



PARTNERSHIPS FOR PEOPLE-CENTRED LAND GOVERNANCE

Lessons from research on multi-stakeholder processes

Juan Pablo Sarmiento Barletti, Tamara Lasheras de la Riva, Douglas Bwire Ombogh
and Nining Liswanti

**INTERNATIONAL
LAND
COALITION**



LANDCOLLABORATIVE



ACRONYMS

CIFOR-ICRAF	Center for International Forestry Research and World Agroforestry (CIFOR-ICRAF)
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
ILC	International Land Coalition
MSP	Multi-Stakeholder Platform
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NLC	National Land Coalition
PCLG	People-Centred Land Governance
RVO	Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland (Netherlands Enterprise Agency)
S4HL	Stand for Her Land Campaign
VGGT	Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security

CITATION ILC and CIFOR-ICRAF, *Partnerships for people-centred land governance: Lessons from research on multi-stakeholder processes*, July 2024.

This Report was written by *Juan Pablo Sarmiento Barletti, Tamara Lasheras de la Riva, Douglas Bwire Ombogoh* and *Nining Liswanti* of the Center for International Forestry Research and World Agroforestry (CIFOR-ICRAF). The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of ILC and CIFOR-ICRAF. Any other information shown in this Report do not imply any judgment, endorsement or acceptance on the part of ILC and CIFOR-ICRAF.

For more information, please contact Alain Christian Essimi Biloa at a.essimibiloa@landcoalition.org.



This report is subject to copyright. Because ILC encourages dissemination of knowledge, this work may be reproduced, in whole or in part, for non-commercial purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, as long as full attribution to this work is given. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured. Any queries on rights and licenses, including subsidiary rights, should be addressed to info@landcoalition.org

For more information, please contact *Alain Christian Essimi Biloa* at a.essimibiloa@landcoalition.org

Published: International Land Coalition, July 2024
Design: Federico Pinci, <http://www.federicopinci.info>

FOREWORD

The International Land Coalition believes in multi-stakeholder partnerships. People-centred land governance is by definition a multi-stakeholder process; decision-making over land needs to involve all who have a stake in it, not least those who live on it.

This is also a key message of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT), adopted by governments through the World Committee for Food Security more than a decade ago.

ILC, and its partners through the LandCollaborative, have worked over the past decade to build national multi-stakeholder partnerships on land. Known as National Land Coalitions, they are active in more than 30 countries¹ today. They advocate for policy and legal reform, strengthen capacities, and most of all support struggles to defend, secure or regain land rights by local communities. They are crucial in creating spaces for historically marginalized groups to voice their perspectives, advocate for rights recognition, and build capacities for political engagement. Governments, as primary duty-bearers, are also central to these partnerships, providing the legal and policy frameworks necessary for good land governance.

We are constantly learning how we can best support such change-making multi-stakeholder platforms. We seek to support partnerships that can shift power into the hands of rights-holders over land. But we also know that if we do it wrong, we can inadvertently concretise inequalities and exacerbate exclusion.

This review pulls together key lessons from the experiences of the ILC network. It combines them with findings from the limited literature on government and civil society partnerships in the land sector, as well as with broader perspectives and knowledge on multi-stakeholder partnerships and platforms. It draws practical lessons from these experiences, and formulates actionable recommendations on how we can do it better.

This report is accompanied by a Toolkit, which guides partnerships that are context-specific, genuinely inclusive, and capable of expanding their impact over time. The toolkit provides a comprehensive framework for designing, implementing, and evaluating effective partnerships in land governance.

We are committed to building a global community of practice in support of impactful multi-stakeholder platforms for people-centred land governance. We trust that this report and toolkit will be useful to land governance practitioners, supporters, promoters, funders, and change makers. Let's get to work!

Mike Taylor

Director of ILC Secretariat

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
INTRODUCTION	9
METHODS	12
MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PROCESSES:	
FINDINGS FROM THE SCHOLARLY LITERATURE	13
<i>Benefits</i>	14
<i>Challenges</i>	17
TYPOLOGIES OF MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PROCESSES	21
CASE STUDIES	26
<i>Case studies at a glance</i>	26
Sierra Leone <i>Implementation of the VGGTs and National Land Policy</i>	27
Philippines <i>Agriculture and Rural Development Knowledge and Policy Platform (ARDKPP)</i>	28
Uganda <i>Stand for Her Land (S4HL) Campaign</i>	29
Kyrgyzstan <i>The NLC on Sustainable Land and Governance</i>	30
Albania <i>The National Land Coalition (NLC)</i>	31
Colombia <i>Strengthening local community capacities in the implementation of the Multipurpose Cadaster</i>	32
<i>Comparative analysis</i>	33
<i>Theories of change and practices</i>	38
LESSONS	41
CONCLUSION	50
REFERENCES	52

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are very grateful to the *Government and CSOs Partnerships Advisory Group* members who provided strategic guidance to the research team: Anna Schreiber (WHH), Davie Benton Chilonga (Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development, Malawi), Doreen Nancy Kobusingye (NLC Uganda), Francesca Romano (FAO), Buawah Jobo Samba (Ministry of Lands, Housing and Country Planning, Sierra Leone), Lisette Meij (RVO), Nicolas Avellaneda (NLC Argentina), Timothy Salomon (NLC the Philippines), Brendan Schwartz and Pr. Julian Quan (NRI, University of Greenwich)

The Report benefited from comments and suggestions from Alain Christian Essimi Biloa, Annalisa Mauro, Yonas Mekonen, Sabine Pallas, Stefano di Gessa and Ashley von Anrep of the *ILC Secretariat*. The *Netherlands Enterprise Agency (RVO)* through the LAND-at-scale Program also participated in the development of this Report, with the support and contribution of Astrid Broekaart, Gemma Betsema, Imke Greven, Aoife Ossendorp and Maaike van den Berg.

Special thanks to the Government representatives, Partners and the Multi-stakeholder Platforms Facilitators and Focal points who participated in June 2024 to the Report presentation and validation sessions in Kampala, Uganda during the Learning Week to promote Government and CSOs Partnerships in the land governance sector. Same gratitude goes to the contributors of case studies presented in this report (Annex).



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The surge in interest surrounding partnerships between government entities and civil society organisations (CSOs) aimed at fostering more equitable land governance signifies a commendable step forward. These partnerships recognise the need for multi-sector and multi-level arrangements to address the complexities of land governance and leverage the diverse capacities, resources, and knowledge of the stakeholders involved. These partnerships gain particular significance given the broad spectrum of civil society actors involved, ranging from non-government organisations (NGOs) to representative organisations of Indigenous Peoples, alongside the various government sectors invested in land governance. Within these frameworks, CSOs assume diverse roles, including facilitation, organisation, advocacy for policy change, and capacity development for local communities. Moreover, CSOs serve as crucial agents in creating spaces for historically marginalised groups to voice their perspectives, advocate for rights recognition, and build capacities for future political engagement. While CSOs play pivotal roles in facilitating partnerships, the active participation of governments as partners is key. Governments, as primary duty-bearers and central actors in crafting, implementing, and enforcing legal and policy frameworks, play a pivotal role in partnerships.

Partnerships are integral components of the broader trend of multi-stakeholder processes. There is much attention and funding set on these processes and their potential for convening various stakeholders to negotiate, make decisions, and/or exchange knowledge, aiming to yield more effective and equitable outcomes compared with conventional top-down or unisectoral decision-making pathways. The expansion of multi-stakeholder processes is linked to the growing expectation of increased and improved participation and empowerment of civil society actors in decision-making and planning, emphasising the upholding of participatory democracy and rights. Moreover, these processes have been increasingly incorporated into international, national, and subnational policies to support sustainable development initiatives. However, the successful implementation of these partnerships hinges on evidence-based lessons of what works and what does not, considering the complex interactions across various levels and systems of knowledge that they entail. Despite challenges and limitations, addressing these inquiries is crucial to deepening our practical understanding of the factors that foster successful partnerships. This report, based on a review of the literature and an examination of six multi-stakeholder partnerships involving government agencies and CSOs, endeavours to contribute to this understanding. Below are synthesised nine key lessons from the literature and case study research.

Contextual awareness

Effective partnerships require a deep understanding of the geographical, political, socio-cultural, and economic contexts in which they operate. Historical factors, such as colonisation, conflicts, and governance systems, significantly influence partnerships. For instance, Sierra Leone's post-conflict land reforms and Uganda's gender disparities highlight the importance of tailored approaches. Recognising existing multi-stakeholder processes and governance issues ensures that initiatives build on established systems, enhancing relevance and effectiveness.

Clear theory of change and monitoring mechanism

A co-produced theory of change aligns diverse objectives and allows for adaptation to changing contexts. Although not always formalised, guiding frameworks provide direction and coherence. Comprehensive monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, such as those in Sierra Leone and Uganda, ensure accountability and continuous improvement. Embedding projects within broader initiatives, as demonstrated in Colombia, can enhance impact by aligning with larger goals.

Adaptability

Partnerships must be designed to adapt to evolving contexts in the land sector. Successful partnerships incorporate reflexive and adaptive practices, allowing for the inclusion of new knowledge, addressing value conflicts, and reassessing changes at different levels. Clear governance structures and regular consultative meetings, as seen in Sierra Leone and Uganda, facilitate effective coordination and decision-making.

Multi-sector and embedded partnerships

Effective partnerships involve diverse stakeholders, including government agencies, CSOs, grassroots groups, and academic institutions. The roles of these actors vary, with government ministries often central to implementation and international organisations providing crucial support. Engaging a diverse range of stakeholders ensures comprehensive and inclusive initiatives, leveraging technical expertise and enhancing credibility.

Inclusiveness

Addressing power inequalities and ensuring the participation of marginalised groups, such as women and youth, leads to more equitable outcomes. Strategies for inclusiveness vary but often include gender equity components and participatory approaches. For example, Uganda's campaign focuses on women's land rights, while Kyrgyzstan ensures women's participation in natural resource management.

Accountability mechanisms

Incorporating governance mechanisms to hold participants accountable is essential. Transparent processes build trust, manage expectations, and ensure realistic goals. Establishing clear roles, responsibilities, and guidelines early on helps align stakeholder efforts and addresses potential conflicts.

Capacity sharing and co-learning

Effective participation requires shared understanding and capacity-development. Partnerships should recognise and address power inequalities in knowledge access, promoting co-learning and the co-creation of outputs. Integrating local knowledge systems and fostering informed participation are crucial for legitimacy and success.

Facilitation and leadership

Neutral facilitators and adaptive leadership are vital for sustaining equitable and effective partnerships. Facilitators balance diverse perspectives and ensure inclusive decision-making. Flexibility in leadership and effective conflict management further enhance partnership dynamics.

Time and financial resources

Building trust and mutual learning requires significant time and financial investment. Realistic timelines and sufficient resources are essential for developing and managing partnerships. Recognising that not all participants are compensated for their involvement ensures fair and sustained engagement.

Below, considering the evidence reviewed, we synthesise a series of incentives for government actors and CSOs to get involved in well-functioning partnerships.

The incentives for government actors to participate in *well-functioning* partnerships include:

- » **To design more effective policies:** Input from stakeholder groups will lead to policies that do better at addressing their issues.
- » **To have greater impact:** Involving CSOs in policy design and implementation makes a process likelier to have greater impact across time, especially when they create a sense of ownership among local actors.
- » **To build trust:** CSOs hold legitimacy (e.g. as representative organisations or allies) in areas and/or contexts of historical disagreements over land tenure.
- » **To develop capacities:** Some CSOs are specialised in capacity development for community and government actors (e.g. technical, intercultural communication, operationalising local knowledge) in ways that government agencies may not.
- » **To support international commitments:** Partnerships can create buy-in of local people in support of government policies and political goals linked to expanded participation.
- » **To access new sources of funding:** Partners can pool funds or access new funding sources for specific actions.

The incentives for civil society actors to participate in well-functioning partnerships include:

- » **To support the design of more effective policies:** Partnerships should bring the representatives of the men and women that manage land and resources to the spaces where decisions that may affect them are made.
- » **To ensure that policies are implemented:** CSO actors can embed initiatives in government policy cycles to support the recognition of and respect for rights.
- » **To promote multi-sector collaboration:** CSOs can bring together government sectors that have linked responsibilities over land and resources but normally work in silos.
- » **To shift paradigms in understandings of local practices:** Collaboration and co-learning with local actors and targeted capacity development may lead to shifts in paradigms held by government actors about local land governance practices.
- » **To improve relationships between key actors:** Partnerships support alignment, trust, and co-learning between actors that may not normally collaborate.
- » **To pool existing or access new funding:** Partners can pool their existing resources (and capacities) or find new funding pathways to support their common objectives.

INTRODUCTION

The burgeoning interest in partnerships between government and civil society organisations (CSOs) aimed at fostering more equitable land governance is laudable. This trend reflects a heightened recognition of the imperative for collaborative, multi-sector, and multi-level arrangements, along with the pooling of capacities, resources, and knowledge they entail, to advance people-centred land governance (Jansen and Kalas, 2020). These partnerships are particularly significant given the broad spectrum of civil society actors involved, ranging from NGOs to representative organisations of Indigenous Peoples, alongside the various government sectors invested in land governance (Larson et al., 2018). Within these collaborative frameworks, CSOs assume diverse roles, including facilitation, organisation, advocacy for policy change, and capacity development for local communities (Blomley and Walters, 2019; Kusters et al., 2018). Moreover, CSOs serve as critical agents in creating spaces for historically marginalised groups to voice their perspectives, advocate for rights recognition, and build capacities for future political engagement (Larson et al., 2022).

However, it is essential to recognise that CSOs' roles in these partnerships are supportive rather than substitutive of institutional government processes. Similarly, governments, as primary duty-bearers and central actors in crafting, implementing, and enforcing legal and policy frameworks, play a pivotal role in land governance partnerships. The proponents of such multi-stakeholder collaborative processes are driven by the aim of harnessing resources and capacities to pave the way for achieving shared objectives (Hewlett et al., 2021).

We perceive partnerships as integral components of the broader framework of multi-stakeholder processes. These processes, also referred to as partnerships, platforms, forums, and initiatives, convene various stakeholders to negotiate, make decisions, and/or exchange knowledge, aiming to yield more effective and equitable outcomes compared with conventional top-down or unisectoral decision-making pathways (Campbell, 1994; Pretty, 1995; Buchy and Hoverman, 2000; Beierle, 2002; Reed, 2008). The United Nations defines partnerships as *"voluntary and collaborative relationships between various parties, both public and non-public, in which all participants agree to work together to achieve a common purpose or undertake a specific task and, as mutually agreed, to share the risks and responsibilities, resources and benefits"*.¹ While academic definitions vary, they universally acknowledge the potential of multi-stakeholder processes to address the multifaceted nature of complex challenges. For instance, multi-stakeholder networks are described as *"voluntary cooperative arrangements between actors from the public, business, and civil society that display minimal*

1 <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnerships/about>

institutionalization, feature common nonhierarchical decision-making structures, and address public policy issues" (Streets, 2004: 5).

Multi-stakeholder platforms are characterised as *"roundtables where people with diverse perspectives gather"* (Warner, 2006: 17), while multi-stakeholder initiatives involve *"a variety of actors of diverse character and power engaged in a variety of interrelated practices across various sites"* (Kohne, 2014: 471). Despite these nuanced definitions, there is a consensus regarding the defining characteristics of partnerships. Partnerships bring together *"a coalition of interests drawn from more than one sector to generate agreement, have common aims and a strategy to achieve them, partners share risks, resources, and skills, and achieve mutual benefit and synergy"* (Hutchinson and Campbell, 1998).

The expansion of multi-stakeholder processes is linked to the growing expectation of increased and improved participation and empowerment of civil society actors in decision-making and planning (Fung and Wright, 2003; Berkes et al., 1989; Botchway, 2001; Hemmati, 2002). The benefits of this widened participation include the upholding of participatory democracy and rights (see e.g. Backstrand, 2006; Chatre, 2008; Gambert, 2010; Pruitt and Thomas, 2007; Reed, 2008; Reed et al., 2009) and collaborative governance, an approach to decision-making and management that emphasises co-learning, cooperation, and improved mutual understanding towards more adaptive, effective, and equitable outcomes, as opposed to mainstream top-down and unisectoral approaches (Edelenbos and Teisman, 2013; Hahn et al., 2006; Lubell, 2015; Westerink et al., 2017; Kallis et al., 2009; Fernández-Giménez et al., 2019).

This perspective on the potential of coordination has garnered attention in international forums and national and subnational policies (Brockhaus et al., 2014; Gallemore et al., 2014; Kowler et al., 2014). Notably, the pathway towards achieving the United Nations Agenda 2030 is set around multi-stakeholder engagement and collaboration. The document highlights the importance of *"the global partnership for sustainable development, complemented by the use of multi-stakeholder partnerships"* (United Nations, 2015; Malekpour et al., 2021; Horan, 2022) as key to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (see SDG 17). This commitment is linked to previous recognitions such as those outlined in the final declaration of the Rio+30 summit, which emphasised the need for partnerships at different levels to advance sustainable development initiatives (Rio Declaration, 1992). Regional agreements further reinforce partnerships. For instance, the *African Union's Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa* advocates for a *"shared vision among all stakeholders of a comprehensive and coordinated land policy as a major factor in national development"* (African Union, 2010). In response to this global and regional interest, multi-stakeholder processes have been increasingly incorporated to support initiatives at the subnational level by both civil society and governments (Franco and Monsalve Suárez, 2017; Boyd et al., 2018; Ros-Tonen et al., 2018; Stickler et al., 2018; Sarmiento Barletti and Larson, 2020).

Given this optimistic outlook, the successful implementation of these partnerships hinges on evidence-based lessons of what works and what does not. Challenges arise in bringing together the different government sectors and civil society actors, often with different priorities, to foster collaborative interactions towards addressing a common problem or achieving shared goals (see e.g. Estrada-Carmona et al., 2014; Bastos Lima et al., 2017). Despite this discursive interest and the considerable time and financial investment placed towards the creation of multi-stakeholder processes in different sectors and geographies, *"the reality is that we are still only scratching the surface in terms of the number, and quality, of partnerships required to deliver the SDGs"* (UNDESA, 2019). Moreover, it is worth noting that multi-stakeholder processes are not new; Hutchinson noted three decades ago that as partnerships were *"the 'buzzword of the eighties', there is good reason to believe that its popularity will continue through the 1990s"* (1994: 342). Since then, these processes have been heralded as *"the collaboration paradigm of the 21st century"* (Austin, 2000: 44).

Researchers have noted that these processes tend not to be prepared to address the underlying issues that structure inequity, such as unequal power relations and exclusion (Ravikumar et al., 2018; Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020). The literature highlights the importance of not perceiving multi-stakeholder processes as technical, apolitical, or neutral endeavours. Understanding the potential of such arenas requires recognising them as socio-political constructs (Lefebvre, 1991) that evolve within their specific contexts (Warner and Verhallen, 2007). Moreover, these processes often entail complex interactions across levels (Nunan, 2018; Carlsson and Sandström, 2008; Paavola and Adger, 2009) and systems of knowledge (Turnhout et al., 2019) that are affected by the histories of interactions between actors that can range from collaboration to conflict (Marshall et al., 2010; Diaz-Kope and Miller-Stevens, 2015). Scholars have raised concerns about the potential for partnerships to be co-opted by more powerful actors, including government agencies, either as token efforts or to advance their own agendas under the guise of collaboration. Even in cases with no such active co-optation, government actors often wield significant influence, even in ostensibly collaborative networks, impacting decision-making processes and information flow (Fliervoet et al., 2016; Watson et al., 2009; Agrawal, 2005).

Given the growing interest in partnerships, there is a need to draw from evidence of effective and equitable practices and explore how those lessons can be applied to other contexts. This report – based on a review of the literature and an examination of six multi-stakeholder partnerships involving government and CSOs – addresses this evidence gap in order to deepen our practical understanding of the factors that foster successful partnerships, while also acknowledging and addressing their limitations.

METHODS

This review builds on prior research by the authors (Hewlett et al., 2021; Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020; Sarmiento Barletti and Larson, 2019). The methodology involved several key steps. The authors conducted a systematic search using specific terms related to collaboration and land governance, applying exclusion and inclusion criteria, a snowball strategy, and surveys. They searched Google Scholar and Web of Science for combinations of the following terms: "collaboration*", "multi-stakeholder*", "multi-actor*", "partnership*", "land reform*", "land tenure*", "land rights", "titling*", "tenure", "tenure reform", "property rights", and "land governance". Additional resources were identified through a snowball strategy, including grey literature from key organisational repositories such as those of the International Land Coalition and CIFOR-ICRAF. Notably, the literature on multi-stakeholder processes focusing on land use, forests, and landscape management was included as part of the snowball strategy as the issues around equity and inclusion in these sectors hold relevance for the land governance sector. This includes the multi-sector and multi-level nature of the challenges to people-centred land and resource governance, as well as the kinds of actors and power inequalities between them that structure partnerships in the land sector. The authors reviewed papers in English, French, and Spanish, screening abstracts and selecting relevant documents, then coding their notes using predetermined and inductive codes.

To complement the literature search, they conducted desk research, surveys, and interviews with six partnerships supporting people-centred land governance. Case studies were selected with the International Land Coalition, ensuring representation from its four regions (Africa, Asia, EMENA, and LAC). The selection aimed to cover different types of partnerships with varying degrees of success, allowing for an in-depth analysis of their planning, processes, and outcomes. Semi-structured interviews with key informants were conducted through Microsoft Teams and surveys were deployed in Albanian, English, French, and Spanish. The questionnaires and surveys sought to understand how the different partnerships work, how they were organised, the context in which they were organised, their internal governance and mechanisms, and their limitations and achievements.

The review was synthesised into lessons on the key challenges and enabling conditions for partnerships between government and civil society actors, and placed in conversation with the findings from the interviews with the six case studies. The lessons derived from the review were presented and validated in three sessions during ILC's Learning Week in Kampala, Uganda in June 2024. The comments and suggestions received by participants in those sessions have been included in the final draft of this review.

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PROCESSES: FINDINGS FROM THE SCHOLARLY LITERATURE

The growing mainstreaming of multi-stakeholder processes draws attention to the variety of actors that determine land use practices on the ground. Such processes are described as addressing two key issues to the land sector. The first is the lack of coordination between actors and sectors that can affect land reform. The second is the recognition of power inequalities between the stakeholders and sectors involved. Generally, participatory processes are seen as a way to address power inequalities among stakeholders, to understand the perspectives of those most affected by land use policy and decisions and to try to bring on board those with the power to affect the implementation and sustainability of proposed initiatives (see Dougill et al., 2006; Tippett, 2007; Reed, 2008; Reed et al., 2009).

Analysts with different positions regarding multi-stakeholder processes acknowledge the problematic nature of power inequalities in business-as-usual approaches, but diverge on whether multi-stakeholder participation can transform them. One position highlights the potential for more horizontal decision-making processes, with more equitable and effective outcomes for local populations (Sayer et al., 2013; Estrada-Carmona et al., 2014; Bastos Lima et al., 2017). The other argues that mainstream participation only masks existing technologies of governance that do not address, and may reinforce, structures of inequality (Cooke and Kothari, 2001; Warner, 2006). These positions link stakeholder participation to positive outcomes ranging from the normative (as an ideology) – including the upholding of rights, justice, and participatory democracy – to the pragmatic (as a method), such as the proposition that stakeholder participation leads to more sustainable and cost-efficient initiatives with more local ownership (Buchy and Hoverman, 2000; Hemmati, 2002; Reed, 2008). The emphasis on participation also reflects calls from academia and grassroots organisations for a rights-based approach to decision-making in processes that affect them and their self-determined well-being pathways (e.g. Chambers, 1983; Chambers et al., 1989).

These processes can also create important opportunities for dissent where these are not available for historically underrepresented groups (Palacios Llaque and Sarmiento Barletti, 2021; Rodriguez and Sarmiento Barletti, 2021).

Arnstein's Ladder of Citizenship Participation (1969) is one of the most prominent analytical models used to understand the participation of civil society in processes related to the work of government. The ladder ranges from "manipulation" to "citizen control", juxtaposing citizens "with the powerful in order to highlight the fundamental divisions between them" (Arnstein, 1969: 217). Each step on the ladder represents increased power for citizens in terms of their ability to influence decision-making. Partnership, the sixth step in the ladder, involves joint control and "ownership", with any relevant benefits and risks shared by governments and civil society actors. A re-reading of Arnstein's model from scholars in the Global South, however, rethinks the ladder and its steps, noting that government will is key to determining the results of any multi-stakeholder process (Guaraldo Choguill, 1999). This is linked to the observation that different participants in a multi-stakeholder process may have different understanding of what "coordination" or "collaboration" means (Kusters et al., 2020). In some cases, government officials may set up a process to communicate plans or policy changes, without necessarily being open to considering stakeholder feedback, yet understand this as coordination; participants may perceive it as one-sided information (Rodriguez and Sarmiento Barletti, 2021). These are far from the kind of relationships of collaboration that are implied in multi-stakeholder processes, as being mutually beneficial to its participants to come together to work for common goals, sharing responsibilities – to different degrees – to achieve them (Ayivor et al., 2020).

The section that follows synthesises some of the benefits and challenges of multi-stakeholder processes described in the scholarly literature, before moving on to discuss the different typologies that have been developed to understand and compare those processes.

BENEFITS

PARTNERSHIPS CAN BRING ACTORS TOGETHER FOR BIGGER IMPACT ON SHARED GOALS

The literature notes that collaborative multi-stakeholder efforts are key to addressing complex issues such as rural economic poverty and land reform (Cullen et al., 2005). In general, multi-stakeholder processes are described as integrated and coherent approaches with the potential to deal with the complexities of "wicked" problems involving different interests, drivers and actors with different degrees of access to power and responsibilities over the recognition and respect of rights (Addy et al., 2016; DeFries and Nagendra, 2017; May and Spears, 2012; Jordan and Lenschow, 2010; Waylen et al., 2019).

The most often cited definitions for multi-stakeholder mechanisms are positive. Wollenberg et al. describe multi-stakeholder processes as "courses of action where two or more interest groups provide their views, make a decision or coordinate an activity together" (2005: 45). Similarly, Steins and Edwards (1999: 244) describe them as "decision-making bodies (voluntary or statutory) comprising different stakeholders who perceive the same [...] problem, realise their interdependence for solving it, and come together to agree on action strategies for solving the problem". For Faysse (2006), these processes are based on ongoing negotiation; they may always be imperfect, but their positive outcomes outweigh any negative ones.

Most definitions of partnerships are based on the diversity of actors that are brought together under one and emphasise relationship-building, knowledge-sharing, co-learning, and improved communication (Waylen et al., 2023). Partnerships bring together actors to foster shared visions and set common goals, in many cases setting out activities or pooling resources, knowledge, and capacities that they may not be able to do on their own. These relationships between different actors have been linked to the kinds of interaction expected in collaborative governance arrangements and are expected to reach decisions or outcomes that different types of stakeholder will find more acceptable and will avoid the potential misunderstanding and conflicts that are more common in mainstream top-down or unilateral processes (Faysse, 2006). These are decision-making, interactive processes between actors with a shared common goal (Manring, 2005; Cheng et al., 2015). Collaborative governance emphasises common goals and trust-building across actors, sectors, and levels (Bordin, 2017; Kirsop-Taylor et al., 2020).

The literature on multi-stakeholder processes is permeated by optimism on the possibilities for improved coordination and collaboration when platforms or partnership are done right (see Sarmiento Barletti and Larson, 2019 for a review). Brouwer and Woodhill (2015) note the following nine characteristics of well-functioning multi-stakeholder initiatives: (1) they build on a shared and defined "problem situation" or opportunity; (2) all stakeholders are engaged in the partnership; (3) it works across different sectors and scales; (4) it follows an agreed but dynamic process and timeframe; (5) it involves stakeholders in establishing their expectations for a good partnership; (6) it works with power differences and conflicts; (7) it fosters stakeholder learning; (8) it balances bottom-up and top-down approaches; and (9) it makes transformative and institutional change possible. These characteristics are idealised but helpful to think through the potential of partnerships, but the factors that allow or challenge such performance are perhaps more important. Furthermore, these characteristics must be understood within a wider trend that approaches multi-stakeholder processes as ongoing and imperfect negotiation processes that nevertheless have more positive outcomes than negative ones (Faysse, 2006).

In similar vein, research has shown that representatives of Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in such processes (Larson et al., 2022) have recognised the limitations of such spaces in terms of what can be achieved and of the power inequalities across their participants but were still optimistic about their potential given the history of a lack of participatory spaces in their landscapes. Even with willingness to engage, inequalities influenced by historical power relations may impact the ability of less powerful stakeholders to assert their rights (Gonzales Tovar et al., 2020; Rodriguez and Sarmiento Barletti, 2021).

Table 1. Benefits of partnerships synthesised from the literature

- » Channel for direct participation by different stakeholders that may not normally collaborate.
- » An alternative to state-driven processes for input and collaboration.
- » Create opportunities for different groups to learn about each other, communicate, build relationships and trust.
- » Can create a more level playing field for underrepresented groups.
- » Can shift power to local or previously underrepresented groups.
- » Do not assume win-win outcomes and are more explicit about winners and losers.
- » More realistic about time required to bring people together and to reach agreement.
- » Bring more diverse viewpoints and skills that produce synergies and enhance capacities to innovate and cope with complex environments.
- » Allow networking between underrepresented groups and more powerful allies.
- » Allow access to spaces of discussion with more powerful actors that underrepresented actors can use to raise issues out of the partnership's mandate.
- » Foster multisectoral collaboration and improved relationships between different groups.
- » Can create links to leverage more funds to achieve a joint solution.
- » Can promote or improve communication between different sectors and actors.

Sources: Global Comparative Study on REDD+; Arnstein, 1969; Pretty, 1995; Buchy and Hoverman, 2000; Moore et al., 2001; Beierle, 2002; Senecah, 2004; Rowe and Frewer, 2005; Wollenberg et al., 2005; Warner, 2006; Reed, 2008; Gambert, 2010; Kohne, 2014.

Considering the evidence that has been synthesised in this review, Tables 2 and 3 set out a series of incentives for government actors and CSOs to get involved in well-functioning partnerships. This characteristic is emphasised because ineffective and inequitable partnerships may not lead to the outcomes that are noted below.

Table 2. Incentives for government agencies to participate in partnerships

- » To design more effective policies: input from groups that are affected by policy will lead to policies that do better at addressing their issues.
- » To have greater impact: involving CSOs in policy design and implementation makes a process likelier to have greater impact across time (resilience), especially when it creates a sense of ownership by local actors.
- » To build trust: CSOs hold legitimacy (as representative organisations or allies) in areas/contexts of historical disagreements over land tenure.
- » To develop capacities: CSOs specialised in capacity development for community AND government actors (e.g. technical, intercultural communication, operationalising local knowledge) in ways that governments may not.
- » To support international commitments: buy-in of local people in support of government policy (e.g. Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and political goals linked to expanded participation (e.g. Paris Agreement, CEDAW, SDGs).
- » To access new sources of funding: collaborations can pool funds or access new funding sources for specific actions.

Table 3. Incentives for civil society organisations to participate in partnerships

- » To support the design of more effective policies: bring the representatives of the men and women that manage land and resources to the tables where decisions that may affect them are made.
- » To ensure that policies are implemented: embed initiatives in government policy cycles to support recognition and respect for rights.
- » To promote multi-sector collaboration: bring together government sectors that have linked responsibilities over land and resources but work in silos.
- » To shift paradigms in understandings of local practices: collaboration and co-learning with community actors, and targeted capacity development, may lead to shifts in paradigms relating to local land governance practices.
- » To improve relationships between key actors: partnerships support alignment, trust, and co-learning between actors that may not normally collaborate.
- » To pool existing or access new funding: partners can pool their existing resources (and capacities) or find new funding pathways to support their common objectives.

CHALLENGES

PARTNERSHIPS MUST STILL BE MADE TO WORK

Despite the rhetoric, multi-stakeholder processes do not guarantee equality across participants solely by bringing them together. The critique of the participatory process in development, which is generally used in the literature on multi-stakeholder processes, can be summarised into four key points:

- » The participatory paradigm in rural development carries an insufficiently sophisticated understanding of how power is constituted and practices; this lack of understanding challenges any construction of pathways towards empowerment (Mosse, 1994; Kothari, 2001).

- » The paradigm centres its objectives on the “local” rather than understanding the wider and multi-level structures of oppression and injustice (Mohan and Stokke, 2000).
- » In similar vein, the paradigm builds on an inadequate understanding of the role of structure and agency in social change (Cleaver, 1999).
- » Participatory processes tend to place participation as a “technical” method to include local peoples in projects, rather than as a political pathway for empowerment, and thus real transformation (Rahman, 1995; Carmen, 1996).

In a global comparative study of multi-stakeholder platforms, the authors found that the organisers of those processes understood power inequalities as obstacles to their objectives (Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2021). However, they posited that these inequalities could be overcome by including historically disempowered peoples in their platforms, but generally failed to consider specific measures to address inequalities. The interactions between actors, framed by the wider context in which a multi-stakeholder process has been organised, are shaped by power relations that define, among other things, what kinds of actions are possible and what kind of knowledge is more desirable (Mahmud, 2004; Cardini, 2006; Gaventa, 2006; Grönholm, 2009; Perrault, 2015). An awareness of these power inequalities is important given the kinds of actors that interact within a process – ranging from government to civil society actors – but also an awareness of the inequalities with the “civil society” category, for instance, between community organisations and NGOs of different kinds. These critiques reveal the possibility that partnerships may not always be democratic and symmetrical, and could be co-opted by government actors as spaces to facilitate and legitimate top-down policy-making with performance targets that not all partners may share (Cardini, 2006; Larson et al., 2021; Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2021)

Ignoring these differences may overlook the individual agendas and power dynamics among actors (Berkes, 2009; Estrada-Carmona et al., 2014; Milder et al., 2012) that may lead to the co-option of processes by more powerful actors (Ravikumar et al., 2018). Treating all participants or partners as if they had the same access to informing the outcome of a collaborative process may lead to the reification or exacerbation of the existing power inequalities underlying the structures upon which inequality and injustice are constructed (Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020; Larson et al., 2021). This is an important point to remember as research has found that multi-stakeholder coordination bodies tend to take participation for granted, without critically examining their own processes from a perspective that seeks to understand who is coordinating and why (Ravikumar et al., 2018; Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2021)

The literature also addresses the challenges to coordination processes posed by conflicts among land stakeholders (Ravikumar et al., 2018). A significant challenge lies in the differing – and sometimes incommensurable – development priorities held by various actors across sectors and levels. Recognising power inequalities and the political dynamics underlying land use decision-making and perpetuating business-as-usual practices is crucial for understanding how coordination processes can lead to more equitable and sustainable outcomes. An example of these inequalities is the power disparity among different ministries or subnational offices. Ministries overseeing land or development schemes (e.g. finance, agriculture, mining) often have more resources and decision-making power than those addressing deforestation and the rights of Indigenous/local peoples (e.g. environment, culture). The literature shows that the potential for change in these processes is also challenged by other characteristics, including capacity gaps for effective participation (Harrison, 2003); the participation of non-representative actors (Baud and Nainan, 2008; Acharya et al., 2004; Coelho, 2004; Cornwall, 2004); and the mainstream tendency for top-down decision making, especially in contexts with no clear legal or policy frameworks for participation (Cornwall, 2002).

Table 4. Challenges synthesised from the literature

- » Stakeholders tend to have different values, interests, and commitments, which can challenge the pursuit of partnerships goals.
- » Much depends on the nature of the convener and facilitator.
- » Not all processes have participants with the skills required to identify conflicts and transform them.
- » Multi-stakeholder partnerships rarely have a sustainable institutional base.
- » They create an artificial context that may not persist after they end.
- » Representatives of interest groups may not be accountable to a constituency.
- » Not necessarily legitimate or accepted by authorities.
- » Lack the checks and balances and accountability measures of public processes.
- » Have many aspects that cannot all be handled at once.
- » Not all stakeholders participate (can be excluded by organisers or exclude themselves).
- » Transaction costs can be high.
- » Where large numbers participate, in-depth discussion and debate of complex ideas may be difficult.
- » Can give the impression that ideas are only legitimate when approved by all stakeholders.
- » Difficulty in getting and retaining the input of key stakeholders.
- » Might legitimise the business-as-usual practices of more powerful actors by inviting stakeholders that get little say in how outcomes are designed and/or implemented.

Sources: Global Comparative Study on REDD+; Arnstein, 1969; Pretty, 1995; Buchy and Hoverman, 2000; Moore et al., 2001; Beierle, 2002; Senecah, 2004; Rowe and Frewer, 2005; Wollenberg et al., 2005; Warner, 2006; Reed, 2008; Gambert, 2010; Kohne, 2014.

Table 5. Benefits (with some challenges) of stakeholder participation

IMPROVED QUALITY OF OUTCOMES	MORE PERSPECTIVES LEAD TO A MORE COMPLETE OVERVIEW OF THE ISSUE AT HAND AND THUS TO SOLUTIONS OR OUTCOMES OF AN IMPROVED QUALITY (WOODHILL AND ROLING, 1998; BERKES, 1999; OLSSON ET AL., 2004). GENERALLY, THE LITERATURE CONSIDERS LOCAL INPUTS AS LEADING TO BETTER RESULTS AND SUSTAINABILITY (CF. ARHEIMER ET AL., 2004). IT IS WORTH NOTING THAT SOME POSITIONS WARN THAT MORE PERSPECTIVES MAY NOT ALWAYS LEAD TO BETTER OUTCOMES BECAUSE OF THE INTERACTION OF COMPETING INTERESTS IN A FORUM (BRODY, 2003; CONNELLY ET AL., 2006).
Insight into values that cannot be gained through technical approaches	The participation of non-technical “experts” provides insight into knowledge that goes further than “science” (Middendorf and Busch, 1997). This is not uncontested, however, as some scholars question the usefulness of local knowledge in contemporary discussions (Krupnik and Jolly, 2002; Doolittle, 2003; Briggs and Sharp, 2004). This goes back to the older discussion of the role of Indigenous/traditional knowledge in development, such as Sillitoe’s (1998) seminal work on the topic.
Legitimacy and democratic ideals	As top-down approaches to decision-making go against democratic ideals, proponents of participatory processes highlight their potential to uphold such ideals by granting people more control over the initiatives that affect their lives (Colfer et al., 1995; Colfer, 2005). In doing so, local participation also grants legitimacy to decision-making processes.
Achieving political goals	Political goals such as the empowerment of underrepresented groups may be used to justify participation. Participation is also applied to issues that need consensually agreed targets (Arheimer et al., 2004) or when the government needs access to relevant information held by specific groups (Geurts and Mayer, 1996). This does not mean that the participatory process will be fair or follow some kind of procedural justice, or that it will not be used by the government as proof of consultation to justify policies. Conversely, these spaces could also be used by local representatives to make unrelated claims that fit with their agendas and priorities.
Social learning	By encouraging stakeholders to work together, multi-stakeholder forums can foster social learning. This can transform relationships and change people’s perceptions of each other’s positions and demands, and thus enable them to identify new ways of working together and/or reaching a more satisfactory outcome (McDougall et al., 2008; Akpo et al., 2014).

Source: Adapted from Sarmiento Barletti and Larson, 2019.

TYOLOGIES OF MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PROCESSES

This section engages with different typologies that have been developed in the scholarly literature to understand multi-stakeholder processes, including partnerships, forums, and platforms. This is done for several reasons. Firstly, categorising multi-stakeholder processes as solely top-down, bottom-up or a blend of both lacks practical utility, as does classifying them as a legal and/or policy requirement versus those created outside those realms. Secondly, attempting to pigeonhole platforms as purely utilitarian or normative presents similar challenges. Thirdly, the authors have previously noted a dearth of research and analysis on equity within multi-stakeholder partnerships (Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020). Fourthly, prior studies have underscored that the potential of a multi-stakeholder partnership to foster greater equity, as well as its long-term sustainability and success, are jeopardised when local people are not acknowledged as pivotal partners and agents of change (beyond mere beneficiaries of projects or initiatives), and when the partnership and/or its solutions lack meaningful institutionalisation (Hewlett et al., 2021; Yami et al., 2021). Before moving on to a wider discussion of types, it is worth noting that these should be considered as types that support analysis but are permeable. Participants in the same partnership or platform may have different appreciations of what the partnership’s objective should be and how to get there (see Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020).

The typologies available in the literature are useful to understand why multi-stakeholder processes are put together, how they work internally, and why they reach their outcomes (or not). Mackintosh (1992) sets out three different models for partnerships. The first, termed the “*synergy*” model, is designed to produce outcomes that are better than what partners can achieve when working separately by bringing together their skills and access to power. Participants in this model work towards understanding each other’s objectives, seeking to achieve common ground to facilitate collaboration. The “*enlargement*” model brings partners together to work towards achieving a larger funding pool, including from a third party. This analytical model recognises the pressure that participants may experience to adapt their practices to align with those of other partners to present a united front to achieve funding.

Finally, the “*transformative*” model emphasises change and innovation, moving towards reform and catalysing a collective effort towards transformation. Participants in this model work to align their objectives and priorities, motivating each other to embrace change. This transformative pathway is characterised by continuous negotiation throughout a partnership’s duration.

In a similar vein, Snape and Stewart (1996; see also Hunter and Perkins, 2014) delineate three categories of partnerships: facilitating, coordinating and implementing. Facilitating partnerships tackle entrenched, highly contentious, or politically sensitive issues characterised by power dynamics where trust and solidarity are paramount for success. Coordinating partnerships address less contentious matters where partners converge on priorities but contend with individual pressing demands. Implementing partnerships adopt a pragmatic, time-limited approach, focusing on specific mutually beneficial projects. Sarmiento Barletti and Larson (2020) offer a synthesised framework comprising three types of partnerships, which, while permeable, serve as useful categories for conceptualisation. First, decision-making processes convene to reach specific decisions often framed as trade-offs. Typically short-term, these spaces entail deliberation and negotiation, often grappling with complex political dynamics that complicate consensus-building. Second, management-oriented partnerships aim to oversee projects or activities necessitating coordinated engagement from multiple stakeholders. Third, influence-oriented partnerships aim to inform public policy cycles or facilitate exchanges of information, best practices, and technical expertise.

In a related review (Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020), the authors identified four distinct “*programme theories*”, the strategies through which the proponent of each process expected to create change (see Nilsson et al., 2016), in this case by securing local buy-in to multi-stakeholder processes through four primary mechanisms: sustainability, livelihoods, participation, and multi-level coordination. These types build on the notion that the involvement of local people is essential to achieve sustainable and resilient positive change. The four programme theories, their mechanisms, and intended outcomes are synthesised in Table 6. In the application of these types, it is unsurprising that a partnership would fail to perfectly correlate to a programme theory; most will include aspects from multiple theories. Despite their porosity, the four programme theories are useful to reveal the priorities and assumptions behind a multi-stakeholder process.

Table 6. Programme theories, mechanisms, and intended outcomes

PROGRAMME THEORY	MECHANISM	INTENDED OUTCOME
Sustainability-social inclusion initiatives seek change by integrating sustainable land use change, livelihoods, and social inclusion goals [<i>Sustainability paradigm</i>].	Include local people in initiatives towards sustainability, as this will motivate them to adopt the proposed initiative.	Improves sustainable land use, reducing the vulnerability of local peoples, and enhances their participation in decision-making.
Development-sustainability initiatives seek change by integrating sustainable land use and development goals [<i>Livelihoods paradigm</i>].	Create economic output through protecting and/or regenerating forests, which are then distributed among local stakeholders to provide development benefits.	The income or benefits of the new land use outweigh the losses in income from prior practices incurred by local stakeholders, and thus motivates them to implement the initiative.
Enhanced participatory decision-making initiatives seek change by providing communities with greater control over natural resources through local institutions, which are integrated with government and formalised [<i>Participation paradigm</i>].	Grant local people more control over their resources through co-management and co-learning and/or capacity-building efforts.	Leads to more sustainable land use that is economically beneficial to local populations, and will reduce vulnerabilities.
Multi-level governance initiatives seek change through cross-scale initiatives that involve different stakeholders and government agencies, from different sectors and levels [<i>Multi-level paradigm</i>].	Enhance social capital through collaborative decision-making and multi-level coordination.	Leads to a more transparent and legitimate participatory process with increased local ownership of initiative.

Adapted from Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020.

Finally, Hewlett et al. (2021) provide us with an analytical tool that goes beyond typologies to compare different partnerships and insights into their functioning across contexts. Intensity brings together two distinct facets of multi-stakeholder processes: social inclusivity in its process and its commitment to power distribution among participants such as access to effective participation, land and resources, decision-making authority, and respect for diverse forms of knowledge. Intensity allows us to assess a process’s explicit objectives and position it relative to others, based on its emphasis on empowerment, promoting equity, and undertaking measures to rectify structural inequities. This includes the degree to which resources, effort, and innovative methods are employed to support the structural shifts that will support the social inclusion of local people through power-sharing mechanisms. For example, a low-intensity partnership might strive to empower marginalised communities by encouraging influential actors to listen to and learn from them, without explicitly addressing power differentials. Conversely, a high-intensity one may aim to address those differentials by integrating local knowledge into discussions previously dominated by technical discourse, while also guaranteeing land and resource rights for communities and women within them.

Embeddedness provides a framework to categorise multi-stakeholder processes based on their scope and integration with wider initiatives. Embeddedness refers to the extent to which a multi-stakeholder process and/or its objectives are integrated or intertwined with broader societal or governmental initiatives and processes. While some partnerships may operate independently with single, short-term objectives, they are more commonly part of broader processes aimed at enabling environmental, economic, political, and/or social transformations. If intensity focuses on the internal workings and objectives of a partnership, embeddedness considers the surrounding context in which it functions. While such integration may offer advantages, it is crucial to assess the implications, opportunities, and constraints associated with a partnership's embeddedness within broader projects and programmes, including national-level policies, regional initiatives, other externally funded projects, and global objectives. Approaching a partnership through its embeddedness enables the delineation of the interconnections between a partnership and existing or planned policies, projects, programmes, governmental and social institutions, and movements, thereby enhancing our comprehension of the pathways or hindrances to a partnership's impact.

Table 7. Levels of intensity/embeddedness, their characteristics and results

LEVELS	CHARACTERISTICS	SUMMARY
Low intensity and embeddedness	Platforms with a limited scope of participation, which focus on a single issue and tend to be tangentially related to wider projects or programmes as they are coincidentally nested in them without prior planning.	Platforms focus on a single issue and are not entangled with wider processes; therefore, they do not lead to any structural changes.
High intensity and low embeddedness	Cases that address power inequalities inside the platform, give significant emphasis to inclusivity and empowerment, and have high levels of participation. However, they do not enable structural changes as they are tangentially related to wider programmes or projects, and/or are coincidentally nested in them without prior planning.	Despite equitable approaches that seek to address power structures, this type of platform would not enable changes in power relations outside the partnership.
Low intensity and high embeddedness	Platforms with limited scope for participation, limited level of local control over processes and/or decision-making, and lack of legally binding agreements. However, the high level of embeddedness allows for integration with multi-level governance processes, the recognition and/or devolution of rights and responsibilities, and structural and institutional change. These platforms tend to be created or formalised by governance institutions, and intentionally embedded and/or directly connected to wider projects or programmes.	Platforms embedded in broad contexts of relative equality may only need low or medium intensity to achieve equity-related goals. A highly embedded platform in a context of inequality, however, may not have a wider impact if it places little or no importance on changing the status quo by addressing power inequalities (low intensity).
High intensity and embeddedness	Cases that allow for structural and institutional changes, and are characterised by high levels of participation, significant emphasis on inclusivity, and a focus on empowerment. They tend to be integrated with multi-level governance processes and intentionally embedded and/or directly connected to wider projects or programmes.	Will help to address power inequalities beyond the platform itself

Adapted from Hewlett et al., 2021.

There are a series of different reasons supporting analytical engagement with multi-stakeholder processes through their intensity and embeddedness (Hewlett et al., 2021). The authors have previously posited that the resilience and capacity of such processes to support change are hindered when local people are not acknowledged as primary partners and agents of change (as opposed to mere "beneficiaries"), and when the forum and/or its outcomes lack meaningful institutionalisation (Larson et al., 2021). Intensity and embeddedness are helpful concepts to reach more explanatory and insightful conclusions as to how and why a multi-stakeholder process may have particular outcomes.

CASE STUDIES

LAND GOVERNANCE PARTNERSHIPS MODELS IN ALBANIA, COLOMBIA, KYRGYZSTAN, THE PHILIPPINES, SIERRA LEONE AND UGANDA

This section reviews six different partnerships across six countries. By identifying the constraints and bottlenecks in these collaborations, the authors aim to reinforce the lessons learned from their review and examine more of the key enabling characteristics for effective partnerships. Their examination of these cases – based on a combination of a desk review and interviews with key actors involved in each partnership – produced insights into the strategies, mechanisms, and outcomes of multi-stakeholder engagement in addressing complex land and resource governance challenges. Leveraging these insights, the International Land Coalition (ILC) and Land Collaborative partners will be able to support their network of partnerships and platforms towards the goal of enabling people-centred land governance.

CASE STUDIES AT A GLANCE

The six case studies presented in this section were selected with ILC staff. They highlight different partnership models between governments and civil society organisations for improved land governance. Spanning across ILC's priority regions, the case studies include two from Africa (Sierra Leone and Uganda), two from Asia (the Philippines and Kyrgyzstan), one from Europe (Albania), and one from Latin America (Colombia). The research is based on a review of relevant literature available online and provided by partnership participants and key informant interviews with representatives from organisations involved in the six partnerships. These initiatives are all aimed at supporting people-centred land governance but include different areas of focus, including the implementation of the VGGTs, sustainable land and resource management, and women's land rights, among others.

Some of these partnerships are part of larger initiatives, such as the Stand for Her Land (S4HL) campaign in Uganda and the Multipurpose Cadaster project in Colombia. Others, like the implementation of the VGGTs and the National Land Policy in Sierra Leone, were established through government frameworks, while some were driven by CSOs and other institutions like the NLC Albania and NLC Kyrgyzstan. Additionally, the structures of these partnerships vary: some have formal governance frameworks, like the NLCs, whereas others operate through more informal participation, such as ARDKPP in the Philippines. These initiatives involve a wide range of stakeholders, and their significant achievements include policy developments, capacity development, and enhanced community participation. Below, summaries are presented for each of the case studies.

ALBANIA

THE NATIONAL LAND COALITION (NLC)

The National Land Coalition (NLC) of Albania, established in 2014, is a multi-stakeholder platform dedicated to promoting sustainable forest governance and land management. Led by Albania's National Federation of Communal Forests and Pastures (NFCFPA), the partnership includes national and local government agencies, civil society organisations, academic institutions, and international partners. The NLC focuses on policy influence, capacity development, and advocacy for the legal recognition of community forest rights. By involving diverse stakeholders and leveraging ILC's commitments to people-centred land governance, the NLC aims to secure community forest rights, tackle economic poverty, and ensure sustainable forest management, thereby mitigating the climate crisis and reversing biodiversity loss. It has a well-defined theory of change, with strategic objectives and activities. The Albanian government plays a pivotal role in the NLC, with key agencies such as the Ministry of Tourism and Environment, the National Forestry Agency, and local municipalities actively participating in policy development, support, and facilitation. The partnership employs collaborative frameworks, direct engagement with government officials, field visits for government representatives, and policy recommendations to high-level officials. The core vision of the partnership is to establish a strong collaborative relationship with the government, embedding sustainable practices and community rights into forestry policy. The government co-chairs the Coordination and Consultative Committee, ensuring that the NLC's views are considered in policy and law formulation processes. Through these efforts, the partnership helps align national policies with local needs, enhances sustainable forestry management, and strengthens community rights. This collaborative effort ensures that the platform's insights and proposals are considered at the highest levels of decision-making. The platform's success is attributed to its inclusive approach, strong multi-stakeholder engagement, evidence-based advocacy, and dynamic governance structure. Key achievements include influencing national forestry policies, enhancing women's participation in forest governance, and building robust partnerships. Challenges such as engaging slow-moving government bodies, managing diverse stakeholder expectations, and ensuring sustainable funding have been addressed through advocacy, capacity development initiatives, and adaptive management strategies. Lessons learned from this partnership emphasise the importance of inclusive stakeholder engagement, building trust and common goals, conflict resolution strategies, and effective policy advocacy.

COLOMBIA**STRENGTHENING LOCAL COMMUNITY CAPACITIES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MULTIPURPOSE CADASTER**

The project to strengthen local community capacities in the implementation of the Multipurpose Cadaster in Colombia is part of a broader initiative supported by the World Bank and other international partners. Spanning 2023 and 2024 and focused on the Montes de María region in northern Colombia, this project aims to enhance land governance through capacity development, participatory methods, and inter-institutional coordination. The partners include the Agustín Codazzi Geographic Institute (IGAC), the World Bank and the Center for Research and Popular Education (CINEP). The latter partner worked more closely with the rural, Indigenous, and Afro-Colombian communities who were the key stakeholders in the partnership's work. The government's role is key in the implementation of the Multipurpose Cadaster as it aims to update its territorial information by 2025. This makes it a priority for state institutions to develop a geographical information system that supports decision-making and public policy development, promoting social justice, transparency, and actions against inequality to achieve peace. The need to involve communities in cadastral operations is a central goal of the IGAC, the highest cadastral authority (Decree 148/2020). The IGAC plays a crucial role in this partnership, ensuring that cadastral updates comply with national standards and meet local community needs by integrating community knowledge through a methodology that fosters dialogue and participation. The project, part of the Intercultural School of Geography for Life, operates under IGAC's guidance, with a monitoring framework focused on operational aspects. IGAC collaborates with various government entities and with local and regional entities to create an enabling environment for community stakeholders to be recognised by agencies with cadastral responsibilities. The project emphasises the participation of historically marginalised groups, such as women and youth, in cadastral processes. It successfully met several of its initial goals, including capacity development for communities and raising awareness about the Multipurpose Cadaster. Notable achievements have included significant community engagement, important educational milestones, and fostering local ownership of the cadastral process. However, the project has faced challenges such as inter-institutional coordination, unresolved power dynamics, resource management issues, and communication gaps. These obstacles were addressed through regular meetings, dialogue, and enhanced coordination mechanisms. Despite these challenges, the project demonstrated the critical importance for partnerships of strong government support and international cooperation in achieving its objectives. CINEP facilitated effective communication and coordination among stakeholders, ensuring that the voices and needs of local communities were central to the project's implementation.

KYRGYZSTAN**THE NLC ON SUSTAINABLE LAND AND GOVERNANCE**

The National Engagement Strategy (NES) and National Land Coalition (NLC) in Kyrgyzstan focus on sustainable land, forest, and water management through multi-stakeholder engagement. Established in 2018, this platform includes local community organisations, government agencies, and international partners. It aims to address natural resource degradation by promoting equitable access, capacity development, and collaborative governance. Significant achievements include the issuing of land ownership certificates, community-based management plans and a concept for agroforestry development in Kyrgyzstan for 2022–2050. The platform operates through a bottom-up approach, ensuring active participation from all stakeholders and beneficiaries. Governance and coordination are managed by a host organisation (KAFLU) and a steering committee, ensuring effective representation and collaboration. The partnership between the platform and government was based on a memorandum of understanding (MoU) with a commitment to work together following the framework of the strategy engagement plan that is in line with the government's regulations. The government's role was to develop and revise the legislation on tenure rights based on recommendations from the partnership that could provide a significant positive impact to land/forest/water users. Despite facing challenges such as scheduling conflicts, political instability, and financial constraints, participants note that the platform has successfully promoted sustainable land management practices and improved the socio-economic well-being of local communities. Lessons learned from the platform highlight the importance of continuous capacity development, strong local involvement, and robust relationships with government agencies. Clear strategic plans, shared goals, and collaborative efforts are essential for effective partnerships. The platform's adaptability and consistent engagement with stakeholders have been instrumental in overcoming obstacles and achieving its objectives.

PHILIPPINES**AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT KNOWLEDGE AND POLICY PLATFORM (ARDKPP)**

The Agriculture and Rural Development Knowledge and Policy Platform (ARDKPP) in the Philippines is a multi-stakeholder partnership aimed at addressing hunger and poverty conditions among rural populations. The initiative to create the platform started in 2014 during the International Year of Family Farming (IYFF) within the framework of IFAD's Knowledge Learning Market and Policy Engagement (KLMPE). In 2017, the ARDKPP was formally established as the technical working group. The ARDKPP brings together farmers' organisations, civil society groups, universities, international organisations, and government agencies. Over the years, the platform has produced outputs including policy briefs, proposals, major event declarations, and books on best practices. Although not formally structured, the ARDKPP operates through voluntary participation and is co-chaired by the national farmers' federation PAKISAMA and other core members. The platform's focus on inclusive stakeholder engagement and continuous monitoring has ensured the implementation of a strong participatory approach, though its impact is primarily seen through annual events rather than long-term structural changes. The initiative also targets historically marginalised groups, such as women, Indigenous Peoples, and youth, ensuring their active participation in policy dialogues. One of its major achievements is the Philippine Action Plan for Family Farmers (PAP4FF) 2019–2028, developed with broad stakeholder input. The government plays the role of lead agency for implementing the PAP4FF, with the mandate to develop the capacities of farm and fishing stakeholders. Government actors have also convened different stakeholders with the same objective and vision in developing the family farming National Action Plan for the country. Through this process, government actors were able to convene CSOs, private sector actors, and local government units. However, the government's limited engagement, insufficient budgetary resources, and the need to continually align with new leadership have challenged further processes. Despite these challenges, participants attribute the platform's success to its common agenda, openness, donor facilitation, enabling policies, and resource pooling from various sectors.

SIERRA LEONE**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE VGGTS AND NATIONAL LAND POLICY**

The partnership to support the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries, and Forests (VGGTs) and the National Land Policy in Sierra Leone addresses pressures on effective land and natural resource governance. Initiated in 2009, the partnership involves ministries including the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Environment, CSOs, and international partners such as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the German Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture. Launched in 2014, the VGGTs guide the government's reforms by anchoring the VGGTs within government structures through a formal governance framework, including the creation of a multi-stakeholder platform to support sustainability and land management issues. The initiative has led to significant policy developments, including the National Land Policy, which emphasises human dignity, fair access to land, and the protection of women's land rights. The project focuses on capacity development, legal literacy, and participatory land mapping. Key successes include the formation of Community Management Associations in coastal communities to improve governance in the fishing sector, aligning Sierra Leone's Fisheries Act and policy with the VGGTs, community-based forest management implementation, the development of a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, and regular Consultative and Coordinative Committee (CCC) meetings, which ensure continuous stakeholder engagement and feedback. Despite these successes, the partnership faced challenges including delays in technical working groups, difficulties in reaching consensus among ministries, and different perspectives on ways forward among technical staff. The government took leadership in initiating the process by requesting support to pilot the VGGTs. It played a technical role through the different ministries represented in the technical working group, and in the governance of the partnership through an interministerial task force. The interministerial task force was the top-most decision-making body and held quarterly meetings to review and endorse technical briefs and key issues submitted by the Technical Working Group and Steering Committee. The government was the host of the secretariat for the implementation of the VGGTs, hosted in the Ministry of Lands.

UGANDA**STAND FOR HER LAND (S4HL) CAMPAIGN**

The S4HL Campaign in Uganda, part of a global initiative, aims to bridge the gap between policy and implementation to help women claim their land rights. Launched in December 2021, the campaign involves grassroots women's organisations, CSOs, government ministries, and international partners. The campaign emphasises the development of legal literacy, changing social norms, and enhancing women's participation in land governance. The strategy is two-fold: to empower rights-holders to articulate their concerns, and to strengthen duty bearers' capacities to deliver on women's land rights mandates. Significant achievements include the issuance of land ownership certificates to rural families and improved perceptions of land use beyond financial collateral. The global goal of S4HL is to secure land rights for 10 million women in 10 countries over 10 years through advocacy, social communications, and coordinated activities. The campaign's governance and coordination are managed by a steering committee coordinated by Landesa at the global level, with a country-level steering committee in Uganda ensuring effective stakeholder representation. The campaign's success is attributed to its bottom-up approach, strong local involvement, and continuous capacity development efforts, leading to more inclusive and gender-responsive land governance. Building strong relationships with the government, having sustainable funding, and setting clear, tangible outputs have also been crucial to its success. However, the campaign faces challenges such as directive rather than consultative enforcement of regulations, donor dependence, and unclear sustainability and exit plans. Social norms, cultural practices, and bureaucratic processes also hinder further progress. To tackle these challenges, the campaign leverages existing women's land rights movements and engages with local leaders to challenge discriminatory practices and policies. The government provided political will and space for CSOs in the country to engage with it. It provided support to the campaign at the national level through the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development, which is the lead agency on matters related to women's land rights. The government was key in developing the capacities of other participants in policy review processes, including workshops. Government officials were also recipients of capacity development interventions aimed at strengthening their capacities to implement laws on women's land rights.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

The six case studies hold similarities and differences in their approaches to land governance, community empowerment, and sustainable resource management. While they share common goals, the strategies, stakeholders, and outcomes vary significantly across the cases. This section approaches the six partnerships comparatively by deploying two of the typologies discussed earlier in this review. It starts with intensity and embeddedness (Hewlett et al., 2021) and then moves on to engage with each partnership through the four programme theories for multi-stakeholder platforms (Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020) described in the review.

INTENSITY AND EMBEDDEDNESS

The following analysis present the cases highlighting the varying degrees of intensity and embeddedness in their efforts to promote equitable and effective people-centred land governance.

Albania – Intensity: High / Embeddedness: Medium

Intensity: The NLC Albania demonstrates high intensity due to its focus on empowerment, inclusivity, and addressing structural inequalities. The coalition engages a wide range of stakeholders, including local forest users, women, youth, and broader local communities, ensuring broad participation and representation. Key strategies such as capacity development, inclusive stakeholder engagement, participatory planning, and advocacy for the legal recognition of forest rights highlight the coalition's commitment to equity and empowering marginalised groups. The NLC's theory of change and multi-year action plan (2023–2025) further emphasise its strategic approach to influencing policies and legal frameworks. Regular Consultative and Coordinative Committee meetings and periodic reviews ensure ongoing management, continuous engagement, and the effective tracking of progress, aligning with indicators of high intensity.

Embeddedness: The platform is moderately embedded within national and international frameworks, with ongoing efforts towards deeper integration and structural changes. The coalition aligns with national policies and international guidelines, such as the VGGTs, and involves stakeholders at subnational, national, and international levels. Recent achievements, such as the approval of various decisions by the Council of Ministers related to forest inspection, protection, and user rights, demonstrate progress towards embedding sustainable forest management practices. However, the extent of realised changes in local participation and control over resources is still evolving. These ongoing efforts reflect the coalition's commitment to embedding sustainable practices within Albania's societal and governmental frameworks, as well as its efforts to fulfil its structural and institutional objectives.

Colombia – Intensity: Medium / Embeddedness: Medium

Intensity: The partnership demonstrates medium intensity. It places significant emphasis on capacity development and community engagement, targeting peasant, Indigenous, and Afro-descendent communities in Northern Colombia. It uses participatory methods and aims to include marginalised groups, such as women and youth, to address social inequalities. While the project involves specific measures for inclusivity and empowerment, its five-month duration restricts the potential for long-term structural changes. The partners promote rights recognition and respect by supporting communities in understanding and participating in cadastral processes, though it does not directly negotiate resource rights. Additionally, the project encourages elements of co-management by integrating community knowledge and participation in the cadastral updates, although it remains within a structured framework rather than full co-management. Despite the operational focus, the project successfully maintains regular coordination, and involves continuous monitoring and evaluation to adapt its work based on feedback. These efforts, though impactful within the project's timeframe, align with medium intensity due to their specific, short-term goals and operational constraints.

Embeddedness: The partnership holds a medium level of integration within national and international frameworks. The project aligns with Colombia's Multipurpose Cadaster policy and is part of the larger Intercultural School of Geography for Life initiative led by IGAC. It benefits from substantial political support and financial backing from international organisations, indicating significant connections to wider policies and guidelines. The project operates through an inter-institutional coordination mechanism, involving regular meetings and collaboration among key stakeholders, but it is informal and not institutionalised. This operational character limits the achievement of deeper structural changes. While the project is well-entrenched within the current national policy framework and promotes local participation, efforts are needed to achieve the institutionalisation and integration of the partnership into broader land governance structures, reflecting a medium level of embeddedness.

Kyrgyzstan – Intensity: High / Embeddedness: Medium

Intensity: The NLC Kyrgyzstan emphasises empowering local communities, increasing their access to and control over natural resources and enhancing their involvement in decision-making. The platform integrates traditional land users into policy discussions and capacity development initiatives. Structured operations are maintained through the Coordination Council, which holds regular monitoring and evaluation meetings. CSOs have agreements with the government through MoUs. The platform's advocacy and policy influence have led to tangible changes, including a draft concept of the development of agroforestry in Kyrgyzstan (2022–2050) and the Law on Forest Use, empowering local communities to manage resources effectively. It actively involves marginalised groups, including women and youth, ensuring

the participation of at least 30% women in decision-making processes and capacity development programmes. Despite challenges including political and bureaucratic hurdles, the platform's high intensity is based on its comprehensive efforts to recognise rights, empower local communities, and address inequalities to influence policy changes.

Embeddedness: This platform exhibits substantial integration within national frameworks and efforts to influence policy and practice at multiple levels. The platform aligns with key national policies, promoting sustainable land and resource management practices across Kyrgyzstan. It actively engages with various governance levels, involving subnational, national, and international stakeholders. The platform operates through formal coordination mechanisms and has established structures like the Coordination Council, facilitating structured and consistent operations. For example, the Coordination Council includes heads of ILC member organisations in Kyrgyzstan and plays a crucial role in strategic direction. Despite these structured operations, the platform faces challenges in achieving broader policy integration due to coordination issues and political changes. However, the platform's substantial connections to national policies and frameworks demonstrate a medium level of embeddedness, with concrete results such as successful advocacy for policy changes and the implementation of community-based management plans.

Philippines – Intensity: Medium / Embeddedness: Medium

Intensity: This platform is characterised by a balanced approach to stakeholder engagement and policy advocacy. IFAD took the lead in using the annual Knowledge Learning Market and Policy Engagement (KLMPE) event to gather a diverse range of actors once a year, fostering dialogue and knowledge exchange. It has made significant strides in advocating for family farming through the development of the Philippine Action Plan for Family Farming (PAP4FF), demonstrating a robust commitment to policy influence. The platform ensures the participation of marginalised groups, including women, youth, and Indigenous Peoples, in its discussions and policy recommendations. However, it faces challenges in maintaining continuous engagement and follow-through on its initiatives. The limited frequency of meetings, resource constraints, and inconsistent government participation indicate a medium level of intensity. While the platform makes substantial efforts to empower stakeholders and address inequalities, its impact is moderated by operational and structural challenges, preventing it from achieving a high intensity rating.

Embeddedness: The platform is moderately embedded in both national and international frameworks. Building on the momentum from the International Year of Family Farming (IYFF) in 2014, it aims to align global initiatives with its national agenda. The platform facilitates the annual KLMPE event, which brings together diverse stakeholders, including government agencies, CSOs, NGOs, and academic institutions.

One of the ARDKPP's notable achievements is the formulation of the PAP4FF, showcasing its ability to drive policy advocacy and stakeholder collaboration. However, the platform lacks a formal legal mandate and consistent government support, limiting its deeper integration into existing institutional frameworks. The sporadic engagement and reliance on voluntary participation further indicate a medium level of embeddedness, reflecting significant but not fully institutionalised integration into broader governance structures.

Sierra Leone – Intensity: High / Embeddedness: Medium

Intensity: This partnership demonstrates high intensity through its multifaceted approach to improving land governance. The project integrates VGGT principles into the National Land Policy, providing a framework for equitable governance. However, enforcing these agreements uniformly across all levels of government can be challenging, requiring continuous oversight and capacity development. The project's ongoing management includes periodic evaluations and continuous efforts to build on successive phases. The formalised governance structure ensures regular coordination and dialogue among stakeholders, sustaining the project's momentum and contributing to its long-term success.

However, challenges remain in maintaining consistent stakeholder engagement and ensuring that the periodic evaluations effectively inform subsequent phases. The project supports increased rights to resources through advocacy and policy influence, resulting in tangible changes. These include the establishment of village land committees and the use of mapping technologies like Open Tenure/ Solutions for Open Land Administration (SOLA) to document customary lands. These initiatives have empowered local communities, particularly women and marginalised groups, to assert their rights and participate actively in land governance. Despite these successes, the project faces challenges in ensuring the sustainability of these initiatives, particularly in terms of ongoing funding and the capacities of local institutions to maintain and expand these efforts.

Embeddedness: This case study exhibits a medium level of embeddedness, reflecting substantial integration within both national and international frameworks. The project aligns with key national policies like the National Land Policy and international frameworks like the VGGTs, demonstrating significant entanglement with national and international stakeholders. The formalised governance structure, including the VGGT Secretariat hosted by the Ministry of Lands, anchors the project within government structures, enhancing its sustainability and institutionalisation. The project is intentionally designed to fit within broader frameworks, including national and international policies, promoting participation and inclusivity in land governance. It is directly connected to wider policies and guidelines, integrating the VGGTs into the National Land Policy. However, the project faces challenges in achieving deeper structural changes and the enforcement of regulations. Additionally, it promotes local participation in decision-making and control over resources, though the full extent of these changes is still developing.

The coordination challenges at the local level and the ongoing political changes pose significant hurdles. Despite being embedded in broader international and national policies, this case's integration at the local level requires further efforts to achieve comprehensive structural and institutional reforms, reflecting a medium level of embeddedness.

Uganda – Intensity: High / Embeddedness: Medium

Intensity: The S4HL Campaign exhibits high intensity through its robust approach to enabling women to claim their land rights. The campaign employs a rights-based approach, using tools such as educational workshops, radio talk shows, policy review sessions, and community engagement to empower women and develop their land governance capacities. It emphasises inclusive stakeholder engagement and participatory methods, involving women in policy dialogues. Elements of co-management are present as the campaign integrates community knowledge and participation, creating a shared responsibility in advocating for women's land rights. One of the key achievements is the establishment of a Customary Land Registry, which was initiated in 2020 due to long-term engagement and advocacy.

Guidelines have been created for integrating this registry into the National Land System, formalising land ownership for women. Formal agreements and coordination mechanisms highlight the binding nature of agreements among stakeholders. The campaign has established strong partnerships, regular coordination through its steering committee, and continuous monitoring and evaluation, supporting adaptability and improvement based on feedback. However, the campaign faces challenges, particularly the limited five-year timeframe which constrains the potential for long-term structural changes. Additionally, achieving deeper structural changes and addressing entrenched social norms remain significant hurdles. Despite these challenges, the comprehensive focus on empowerment, equity, and inclusion, along with the binding nature of agreements and formal coordination mechanisms, solidifies the S4HL campaign's high intensity rating.

Embeddedness: This case demonstrates a medium level of embeddedness through its integration within national and international frameworks. Coordinated by the Uganda Community Based Association for Women and Children's Welfare (UCOBAC), the campaign aligns with key national policies which support women's land rights. It also builds on opportunities like the National Land Policy and the Land Sector Strategic Plan (LSSP II). Internationally, the campaign is part of the global Stand for Her Land initiative, which provides strategic and technical support, connecting it to wider global policies and guidelines on women's land rights and sustainable development. While the campaign benefits from substantial political and institutional support and operates through formal coordination mechanisms, it faces challenges in achieving deeper structural changes, particularly in the enforcement of regulations and transformation of social norms.

Therefore, its embeddedness is rated as medium due to its strong alignment with national and international policies, inclusion of international funding, and intentional integration with multi-level governance processes, without having been able to create significant structural change in existing institutions. Additionally, entrenched social norms and cultural practices continue to pose significant barriers to fully institutionalising gender equity in land governance.

THEORIES OF CHANGE AND PRACTICES

The analysis reveals both similarities and differences in how partnerships leverage programme theories to achieve their goals. The case studies often combine multiple programme theories, demonstrating that integrating different paradigms can significantly enhance the effectiveness of initiatives. This approach allows them to address complex socio-environmental issues comprehensively by engaging diverse stakeholders, promoting participatory decision-making, and ensuring social inclusion and sustainability. As noted by Sarmiento Barletti et al. (2020), securing local buy-in to multi-stakeholder processes is essential for achieving sustainable and resilient change through mechanisms such as sustainability, livelihoods, participation, and multi-level coordination.

Several case studies illustrate the benefits of integrating enhanced participatory decision-making and multi-level governance. For instance, case studies in Albania and the Philippines employ these paradigms to foster inclusive stakeholder engagement and collaborative decision-making across different governance levels. These platforms successfully bring together government agencies, CSOs, and local communities to promote sustainable land use and resource management. In Uganda and Colombia, they align with enhanced participatory decision-making by empowering local communities, particularly women and marginalised groups, through capacity-building.

In Sierra Leone and Kyrgyzstan, there was an emphasis on the sustainability-social inclusion paradigm alongside enhanced participatory decision-making or multi-level governance. The Sierra Leone initiative focuses on implementing the VGGTs to promote sustainable and responsible governance of natural resources, involving a wide range of stakeholders in the process. Kyrgyzstan also highlights sustainability and social inclusion by promoting equitable access to natural resources and addressing issues related to climate change and resource degradation. These platforms ensure that historically marginalised groups are actively involved and benefit from sustainable land management practices. Overall, the integration of multiple programme theories is crucial for addressing the complex challenges of land governance and resource management. For more detailed analysis, see Table 8.

Table 8: Integration of programme theories in case studies

CASESTUDY	PROGRAMMETHEORY	RATIONALE
Albania	Multi-level governance	Inclusion of various stakeholders from national and subnational governments, CSOs, academic institutions, and international partners. Focus on multi-stakeholder dialogue, inclusive decision-making, and advocacy for legal recognition of forest rights. Promotes collaborative frameworks and enhances local ownership of forest governance initiatives.
	Enhanced participatory decision-making	Emphasis on inclusive stakeholder engagement, participatory planning, and capacity development for forest management. Objectives include securing community forest rights, promoting sustainable forest management, and ensuring participation of women and marginalised groups. Aims to empower local communities, improve sustainable land use practices, and reduce vulnerabilities.
Colombia	Enhanced participatory decision-making	Focuses on building the capacities of peasant, Indigenous, and Afro-descendant communities in land governance and cadastral processes. Utilises on-site training, participatory methods, and community engagement, particularly targeting marginalised groups such as women and youth. Aims to empower communities to actively participate in the Multipurpose Cadaster, promoting sustainable land use and community capacity development.
Uganda	Enhanced participatory decision-making	Empowers women by enabling legal literacy, addressing social norms, and strengthening the participation of grassroots women in land governance. Promotes community engagement and capacity development, aiming to give women more control over land resources and to improve their involvement in land governance processes.
	Sustainability-social inclusion	Addresses social norms and cultural practices preventing women from accessing, owning, and controlling land. Emphasises the importance of social inclusion by focusing on historically marginalised groups, particularly women, integrating sustainable land use practices with social inclusion goals. Aims for a more inclusive and sustainable approach to land governance.
Sierra Leone	Sustainability-social inclusion	Aims to improve the governance of natural resources by implementing VGGT principles. Focuses on sustainable and responsible governance of land, fisheries, and forests, targeting women and other historically marginalised groups for capacity-building and advocacy. Involves a wide range of stakeholders to incorporate local perspectives into governance practices, promoting sustainable land use.
	Enhanced participatory decision-making	Emphasises inclusive stakeholder engagement, capacity development, and empowering local communities. Establishes a multi-stakeholder platform to promote participatory decision-making and give local communities greater control over land governance processes. Implements extensive training programmes and awareness campaigns to enhance local stakeholders' capacity.
Kyrgyzstan	Sustainability-social inclusion	Focuses on promoting safe and equitable access to natural resources through advocacy, dialogue, knowledge exchange, and capacity-building. Addresses natural resource degradation, climate change, and community needs, with emphasis on gender balance and social inclusion. Ensures that marginalised groups participate in and benefit from sustainable land management practices.

CASESTUDY	PROGRAMMETHEORY	RATIONALE
	Multi-level governance	Operates as a national multi-stakeholder platform involving local communities, NGOs, donor organisations, and government bodies. Promotes collaboration and coordination among stakeholders to align policies and practices across governance levels. Engages government representatives, civil society, and local communities in policy development and implementation.
Philippines	Enhanced participatory decision-making	Facilitates multi-stakeholder engagement and participatory dialogue among government agencies, CSOs, farmers' organisations, intergovernmental organisations, and academia. Organises annual KLMPE event to share best practices, discuss policy recommendations, and engage in dialogue. Involves stakeholders in planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation, with an inclusive approach during the development of the Philippine Action Plan for Family Farming (PAP4FF).
	Multi-level governance	Operates as a multi-stakeholder, multi-level governance initiative involving various levels of governance. Engages government representatives, civil society, and local communities in policy development and implementation. Develops and promotes PAP4FF to foster collaborative governance structures that integrate diverse perspectives and expertise.

LESSONS

This section synthesises the key lessons for fostering more effective and equitable partnerships, drawing from both the literature review and the insights gained from the six case studies previously discussed. While not exhaustive, these lessons highlight significant trends identified in the literature and prior research by the authors (Sarmiento Barletti and Larson, 2019; Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020; Hewlett et al., 2021).

CONTEXT (STILL) MATTERS

Partnerships do not occur in isolation; their organisers and facilitators must possess a deep understanding of the contexts in which they operate. The existing characteristics of these contexts can significantly influence the work and outcomes of the partnerships (Cornwall, 2001, 2003; Escobar, 2006; Mosse, 2001, 2004).

An important lesson from the literature on multi-stakeholder collaborations is the need to acknowledge the historical landscape where they are implemented or aim to have an impact. Geographical, political, socio-cultural, and economic contexts uniquely shape the implementation and outcomes of multi-stakeholder partnerships. Tailoring initiatives to specific socio-political and economic contexts enhances their relevance and effectiveness. For example, post-conflict recovery in Sierra Leone required comprehensive land reform, while in the Philippines high agricultural dependency drove the need for coordinated policy advocacy. Historical land conflicts and the 2016 Peace Agreement between the government and the former Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) in Colombia highlighted the necessity of effective cadastral processes and community participation, making the Multipurpose Cadaster a key tool for achieving *"Peace with Legality"* and advancing equity; while Kyrgyzstan's post-Soviet transition and traditional land use practices influenced its sustainable resource management initiatives. This contextual knowledge should encompass governance issues affecting the land sector, including existing multi-stakeholder processes aimed at enabling change within specific landscapes. For instance, gender disparities in Uganda and Albania's forest dependency shape their respective initiatives. Addressing cultural and social barriers, such as gender disparities in Uganda, has led to more inclusive and equitable outcomes, ensuring that marginalised groups benefit from the initiatives.

This historical awareness must also encompass an understanding of how previous governance systems and related actors have influenced the issues that the partnership aims to address (Waylen et al., 2023; Omoding et al., 2020; Ayivor et al., 2020). Understanding the formal and informal governance processes at play in the specific landscape, along with the actors who influence and are influenced by these processes, is crucial. Partnerships require this knowledge to avoid initiating new processes in contexts where existing institutions, platforms, and networks of collaboration already exist (Kusters et al., 2020; Musakwa et al., 2020; Falayi et al., 2020). The particularities of socio-political life in various contexts, while potentially sharing similarities, are shaped by the historical construction of place-based identities, which in turn are influenced by prior socio-political processes and external forces. Recognising and understanding how history has positively or negatively shaped the relationships between participants is crucial (Cockburn et al., 2020). In the realm of land governance, this includes processes such as colonisation, evictions, conflicts, and violence, as well as collaboration and allyship. These historical interactions among potential partners will affect the partnership's dynamics (Cardini, 2006). Therefore, it is advisable to openly discuss any prior history with potential partners to leverage past experiences effectively and mitigate potential downsides. This approach should be framed as a constructive endeavour to transparently communicate any existing or past working relationships between individuals or organisations.

PARTNERSHIPS NEED A CLEAR, CO-PRODUCED THEORY OF CHANGE AND MECHANISMS TO MONITOR THEIR PROGRESS

Partnerships must have a clear theory of change that aligns the objectives of the partners involved, aiming for a commonly set goal while maintaining flexibility through learning loops to adapt to the often-changing political and other contexts that frame land governance (Favretto et al., 2020).

The co-production of a partnership's theory of change and the collaborative monitoring of its progress through learning loops offer opportunities to practise transparency and trust-building. Partnerships would also benefit from involving non-participant stakeholders (ranging from government sectors that are not in the partnership to representative organisations of Indigenous Peoples and local communities) in these learning loops, incorporating their knowledge systems into ongoing governance processes (Williams et al., 2020; Cockburn et al., 2020).

Each case study was designed to address specific issues in land governance and resource management. For instance, Sierra Leone aimed to align international practices with national reforms in a post-civil war context. The Philippines sought to improve rural livelihoods through policy advocacy in an annual knowledge exchange event, focusing on family farming issues.

Uganda targeted securing women's land rights amidst gender disparity, while Kyrgyzstan promoted sustainable resource management in response to natural resource degradation. Albania aimed to enhance forest management and mitigate the climate crisis, and Colombia's cadaster project aimed to improve land governance through enhanced community participation and capacity-building, addressing historical land conflicts. Lessons from the case studies demonstrate that designing projects that respond to specific local challenges and opportunities, such as post-conflict recovery in Sierra Leone and gender issues in Uganda, enhances their impact and relevance. Clearly defining the purpose of partnerships, as demonstrated in these case studies, helps align stakeholder efforts and resources toward common goals.

However, they all have different approaches to theories of change. Sierra Leone follows VGGT principles to guide government reforms but does not currently hold a formal theory of change. Uganda has a global theory of change focused on securing women's land rights. Albania and Kyrgyzstan have strategies and multi-year action plans; the Philippines does not have a formal theory of change but centres its activities around annual events. Colombia lacks a formal theory of change but the partnership is embedded within a broader initiative. While the case studies do not always have a formal theory of change, having guiding frameworks or principles, as seen in Sierra Leone and Uganda, provides direction and coherence. Embedding projects within broader initiatives, as demonstrated in Colombia, can enhance their impact by aligning them with larger goals and resources.

Similarly, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are key to any partnership, ensuring continuous learning, improvement, and accountability. Sierra Leone has established a robust M&E system with regular consultative meetings and annual multi-stakeholder events. Uganda's campaign employs a comprehensive MEAL plan, tracking progress against specific indicators. The Philippines relies on progress reports from core members and thematic group updates, while Kyrgyzstan conducts regular evaluation meetings and progress reviews. Albania uses periodic reviews and stakeholder feedback to monitor progress, although it faces challenges in maintaining sustainable funding and robust M&E frameworks. Colombia employs periodic meetings and engagement feedback to adapt training and implementation strategies but lacks a formal theory of change and comprehensive monitoring of the partnership itself. Implementing comprehensive M&E systems, as seen in Sierra Leone and Uganda, ensures accountability and facilitates continuous improvement. Using feedback to adapt strategies helps address emerging challenges and enhances project effectiveness.

PARTNERSHIPS MUST BE ORGANISED TO ADAPT TO CHANGE

Any theory of change must be developed with the awareness that it will need to adapt to the often-changing contexts in the land sector. The literature shows that the more successful multi-stakeholder processes are those that have built in the need for reflexive and adaptive practices (Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020), including the use of relevant learning tools (Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020; Evans et al., 2021). It is as important to have an institutional flexibility with clear guidelines to allow for the incorporation of new approaches and actors in ways that are meaningful for them (Sanders et al., 2020). Given the often wicked nature of the contexts that frame environmental, land, and resource management in the Global South, Dentoni et al. (2018) note that partnerships need to engage with change in at least three ways. Firstly, for “*knowledge uncertainty*”, partnerships must be open to new sources of knowledge to inform their work, adapting to new information and considering its potential impact (positive or negative) on their goals. Secondly, for “*value conflicts*”, partnerships must be prepared to address potentially conflicting values between actors by acknowledging conflicts that may arise within their lifetime and including mechanisms to address disputes. Finally, for “*continuous adaptation*”, partnerships need to reassess change at different levels that may impact their work, including mechanisms to do so.

This adaptability is reflected in the different governance structures available to partnerships. Of the case studies, Sierra Leone, Kyrgyzstan, Uganda, and Albania have well-established platforms with regular consultative meetings. The Philippines lacks a formal structure, focusing on annual events. Colombia relies on inter-institutional coordination mechanisms for operational purposes. Sierra Leone’s initiative is deeply embedded in government processes, while Colombia’s and Uganda’s projects are part of broader efforts supported by international organisations. Establishing clear and inclusive governance structures facilitates effective coordination and decision-making, enhancing project outcomes. Regular consultative meetings help maintain stakeholder engagement and ensure accountability. Embedding projects in government processes, as seen in Colombia, leads to sustainable results.

PARTNERSHIPS NEED TO BE MULTI-SECTOR (AND EMBEDDED) TO BE EFFECTIVE

The inclusion of different participants must build on the realisation that governments are not monolithic entities; different agencies may have different positions, access to finance, and decision-making power in relation to a partnership’s goals. Partnerships must aim to include the government sectors that make decisions affecting policy and implementation frameworks relevant to the matter at hand (e.g. government agencies for land, environment, and finance).

The positions of civil society actors may also vary, ranging from direct representation or allyship with local actors to supporting agendas linked to their funding sources.

The involvement of actors varies across the six case studies. Government agencies are key stakeholders in all cases but play different roles. In Sierra Leone and Colombia, government ministries have central roles in implementing reforms and policies within the partnership frameworks, while international organisations like FAO and the World Bank provide crucial technical and financial support. CSOs and grassroots organisations are vital in promoting local participation and advocacy, as seen in Uganda, the Philippines, and Colombia. Academic institutions contribute significantly to research and capacity-building, particularly in Kyrgyzstan and Albania. The expertise of academic institutions and international organisations provides valuable technical support and enhances the credibility of projects. This multi-faceted involvement ensures that projects are well-rounded, inclusive, and better equipped to address complex challenges. Lessons from the case studies demonstrate that engaging a diverse range of stakeholders enhances the comprehensiveness and local acceptance of initiatives. Importantly, this range is important as it will support the embedding of partnerships in existing governance structures and the alignment of their objectives with existing policy frameworks and priorities (Jansen and Kalas, 2020).

PARTNERSHIPS MUST WANT (AND HAVE THE TOOLS) TO BE INCLUSIVE

Previous research has evidenced that despite acknowledging the power inequalities between the participants in a platform, their organisers rarely had inclusion strategies that went beyond “*bringing people around a table*” (Larson et al., 2021; Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2021). Unsurprisingly, these inequalities and experiences of exclusion are harder to address in cases where there are already historically marginalised groups (e.g. Indigenous Peoples and local communities) and groups within those groups (e.g. women and youth) that tend to be less represented in their own land governance processes.

In the case studies, the integration of gender equity and social inclusion components varies. Often partnerships focused more on their goals than their internal structures. For example, Sierra Leone and Uganda strongly emphasise women’s land rights, legal literacy, and social norms transformation. Albania focuses on gender justice in forest governance, promoting women’s participation in decision-making processes. The Philippines includes gender and social inclusion in its annual gatherings and thematic areas, involving historically marginalised groups such as women, youth, and landless farmers. Colombia’s cadaster project emphasizes the participation of rural women and youth, incorporating gender-focused variables in registration instruments to ensure accurate record-keeping related to women.

A strong emphasis on women's rights and participation leads to more inclusive and equitable outcomes.

Ensuring the participation of marginalised groups, as demonstrated in Colombia, enhances the legitimacy and sustainability of initiatives. The NLC cases show a focus on both internal and external aspects. Kyrgyzstan ensures at least 30% women's participation in all activities, addressing gender gaps and promoting women's involvement in natural resource management. Similarly, Albania promotes participation in decision-making, with 35% women members in the Coordination and Consultative Committee, emphasising both gender justice in forest governance and internal gender balance within the platform. Importantly, this approach to inclusiveness will support the nurturing of local ownership of the partnership's work and objectives, making it more likely that its work will continue even after its lifetime (Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020). This requires effectively integrating local perspectives, knowledge, and aspirations into the partnership's work, as in, for example, a collaboratively developed theory of change (Graham, 2020). In some multi-stakeholder platforms, this integration has also been carried out through the implementation of parallel meetings for specific stakeholder groups to coordinate their positions before bringing their proposals in a more organised manner to the main interactions with other partners (Gonzales Tovar et al., 2021; Gonzales Tovar et al., 2022).

This is yet another reminder of the importance of a partnership's process. As noted in the review, approaches that consciously work to support inclusivity can create benefits that go beyond equity and rights by creating alignment, openness, trust, and co-learning that may shift dissimilar perceptions held by partners (Wolford, 2010); and more balanced voices to inform decision-making or a project's implementation method. The strategies employed in each case vary based on their specific goals and contexts, yet share common elements that contribute to successful outcomes. Sierra Leone focuses on multi-stakeholder engagement, institutional framework establishment, capacity-building, and public participation to improve land governance. Similarly, the Philippines emphasises inclusive stakeholder engagement, annual events, policy dialogues, and participatory approaches to advocate for rural development. Uganda's campaign centres on empowering rights-holders, strengthening the role of duty-bearers, promoting dialogue, and engaging communities to transform social norms and enhance women's land rights. Kyrgyzstan and Albania employ inclusive stakeholder engagement, participatory planning, capacity development for sustainable management, and evidence-based advocacy. Colombia's cadaster project utilises on-site training, participatory methods, and community engagement to improve land governance.

By engaging stakeholders through inclusive and participatory methods, as seen in the case studies, these initiatives work towards ensuring broad support and effective implementation. The focus on capacity development, as demonstrated in many of the case studies, can empower local communities and enhance

project sustainability. Additionally, the use of evidence-based advocacy, as practised in Kyrgyzstan and Albania, strengthens the credibility and impact of these initiatives. These interconnected strategies collectively contribute to more effective and sustainable land governance.

PARTNERS NEED MECHANISMS (INCLUDING TRANSPARENCY PRACTICES) TO HOLD EACH OTHER ACCOUNTABLE

Building on the previous point, an important way in which partnerships can consciously work towards more equitable and inclusive processes is by including governance mechanisms to hold participants accountable. This is especially important in cases where partnerships are held by rights-holders and duty-bearers (Palacios Llaque and Sarmiento Barletti, 2020; Rodriguez and Sarmiento Barletti, 2020). The inclusion of these mechanisms would be internal and external confirmation of the importance of ensuring a partnership that is not merely symbolic or just a promising method for improved collaboration but one that leads to real impact, including policy changes (Wolford, 2010; Silva-Castañeda, 2015). The introduction of such mechanisms is also an important approach to create trust between a platform's participants, deal with differences, and transform conflicts to promote collaboration (Silva-Castañeda, 2015). Progress in a partnership's work, and any attempt to address power inequalities is challenged by a lack of transparency and trust (Brouwer et al., 2013).

PARTNERS' EXPECTATIONS MUST BE REALISTIC AND MANAGED

Linked to the previous point, an effective partnership must be based on realistic expectations that build on the transparency and trust held by its participants. It is important to establish clear goals and set realistic expectations early on so that all participants understand the potential benefits and compromises associated with the various decisions and pathways that may be taken (Kusters et al., 2020; Hedden-Dunkhorst and Schmitt, 2020). The disconnections between the expectations and capacities of government and civil society actors can lead to conflicting stances as a partnership works towards its goals (Wolford, 2010); as discussed earlier, these disconnections build on the historical interactions between different partners that need to be understood in detail by partnership proponents (Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020). One of the main challenges is the marked differences between groups of stakeholders on what should be the highest priority. This highlights the importance of initial communication effort among partners (Appiah, 2001) and written guidelines including the roles and responsibilities for the different partners and allies (Nindyatmoko et al., 2022).

PARTNERS' ACCESS TO CAPACITIES AND KNOWLEDGE ARE FRAMED BY POWER RELATIONS

Capacity sharing within partnerships encapsulates the notion that each participant harbours distinct competencies worth contributing to the collective endeavour. This process proves most efficacious when integrated seamlessly into joint meetings rather than pursued as discrete endeavours (Dockry, 2015). Within the domain of land governance, while the dissemination of crucial technical proficiencies to the stakeholders that need it remains imperative, commensurate attention must be accorded to fostering capacities aimed at comprehending the underlying rationales behind local land use practices, including socio-cultural norms and local governance.

Effective partnerships need to formulate and implement culturally pertinent internal and external communication strategies, particularly salient in contexts where prevailing power dynamics engender disparate knowledge accessibility among stakeholders (Cockburn et al., 2020). In instances where processes and planning are skewed towards technical expertise, the efficacy of inclusive and culturally relevant communication modes, coupled with targeted facilitation, proves pivotal in fostering inclusivity and facilitating social learning (Fisher et al., 2020). Moreover, it is incumbent upon stakeholders to acknowledge the challenges inherent in integrating local knowledge systems and to devise pathways conducive to mutual learning and the collaborative production of outcomes, thereby recognising the parity of significance accorded to diverse knowledge, experiences, and capacities in effecting change (Schut et al., 2016). The literature shows the challenges in contexts characterised by disparate access to knowledge, evident in instances where multi-stakeholder processes have had conflicts and disagreements stemming from the importance placed on technical solutions (Sanders et al., 2020; Nindyatmoko et al., 2022). This underscores the need for flexibility in accommodating local perspectives to build local legitimacy and address the disparities that may challenge collaboration or exacerbate existing misunderstandings between governmental and civil society actors (Dockry, 2015).

PARTNERSHIPS ARE NOT EASY TO FACILITATE

In essence, the engagement of impartial facilitators and conveners, coupled with adaptive leadership and proficient conflict resolution mechanisms, constitutes a cornerstone in the establishment and sustenance of equitable and efficacious partnerships. Facilitators are crucial actors in supporting partnerships; skillful facilitators will support a partnership in balancing the diverse perspectives of partners within their broader working context (Silva-Castañeda, 2015).

Their role is instrumental in ensuring that stakeholder inputs are evaluated based on their substantive merit rather than the positional authority or perceived influence of the contributors (Schwilch et al., 2012). The literature underscores the importance of engaging neutral facilitators, particularly in contexts where stakeholders hold complex and differing positions (Tamara et al., 2021). The adoption of flexible leadership styles, alongside the establishment of trust, and effective conflict management have also been identified as essential components in fostering successful partnerships (Sanders et al., 2020). The literature presents different examples of facilitation roles (e.g. knowledge brokers, network builders, supporters of collaboration, trust-builders) that academics and some CSOs may hold in balancing power dynamics in platforms in contexts where they are perceived as neutral (Cockburn et al., 2020; Njoroge et al., 2020; Hedden-Dunkhorst and Schmitt, 2020; Kusters et al., 2020).

PARTNERSHIPS TAKE TIME AND MONEY

This lesson ties into all the previous ones. Improved coordination and collaboration require financial resources and realistic timelines. Building trust and mutual learning – central to unlocking the transformative potential in any multi-stakeholder process – take time and repeated interaction among participants (Fisher et al., 2020; Tamara et al., 2021). At the outset of a partnership, an extended period of shared learning, strategising, and dialogue may be necessary (Jansen and Kalas, 2020). Therefore, realistic timelines commensurate with the partnership's aspirations are imperative, along with the resources to establish and sustain it.

Partnership organisers should recognise that not all participants are compensated for their involvement (Larson et al., 2021). These differences need to be understood at the partnership's inception, when organisers and/or facilitators examine the power inequalities (in their different forms) among participants (Brouwer et al., 2013). Furthermore, investing in capacity development, communication strategies, and good facilitators (among other issues discussed earlier) also entail financial investment. Several reviews of multi-stakeholder processes underscore the importance of realistic timeframes and financial investments as key contextual factors influencing their success or failure (Sarmiento Barletti and Larson, 2019; Sarmiento Barletti et al., 2020; Hewlett et al., 2021).

CONCLUSION

The lessons distilled from the literature and six case studies underscore the intricate, context-sensitive nature of fostering effective and equitable partnerships in land governance. These insights emphasise the importance of understanding the unique historical, socio-political, and economic contexts in which partnerships operate. A deep contextual awareness ensures that initiatives are relevant, effective, and sensitive to the specific needs and challenges of the landscapes where they are organised.

Central to the success of these partnerships is the co-production of a clear theory of change, accompanied by robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. The diverse approaches to theories of change across the case studies reveal the value of flexibility and adaptability, tailored to the unique circumstances of each initiative. Continuous learning and adaptability are crucial, as partnerships must navigate land governance issues.

Effective partnerships are characterised by their inclusivity and multi-sectoral engagement. Involving a broad spectrum of stakeholders, from government agencies to civil society organisations, enhances the comprehensiveness and legitimacy of partnership-led initiatives. The emphasis on inclusivity must extend to historically marginalised groups, ensuring that their voices are heard and their needs addressed, thereby fostering more equitable outcomes and local ownership of a partnership's goals to ensure that its impact goes beyond its lifetime.

The governance structures of partnerships play a pivotal role in their success. Clear, inclusive governance frameworks, regular consultative meetings, and the embedding of initiatives within existing governmental processes facilitate coordination, decision-making, and sustainability. Equally important are mechanisms for accountability and transparency, which build trust and ensure that partnerships are more than symbolic, leading to tangible impacts.

Realistic expectations and managed capacities are vital for effective partnerships. Clear goals and transparent communication help align the diverse interests and capabilities of stakeholders, mitigating potential conflicts and fostering collaboration. Capacity sharing and co-learning address power imbalances and ensure that all stakeholders contribute meaningfully to the partnership's objectives.

Finally, the facilitation and financial sustainability of partnerships are crucial. Skilled, impartial facilitators help balance diverse perspectives and navigate conflicts, while adequate financial resources and realistic timelines ensure that partnerships have the time and means to build trust, learn, and achieve their transformative potential.

These findings and other insights from further interaction with key actors will inform an upcoming toolkit to support partnerships in engaging with evidence-based lessons for effective and equitable processes and outcomes. Future research should look more specifically into the participation of private sector actors – and the diversity entailed in that sector – in relevant partnerships. They may not have been central to the partnerships reviewed or studied but are likely to have direct impact on the possibility of achieving people-centred land and resource governance more widely.

REFERENCES

- Adam, U.E. (2020). Striving for par excellence in land use planning: Multi-stakeholder collaboration on customary forest recognition in Bulukumba, South Sulawesi. *Land Use Policy*, 99, 102997.
- African Union (2011). *Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa*.
- Agrawal, A. (2005). *Environmentality: Technologies of Government and Making Subjects*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Arnstein, S.R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216–224.
- Austin, J.E. (2000). Strategic collaboration between nonprofits and businesses. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(1), 69–97.
- Ayivor, J.S., Nyametso, J.K., & Ayivor, S. (2020). Protected area governance and its influence on local perceptions, attitudes and collaboration. *Land*, 9(310).
- Backstrand, K. (2006). Multi-stakeholder partnerships for sustainable development: Rethinking legitimacy, accountability and effectiveness. *Environmental Policy Governance*, 16(5), 290–306.
- Bastos Lima, M.G., Visseren-Hamakers, I.J., Braña-Varela, J., & Gupta, A. (2017). A reality check on the landscape approach to REDD+: Lessons from Latin America. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 78, 10–20.
- Baud, I. & Nainan, N. (2008). Negotiated spaces for representation in Mumbai: Ward committees, advanced locality management and the politics of middle-class activism. *Environment and Urbanization*, 20(2), 483–499.
- Beierle, T.C. (2002). The quality of stakeholder-based decisions. *Risk Analysis*, 22(4), 739–749.
- Berkes, F., Feeny, D., McCay, B.J., & Acheson, J.M. (1989). The benefits of the commons. *Nature*, 340, 91–93.
- Blomley, T. & Walters, G. (eds). (2019). *A landscape for everyone: Integrating rights-based and landscape governance approaches*. IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature.
- Botchway, K. (2001). Paradox of empowerment: Reflections on a case study from Northern Ghana. *World Development*, 29(1), 135–153.
- Boyd, W., Stickler, C., Duchelle, A.E., Rodriguez-Ward, D., Pritchard, L., & Ardila, J.P. (2018). Jurisdictional approaches to REDD+ and low emissions development: Progress and prospects. Working Paper. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.
- Brockhaus, M., Di Gregorio, M., & Mardiah, S. (2014). Governing the design of national REDD+: An analysis of the power of agency. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 49, 23–33.
- Brouwer, H. & Woodhill, J. (2015). *The MSP Guide: How to Design and Facilitate Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships*. Wageningen, The Netherlands: Wageningen University and Research Centre.
- Brouwer, H., Hiemstra, W., van der Vugt, S., & Walters, H. (2013). Analysing stakeholder power dynamics in multi-stakeholder processes: Insights of practice from Africa and Asia. *Knowledge Management for Development Journal*, 9(3), 11–31.
- Buchy, M. & Hoverman, S. (2000). Understanding public participation in forest planning: A review. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 1(1), 15–25.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/s1389-9341\(00\)00006-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1389-9341(00)00006-x)
- Campbell, A. (1994). *Community First: Landcare in Australia*. London: International Institution for Environment and Development.
- Cardini, A. (2006). An analysis of the rhetoric and practice of educational partnerships in the UK: An arena of complexities, tensions and power. *Journal of Education Policy*, 21(4), 393–415.
- Carlsson, L. & Sandström, A. (2008). Network governance of the commons. *International Journal of the Commons*, 2, 33–54.
- Chambers, R. (1983). *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Chambers, R., Pacey, A., & Thrupp, L.A. (eds). (1989). *Farmer First: Farmer Innovation and Agricultural Research*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Chatre, A. (2008). Political articulation and accountability in decentralization: Theory and evidence from India. *Conservation and Society*, 6(1), 12–23.
- Cockburn, J., Rosenberg, E., Copteros, A., Cornelius, S.F., Libala, N., Metcalfe, L., & van der Waal, B. (2020). A relational approach to landscape stewardship: Towards a new perspective for multi-actor collaboration. *Land*, 9(7), 224.
- Cooke, B. & Kothari, U. (eds). (2001). *Participation: The New Tyranny?* New York: Zed Books.
- Cornwall, A. (2003). Whose voices? Whose choices? Reflections on gender and participatory development. *World Development*, 31(8), 1325–1342.
- Cornwall, A. (2001). Making a difference? Gender and participatory development. IDS Discussion Paper 378. Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex.
- Cornwall, A. (2002). Making spaces, changing places: Situating participation in development. IDS Working Paper 173. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Cornwall, A. (2004). Introduction: New democratic spaces? The politics and dynamics of institutionalised participation. *IDS Bulletin*, 35(2), 1–10.
- Cullen, L., Alger, K., & Rambaldi, D.M. (2005). Land reform and biodiversity conservation in Brazil in the 1990s: Conflict and the articulation of mutual interests. *Conservation Biology*, 19(3), 747–755.
- DeFries, R. & Nagendra, H. (2017). Ecosystem management as a wicked problem. *Science*, 356(6335), 265–270.
- Dentoni, D., Bitzer, V., & Schouten, G. (2018). Harnessing wicked problems in multi-stakeholder partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150(2), 333–356.
- Diaz-Kope, L. & Miller-Stevens, K. (2015). Rethinking a typology of watershed partnerships: A governance perspective. *Public Works Management & Policy*, 20(1), 29–48.
- Dougill, A.J., Fraser, E.D.G., Holden, J., Hubacek, K., Prell, C., Reed, M.S., Stagl, S.T., & Stringer, L.C. (2006). Learning from doing participatory rural research: Lessons from the Peak District National Park. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 57, 259–275.
- Edelenbos, J. & Teisman, G. (2013). Water governance capacity: The art of dealing with a multiplicity of levels, sectors and domains. *International Journal of Water Governance*, 1(1-2), 89–108.
- Escobar, A. (2006). Difference and conflict in the struggle over natural resources: A political ecology framework. *Development*, 49, 6–13.
- Estrada-Carmona, N., Hart, A.K., DeClerck, F.A.J., Harvey, C.A., & Milder, J.C. (2014). Integrated landscape management for agriculture, rural livelihoods, and ecosystem conservation: An assessment of experience from Latin America and the Caribbean. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 129, 1–11.
- Falayi, M., Gambiza, J., & Schoon, M. (2020). Unpacking changing multi-actor and multi-level actor ties in transformative spaces: Insights from a degraded landscape, Machubeni, South Africa. *Land*, 9(7), 227.
- Favretto, N., Afonis, S., Stringer, L.C., Dougill, A.J., Quinn, C.H., & Ranarijaona, H.L.T. (2020). Delivering climate-development co-benefits through multi-stakeholder forestry projects in Madagascar: Opportunities and challenges. *Land*, 9(157).
<https://doi.org/10.3390/land9050157>
- Fernández-Giménez, M., Allegretti, A., Angerer, J., et al. (2019). Sustaining interdisciplinary collaboration across continents and cultures: Lessons from the Mongolian Rangelands and Resilience Project. In S. Perz (ed.), *Collaboration Across Boundaries for Social-Ecological Systems Science* (pp. 67–85). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Faysse, N. (2006). Troubles on the way: An analysis of the challenges faced by multi-stakeholder platforms. *Natural Resources Forum*, 30(3), 219–229.
- Fisher, MR., Workman, T., Mulyana, A., Balang Institute, Moeliono, M., Yuliani, E.L., Colfer, C.J.P., & Adam, U.E.F.B. (2017). Striving for PAR excellence in land use planning: Multi-stakeholder collaboration on customary forest recognition in Bulukumba, South Sulawesi. *Land Use Policy*.
- Fliervoet, J., Geerling, G., Mostert, E., & Smits, A. (2016). Analyzing collaborative governance through social network analysis: A case study of river management along the Waal River in The Netherlands. *Environmental Management*, 57(2), 355–367.
- Franco, J., & Monsalve Suárez, S. (2017). Why wait for the state? Using the CFS Tenure Guidelines to recalibrate political-legal struggles for democratic land control. *Third World Quarterly*, 39(8), 1386–1402.
- Fung, A. & Wright, E. O. (2003). *Deepening Democracy: Empowered Participatory Governance*. London: Verso.
- Gallemore, C., Prasti, H., & Moeliono, M. (2014). Discursive barriers and cross-scale forest governance in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Ecology and Society*, 19(2), 18.
- Gambert, S. (2010). Territorial politics and the success of collaborative environmental governance: Local and regional partnerships compared. *Local Environment*, 15(5), 467–480.
- Graham, C. (2020). Managing climate change: The role of multi-stakeholder partnerships in building climate resilience in sub-Saharan Africa. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Partnership Studies*, 7(2).
- Gaventa, J. (2004). Towards participatory governance: Assessing the transformative possibilities. In S. Hickey & G. Mohan (eds), *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation? Exploring New Approaches to Participation in Development* (pp. 25–41). London: Zed Books.
- Gonzales, J., Larson, A.M., Sarmiento Barletti, J.P., & Barnes, G. (2021a). Politics, power and the search for sustainability in multi-stakeholder territorial planning: A comparative study of two contrasting cases in the Brazilian Amazon. *International Forestry Review*, 23(S1).
- Gonzales, J., Sarmiento Barletti, J.P., Larson, A.M., Barnes, G., & Tucker, C. (2021b). Can multi-stakeholder forums empower indigenous and local communities and promote forest conservation? *Conservation Science & Practice*.
- Guaraldo Choguill, M. (1999). A ladder of community participation for underdeveloped countries. *Habitat International*, 20(3), 431–444.
- Hahn, T., Olsson, P., Folke, C., & Johansson, K. (2006). Trust-building, knowledge generation and organizational innovations: The role of a bridging organization for adaptive comanagement of a wetland landscape around Kristianstad, Sweden. *Human Ecology*, 34(4), 573–592.
- Hedden-Dunkhorst, B. & Schmitt, F. (2020). Exploring the potential and contribution of UNESCO biosphere reserves for landscape governance and management in Africa. *Land*, 9(237).
- Hemmati, M. (2002). *Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability: Beyond Deadlock and Conflict*. London: Earthscan.
- Hewlett, C., Sarmiento Barletti, J.P., Larson, A.M., et al. (2021). Intensity and embeddedness: Two dimensions of equity approaches in multi-stakeholder forums. *CIFOR Occasional Paper 221*.

- Horan, D. (2020). Enabling integrated policymaking with the sustainable development goals: An application to Ireland. *Sustainability*, 12(18), 7800.
- Hunter, D.J. & Perkins, N. (2014). Partnership working in public health. *Policy Press Scholarship*.
- Hutchinson, J. (1994). The practice of partnership in local economic development. *Local Government Studies*, 20(3), 335–344.
- Hutchinson, J. & Campbell, M. (1998). Working in partnership: Lessons from the literature. England: Department for Education and Employment.
- Jansen, L. & Kalas, P.P. (2020). Improving governance of tenure in policy and practice: A conceptual basis to analyze multi-stakeholder partnerships for multi-stakeholder transformative governance illustrated with an example from South Africa. *Sustainability*.
- Jordan, A. & Lenschow, A. (eds). (2008). *Innovation in Environmental Policy? Integrating the Environment for Sustainability*. Cheltenham: Elgar.
- Kallis, G., Kiparsky, M., & Norgaard, R. (2009). Collaborative governance and adaptive management: Lessons from California's CALFED Water Program. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 12(6), 631–643.
- Kirsop-Taylor, N., Russel, D., & Winter, M. (2020). The contours of state retreat from collaborative environmental governance under austerity. *Sustainability*, 12(7), 2761.
- Kohne, M. (2014). Multi-stakeholder initiative governance as assemblage: Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil as a political resource in land conflicts related to oil palm plantations. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 31(3), 469–480.
- Kowler, L., Tovar, J., Ravikumar, A., & Larson, A. (2014). The legitimacy of multilevel governance structures for benefit sharing: REDD+ and other low emissions options in Peru. *InfoBrief*, 101. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.
- Kusters, K., De Graaf, M., Buck, L., et al. (2020). Inclusive landscape governance for sustainable development: Assessment methodology and lessons for civil society organizations. *Land*, 9(4), 128.
- Kusters, K., Buck, L., De Graaf, M., Minang, P., Van Oosten, C., & Zagt, R. (2018). Participatory planning, monitoring, and evaluation of multi-stakeholder platforms in integrated landscape initiatives. *Environmental Management*, 62, 170–181.
- Larson, A.M., Sarmiento Barletti, J.P., & Ravikumar, A. (2018). The challenge of coordination in REDD+ policy and practice. In A. Angelsen, C. Martius, V. de Sy et al. (eds), *Transforming REDD+: Lessons and New Directions*. Bogor: CIFOR.
- Larson, A.M., Sarmiento Barletti, J.P., & Heise, N. (2022). A place at the table is not enough: Accountability for indigenous peoples and local communities in multi-stakeholder forums. *World Development*, 155.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lubell, M. (2015). Collaborative partnerships in complex institutional systems. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 12, 41–47.
- Mackintosh, M. (1992). Partnership: Issues of policy and negotiation. *Local Economy*, 7(3), 210–224.
- Malekpour, S., Tawfik, S., & Chesterfield, C. (2021). Designing collaborative governance for nature-based solutions. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 62, 127177.
- Marshall, K., Blackstock, K., & Duglinson, J. (2010). A contextual framework for understanding good practice in integrated catchment management. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 53(1), 63–89.
- Mohan, G. & Stokke, K. (2000). Participatory development and empowerment. *Third World Quarterly*, 21(2), 266–280.
- Moore, S.A., Jennings, S., & Tacey, W.H. (2001). Achieving sustainable natural resource management outcomes on the ground: The key elements of stakeholder involvement. *Australian Journal of Environmental Management*, 8(2), 91–98.
- Mosse, D. (1994). Authority, gender, and knowledge: Theoretical reflections on the practice of participatory rural appraisal. *Development and Change*, 25(3), 497–526.
- Mosse, D. (2001). "People's Knowledge," Participation and Patronage: Operations and Representations in Rural Development. In B. Cook & U. Kothari (eds), *Participation: The New Tyranny?* (pp. 16–35). London: Zed Books.
- Mosse, D. (2004). *Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice*. London: Pluto Press.
- Musakwa, W., Gumbo, T., Paradza, G., Mpofu, E., Nyathi, N.A., & Selamolela, N.B. (2020). Partnerships and stakeholder participation in the management of national parks: Experiences of the Gonarezhou National Park in Zimbabwe. *Land*, 9(399).
- Nindiyatmoko, A., Setyowati, K., & Haryanti, R.H. (2022). Collaboration after conflict: A lesson from collaborative action in customary land tenure conflicts in Lombok, Indonesia. *Forest and Society*, 6(1), 294–310.
- Njoroge, P., Ambole, A., Githira, D., & Outa, G. (2020). Steering energy transitions through landscape governance: Case of Mathare informal settlement, Nairobi, Kenya. *Land*, 9(206). <https://doi.org/10.3390/land9060206>
- Nonet, G.A.-H., Gössling, T., Van Tulder, R., & Bryson, J.M. (2022). Multi-stakeholder engagement for the Sustainable Development Goals: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 180(4), 945–957. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05192-0>
- Nunan, F. (2018). Navigating multi-level natural resource governance: An analytical guide. *Natural Resources Forum*, 42(3), 159–171.
- Omoding, J., Walters, G., Andama, E., Carvalho, S., Colomer, J., Cracco, M., Eilu, G., Kiyangi, G., Kumar, C., Langoya, C.D., & et al. (2020). Analysing and applying stakeholder perceptions to improve protected area governance in Ugandan conservation landscapes. *Land*, 9(207). <https://doi.org/10.3390/land9060207>
- Paavola, J. & Adger, W. N. (2006). Fair adaptation to climate change. *Ecological Economics*, 56(4), 594–609.
- Palacios Llaque, D. & Sarmiento Barletti, J.P. (2021). The challenges of multiple governmentalities and forms of participation in protected natural areas: The Amarakaeri Communal Reserve (Peruvian Amazon). *International Forestry Review*, 23(S1).
- Pretty, J.N. (1995). Participatory learning for sustainable agriculture. *World Development*, 23(8), 1247–1263.
- Pruitt, B. & Thomas, P. (2007). *Democratic Dialogue: A Handbook for Practitioners*. Washington, DC, Stockholm, New York: General Secretariat of the Organization of American States, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, United Nations Development Programme.
- Rahman, M.A. (1995). *People's Self-development: Perspectives on Participatory Action Research*. London: Zed Books.
- Ratner, B.D., Larson, A.M., Sarmiento Barletti, J.P., Eldidi, H., Catacutan, D., Flintan, F., Suhardiman, D., Falk, T., & Meinzen-Dick, R. (2022). Multistakeholder platforms for natural resource governance: Lessons from eight landscape-level cases. *Ecology and Society*, 27(2), 2. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-13168-270202>
- Ravikumar, A., Larson, A.M., Myers, R., & Trench, T. (2018). Inter-sectoral and multilevel coordination alone do not reduce deforestation and advance environmental justice: Why bold contestation works when collaboration fails. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 36(8), 1437–1457.
- Reed, M. (2008). Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review. *Biological Conservation*, 141, 2417–2431.
- Reed, M.S., Graves, A., Dandy, N., Posthumus, H., Hubacek, K., Morris, J., Prella, C., Quinn, C.H., & Stringer, L.C. (2009). Who's in and why? A typology of stakeholder analysis methods for natural resource management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 90(5), 1933–1949.
- Rio Declaration. (1992). *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*, in the Report of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. UN Doc. A/CONF.
- Rodriguez, D. & Sarmiento Barletti, J.P. (2021). Can multi-stakeholder forums mediate indigenous rights and development priorities? Insights from the Peruvian Amazon. *International Forestry Review*, 23(S1).
- Ros-Tonen, M., Reed, J., & Sunderland, T. (2018). From synergy to complexity: The trend toward integrated value chain and landscape governance. *Environmental Management*, 62, 1–14.
- Rowe, G. & Frewer, L. (2000). Public participation methods: A framework for evaluation. *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, 25(1), 3–29.
- Sanders, A.J.P., Ford, R.M., Keenan, R.J., & Larson, A.M. (2020). Learning through practice? Learning from the REDD+ demonstration project, Kalimantan Forests and Climate Partnership (KFCP) in Indonesia. *Land Use Policy*, 91, 104285.
- Sarmiento Barletti, J.P., Larson, A.M., & Heise, N.M. (2022). Understanding difference to build bridges between stakeholders: Perceptions of participation in four multi-stakeholder forums in the Peruvian Amazon. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 58(1), 19–37.
- Sarmiento Barletti, J.P. & Larson, A.M. (2020). How are land-use multi-stakeholder forums affected by their contexts? Perspectives from two regions of the Peruvian Amazon. In J. Innes & W. Nikolakis (eds), *The wicked problem of forest policy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sarmiento Barletti, J.P., & Larson, A.M. (2019). *Multi-Stakeholder Forums: Literature Review for In-Depth Research*. CIFOR Occasional Paper.
- Sarmiento Barletti, J.P., Larson, A.M., Hewlett, C., & Delgado, D. (2020). Designing for engagement: A realist synthesis review of how context affects the outcomes of multi-stakeholder forums on land use and/or land-use change. *World Development*, 127.
- Sarmiento Barletti, J.P., Larson, A.M., & Vigil, N.H. (2021). Organizing for transformation? How and why organizers plan their multi-stakeholder forums. *International Forestry Review*, 23(1), 9–23. <https://doi.org/10.1505/146554821833466103>
- Sayer, J., Sunderland, T., Ghazoul, J., Pfund, J.-L., Sheil, D., Meijaard, E., Venter, M., Boedhihartono, A. K., Day, M., Garcia, C., van Oosten, C., & Buck, L.E. (2013). Ten principles for a landscape approach to reconciling agriculture, conservation and other competing land uses. *PNAS*, 110(21), 8349–8356.
- Schwilch, G., Bachmann, F., Valente, S., Coelho, C., Moreira, J., Laouina, A., Chaker, M., Aderghal, M., Santos, P., & Reed, M.S. (2012). A structured multi-stakeholder learning process for sustainable land management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 107, 52–63.
- Schut, M., Lamers, D., Sartas, M., Okafor, C., Hicintuka, C., Mapatano, S., Kagabo, D., Van Asten, P., & Vanlauwe, B. (2016). Multi-stakeholder processes in Central Africa: Successes, struggles and lessons learned.
- Senecah, S.L. (2004). The trinity of voice: The role of practical theory in planning and evaluating the effectiveness of environmental participatory processes. In S.P. Depoe, J.W. Delicath, & M.-F.A. Elsenbeer (eds), *Communication and Public Participation in Environmental Decision Making* (pp. 13–33). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Stickler, C., Duchelle, A.E., Ardila, J.P., et al. (2018). *The State of Jurisdiction Sustainability: Synthesis for Practitioners and Policymakers*. California: Earth Innovation Institute.
- Silva-Castañeda, L. (2015). What kind of space? Multi-stakeholder initiatives and the protection of land rights. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 22, 67–83.

Snape, D. & Stewart, M. (1996). Keeping up the momentum: Partnership working in Bristol and the West of England. Bristol Chamber of Commerce.

Streets, J. (2004). "Voluntary cooperative arrangements between actors".

Tamara, A., Heise, N.M., Liswanti, N., et al. (2021). Trust Building and Leadership in Multi-stakeholder Forums: Lessons from Indonesia. *International Forestry Review*, 23(S1).

Tippett, J., Handley, J.F., & Ravetz, J. (2007). Meeting the challenges of sustainable development: A conceptual appraisal of a new methodology for participatory ecological planning. *Progress in Planning*, 67, 9–98.

United Nations. (2015). Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015, 42809, 1–13.

UNDESA. (2019). UN DESA Annual Highlights Report. UN.

Warner, J.F. (2006). More Sustainable Participation? Multi-Stakeholder Platforms for Integrated Catchment Management. *Water Resources Development*, 22(1), 15–35.

Warner, J.F., & Verhallen, J.M.M.A. (2007). The nature of the beast: towards a comparative MSP Typology. In J.F. Warner (ed), *Multi-stakeholder platforms for integrated water management* (pp. 21–30).

Waylen, K.A., Blackstock, K.L., Marshall, K., & Juarez-Bourke, A. (2023). Navigating or adding to complexity? Exploring the role of catchment partnerships in collaborative governance. *Sustainability Science*, 18(6), 2533–2548.

Waylen, K., Blackstock, K., van Hulst, F., et al. (2019). Policy-driven monitoring and evaluation: Does it support adaptive management of socio-ecological systems? *Science of the Total Environment*, 662, 373–384.

Westerink, J., Jongeneel, R., Polman, N., Prager, K., Franks, J., Dupraz, P., & Mettepenningen, E. (2017). Collaborative governance arrangements to deliver spatially coordinated agri-environmental management. *Land Use Policy*, 69, 176–192.

Wijaya, A., Glasbergen, P., Leroy, P., & Darmastuti, A. (2016). Governance challenges of cocoa partnership projects in Indonesia: Seeking synergy in multi-stakeholder arrangements for sustainable agriculture. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 20(1), 129–153.

Williams, P.A., Sikutshwa, L., & Shackleton, S. (2020). Acknowledging indigenous and local knowledge to facilitate collaboration in landscape approaches—Lessons from a systematic review. *Land*, 9(331).

Wolford, W. (2010). Participatory democracy by default: Land reform, social movements and the state in Brazil. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(1), 91–109.

Wollenberg, E., Anderson, J., & Lopez, C. (2005). *Though All Things Differ: Pluralism as a basis for cooperation in forests*. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.

Yami, M., Sarmiento Barletti, J.P., & Larson, A.M. (2021). Multi-stakeholder forums and good governance: Two cases from communal forest management in Ethiopia. *International Forestry Review*, 23(S1).

Zagt, R. (2020). Inclusive landscape governance for sustainable development: Assessment methodology and lessons for civil society organizations. *Land*, 9(128).

ANNEX

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO THE CASE STUDIES



FOLLOW US ON



landcoalition



@landcoalition



@landcoalition



landcoalition

INTERNATIONAL LAND COALITION SECRETARIAT c/o IFAD

Via Paolo di Dono 44 , 00142-Rome, Italy tel. +39 06 5459 2445

fax +39 06 5459 3445 info@landcoalition.org | www.landcoalition.org