



Life on Land

1. What is land? 2. Who does land belong to? 3. How do we manage land for the common good?

Journey



Life on Land Journey

Land is the ground beneath our feet and everything that lives in it; it is forests and wetlands, grasslands and farmlands, and it is our home and our heritage. Life on land is intimately connected to the land itself, and we view land according to how we wish to use it, often overlooking many of the roles that land plays in our lives. For some of us land is a living ecosystem and a place to protect nature, for others it is a landscape supporting lives and livelihoods, whilst others still view land as territory at the heart of our cultural identity.

Between a quarter and a third of all land on earth is degrading and as much as 24 billion tons of fertile soil are lost annually. The global economic impact of land degradation has been estimated at up to €3.4trillion in 2008, equaling 3.3–7.5 per cent of global GDP. Halting further loss and ensuring land is sustainably managed—achieving Land Degradation Neutrality in the language of the SDGs and the UNCCD—is a global emergency. Solutions for sustainably managing land abound, and when the multiple values of land are accounted for, sustainable land management is highly cost effective. Yet land degradation continues because we prioritize individual uses of land over multifunctionality.

The Secretariat of the UNCCD, the Economics of Land Degradation initiative, the IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management and the IUCN Global Drylands initiative collaborated in organizing a themed journey entitled “Life on Land” at the IUCN World Conservation Congress, Hawaii, September 2016. The journey was designed to support a move towards a more comprehensive response to achieving Land Degradation Neutrality by 2030, as part of the Sustainable Development Goals. It connected many diverse approaches to land use and land management to explore potential synergies or conflicts. This report gives a short overview of the content of the journey combined with a synthesis of the main observations and lessons contributed by

the journey participants. This includes lessons gathered at the Knowledge Café where the journey was concluded.

Overview of the journey

The journey *Life on Land* consisted of a series of events capturing diverse interpretations of land and how land issues are addressed by the conservation and development communities. The events provide insights into how different perceptions of land influence policy and investment, and how these can be better aligned for more effective action. The events within the journey were connected through a series of guiding questions:

1. **What is land?** How do different interpretations of the term “land”, and different perspectives on its present and future value, contribute to, or impede, sustainable land management?
2. **Who does land belong to?** How do we balance rights to land with responsibilities for the sustainable management of land?
3. **How do we manage land for the common good?** What policies and investments are needed to protect the multiple values of land to society, and how can they be increased proportional to the importance of land to society and future generations?

The journey will support IUCN's contribution to delivering SDG 15.3 on Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) and therefore contributes to achieving the same target of the UNCCD. LDN can be considered as an “SDG-accelerator”, boosting progress towards multiple other goals, including Goal 1 (No Poverty), Goal 2 (No Hunger), Goal 8 (economic Growth), and Goal 13 (Climate Action). Achieving LDN can also contribute to several Aichi targets including Target 5 on habitat loss, Target 7 on sustainable agriculture and forestry, Target 9 on invasive alien species, Target 13 on the genetic diversity of domesticated plants and animals, Target 14 on ecosystem services, Target 15 on ecosystem resilience and carbon stocks, Target 18 on local and indigenous knowledge, and Target 19 on science and knowledge. By promoting progress towards LDN this journey will also support core IUCN efforts to enhance biodiversity, mitigate and adapt to climate change, strengthen resilience of ecosystem services, while contributing to achieving equity and poverty reduction in conservation.

Partners

The following partners were either consulted in the development of the journey or participated in various steps in the journey. A full list of events that were part of the Journey are provided at the end of this report.

IUCN State members: Partners include Ministry of Environment Jordan, Ministry of Environment Turkey, Ministry of Environment Namibia.

IUCN non state members: Partners include ENDA Senegal, TEMA Turkey, Ecoagriculture Partners, CENESTA Iran, The Nature Conservancy, World Conservation Society, Birdlife International, Society for Ecological Restoration.

IUCN Commissions: CEM (Dryland Ecosystems Thematic Group, Ecosystem Services Thematic Group, Ecosystem Restoration Thematic Group), WCEL (Soil and Desertification Specialist Group), WCPA (Climate Change Specialist Group), CEESP.

IUCN Secretariat: Global Drylands Initiative, Ecosystem Management Programme, Water and Wetlands Programme, Business and Biodiversity Programme, Forest Programme, ROWA, ESARO, PACO.

Organizing partners: IUCN Secretariat, CEM, UNCCD, ELD Initiative

Discussion: promoting sustainable management of land to achieve SDGs and other targets

The following section captures the main lessons from the journey, organised around the three guiding questions. These questions were discussed at the closing event in the journey, which was the knowledge café entitled “Life on Land: Challenges and Opportunities for Achieving Land Degradation Neutrality” (Sept 5th, 14:30 – 16:30, Event WCC_10339). The objective of the session was to report on perspectives on Land, identify strategic opportunities and partnerships for achieving LDN, and agree on the aim and outline of report on the journey Life on Land. The following draws heavily on the closing event.

What is land?

The journey was successful in shedding light on a wide range of perspectives on land that hold sway within the conservation and sustainable development sector. This helps to explain the challenges in defining land and agreeing on what we mean by land degradation. The terms Land and Land Degradation can be defined in individual contexts, but the colloquial nature of the term should not be ignored and therefore different definitions will be needed according to context.

Land degradation as a cost to society

An estimated 20 million hectares of fertile land become degraded each year and in the next quarter of a century global food production could fall by up to 12%, pushing up food prices by up to a third (UNCCD). Estimates of the extent and cost of degradation vary considerably due to weakness in the evidence base. Global assessments of the extent of land degradation rely on remote sensing data which have important shortcomings. Data from assessments at higher resolution are weak in many countries and are insufficient to give a precise estimate. Nevertheless, the impact of land degradation has been estimated at up to €3.4trillion globally in 2008, equaling 3.3–7.5 per cent of global GDP. The costs of further degrading our land based ecosystems are estimated at up to 6.3 – 10.6 trillion USD globally (ELD 2015).

Land as an economic asset and a business opportunity

Conversations over land typically started with a discussion of the economic uses of land, and particularly the role of land in producing food versus other uses of land, and the potential trade-offs between these roles and values. The role of land in agriculture can be highly fluid and can change in response to political and economic stimuli. For example, Hawaii has a strong association with plantations of sugar cane, yet these plantations have largely closed down and production has shifted primarily to grain crops.

For agribusinesses, land is the opportunity to sell their products in support of the livelihoods and lives of local growers. However, there are divergent perceptions over how best to support land users and questions were raised over the role of agribusiness in promoting industrial monocultures, which are one of the leading drivers of land degradation (according to the WBCSD). This has implications for the way big businesses are investing in the sector.

The value of agriculture in managing and maintaining sustainable landscapes is poorly recognised. People have different sustainability models and there is insufficient clarity over, for example, whether it is more sustainable to plough land and reduce the use of pesticides, or to reduce tillage but then incur a higher demand for pesticides. These may be important areas for both improved scientific consensus and stronger government regulation.

Sustainable management of land represents an opportunity for entrepreneurs to manage and reduce the risk of their resource supply. Opportunities are being explored for the private sector to raise funds to acquire needed financial and economic capital to bridge short-term investment gaps. This includes the Land Degradation Neutral fund under development by the Global Mechanism of the UNCCD. Questions remain

over whether private business genuinely face a capital shortfall or whether there are other factors limiting their engagement in sustainable land management. Tools to assess and channel investments towards more resilient and reliable sourcing are available from the WBSCD or the ELD Initiative:

<http://www.wbcd.org/work-program/sector-projects/water/global-water-tool.aspx>; <http://eld-initiative.org/index.php?id=156>.

Representatives of agribusiness considered that the current model of intensification is ultimately driven by consumers, and therefore awareness needs to be built in the general public to demand a different product. This point was debated, with others considering that consumer preferences are driven by active marketing of products from current unsustainable approaches. One representative of the private sector acknowledged that businesses tend to focus on a select few management practices and miss out on alternative land management strategies and local knowledge that emphasize diversity, synergies and complementarities in land use technologies, thereby failing to adapt existing products to new opportunities.

This remains one of the principle issues of contention that cuts to the heart of the debate over achieving Land Degradation Neutrality: whether sustainable land use systems can be scaled up sufficiently to play a major role in addressing land degradation, or whether ongoing degradation on a large scale is unavoidable and can only be mitigated through offsets. This is also a question over the degree of intensity of production that can be sustained.

Land as property

Land has high value as property, particularly in urban and other populous areas. In some countries large areas of land have changed hands in recent years, for example in Hawaii where the population has shifted from 98% involved in farming to only 2% in the present day, whereas in some developing countries the majority of the population remains on the land. However, the value of land for nature, agriculture and livestock is not always fully acknowledged and land users may be dispossessed without recognition or compensation.

In the case of the US, land was described as “the coin of realm”, implying that it is a uniquely valued and trusted asset. Large areas of land change hands through transactions, which face different degrees of regulation. Changing ownership can have contradictory implications for the sustainability of land management. In some cases it is part of a process of intensification in which more sustainable, sometimes traditional, practices are replaced by less sustainable models of agriculture. In other cases land may be taken out of production, which may have positive environmental outcomes, but at the same time complete abandonment can lead to further degradation.

Land as territory and land as power

Ownership or control of land confers power on the rights-holder and for many conservationists land is primarily considered through the lens of territory and community rights. This is especially so in many places in Africa, where individual land property rights are non-existent, and tenure rights to natural resources are shared among different users within local communities. For instance, in West Africa, different use groups (men, women, cooper farmers, pastoralists) may have different rights to parts of the same resource, for instance trees in a forest: fodder for the livestock, fruits harvested by women and timber harvested by men. Where such rights are customary and not formally established they are easily overlooked with increasing pressure on land and intensity of its use. Not recognizing the rationale for such customary right systems (for instance the need of long fallow periods and multiple uses of the resource by different users) can have detrimental outcomes for the environment.

Ownership and control of land can have important positive but also negative implications for the responsibility to manage and conserve land or land-based resources. Loss of land and resource tenure rights

or changes in how those rights are exercised can be important factors in land degradation. The conservation sector needs to be aware of how conservation actions can infringe upon such rights, but also has a role to play in upholding rights as a platform for sustainable management of land and landscapes.

Questions of territorial rights and power come to the fore when land use objectives, including conservation objectives, are being established. Conservationists and local rights holders may have different perceptions over what is the “best” use of land, what is sustainable, what is “natural” and so on. For example, differences frequently arise over the balance between pasture, forest and crop cover and how degradation is measured in relation to the land use objectives. One person’s sustainably managed farmland may be another person’s degraded forest, or one person’s restored forest may be another person’s degraded pastureland. The question of who decides is ultimately a question of power, although decisions can be influenced by science and other forms of knowledge as well as by competing economic interests and no doubt many other factors. The bottom line is that the question of whether land is degraded ultimately depends on the management objectives of the different stakeholders, but achieving consensus over these objectives is often difficult.

The issues of territoriality, power and resource tenure rights were not strongly reflected in the journey “Life on Land” and this highlights a challenge for achieving LDN. This interpretation of the term “land” needs to be fully recognised and actors working on land from a rights rather than an economic or ecosystem perspective should be actively engaged. IUCN’s publications on LDN recognise that LDN should not be achieved at the expense of land rights and setting effective LDN targets requires all stakeholders to be effectively engaged in the process.

The empowering qualities of land were also not strongly reflected in this Journey, although this is tacitly recognised by many conservation actors through their participatory approaches to natural resource management. Empowerment related to land rights and responsibilities is implicit in community based approaches to conservation and natural resource management, including widespread approaches like community forest management. For this reason, simple participatory approaches to natural resource management often have far-reaching consequences on poverty reduction and on the wider engagement of citizens in public planning and dialogue.

Land as nature

Land is more than just soil and rocks: it is also the biodiversity that lives in and on the soil. Migratory species rely on large territories and can be susceptible to land degradation in locations within their range. Achieving LDN requires also looking at the larger scale – landscapes, flyways, etc. – and understanding how society, business and others interact to manage land as a vital part of nature and our life support system.

Land is also considered by some as an ecosystem – not merely a component of an ecosystem – and therefore land management should benefit from an ecosystem approach. Soil ecosystems rely on a great diversity of species and on the interaction between fresh water and organic matter. In many cases the science and practice of soil ecology is not adequately taken into account in land management decisions and this contributes to the prevalence of non-organic farming approaches, or the over-reliance on chemical inputs at the expense of organic inputs like compost and manure. To understand sustainability dynamics in relation to land, it may be beneficial to develop a stronger understanding of land as a “closed system”: one in which organic inputs are applied as much as organic products are taken away from the land. However, this raises fundamental questions over sustainability criteria in relation to the demand to feed 9 billion people in the future. An important issues of debate but not discussed in this journey.

Land as culture

For many people, land is about dignity, culture and identity. Many people derive benefit simply from being on the land, or they may derive their cultural or spiritual identity from their place within a landscape or territory: “being on the land is very beneficial – it is a reinforcement of who we are”. Societies can have strong connections to the land and this can be an entry point for sustainable land management: “good stewardship is good business”.

Culture can have an important impact on how people view the value and the use of land. People view the land differently and this can lead to an impasse in defining appropriate land management strategies. Land does not always have intrinsic value but it has value when people use it. The problem arises when those who believe in an intrinsic value of land negotiate with those who want to turn land into money. Although cultural aspects of land vary greatly by region, markets are global and this can greatly influence maintaining cultural values of land and other intangible associations with land. Economic assessments that translate local perceptions into monetary values can play a role in demonstrating and promoting these values of land. Although these approaches also face resistance from those who consider such values to be unsuited to monetisation and who resist the attempt to commoditise culture.

Land as a common good

Land plays an important role in capturing and storing atmospheric carbon, it governs nutrient and hydrological cycles, and therefore land plays many roles that benefit society as a whole, and not only local land managers. These diverse roles of land are recognised to different degrees depending on the country and local context. For example, several countries have instituted policies that govern land use in order to reduce the risk of landslide or floods. These policies recognise that land, whether for agriculture or urban development, also plays an important role in storing and releasing water and protecting soil, and that these functions have a value for society as a whole.

Landscapes are a mosaic of ecosystems and communities, and the role of land as a common good does not get sufficient recognition. In one sense land belongs to everybody, but it does have different local custodians. The role of those custodians in protecting the positive, or reducing the negative, externalities associated with different land uses remains an area of huge regional and global importance that is often not adequately reflected in policy discourse.

Who does land belong to?

The question of belonging and ownership is challenging to answer in simple terms and can be determined in different ways, from legal titling of land to community and customary entitlement to a simple sense of belonging. Many countries lack adequate laws, or fail to implement established law, to legally determine who owns land. In many cases this leads to default ownership by the state, which can have harmful consequences for local land users who feel alienated or dispossessed, or who see their land re-allocated without their consent.

Most land in the USA is publically owned (much of which is not under production), whereas in Europe most land is private, and about half of all land is used for agriculture. In other regions rights to land and the associated resource rights are less clear-cut and the most appropriate forms of “ownership” it remains to be seen (land ownership, ownership over or rights to a land-based resource, etc.). This is not to say that one or another model is necessarily better – there are merits to each – but the process of arriving at clarity over land rights is complicated and in Africa and parts of other regions it remains to be determined, especially where customary rights are not necessarily the same as formal government established rights.

Private investors in Africa are daunted by the challenges of working with a large number of small-holder farmers to reach agreements, whereas in countries like the US, vast areas are controlled by corporations and

cooperatives who determine the land use and with whom it is relatively easier to negotiate. Farming and grazing in Africa is largely small-scale and local and is practiced by around 60% of the population. Foreign investors are leasing land and this raises questions both over who has existing rights to reallocate land, but also who has the responsibility to use the land sustainably for the sake of future generations.

Traditional forms of governance and land tenure still prevail in many parts of the world, and even where statutory law is the dominant system, remnants of customary law are often codified within the law. In Hawaii, as in many parts of Africa, traditional governance was led by the chiefs who set rules and determined how land was used and remnants of these old rules still exist. In Europe, land rights and land ownership and control may reflect centuries of change and political reform, with layers of rights and responsibility embedded in both legal systems and in the behaviour of communities of land users.

Statutory legal systems are not always flexible enough to cope with the complexity of customary land rights. In Nigeria for example there are floodplains with multiple overlapping uses by different land rights holders. Fisher folk have rights to the land during the flood, crop farmers during the flood recession, and livestock herders have rights post-harvest and to grasslands within the floodplain. The question of who the land belongs to is unclear because there are often multiple rights over land and land-based resources: rights over trees and pastures; rights of men and women; rights of herders and croppers etc. Rights overlap and care should be taken in adopting certain restrictive concepts of property rights. Land often belongs to a “community” and that community may include different ethnic groups and different livelihood types, so defining land rights often needs to take into account traditional governance systems and mechanisms of negotiation. Relegating one land use to secondary or another to primary users can be harmful to the rights of one or other group.

How do we manage land for the common good

It is clear that land is a common asset that provides multiple ecosystem services to society at different scales, such as mitigating climate change at the global scale, regulating water supply at a landscape scale or supporting agriculture at a more local scale. It is estimated that soils store more than double the carbon (2,700 Gigatonnes) of the combined total of atmosphere (780 Gt) and biomass (575 Gt) (Lal, 2008). Above ground biomass is also a significant sink and an important part of the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, and the ongoing degradation of land reduces soil’s capacity as carbon stock. Globally, croplands bear a carbon sequestration potential of 0.43 to 0.57 gigatons every year whereas agriculture, forestry and other land uses are estimated to be responsible for about one quarter (24 per cent) of anthropogenic GHG emissions (IPCC, 2014).

It is not enough to simply identify who owns the land; land management, for example, has downstream consequences for many people and there are responsibilities associated with ownership, use and control of land. Land owners in many countries face restrictions on how they use land, which determines how they use the land, often in an attempt to safeguard the ecosystem services that they provide. Understanding who benefits from land management and who bears the costs represents a first step towards solving the tragedy of the commons.

Maintaining or increasing the provision of land-based ecosystem services can be achieved through regulations, such as restriction on removing vegetation cover on slopes, or through adequate local governance measures. Protection of ecosystem services can also be achieved through capacity building, such as informing farmers of the benefits of contour ploughing, through appropriate pricing of inputs, such as ensuring fair prices for water to discourage profligate irrigation, and through financial incentives to land users, such as payments for ecosystem services.

The precedent for restricting harmful land management practices has been set, but it would be instructive to understand the circumstances under which these forms of protection have been achieved, and particularly if they are more prevalent when there is an easy-to-measure cause-and-effect relationship, such as responding to catastrophic landslides or flooding or to siltation of reservoirs. In other words, are measures applied to safeguard an ecosystem service, or to prevent breakdown in ecosystem functioning?

Effectively negotiating sustainable outcomes for land requires system and stakeholder approaches rather than a linear, sectoral approach. A systems approach better reflects the diversity of land values and helps optimize synergies in securing them. For example, at a societal level it may be better to adopt less intensive farming systems that protect water supply, carbon storage and biodiversity. It is often assumed that less intensive production implies lower profits and lower output but this is not always the case. Shifting to agroforestry in the Sahel, for example, provides not only improvement in a suite of ecosystem services but also improves yields and profitability, at least in terms of return to investment (input of labour may increase). Understanding these trade-offs and synergies is crucial to identify appropriate solutions for scaling-up and to address potential barriers to sustainable land management.

Developing the right business models requires a deeper understanding of the full costs of land degradation, including the cost to society of lost or diminished ecosystem functions, as well as a holistic understanding of the overall range of benefits. This in turn requires convincing arguments to governments that investing in reversing land degradation is in the national interest and can even be made profitable, as is documented in one of studies presented in this Journey (Investing sustainably in the Jordan rangelands, WCC_12311/4).

Safeguarding the multiple benefits of land requires effective stakeholder dialogues and concerted action as well as suitable enabling institutions. It is important to analyse the broader stakeholder interests in sustainable land management and restoration and to establish the stakeholder platforms that can facilitate the processes. This would include the facilitation of the governance institutions that bridge various sectors at the local level (e.g. institutions that pursue dual water supply and food production goals) as well as institutions that safeguard social and natural capital. These could include institutions that enable collaboration and negotiation and which create a platform to work from and a vehicle to drive success. It may be unrealistic to expect a collective agreement on how best to manage an area and the individuals with decision-making power may be biased by prior knowledge, expectations, stereotypes or vested interests. Even basic values, such as sensitivity to environmental concerns, may be absent and can take a generation to change. In an ideal world all sectors would come together to work out how to share all the benefits of nature for the common good, with a single institution mandated to cost-effectively manage or facilitate the inputs and outputs of all the different sectors. Examples from the field have shown that economics often serve as the common denominator and a shared language across stakeholder and sectoral groups.

Proven sustainable land management measures are well-known and well-documented. Barriers are currently related to scaling up, institutional coordination, developing incentivizing enabling environments, mainstreaming sustainability in investment, and managing trade-offs between sectors. National policies are sometimes needed to enable local implementation, as in Brazil where farmers are mandated to set aside land for certain uses. Policy could focus on two purposes of land management: restoring land for sustainable production activities and optimising land use for the delivery of a full suite of ecosystem services.

During the Journey “Life on Land”, Her Royal Highness Princess Sharifa of Jordan stated “it cost a million cups of coffee and a million cups of tea” to scale up rangeland restoration in Jordan. Her comment reflected the hidden cost of achieving community-based solutions to land degradation through stakeholder dialogue and concerted action. Often the material cost of intervention is low and consists primarily of training and re-orientating the way farmers use and manage their land. The real cost lies in building trust with communities,

the lengthy period of consultation and stakeholder inclusion, and mediating the sensitive negotiations: a cost that often pays back in the longer term.

Concluding comments and questions

- Land Degradation Neutrality is intrinsically win-win and can become a game-changer in sustainable development. The ecosystem and societal benefits of LDN locally and globally more than justify the cost. Improved financial flows to degradation prone areas will enhance local livelihoods, limit the negative impacts of land degradation, preserve biodiversity, sequester more carbon and will contribute to national economies. However, much has still to be done to design the strategies and policies to achieve this.
- A stronger emphasis is required on the protection of soil biodiversity, which is the corner stone of all the ecosystem processes we have discussed. Particularly understanding the role of soil biodiversity in water, nutrient, and carbon cycles, and how to close the carbon loop in agricultural systems. This could be achieved through stronger communication of the LDN indicator on soil organic carbon, with awareness raising on how it is derived, what it tells us about the health and productivity of the land, and what ecosystem services it provides.
- The role of soil in carbon sequestration and storage and in mitigating climate change deserves greater attention in relation to the Paris Agreement on Climate Change.
- While Land Degradation Neutrality is a target at the global level, it needs to be translated to national and local levels with a better understanding of what policies and practices are needed to achieve it. More communications work is required to ground LDN in the lives of land users and planners at the sub-national level: what does it mean for them? What is their role? How will they benefit? Whose responsibility is it? Within this conversation it is important to avoid a people vs. nature dichotomy. The language of resilience may be a good entry point, but resilience needs to be understood through the eyes of local land users.
- Agribusinesses play an important role in determining land management practices, influencing both government policy and farmer practice. It is however still not clear what role agribusiness can and will play in promoting and supporting LDN, recognising that this may not be their ultimate business priority. It will be necessary to build trust between agribusinesses, corporations along the land value chains, and development partners that are promoting LDN. This requires dialogue over products and practices that are currently deemed unsustainable, or are at least controversial. The private sector can do more to invite development partners into their fora (e.g. WBCSD), possibly using current discussions over climate smart agriculture as an entry point.
- There is important need for economic valuation of cost of the “do nothing and further degradation option” or of the cost of an exploitive agri-business model and of the benefits of remedying or avoiding land degradation through inclusive and integrated approaches. Knowing better such economic values can provide the rationale and interest of sustainable investments in land use that not only have local benefits but also can trigger payment for ecosystem services and financial flows (local, national, global) to encourage such local investments.
- Some actors have called for a stronger science-policy-practice interface grounded in real life projects and experiences. These interfaces already exist, including the UNCCD Science-Policy Interface (SPI) and knowledge platforms like WOCAT, but there is insufficient awareness of these resources. A concerted effort is needed to communicate these resources outside of the small Land Degradation circle. The UNCCD’s forthcoming Global Land Outlook is one important opportunity to raise the profile of current knowledge on Land Degradation and the widespread efforts to address it.
- There is interest in some quarters to continue the discussions stimulated by this journey, with partners reconvening at key international events, and with ongoing exchange of knowledge and perspectives. It is worth considering the destination of such a longer term “journey” and the key milestones on the route.

Ongoing discussion could focus on (i) the role of nature conservation to advocate for LDN in view of the imminent gains in terms of biodiversity and climate change resilience; (ii) the role of the sustainable development community in articulating the need of LDN for sustainable livelihoods equity among different land users and (iii) the role of agribusiness in achieving LDN with frank exchange of views between different sectors over the pros and cons of engaging the private sector more centrally.

IUCN 2016 World Conservation Congress Life on Land Journey Events

Date	Event
2 nd September 2016	Pavilion
	<u>WCC 12167</u> : Life on Land: Protecting Ecosystem Services through Land Degradation Neutrality (Water Pavilion) - 1100hrs - 1300hrs
	Workshop
	<u>WCC 10247</u> : The Historic Urban Landscape Approach: integrating cultural and natural values in urban conservation. (RM318A) - 1700hrs - 1900hrs
3 rd September 2016	Knowledge Café'
	<u>WCC 10355</u> : The Ramsar world wetland city scheme: inspiring local communities to value wetlands (RM311-7) - 0830hrs - 1030hrs
	Conservation Campus
	<u>WCC 10309</u> : "Tackling land degradation on-the-ground" – a capacity building platform for land and soil conservation (RM301A) - 0830hrs - 1300hrs
	Workshops
	<u>WCC 9703</u> : Promoting agricultural landscapes that are good for people and good for nature (RM 317A) - 1100hrs - 1300hrs
	<u>WCC 10282</u> - Indigenous and Community Land Rights: Realizing a new conservation ethic (RM 312) - 11:00 - 13:00hrs
	Knowledge Café's
	<u>WCC 10365</u> : Managing land, water and living resources - an ecosystem approach to managing impacts and dependencies in the extractive sector (RM311-8) - 1430hrs - 1630hrs
	<u>WCC 10324</u> : Developing a global soil regime (RM311-4) - 1430hrs - 1630hrs
<u>WCC 9689</u> : Constructing Resilience: The 'Nature' and 'Culture' of food cultivation in the landscape and seascape (RM 313C) - 1100hrs - 1300hrs	
4 th September 2016	Pavilion
	<u>WCC 12311</u> : Homing in on the Range: Reviving rangeland landscapes to achieve Land Degradation Neutrality (Forest Pavilion) - 1430hrs - 1630hrs
	Conservation Campus
	<u>WCC 9634</u> : From Earth Observation to Earth Action: satellite applications for biodiversity conservation (RM304A) - 1430hrs - 1900hrs
	Knowledge Café
<u>WCC 9761</u> : The "Dry Forest Hui O Hana": Collaborative partnerships to protect large-scale, multi-jurisdiction landscapes. (RM311-3) - 1700hrs - 1900hrs	
5 th	Conservation Campus

<u>WCC_9632</u> : Training on the Indicators of Resilience in Socio-Ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS). (RM308B) - 0830hrs - 1900hrs
Pavilion
<u>WCC_12162</u> : The business case of sustainable land management. Launching the Economics of Land Degradation (ELD) Initiative toolbox for the Private Sector (Business and Biodiversity Pavilion) - 13:00 - 14:30
Knowledge Café's
<u>WCC_10391</u> : How can stakeholder engagement processes lead to more sustainable landscapes? (RM311-12) - 1430hrs - 1630hrs
<u>WCC_10339</u> : Life on Land: Conservation opportunities in achieving Land Degradation Neutrality. (RM311-7) - 1430hrs - 1630hrs
Conservation Campus
<u>WCC_9631</u> : The economics of land degradation - Estimating the benefits of conservation and sustainable land management (RM304A) - 1430hrs - 1900hrs
Workshops
<u>WCC_10213</u> : Greening Infrastructure: Landscape planning to address cumulative impacts from large infrastructure projects. (RM 313A) - 1700hrs - 1900hrs
<u>WCC_10297</u> : Ecosystem Management for Conservation and Human Well-being (RM 312) - 1700hrs - 1900hrs
Knowledge Café
<u>WCC_9783</u> : Property Rights, Ecosystem Services, and Land Conservation: Using Property Law to Protect Private Protected Areas (RM311-3) - 1700hrs - 1900hrs
<u>WCC_10390</u> : "On the Move": Mobile Pastoralism in the Mediterranean – Retro-innovation for a sustainable future (RM311-11) - 1700hrs - 1900hrs

Posters

Date	Poster name
2 nd Sept 2016	<u>WCC_10106</u> : The economics of land degradation in Central Asia: Highlighting the added value of nature conservation on across national borders and institutions (Screen 22) - 1300hrs - 1330hrs
3 rd Sept 2016	<u>WCC_10075</u> : Land-use Planning for Long-term Conservation Outcomes in Papua New Guinea (Screen 18) - 1900hrs - 1930hrs
	<u>WCC_9944</u> : Advancing Landscape-scale Conservation in a Changing Climate through Public – Private Partnerships (Screen 8) - 1900 - 1930hrs
	<u>WCC_10504</u> : A Landscape Approach to Temperate Grassland Conservation in the North American Great Plains (Screen 5) - 1300 - 1330hrs
	<u>WCC_10012</u> : Indicators of Resilience in Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (Screen 1) - 14:00 - 14:30
4 th Sept 2016	<u>WCC_10103</u> : The economics of land degradation - Bridging knowledge across scales (Screen 1) - 1400hrs - 1430hrs
	<u>WCC_10079</u> : Biosphere Reserves as multi-use conservation landscapes: Perspectives from the Kruger to Canyons Biosphere Reserve, South Africa (Screen 14) - 1400hrs - 1430hrs
	<u>WCC_9916</u> : Connecting Protected Areas using landscape features: A case study from Ecuador (Screen 21) - 1400 - 1430hrs
	<u>WCC_10471</u> : Beyond protected areas – landscape approaches to save wildlife and wild places outside national parks (Screen 17) - 1900 - 1930hrs
5 th Sept 2016	<u>WCC_9892</u> : Culture and practices of wise use of wetlands in Asia (Screen 4) - 1300hrs - 1330hrs
	<u>WCC_10055</u> : Land use change scenarios for a biosphere reserve (Screen 17) - 1400 - 1430hrs
	<u>WCC_10107</u> : Partnering for Land Protection: The State of Hawaii's Legacy Land Conservation Program (Screen 20) - 1400 - 1430hrs
Date, time and screen	<u>WCC_9926</u> : The Peatland Code – Funding for Peatland Natural Capital
	<u>WCC_9998</u> : Innovative partnerships achieving large-scale conservation: the Landscape Conservation Cooperative network in action

not indicated	<u>WCC 10005</u> : The role of the supernatural environment in Bering Strait region land and water use
---------------	--