, FIG Working Week, Eilat, Israel, 3-8 May 2009

Stein-Erik Kruse and D. Okpala *Review of the Cooperation between UN-Habitat and the Government of Norway* August 2007.

La Cava G and Ozbil (2006) *Approach Paper: Mainstreaming Youth Issues in Europe and Central Asia* (ECA Region, World Bank)

Lansdown G (2002) *The participation of children*. In: Montgomery, Heather, Rachel Burr, Martin Woodhead *Changing Childhoods: local and global*. The Open University and John Wiley & Sons, Milton Keynes,

Lansdown, G. (2005) 'Understanding the implications of human rights treaty: evolving capacities of the child'; Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.

Lind J and Sturman K (2002) Scarcity and Surfeit: The ecology of Africa's conflicts (Pretoria/Nairobi: ISS/ ACTS)

Malley K (2005) 'Children and Young People Participating in PRSP Processes – Lessons from Save the Children's Experience'. London: Save the Children.

Mboup G (2004) 'Solutions for Urban Youth in Africa Measurement/indicators of youth employment' Expert Group Meeting on Strategies for Creating Urban Youth Employment (GUO: UN-HABITAT)

Mc Carney R and Suave S (2003) The Case for Street Youth: The Lost Decade in Ruble B, Tulchin J, Varat D and Hanley L Youth Explosion in Developing World Cities: Approaches to Reducing Poverty and Conflict in an Urban Age (Washington DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars) 91

Millennium Project Task Force (2003) Millennium Project Task Force on Improving the Lives of Slum Dwellers: Background Paper

National Youth Agency (2008) 'Hear by Right: Standards Framework for the Participation of Children and Young People'; Leicester: National Youth Agency.

NORAD (2005). 'Three billion reasons – Norway's development strategy for children and young people in the south'.

Oslo Youth Council and UN-HABITAT (2010) Manual on Stop Youth Information Resource Centre, Supported by UN-HABITAT

Outcome of the Experts Group Meeting on the 100 Cities Initiative of the World Urban Campaign Nairobi, 26-28 January 2010

Overseas Development Institute (2007) The intergenerational transmission of poverty: An overview ODI Working Papers 286, (London: ODI)

Rogers, P. and Coaffee, J. Moral panics and urban renaissance 9:3 *City* 321-340

Sait S (2008) *Developing land tools for all age groups: Implementing the Land, Property and Housing Rights of Children, Youth and Older Persons* (UN-HABITAT)

Satterthwaite, D. (1999) "City Governance for and with Children" in Bartlett, S. (Ed.) *Cities for Children: Children's Rights, Poverty and Urban Management* London, Earthscan 1999, pp. 213-248

Silliman S (2008) *International Youth and Crime Prevention Summit* <http://www.africafiles.org/article.asp?ID=18695;>

Smolka M and Sabatini F (2000) The Land Market Deregulation Debate in Chile 12:1 *Land Lines*

Sommers M (2006) Youth and Conflict: A Brief Review of Available Literature (USAID) FA1 Strategy Paper

Subbarao K and Coury D (2003) Reaching Out to Africa's Orphans A Framework for Public Action (Washington DC: World Bank) at 29.

UN General Assembly (2008) Policies and programmes involving youth: youth in the global economy – promoting youth participation in social and economic development, 5 February 2008, Sixty-second session, Agenda item 62 (b)

UN General Assembly Resolution S-25/2. Declaration on Cities and Other Human Settlements in the New Millennium, Twenty-fifth Special session, 9 June 2001“Resolve to intensify efforts to enhance the role of youth and civil society and to increase cooperation with parliamentarians in human settlements development”

UN General Assembly Resolution, 59/239. Implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), A/RES/59/239, 24 February 2005.

Medium-term Strategic and Institutional Plan for UN-Habitat for the period 2008–2013, HSP/GC/21/5/Add.1, March 2007

UN-HABITAT (2009) Focus Area 3 Policy and Strategy Paper Access to Land and Housing for All (prelim, 2009); MTA 2010.

UN-HABITAT (2009) Focus Area 3 Policy and Strategy Paper: Access to Land and Housing for All (preliminary) Nairobi: UN-HABITAT

UN-HABITAT (2010) Medium-Term Strategic and institutional Plan: Focus Area Policy and Strategy Paper Focus Area 1: Effective Advocacy, Monitoring, and Partnerships for Sustainable Urbanization (Nairobi: UN-HABITAT)

UN-HABITAT (2010) State of the Urban Youth 2010/11: Levelling the Playing Field (Nairobi: UN-HABITAT)

UN-HABITAT (2011) YOUTH EMPOWERMENT FOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT: Youth empowerment through knowledge based advocacy for improved quality of living (A Proposal for Partnership Support) mainstreaming partnership proposal YEP draft2 / 11 July 2011

UNICEF (2007) ‘Children Living in Poverty: Overview of Definitions, Measurements and Policy’; (Background paper for UNICEF Report on State of the World’s Children 2007) New York: UNICEF.

Wilhjelm H (1995) ‘Children and Planning- A Recent Norwegian Reform to Improve the Physical Environment of Children and Adolescents’ 12:4 Children’s Environments 49-65

Williams, Lincoln 2001 The Official Discourse on Youth in St. Kitts-Nevis (UWI Paper)

World Bank (2006) World Development Report 2007: Development and the Next Generation. Washington, DC: The World Bank

World Bank (2008) Supporting Youth at Risk—A Policy Toolkit for Middle-Income Countries (2008)

World Bank (2010) Investing in your country’s children and youth today: Good policy, smart economics (Washington DC: World Bank)

World Programme Of Action For Youth, Adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolutions A/RES/50/81 and A/RES/62/126 on 14 December 1996 and 18 December 2007

World Urban Campaign Secretariat, Expert group Meeting on the 100 Cities Summit Shanghai, 5-6 October 2010

World Youth Report 2005, Report of the Secretary-General (A/60/61)