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I. Introduction

Although there is global consensus that women’s land rights are fundamental for the realization of food security and rural development, accurate and reliable statistics to monitor the attainment and realisation of these rights are still lacking. Indeed, the lack of clear and accurate statistics on landownership and land management – that are disaggregated by sex - is problematic for developing clear policy responses to, and for monitoring of, inequalities faced by women and men in rural areas (Doss et al., 2015).

Women’s land rights are often discussed using indicators of agricultural holders and landowners interchangeably. The agricultural holder is the manager of the holding and is a useful concept for understanding issues of agricultural productivity and responsibilities in production. The landowner has legal claims to the land and typically has the right to sell, bequeath or mortgage the land. Both are important components of women’s land rights, but they are different and should not be confused with one another – rather they should complement each other to enhance our understanding of women’s rights to and control over land resources. Both landownership and management statistics are becoming increasingly available as multiple international efforts are underway with the aim to increase availability of, and access to, relevant data on gender and land. Indicative of this increased focus, the ‘52 Minimum Set of Gender Indicators’ approved by the UN Statistical Commission on its 43rd session includes the “Proportion of adult population owning land, by sex” and in addition, methodological work is on-going under the UN EDGE (Evidence for Data and Gender Equality) project on collecting sex disaggregated landownership data.

Furthermore, at the end of the FAO World Programme of Agricultural Census 2000 (WCA 2000, on-going from 1996 to 2005), the FAO Statistics Division began encouraging countries undertaking an agricultural census to compile and report key sex-disaggregated structural indicators, including the share of agricultural holders by sex. This is a measure of management, not landownership, which captures women’s responsibilities and management in agriculture. The value of investigating land ownership and management at the plot level has been recognized in view of the next World Programme of Agricultural Census (WCA 2010, on-going from 2016 to 2025) (see section III).

Increasingly, data on women’s land ownership is becoming available through nationally-representative household surveys. Interestingly, most of the currently available data on women’s and men’s landownership comes from Sub-Saharan Africa. This in part is explained by growing interest in agricultural productivity issues on the continent from policy makers, development practitioners and academic institutions which has led to data collection at the plot level allowing one to link plots to plot owners or managers.

In order to monitor progress on land rights globally, a common framework for the processing and interpretation of data is crucial. While there are many challenges to developing comparable indicators of land ownership and management, some cross-country harmonization efforts are on-going. The CGIAR Research Program on Policies, Institutions, and Markets (IFPRI-PIM), led by the International Food Policy Research Institute, has spearheaded these efforts. A notable achievement is a conceptual framework and set of indicators to analyse landownership by sex, as proposed by Doss et al. (2015). The work capitalizes on new data from the Living Standards Measurement Survey’s Integrated Surveys in Agriculture (LSMS-ISA) as well as Demographic Household Surveys (DHS) for several African countries to derive the proposed sex-disaggregated indicators, and concludes that better and more data on landownership is needed to monitor and guide development interventions. Analysis by Kieran et al. (2015) with similar data from Asia reached the same conclusion.

These current efforts to streamline and compile international statistics on gender and land in a unified framework provide the entry point for the expanding the statistical content of the Gender and Land Rights Database (GLRD). The Database draws on the framework by Doss et al. (2015), while supplementing with other statistics. The following sections describe the statistics of the GLRD in detail.

---

2 See Living Standards Measurement Surveys-Integrated Surveys in Agriculture project of the World Bank (LSMS-ISA) for more information.
II. Statistics available in the GLRD

The Gender and Land Rights Database (GLRD) is an on-line platform that was launched by FAO in February 2010 with the objective of highlighting the major political, legal and cultural factors that influence the realisation of women’s land rights throughout the world. As of May 2015, the database included 83 country profiles that contain key information on women’s land rights, mainly legal-based information, but also information about customary land tenure and gender and land-related policies. The database has a tool for assessing the extent to which national legal frameworks enable gender-equitable land tenure, assessing 30 legal indicators in different countries.³

In 2014, FAO embarked on a collaborative effort with IFPRI-PIM to develop a common framework for sex-disaggregated indicators for the GLRD. This collaboration builds on existing theoretical and analytical work by IFPRI as described in the previous section, adapted to the purposes of the GLRD and other statistical work in FAO. The GLRD statistical framework comprises five sex-disaggregated indicators, and the database makes use of already available indicators. In addition, analysis of additional data is currently underway. Sex-disaggregated ownership data derives mainly from large-scale household surveys, while agricultural holders’ data is obtained from several rounds of WCA. Internal collaboration with the FAO Statistics Division has been instrumental in the usage of the WCA data. The following section discusses the five indicators of the GLRD framework and presents the data that is currently available in the GLRD.

All of the indicators in the GLRD are calculated mainly for agricultural land, rather than all land, in both urban and rural areas. This choice is consistent with the fact that agricultural land,⁴ and not any land, is a crucial resource for poverty reduction, food security and rural development. In addition, women’s empowerment passes through the ownership of productive resources, such as agricultural land.⁵ Other types of land, although relevant for women’s empowerment, are better captured by other statistics (e.g. those related to dwelling ownership).

³ GLRD Legislation Assessment Tool has over 30 legal indicators available for 18 countries.
⁴ Agricultural land is land devoted to agriculture, including land for livestock rearing in addition to land for the production of crops. Agricultural land includes arable land, permanent cropland and permanent pastures.
⁵ In the cases where the indicator is only available for land in general (not specifically agricultural land), this is highlighted in the database notes.
**Indicator 1: Distribution of agricultural holders by sex**

**Definition.** Indicator 1 measures the percentage of female and male agricultural holders out of total agricultural holders. The indicator is created as follows:

\[
\left( \frac{\text{Female agricultural holders}}{\text{Total agricultural holders}} \right) \cdot 100 \quad ; \quad \left( \frac{\text{Male agricultural holders}}{\text{Total agricultural holders}} \right) \cdot 100
\]

The **agricultural holder** is defined in agricultural censuses as: “The civil or juridical person who makes the major decisions regarding resource use and exercises management control over the agricultural holding operation. The agricultural holder has technical and economic responsibility for the holding and may undertake all responsibilities directly, or delegate responsibilities related to day-to-day work management to a hired manager” (FAO, 2005).

An **agricultural holding** is defined as: “An economic unit of agricultural production under single management comprising all livestock kept and all land used wholly or partly for agricultural production purposes, without regard to title, legal form, or size. Single management may be exercised by an individual or household, jointly by two or more individuals or households, by a clan or tribe, or by a juridical person such as a corporation, cooperative or government agency. The holding’s land may consist of one or more parcels, located in one or more separate areas or in one or more territorial or administrative divisions, providing the parcels share the same production means, such as labour, farm buildings, machinery or draught animals” (FAO 2005).

This indicator illustrates the management of agricultural holdings by sex, identifying the extent to which women and men have the management responsibility of agricultural production resources. The holder may also be the owner of the holding but not necessarily so. While agricultural holdings typically are land holdings, they may also comprise other agricultural production resources, and in some cases only non-land resources.  

Per definition, a holding is under single management. Most countries report a single holder for each agricultural holding. However, it would be possible to identify the joint management of a

---

6 The area of a holding may be zero, such as where the holdings keep livestock but has no land; this is called a landless holding (FAO 2010).
single holding. In such cases, the total number of holders would therefore be larger than the total number of holdings.\footnote{A joint holder can be both male and female. When countries do not report joint holders as a separate category, they may or may not include them with individual male and female holders, respectively, in the tabulations. In many cases, however, countries report holders as equivalent to holdings (e.g. one holder per holding).}

Furthermore, a holder can also belong to the “juridical person” category (e.g. a cooperative or a corporation), which is typically not gender-disaggregated. In the GLRD, the numbers reported are aligned as much as possible with the numbers reported by the countries themselves in their agricultural censuses. Most often the numbers will not include juridical persons and refer to civil persons only.\footnote{The GLRD as much as possible uses the statistic inclusive of civil persons only; however, not all countries report it in this way, and thus the GLRD uses the statistic inclusive of juridical persons.} The data solely on civil persons provide a better picture of the gender split for holders.

**Data sources.** The agricultural holders’ data come from agricultural censuses, which are undertaken by National Statistical Offices and/or Ministries of Agriculture.\footnote{Management data is also available in other sources, such as the LSMS surveys discussed in the following sections. It would be possible to analyze management data by plot using some of these surveys, but this would not be directly comparable with the data from the WCA, since WCA use agricultural holdings as the basis for sampling, while household surveys are representative of households.} The sex of the agricultural holder is a core item that has long been suggested to countries for data collection by the FAO World Census of Agriculture (WCA) Programme and is increasingly collected by countries that fall under this programme (FAO, 2010).

**Advantages and challenges.** Indicator 1 is by far the most prevalent of the currently available gender and land indicators and is easy to extract from national agricultural censuses. It is created under the common guidelines for agricultural censuses and is as such broadly comparable across countries.\footnote{For example, some countries use agricultural household and agricultural holding interchangeably, some countries explicitly include landless holdings in the holding data while others do not. Common, however, is the concept of the holder being the responsible manager of the holding, with the technical and economic responsibility. This makes the data largely comparable across countries.}

However, the indicator has a number of disadvantages. Firstly, Indicator 1 is measured at the holding level and hence does not capture management within the holding. A holding may consist of several plots of land, with different household members responsible for different plots, but this is generally not captured in the indicator, as typically only one holder is identified per holding. As such, it tends to underestimate the management role of household members...
other than that of the person designated as the official holder. For example, married women often hold some responsibility for the family farm or manage some plots within the holding, but their husbands will typically be identified as the head of the household and the single holder. In this situation, married women’s shares of management responsibility will be not be reported in Indicator 1. To address this issue, the 2020 World Programme for the Census of Agriculture Guidelines elaborated by FAO is proposing the collection of data on managerial decisions and landownersh within the holding in addition to the sex of the holder, which hopefully will lead to increased availability of intra-holding data in the future (see last section).

Secondly, some countries adapt a threshold for minimum size of the holdings included in the census (often due to implementation constraints), leaving out holdings that fall below a certain value. If women are more likely to manage agricultural holdings below the threshold, this could potentially reduce the percentage of female agricultural holders captured by the agricultural census.

Finally, agricultural censuses are undertaken only approximately every 10 years. While yearly collection of this indicator is likely to be redundant - as it is unreasonable to expect the percentage of female agricultural holders to change significantly on annual basis – it may be useful to have it collected more frequently than every ten years. Patterns of male migration out of rural areas, for example, may shift the pattern of women landholders. Initiatives such as the Agricultural and Rural Integrated Surveys (AGRIS) (see last section) could lead to more frequent data collection. Furthermore, the indicator is not necessarily reported in the national agricultural census reports, even when the necessary data have been collected.

**Current availability.** As of May 2015, Indicator 1 was available for 104 countries and territories in the GLRD. Tables 1-6 in the annex show the available sex-disaggregated data across regions. Most of the data points shown in these tables belong to the 2000 and 2010 agricultural census rounds. However, some data derives from the 1990 census round and is consequently relatively outdated, including data for seven countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and several data points for Middle East/North Africa and from Asia and Latin America/the Caribbean. Therefore, for some countries the data available can be as old as 20+ years.

---

11 The FAO World Programmes of Agricultural Censuses follow a 10-year cycle. Every 10 years new guidelines and recommendations are provided to countries to help them generate internationally comparable figures on the structure of agriculture.

depending on how often agricultural censuses are conducted or whether countries include this item or not in their census report.

**Key findings.** The data for this indicator in the GLRD shows that gender inequalities are quite evident in the management of agricultural holdings:

- The share of female agricultural holders ranges from 0.8% in Saudi Arabia to 51% in Cape Verde, with an overall global share of 12.8%
- The region showing the greatest gender gap for this indicator is the Middle East/North Africa (table 4), while the region showing the narrowest gender gap is Europe (table 5).
- Figure 1 shows the share of female agricultural holders against the country’s GDP per capita\(^1\) indicating no correlation between these two indicators. In addition, the figure indicates that gender inequalities in the management of agricultural holdings are present both in developed and developing countries.
- Figure 2 shows the shares of female agricultural holders by region as well as the share of female employment in the agricultural sector, both self-employed in their own farms and wage workers, as a percentage of total female population. The key comparison indicator in this graph is the share of women who are self-employed in agriculture, which includes all women working on their own farms. The share of female agricultural holders for Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) is similar, despite a larger participation of women in self-employed agriculture in SSA than in LAC (54% vs. 23%). This is in stark contrast to the Middle East/North Africa (ME), where less than 5% of holdings are managed by females and where participation of women in agriculture is almost 40%.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) GDP is matched to the year for which the holding data is reported, and adjusted to 2005 values.

\(^2\) Comparing these numbers should, however, be done with caution as figures for agricultural employment are not available for all countries and not always for the same years as for agricultural holdings.
Indicator 2: Distribution of agricultural landowners by sex

**Definition.** Indicator 2 measures the share of female and male agricultural landowners in the total population of landowners. The indicator is created as follows:

\[
\left( \frac{\text{Female agricultural landowners}}{\text{Total agricultural landowners}} \right) \cdot 100 \; ; \; \left( \frac{\text{Male agricultural landowners}}{\text{Total agricultural landowners}} \right) \cdot 100
\]

All of the following indicators are based on the landowners, rather than agricultural holders. The agricultural landowner is defined as the legal owner of the agricultural land; however, definitions of ownership may vary across countries and surveys. The indicator may not necessarily reflect documented ownership certified by a legal document. Especially in places where much of the land is not formally titled or documented, surveys often simply ask whether someone in the household owns the land, and if so, who owns it. In addition to officially titled ownership, it may also include proxies, such as the right to use, sell or bequeath the land, or the right to use it as collateral. This enables the indicator to capture different aspects of the “bundle of rights” related to land, rather than land ownership in the strictest sense of the term. The current indicator in the GLRD uses different definitions of ownership; they are specified for each country in the data notes. As data for more countries become available, it will be useful to calculate these measures using more than one definition of ownership. This will be useful for policy analysis. For example, we may want to know both how many people report that they are landowners and how many have documents for their land. (Doss et al., 2015).\(^{15}\)

An individual is defined as a landowner whether they own land solely (they are the only owner of a plot of land) or jointly with someone inside or outside the household. Thus, households may have multiple landowners. In addition, households may own multiple plots of land with different owners identified for each plot. This contrasts with the data on agricultural holdings where all of the household plots comprise one holding and typically identifies a single holder

---

\(^{15}\) The literature on property rights defines bundles of rights, which refer to gradients of control over a given resource usually applied to land and other natural resources (Lastarria-Cornhiel et al., 2014). These rights can be divided into the rights to use the land (including the right to access and the right to extract resources), the right to appropriate the return from the asset (earnings and income), the right to change its form, substance, and location (decision-making rights such as management and the exclusion of other users), and alienation (including transfer or rights to others) (Di Gregorio et al., 2008 cited in Lastarria-Cornhiel et al., 2014).
with management responsibility.

**Data sources.** The data used to construct Indicator 2 typically stems from large-scale household surveys in which questions on landownership for individual household members are included in an agricultural module (LSMS approach), making it possible to calculate total agricultural landowners by sex. Until now, the data have been collected mainly from LSMS surveys, and particularly the LSMS-ISA, in collaboration with National Ministries of Statistics or other relevant ministries.

Data for this indicator will need to be collected in the future, and initiatives such as the EDGE or the AGRIS are likely to contribute to this process. The indicator is nationally representative insofar as the household survey data are nationally representative, and it may be possible to disaggregate the indicator at subnational level, based on the domains of reference of the survey sample design. The indicators can be collected periodically (about every 2-5 years), which is a reasonable frequency for capturing significant changes in agricultural landownership.  

**Advantages and challenges.** Indicator 2 tells us what proportion of landowners are women. Because multiple owners can be identified within a household, it better reflects individual level land rights. An increase in the percentage of women owning land indicates that more women relative to men obtain rights to this key resource for rural livelihoods. However, comparability across countries - mainly due to differing ownership definitions and low availability of data - limits the current use of this indicator.

There are challenges with collecting data on land ownership that affect this and the following indicators. One is the reliability of people’s response about whether they are owners. One approach would be to confirm documented ownership with the enumerator requesting to see the documents, but this is difficult to implement if for instance these documents may not be available at the time when the survey is conducted, or don’t exist. In addition, there is some evidence that the responses about land ownership will differ, depending on who within the

---

16 On the other hand, the indicator is collected in different years, depending on when surveys are conducted in individual countries. This may negatively affect comparability across countries if collection periods have a very wide span
household is interviewed. Different country definitions of ownership and data collection years pose a challenge for cross-country comparability of Indicator 2.

**Current availability.** Table 8 (annex) shows the available data for this indicator in the GLRD based on data analysis by Deere *et al.* (2012), Deere & Leon (2013), Doss *et al.* (2011) and Kieran *et al.* (2015). Data on individual landownership are currently available for fewer countries than are data on agricultural holdings (Indicator 1). As of May 2015, Indicator 2 had been calculated for 11 countries in the GLRD. The data necessary to calculate this indicator is available for at least 10-15 additional countries.

**Key Findings.** Similar to Indicator 1, gender inequalities are evident; however, the gender gap appears narrower when examining ownership (Indicator 2) rather than management of holdings (Indicator 1), highlighting the importance of using different indicators to complement each other.

- At present, the GLRD has only both Indicators 1 and 2 available for six countries, though not for the same years. For all these countries, the gap between men and women is narrower for Indicator 2. This difference may reflect the different data collection approaches; Indicator 1 typically only lists one person per household while Indicator 2 may include multiple household members.
- For the 11 countries where data is currently available, Ecuador is the only where women make up a (marginally) large proportion of landowners than men (51 versus 49%).

---

17 The EDGE project is analyzing some of these data collection issues. The Gender Asset Gap Project has done some work analyzing how to collect individual level asset data, including land: [http://www.genderassetgap.org/sites/default/files/Lessons%20from%20the%20Field.pdf](http://www.genderassetgap.org/sites/default/files/Lessons%20from%20the%20Field.pdf)

18 Bangladesh, Ecuador, Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Tajikistan, Vietnam.

19 The Gender and Land Rights Database is currently analyzing household survey data to expand the number of data points available for this and other indicators under a broader stream of work, FAO’s Rural Livelihoods Monitor.
Indicator 3: Incidence of female and male agricultural landowners

**Definition.** Indicator 3 measures the incidence of female and male agricultural landowners as a proportion of the total female and male population. Separate indicators are created for sole ownership by women and by men and for any ownership, whether sole or joint, by women and by men. It is created as follows:

\[
\left( \frac{\text{Female agricultural landowners, sole}}{\text{Total female adult population}} \right) \times 100 \quad \left( \frac{\text{Male agricultural landowners, sole}}{\text{Total male adult population}} \right) \times 100
\]

\[
\left( \frac{\text{Female agricultural landowners, sole and joint}}{\text{Total female adult population}} \right) \times 100 \quad \left( \frac{\text{Male agricultural landowners, sole and joint}}{\text{Total male adult population}} \right) \times 100
\]

While the proposed measure for the “52 Minimum Set of Gender Indicators’ would count a person as a landowner if they own any land, whether solely or jointly, it is also useful to know how many women and men own land solely. There is evidence from some countries that joint ownership does not confer equal rights on men and women; thus, it is useful to know the extent to which women have their own land rights as well.

**Data sources.** As for Indicator 2, the main sources of data to construct this indicator are large-scale household surveys that include questions on individual land ownership. There are currently two potential sources of nationally representative data for constructing Indicator 2. The DHS surveys in 2009 began collecting landownership data in selected countries. The DHS surveys ask both male and female respondents whether their household owns land and whether they own land themselves. They are nationally representative for adult men and women of reproductive age. Another important data source for this indicator is the LSMS-type surveys, where the information is collected at the plot level. These surveys typically ask one respondent to identify the owner or owners of each plot of land owned by anyone in the household.

**Advantages and challenges.** Indicator 3 sheds light on how common it is for men and women to own land and as such depicts how widespread ownership is in a given population, which may obviously differ substantially across country contexts. It is important to compare the percentage of women who own land with the same indicator for men: a national female

---

20 The age range varies by country. It can be 15-49 or 15-54 or 15-59.
landownership incidence of 3% may sound like a very small figure when quoted alone, but if the corresponding figure for men is 4%, the implications are quite different. It may also be useful to analyse this indicator alongside the incidence of female and male participation in agriculture and in the agricultural labour force, which would put the indicator into the context of the broader agricultural sector.

As for Indicator 2, Indicator 3 have challenges with collecting data on land ownership in terms of reliability of people’s response about whether they are owners as and lack of documentation, well as different country definitions of ownership and data collection years posing a challenge for cross-country comparability.

**Current availability.** The indicator is available in the GLRD as of May 2015 for 16 countries, based on the analysis by Doss *et al.* (2015) and Kieran *et al.* (2015); additional countries will be added in the near future. The data is shown in table 8.

**Key Findings:**

- The unweighted average of 11 countries from Africa, even if these countries do not represent the whole continent, show that 36% of women own land either solely or jointly. This should be held up against the corresponding figure of 44% for men, revealing some gap between male and female incidence of ownership.
- Data from Asia is more in line with the distributions shown for the indicator of agricultural holdings (Indicator 1); however, it is hard to draw any conclusions given the small number of countries with available data.

---

Indicator 4: Distribution of agricultural land area owned by sex

**Definition.** Indicator 4 measures the share of agricultural land area that is owned by women, men, and jointly by men and women, using the total land area owned by households. (Thus, it excludes land owned by the government and corporations). This indicator is created as follows:

\[
\frac{\text{Agricultural land area owned by women}}{\text{Total agricultural land area owned by households}} \times 100 : \frac{\text{Agricultural land area owned by men}}{\text{Total agricultural land area owned by households}} \times 100 : \frac{\text{Agricultural land area owned jointly by men and women}}{\text{Total agricultural land area owned by households}} \times 100
\]

**Data sources.** Nationally representative household surveys that include questions to identify the area of each agricultural plot and the owner (or owners) are necessary to construct Indicator 4. Relatively few surveys collect this detailed information; the LSMS surveys, particularly the LSMS-ISAs, are currently one source. Surveys that collect data on the area of each plot could easily add questions to identify the owner, making it possible to calculate Indicator 4.

**Advantages and challenges.** The indicator reveals gender-based differences in the amount of land owned by men and women. While this does not tell us how many men and how many women own land, it does provide a good measure of how the land area is distributed between men and women. Since women’s plots are generally smaller than men’s, Indicator 4 would typically show more gender inequality than Indicators 2 or 3. This indicator also provides information on how much of the land is owned individually by men and by women and how much is owned jointly. These patterns vary widely across countries.

When data allows, it would be of interest to include corporations and institutions as another category of landowners in this indicator. While it would not add to the picture in terms of gender inequalities, it would reveal to which degree productive land is controlled by non-households and provide a sense of the importance of those other players in agriculture.

The same caveats as mentioned for Indicators 2 and 3 with respect to comparability of ownership definitions across countries and increased reliability if ownership is documented apply to Indicator 4 as well.
**Current availability.** As of May 2015, the GLRD has this indicator available for six countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and for three countries in Asia\(^{22}\), based on the analysis by Doss et al. (2015) and Kieran et al. (2015).

**Key Findings.** The data shown in table 9 (annex) once again show evident gender inequalities in landownership:

- In all nine countries available from Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia, men own a larger proportion of the land area than women.
- The patterns of individual vs. joint ownership differ by country. In the two Asian countries for which joint ownership is reported, it is a small proportion of total household agricultural land.

\(^{22}\) Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Uganda and Vietnam.
**Indicator 5: Distribution of agricultural land value owned by sex**

**Definition.** Indicator 5 measures the share of agricultural land value that is owned by women, men and jointly, using the total value of land owned by households. (Similar to Indicator 4, it excludes land owned by the government and corporations). This indicator is created as follows:

\[
\left( \frac{\text{Agricultural land value owned by women}}{\text{Total agricultural land value owned by households}} \right) \times 100 : \left( \frac{\text{Agricultural land value owned by men}}{\text{Total agricultural land value owned by households}} \right) \times 100 : \left( \frac{\text{Agricultural land value owned jointly by men and women}}{\text{Total agricultural land value owned by households}} \right) \times 100
\]

**Data sources.** The data sources are generally the same as those mentioned for Indicator 4: large-scale household surveys that include questions on individual landownership. Similarly to Indicator 4, this indicator requires plot level data on value and ownership which is typically only available in specialized agricultural surveys (Doss et al., 2015). A current source of these data is the LSMS-ISA surveys and some other integrated household surveys, where the information is collected at the plot level.

**Advantages and challenges.** Indicator 5 is of interest as land owned by men and women may differ in terms of quality and location, information that is not conveyed by the other indicators in the framework. The value measures may capture these differences. Even if Indicator 4 showed an equal distribution of land area between men and women, women’s plots may systematically be of lower value than men’s, and this difference is captured by Indicator 5. This indicator also identifies the value of land owned only by men or only by women from that owned jointly by men and women (typically couples).

However, there are challenges with collecting data on land values. In places where there are not functioning land markets, value measures may be misleading or unavailable. (Kieran et al., 2015). And while there have been improvements in data collection techniques on land area, such as using GPS, there have not been similar improvements in the way we obtain value measures. Therefore, Indicator 4 is typically more reliable than Indicator 5 for comparisons across countries.
Lastly, as above, the same caveats as mentioned for Indicators 2-4 with respect to comparability of ownership definitions across countries and increased reliability if ownership is documented apply to Indicator 5 as well.

**Current availability.** Data are currently only available for five countries for this indicator in the GLRD, based on the analysis by Doss et al. (2015).23 The results are shown in table 9 (annex). More surveys are available for processing to add to the data availability.

**Key Findings:**

- The proportions of land value owned by women range from 5% in Niger to 39% in Malawi, while the proportions owned by men range from 34% in Uganda to 78% in Nigeria.
- The proportion of land value owned by women solely is lower than the proportion owned by men or owned jointly with men in all countries (Malawi being the only exception as women own the same proportion solely, 39%, as men, which is also larger than the proportion owned jointly with men, 23%).

---

23 Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Uganda.
III. Next steps

A new and updated version of the GLRD was launched by FAO early March 2015. New data for the five indicators has been made available in this updated GLRD, thanks to a fruitful collaboration between FAO’s Statistics Division and IFPRI-PIM. The GLRD is therefore in a position to disseminate most of the currently available data on gender and land. However, while data has been expanded, there is still plenty scope for further growth. In addition to updating the data through in-house processing of existing but yet unprocessed household surveys in the FAO-ESS repository and data extraction from national agricultural censuses, we expect that the GLRD will continue to grow as more data becomes available through new sources including: WCA 2020, AGRIS and EDGE.

- The WCA 2020 has included a specific theme on the “Intra-holding distribution of managerial decisions and ownership on the holding”. The main purpose of this theme is to assess the role of gender in decision making on the holding as well as women’s ownership of critical assets. Indeed, the theme proposes a set of supplementary items – i.e. the sex of the household members making managerial decisions; the area of crops by sex of the crop-manager; the number of livestock by sex of the person managing them; the area of land owned by the sex of the owner; and the number of livestock owned by the sex of the owner.

- Through the AGRIS project, FAO is developing methodological guidelines on how to conduct integrated agricultural surveys, including key indicators to collect, definitions, methods for data collection, periodicity, among others. Effort will also be made to support countries in the actual implementation of these surveys. By doing so, the availability of gender and land indicators is expected to increase substantially in the future.

- The EDGE initiative led by UNSD and UN Women is conducting methodological work on the collection of sex-disaggregated data on assets, including land ownership. This initiative and the related Guidelines are expected to boost the collection of sex-disaggregated data on landownership in nationally representative surveys carried out at country level.

Finally, it is worth repeating that sex-disaggregated landownership indicators are included in the 52 indicators of the Minimum Set of Gender Indicators approved by the UN Statistical Commission (L3 has been proposed, but a revised formulation could be proposed based on the
EDGE conclusions). In addition, landownership disaggregated by sex is one of the proposed monitoring indicators for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). They also are proposing the indicator L3 and are trying to standardize definitions of ownership. This further underlines the increasing recognition of the importance of monitoring and reporting on landownership by sex.

The GLRD will continue to update its indicators by analysing existing information from agricultural censuses, household and agricultural surveys, and continue to build partnerships with other institutions that also analyse gender and land related data, including analysis that goes beyond only landownership (e.g. indicators more specific to security of land tenure). Through these combined efforts, the GLRD will continue to position itself as a key resource on gender and land issues for researchers, policy makers and the general public.
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# Table 1: Distribution of Agricultural Holders by Sex in Sub-Saharan Africa (Indicator 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Total Female</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Total Male</th>
<th>% Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>50,690</td>
<td>17,576</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>33,114</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>886,638</td>
<td>74,559</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>812,079</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>44,450</td>
<td>22,461</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>21,989</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>52,464</td>
<td>17,094</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>35,370</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,117,667</td>
<td>113,312</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>1,004,355</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR of Congo</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4,479,600</td>
<td>398,400</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>4,081,200</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>15,031,400</td>
<td>2,928,300</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>12,103,000</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>69,140</td>
<td>5,731</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>63,409</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>840,454</td>
<td>47,562</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>792,892</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>337,795</td>
<td>103,878</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>233,917</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>2,428,492</td>
<td>371,158</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>2,057,334</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,561,416</td>
<td>501,919</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>1,059,497</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>805,195</td>
<td>24,636</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>780,559</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>3,064,195</td>
<td>708,353</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>2,355,842</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>15,732,850</td>
<td>1,579,341</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>14,153,509</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>437,036</td>
<td>39,597</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>397,439</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4,901,837</td>
<td>966,076</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>3,935,761</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,704,721</td>
<td>277,693</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>1,427,028</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,305,783</td>
<td>250,710</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>1,055,073</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional average (weighted)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>15.4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>84.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FAO Gender and Land Rights Database.  
Regional average is weighted with total holders of each country.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Total Female</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Total Male</th>
<th>% Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>28,695,763</td>
<td>1,322,937</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>27,372,826</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>728,950</td>
<td>211,800</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>517,150</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2005/2006</td>
<td>128,966,000</td>
<td>15,115,000</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>113,851,000</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>20,331,746</td>
<td>1,790,741</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>18,541,005</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>244,404</td>
<td>30,254</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>214,150</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>667,900</td>
<td>60,600</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>607,300</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>526,265</td>
<td>94,906</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>405,401</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,464,769</td>
<td>519,668</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>2,945,101</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3,364,139</td>
<td>271,507</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>3,092,632</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4,768,317</td>
<td>516,572</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>4,251,745</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,748,341</td>
<td>285,214</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>1,463,127</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5,787,774</td>
<td>1,585,850</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>4,201,924</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>61,017</td>
<td>5,382</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>55,635</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional average (weighted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FAO Gender and Land Rights Database.
Regional average is weighted with total holders of each country.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>total number</th>
<th>total female</th>
<th>% female</th>
<th>total male</th>
<th>% male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>202,423</td>
<td>32,768</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>169,655</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>9,697</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8,907</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5,175,636</td>
<td>656,255</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>4,519,381</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>293,925</td>
<td>80,665</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>213,265</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>268,787</td>
<td>80,255</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>188,532</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>842,882</td>
<td>213,731</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>629,151</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>395,588</td>
<td>45,676</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>348,975</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>819,162</td>
<td>63,627</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>755,535</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>2008/08</td>
<td>1,018,951</td>
<td>257,670</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>757,354</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>210,853</td>
<td>63,690</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>139,965</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4,067,618</td>
<td>640,265</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>3,427,353</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>261,321</td>
<td>60,893</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>200,428</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>232,464</td>
<td>68,152</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>164,312</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,246,702</td>
<td>691,921</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>1,554,781</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>15,745</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>13,471</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>República Dominicana</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>243,104</td>
<td>24,772</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>218,332</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,046</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lucia</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>2,906</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>6,894</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19,051</td>
<td>2,802</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>16,249</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>44,781</td>
<td>8,839</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>35,942</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,109,303</td>
<td>288,264</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>1,821,039</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>410,705</td>
<td>80,984</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>329,721</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional average (weighted)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17.8%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>82.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FAO Gender and Land Rights Database.
Regional average is weighted with total holders of each country.
Table 4: Distribution of Agricultural Holders by Sex in the Middle East/North Africa (Indicator 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>total number</th>
<th>total female</th>
<th>% female</th>
<th>total male</th>
<th>% male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,023,799</td>
<td>41,793</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>982,006</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4,537,319</td>
<td>236,632</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4,300,687</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Islamic Rep.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>84,679</td>
<td>4,989</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>79,690</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>91,585</td>
<td>2,712</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>88,873</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>194,829</td>
<td>13,785</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>180,479</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,492,844</td>
<td>66,395</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1,426,449</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>242,267</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>240,399</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>515,850</td>
<td>32,980</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>482,900</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional average (weighted)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.9%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>95.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FAO Gender and Land Rights Database.
Regional average is weighted with total holders of each country
Table 5: Distribution of Agricultural Holders by Sex in Europe (Indicator 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>total number</th>
<th>total female</th>
<th>% female</th>
<th>total male</th>
<th>% male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>150,170</td>
<td>51,780</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>98,390</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>42,850</td>
<td>6,450</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>36,410</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>370,490</td>
<td>84,350</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>286,140</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>233,280</td>
<td>51,400</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>181,870</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>38,860</td>
<td>8,010</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>30,850</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>22,860</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>19,420</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>3,770</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>38,330</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>19,610</td>
<td>7,020</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>12,590</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>63,870</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>56,770</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>516,100</td>
<td>117,120</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>398,990</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>299,130</td>
<td>25,220</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>273,920</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>723,060</td>
<td>200,070</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>522,990</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>576,810</td>
<td>151,870</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>424,940</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>139,890</td>
<td>16,120</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>123,770</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,620,880</td>
<td>497,850</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>1,123,040</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>83,390</td>
<td>39,010</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>44,380</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>199,910</td>
<td>95,360</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>104,550</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12,530</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11,140</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>902,214</td>
<td>327,689</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>574,525</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>48,870</td>
<td>6,290</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>42,580</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>72,320</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>67,910</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>46,620</td>
<td>6,560</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>40,060</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,506,620</td>
<td>448,120</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>1,058,500</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>305,270</td>
<td>89,370</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>215,900</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,859,040</td>
<td>1,248,580</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>2,610,460</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>778,891</td>
<td>141,182</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>637,709</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>24,460</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>20,290</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>74,650</td>
<td>20,340</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>54,310</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>989,800</td>
<td>214,380</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>775,420</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>71,090</td>
<td>10,950</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>60,140</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>59,070</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>55,250</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>186,800</td>
<td>24,490</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>162,310</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional average (weighted) 27.8% 72.2%

Source: FAO Gender and Land Rights Database.
Regional average is weighted with total holders of each country.
### Table 6: Distribution of Agricultural Holders by Sex in Oceania (Indicator 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>total number</th>
<th>total female</th>
<th>% female</th>
<th>total male</th>
<th>% male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5,840</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>4,707</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>65,033</td>
<td>2,326</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>62,463</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Mariana</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>24,640</td>
<td>5,631</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>19,009</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional average (weighted)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FAO Gender and Land Rights Database.
Regional average is weighted with total holders of each country.

### Table 7: Regional Averages of Agricultural Holders by Sex (Indicator 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>pct female holders</th>
<th># countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East/North Africa</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, East and South Asia</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing regions only</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FAO Gender and Land Rights Database.
Figure 1: Female Agricultural Holders and GDP per Capita

Note: Source data on agricultural holders is from FAO Gender and Land Rights Database (different years from 1990 to 2012); GDP per capita is from WDI, matching each year for which data on holders is available and adjusted to constant 2005 USD values.
Figure 2: Female Agricultural Holders and Female Employment in the Agricultural sector

Note: Source data on agricultural holdings is from FAO Gender and Land Rights Database (different years from 1990 to 2012), using weighted averages; Employment Rates are from FAO, ILO & IFAD 2010 (year 2000 or the nearest year), using unweighted averages.
Table 8: Distribution of Agricultural Landowners and Incidence of Female and Male Agricultural Landowners (Indicators 2 and 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>survey year</th>
<th>% female</th>
<th>% male</th>
<th>% female</th>
<th>% male</th>
<th>type of tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution of landowners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% sole</td>
<td>% sole</td>
<td>% joint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Saharan Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso i</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership, agricultural land only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average (unweighted)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latin America</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership, agricultural only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Documented ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Documented ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Documented ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average (unweighted)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Documented ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Documented ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Certified land use rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average (unweighted)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data in FAO Gender and Land Rights Database based on Doss et al. 2015 (Burkina, Burundi, Ethiopia, Lesotho, Malawi, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda, Zimbabwe); Deere et al. 2012 (Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay); Kieran et al. 2015 (Cambodia, Nepal, Bangladesh, Tajikistan, Vietnam).

Reported ownership is when the survey respondent identifies him/herself or someone else in household as an owner of land; however, it does not necessarily imply legal ownership. Documented ownership means that respondent reports that ownership documents exist for the land. Indicators for most countries had low pct of missing values (0-31 observations).

1 Incidence of landownership use sample weights provided in the DHS. In Tanzania, the household ownership data included a “don’t know” option.

Land indicators for individual ownership in Malawi DHS were only asked to currently married or partnered women resulting in missing information for 7,575 women while the indicator data includes a total sample of 15,399 women (from Doss et al. 2015).
## Table 9: Distribution of Land Area by Sex and Distribution of Land Value by Sex (Indicators 4 and 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>survey year</th>
<th>% female only</th>
<th>% male only</th>
<th>% joint</th>
<th>% female only</th>
<th>% male only</th>
<th>% joint</th>
<th>type of tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Saharan Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Documented ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Right to sell/use as collateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>Reported ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Documented ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Documented ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Certified land use rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data in FAO Gender and Land Rights Database based on Doss et al. 2015 (African countries); and Kieran et al. 2015 (Asian countries).

Reported ownership is when the survey respondent identifies him-/herself or someone else in household as an owner of land; however, it does not necessarily imply legal ownership.

Documented ownership means that respondent reports that ownership documents exist for the land.