

Purpose:

The purpose of this maturity matrix is to measure the impact of the Interlaken Group (as a mechanism) to facilitate private sector action to promote responsible investment that secures community land rights. This matrix encompasses all the activities the Interlaken Group conducts. It is organized into the following overarching strategic priorities: convening and supporting implementation of responsible investment practices at the global and national levels, and catalyzing new solutions. It is a working document, to be updated and improved based upon lessons learned and new data sources, as they become available.

Target Audience:

- A. The Interlaken Group – This matrix can be used to assess the impact of the Interlaken Group at both the international and national levels, and to quickly gauge how company and investor conduct related to land tenure has changed as a result of engagement with the Interlaken Group.

Key Activities	Stage 1 (25 th percentile) Early Stage	Stage 2 (50 th percentile) Some Experience	Stage 3 (75 th percentile) Advanced	Stage 4 (90 th percentile) Progressive	Actual Assessment and Indicators
Convening and supporting implementation at the global and national levels					
Creation of safe space for collaboration	No safe space exists for companies and civil society to come together and exchange	Safe space exists though all participants may not trust that the space is truly “safe” and/or the participant profile is skewed	Safe space is attended by a diverse group of stakeholders that are all comfortable voicing their views	Safe spaces are sought after and frequently used by both private sector and civil society and new partnerships are formed, lessons shared, and challenges addressed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total # of participants engaged in IG networks by type • # of partnerships formed as a result of safe space participation • # of collaborative products developed
Partnerships	Partnerships between companies/investors/civil society are rare or nonexistent and cultural norms are typically confrontational or adversarial	Companies and civil society form partnerships for the first time to address land rights challenges	Companies and civil society occasionally form partnerships and work together well to address land rights challenges after they arise	Companies/investors/civil society proactively seek strategic partnerships to address implementation of best practice with respect to land rights or other operational issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of partnerships formed through IG participation • # of collaborative products developed as a result of partnerships developed within the Group
Awareness and skill building on land rights	First time participants or staff members have little to no awareness of or experience addressing land rights issues in company operations	Participants and staff are aware of land rights issues and address them in an ad hoc, reactive manner over a prolonged period of time	Participants and staff are aware of land rights issues and address them in an ad hoc, reactive manner, quickly	Participants and staff are fully aware of land rights issues, know which tools and solutions are appropriate, and proactively and quickly address them with the support of their organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # companies with land rights policy and/or strategy in place resulting from participation in the IG • # of sustainability reports mention the IG

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of land rights conflicts with private sector (decreasing over time) # of companies using IG resources
Implementation of best practice in supply chains and portfolios	Little to no implementation of best practice in supply chains by all companies	Ad hoc or pilot implementation of best practice in supply chains in leading companies	Frequent implementation of best practice in supply chains in leading companies, little to ad hoc implementation in laggard companies	Universal implementation of best practice in supply chains of leading companies and consistent implementation in laggard companies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of companies with land rights commitments # of companies using IG resources # companies sharing examples of experience implementing good practice (these could be broken out by upstream/downstream)
Sharing across industry and contexts “diverse perspective”	Little to no sharing of experiences across industries and regions/countries	Informal sharing of experiences across industries/regions/countries, no organized place to do so	Periodic sharing of experience across industries/regions/countries , facilitation still required	Constant sharing of experience and updates across industries/regions/countries, little facilitation required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of cross regional partnerships # examples of “cross-pollination” of ideas from one context informing another
Integration with global development, sustainability, and rights agendas	Land rights is not recognized as a priority issue at the international level	Land rights discussed internationally as a standalone topic, though not linked to broader sustainability and development agendas	Land rights are integrated into leading platforms/networks as a key component to address sustainability and development issues	Land rights are recognized as a priority within the broader sustainability and development agendas and frequently referenced at the international level by all stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of international events incorporating Land Rights # of IG presentations at international events
Influence implementation of land rights policy/reform	Companies do not pressure governments to implement land rights policy or reform	Companies attempt to pressure governments in one-off instances, in a reactive manner to implement land rights policy or reform	Companies successfully pressure governments to implement policy or reform in one-off instances, in a reactive manner to implement land rights policy or reform	Companies come together to successfully influence government implementation of land rights policy and reform in a proactive manner, across relevant ministries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of companies engaging with gov to implement reform
Catalyzing new solutions					
Development of solutions to address land rights issues	Little to no operationally focused solutions (business case, guidance documents, examples of good practice) created	Some multi-stakeholder designed solutions exist, but implementation is low and good practice examples are rare	Operational/practical solutions exist but there are still gaps in required guidance. Implementation of	A plethora of multi-stakeholder designed operational/practical solutions exist and continue to be refined as implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of collaborative solutions developed # of solutions developed as a result of partnerships from IG

	with input from both the private sector and civil society exist		solutions is high in leading companies.	increases in both leading and lagging companies	
Dissemination of solutions	Leading and lagging companies are unaware of the solutions to land rights challenges that are available	Leading companies are aware of solutions though do not know how to access them or how to use disparate sources together. Lagging companies are unaware of solutions.	Leading companies are aware of solutions available to them and know where to find them. Lagging companies are aware of solutions though do not know how to access them or how to use disparate sources together.	Leading and lagging companies are aware of the available solutions to land rights challenges and frequently access and share them with others and can use pieces of different solutions to build a customized tool that works.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # organizations accessing/exposed to IG tools (broken out by IG participant/not)

Purpose:

The purpose of the following set of questions is to provide a framework to enable the private sector to self assess progress to respect community land rights and adopt rights-based business models. The aim of this framework is to create a simple system that may be quickly used to evaluate private sector progress on land rights using publicly available information. These questions represent the process from recognition of the issue, to implementation, to influencing other key stakeholders and are based on the Interlaken Groups “three asks” for the private sector: 1. To clean up operations, supply chains, and investment portfolios; 2. To influence laggards; and 3. To influence governments to recognize and implement land rights legislation.

In creating this simple framework, we recognize the challenge of capturing concrete progress on the ground for project and investment-affected communities. There is a difference between progress on paper which is captured in the below framework and progress in the day to day lives of affected peoples. We have suggested indicators that might be useful for measuring or assessing levels of implementation but acknowledge that the data and technology is not completely adequate at this stage, though we anticipate that data and transparency will improve.

This is a working document, to be updated and improved based upon lessons learned and new data sources, as they become available.

Target Audience:

- A. Companies and investors – might use these questions and associated indicators to quickly assess progress, or as a framework for engaging service providers and other vehicles like the Interlaken Group (e.g. this may be useful for a quick self-assessment by an upstream producer or portfolio company who are less familiar with the issue).
- B. Donors – might use these questions to measure the impact of investments and better monitor progress on the ground, as a framework to aggregate reported results to more clearly articulate programmatic impacts and reach, and to instigate, design, and coordinate data gathering efforts on the part of grantees.
- C. Civil Society Organizations working with the private sector – these questions and associated indicators might be used to design log frames, more systematically and clearly report on progress with the private sector and provide a basis for coordinating data gathering efforts.

Applying the framework

A scenario where the Group is engaging in a new country: a diagnostic like this might be useful for a local producer to assess themselves (and perhaps direct them to the service providers and more robust tools they need to take action), and similarly for local NGOs/advocates to understand and orient their efforts to engage

Framework Questions:

1. Has the company made a public commitment to respecting community land rights including signing on to the [Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure](#) (VGGTs), [United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People](#) (UNDRIP), and the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)? Yes/No (*an example could be a sourcing policy with criteria*)
2. Has the company adopted an internationally accepted framework to assess adherence to protecting community land rights? Yes/No (*Please state which framework has been adopted, and whether for the entire business or selected operations / investments*)
3. Has the company sought advice/expertise from rights-focused civil society or consultants to address lands rights challenges in its operations, supply chain, or investment portfolio? Yes/No (give examples)
4. Has the company tested new tools, guidance and/or alternative business models that respect local tenure systems? Yes/No (*specify in notes column details including where deployed, nature of operation*)
5. Has the company's progress been assessed by an independent monitor in a transparent and independently verifiable manner that is available to the public? Yes/No (*please specify whether this has been conducted for the entire company or a particular operation*)
6. Does the company encourage suppliers, peer companies, and governments to adopt higher standards and legal structures with respect to land rights? Yes/No
7. Does the company have a system based on international standards to provide remediation and/or compensation to project or historically-affected communities? Yes/No (*please include consideration of expansion safe guards and Land Conflict Resolutions processes and remediation*)
8. To what extent has the company implemented public commitments to respecting community land rights, and to what extent have project or investment-affected communities realized benefits? Please describe.
9. Does the company have specific commitments related to inclusion of women in investment and/or operational process, with special consideration of risks and impacts of projects on women? Yes/No
10. Has the company transitioned all operations and investments to rights-based business models? Yes/No

Indicators (Data Sources):

These could be applied across the supply chain / investment portfolio at a high level, or could be focused on individual operations / supply chains / investments

1. Simple counts of companies related to each of the questions (LEGEND Partners, publicly available sources, Interlaken Group surveys)
2. Market cap/revenue/or other financial indicators linked to these companies (LEGEND Partners, financial databases, Interlaken Group surveys)
3. Percentage of sector or supply of a commodity represented by companies responding to these questions (financial databases, Interlaken Group surveys)
4. Number of hectares represented by companies responding to these questions (LEGEND Partners, company websites, Interlaken Group surveys)

4 June 2019

5. Georeferenced data on operational areas or supply chains represented by companies responding to these questions, linked to social, environmental and land governance-related indicators (e.g. poverty, drought, deforestation etc.) (TMP Public Landscape, Interlaken Group surveys, LEGEND Partners, WRI Global Forest Watch, IFRI)
6. Community based monitors independently and safely collect simple data on social, environmental, and governance impacts of investments and operations to verify level of implementation (few mechanisms exist, Kumacaya, RfUK Forest Connect, TBD)

Sample Assessment Framework Against Key Metrics:

No	Questions	(Example) Company X	Notes
1.	Public commitment to respecting community land rights including signing on to the VGGTs, UNDRIP, and FPIC	Yes	
2.	Adopted an internationally accepted framework to assess adherence to protecting community land rights	No	
3.	Sought advice/expertise from rights-focused civil society or consultants to address lands rights challenges in its operations, supply chain, or investment portfolio	Yes	
4.	Tested new tools and/or alternative business models that respect local tenure systems	Yes	
5.	Progress been assessed by an independent monitor in a transparent and independently verifiable manner that is available to the public	Yes	
6.	Encourages others to adopt higher standards and legal structures with respect to land rights	Suppliers	No
		Peer Companies	Yes
		Governments	No
7.	Have a system based on international standards to provide remediation and/or compensation to project or historically-affected communities	Yes	
8.	Fully implemented public commitments to respecting community land rights, and have project or investment affected communities fully realized benefits	No	
9.	Considers the voice and perspective of women continuously throughout the investment and/or operational process, with special consideration of the risks and impacts of projects on women	No	
10.	Transitioned all operations and investments to rights-based business models	No	