



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

TRAINING ON BEST PRACTICES FOR LAND TENURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE GOVERNANCE IN LATIN AMERICA

QUITO, ECUADOR



12-17 JUNE 2011

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Tetra Tech ARD.

Prepared for the United States Agency for International Development, USAID Contract Number EPP-00-06-00008-00, Property Rights and Resource Governance Project (PRRGP) Task Order under PLACE Indefinite Quantity Contract.

Implemented by:

Tetra Tech ARD
159 Bank Street, Suite 300
Burlington, VT 05404

COVER PHOTOS: AMY REGAS

TRAINING ON BEST PRACTICES FOR LAND TENURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE GOVERNANCE IN LATIN AMERICA

TRAINING COURSE SUMMARY AND PARTICIPANT
EVALUATIONS

12-17 JUNE 2011

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

- ACRONYMS..... iii
- PREFACE 1
- 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND COURSE OVERVIEW 1
- 2.0 EVALUATION METHOD 3
- 3.0 EVALUATION RESULTS..... 5
 - 3.1 MODULES AND COUNTRY TEAM WORKING GROUPS 5
 - 3.2 OVERALL COURSE..... 6
- APPENDIX 1. BEST PRACTICES FOR LAND TENURE AND NATURAL
RESOURCE GOVERNANCE IN LATIN AMERICA TRAINING COURSE
ANNOUNCEMENT 7
- APPENDIX 2. BEST PRACTICES FOR LAND TENURE AND NATURAL
RESOURCE GOVERNANCE IN LATIN AMERICA TRAINING COURSE
AGENDA..... 11
- APPENDIX 3. TRAINING COURSE PARTICIPANTS 17
- APPENDIX 4. BIOGRAPHIES OF TRAINING RESOURCE PERSONS 21
- APPENDIX 5. SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS 27

ACRONYMS

COTR	Contracting Officer's Technical Representative
GLUT	Gaining with Land Use Transactions
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IQC	Indefinite Quantity Contract
LTPR	Land Tenure and Property Rights
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
NRM	Natural Resources Management
PLACE	Prosperity, Livelihoods and Conserving Ecosystems
PRRGP	Property Rights and Resource Governance Project
TO	Task Order
UN	United Nations
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government

PREFACE

Effective natural resource management and rural development hinges upon a strong recognition of tenure and property rights. Development practitioners need to understand and communicate 1) how property rights issues change as economies move through various stages of growth, democratization, and in some cases from war to peace, and 2) how these changes require different property rights reform strategies and sequencing to foster further economic growth, sound resource use, and political stability. The lack of secure and negotiable property rights is one of the most critical limiting factors to achieving economic growth and democratic governance throughout the developing world. Insecure or weak property rights have negative impacts on:

- Economic investment and growth;
- Governance and the rule of law;
- Environment and sustainable resource use, including parks and park land, mineral resources, and forestry and water resources; and
- Biodiversity and sustainable resource exploitation.

At the same time, robust and secure rights (along with other economic factors) can promote economic growth; good governance; and sustainable use of land, forests, water, and other natural resources.

USAID is making a strategic commitment to developing a stronger, more robust policy for addressing property rights reform in countries where it operates. “Property rights” refers to the rights which individuals, communities, families, firms, and other corporate/community structures hold in land, pastures, water, forests, minerals, and fisheries. Property rights range from private or semi-private to leasehold, community, group, shareholder, or types of corporate rights. As land is a main factor for economic production in most USAID-presence countries, it is the main focus of this Property Rights and Resource Governance Project (PRRGP) Task Order (TO) under the PLACE IQC.

PRRGP is a five-year initiative implemented by Tetra Tech ARD (Contract No. EPP-I-00-06-00008-00, Task Order No. 2). The project was launched in September 2008, and is expected to be completed by September 11, 2012. The Task Order is managed by Tetra Tech ARD, on behalf of USAID. It is a mechanism of the USAID/Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade Division/Natural Resources Management/Land Resources Management Team. Dr. Gregory Myers (gmyers@usaid.gov) is the Task Order’s operating Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative (COTR).

PRRGP’s Mission is to:

1. Expand analytical methodologies, tools, and training on property rights issues like common property, governance, gender, conflict and climate change.
2. Refine and scale up use of property rights tools in response to emerging issues and needs by USAID and its partners.
3. Refine knowledge management systems to integrate and spur two-way flows of information between training, tools, and policy interventions.
4. Continue and expand technical assistance on property rights and resource governance to USAID missions and its partners.

One of the central objectives of the USAID PRRGP TO is to build the capacity of US government (USG) staff and host country counterparts to effectively address property rights and resource governance issues to promote equitable economic growth, sustainable resource management, and poverty reduction. Training comprises a central component of the PRRGP strategy to attain that goal, with more than 20% of the TO’s core budget dedicated to a Washington, DC-based training of USG staff (Task 1) and courses in four USAID regions of support (Task 2).

I.0 INTRODUCTION AND COURSE OVERVIEW

The five-day short course *Best Practices in Land Tenure and Natural Resource Governance in Latin America* was held June 12-17, 2011 in Quito, Ecuador. Thirty-two participants took part in the course, representing local and national-level governments and USAID missions from Ecuador, Peru, Colombia, Panama, Bolivia, and Paraguay. The course was delivered exclusively in Spanish.

The core training course was facilitated by Claudio Acioly of UN-Habitat. The time Mr. Acioly dedicated to the course was provided free of charge to USAID by UN-Habitat. For the first time, two private sector organizations (Stewart Global and Trimble) sponsored travel and per diem for government officials to participate in the course.

The core course comprised six modules addressing property rights issues:

- Introduction to land tenure and property rights (LTPR) concepts;
- Natural resource rights and biodiversity protection;
- Governance, land administration, and land markets;
- Women and vulnerable populations' rights to land and natural resources;
- Resource-based conflict and post conflict land issues; and
- Country team working groups: LTPR assessments and action planning.

Modules comprised one to two presentations discussing challenges and best practice approaches from the region. These presentations were followed by discussions and one group learning exercise. In the case of the land markets and administration module, expert presentations were augmented by a three-afternoon educational simulation titled *Gaining with Land Use Transactions (GLUT)*, which illustrated land market operations. Within the simulation, players were organized into teams representing commercial land users, social classes (rich, middle and poor), speculators that own undeveloped land, government, and NGOs. Each team had a specific set of goals. Rules governing play are designed to resemble land markets operating in many developing countries with strong asymmetric information, weak taxation, outdated zoning regulations, informal settlements, and a general weakness on the part of the government to provide urban services. The GLUT simulation was the highest rated element of the course in participant evaluations.



On the final day of the workshop, participants used LTPR Quick Sheets and the LTPR Matrix to assess the LTPR situation in their counties and then developed country action plans, enabling them to apply what they had learned to address the challenges they face at home.¹

For additional information on the course, Appendix 1 provides the course announcement. Appendix 2 contains the course agenda, and Appendix 3, the list of course participants. Appendix 4 presents biographies of the training module coordinators and resource persons and Appendix 5 includes course evaluations summaries.

Course materials, presentations, and reports will be available on USAID's land tenure portal: <http://usaidlandtenure.net/usaidltpproducts/training-documents/best-practices-for-land-tenure-and-natural-resource-governance-in-latin-america-june-13-17-2011-quito-ecuador>.



Participants negotiating in a round of the GLUT simulation exercise.

¹ As a capacity-building exercise, action planning is not meant to take the place of, or conflict with, any actual government planning process.

2.0 EVALUATION METHOD

Participants filled out short evaluation forms on each of the six course modules, as well as a final evaluation for the overall course. The evaluation forms for the modules requested that participants rank their overall satisfaction with each presentation or session within the module, the degree to which the module met each of the stated module objectives, and the degree to which the module was relevant to the participant's work and their learning objectives. Rankings ranged from 1-5, with 5 being the highest score. Space was provided to allow participants to provide comments for each item they ranked, as well as overall comments on the module.

The form for the overall course asked participants to rank each module, the relevance of the course to the overarching course objectives, specifics of course logistics, and their overall satisfaction and learning. In addition, participants were asked to elaborate on:

- Highlights of the course,
- Topics they would have liked to cover in greater depth,
- Topics participants felt too much time was spent on,
- Their preferences for a course with broad thematic coverage versus a narrower focus, and
- Additional suggestions.

A summary of these evaluations is included as Appendix 5.

Illustrative evaluation responses to “What were the highlights for you from the 5-day short course”

- The quality both of presentations and presenters.
- The chance to share experiences from each country regarding NRM.
- The chance to exchange ideas and experiences. Similarities between our institutional problems in each country.
- EVERYTHING!

3.0 EVALUATION RESULTS



The compilation and analysis of the evaluation results (see Appendix 5) indicates that the course was a considerable success. Fours and fives dominated a significant majority of the ranking questions, while the qualitative feedback includes a mix of constructive critiques and comments of a laudatory nature. Even participants offering suggestions for improvement on items tended to rate their satisfaction with the item as high or somewhat high.

The number of evaluations completed for each module and the overall course varied from 26-29 for the 32 participants. Many participants took the time to respond to each of the questions, including the qualitative ones on the evaluation form for the overall course. Many also provided additional commentary to supplement their rankings on both the module and overall evaluation forms.

3.1 MODULES AND COUNTRY TEAM WORKING GROUPS

The average rating for each of the modules was between 3.8 and 4.5. The two course elements ranking highest were the introductory module on concepts and definitions and the GLUT simulation. The module on women and vulnerable populations received the lowest score.

There were a total of 11 technical presentations throughout the course. The presentations scoring the highest were:

1. Land Markets by Carlos Morales(4.6);
2. Formalization of Property Rights and Land Administration by Kevin Barthel (4.5); and
3. Concepts and Definitions on Land Tenure and Property Rights by Rene Salomon (4.4).

From participant commentary, it was clear that many valued the ability to interact with representatives and learn from other countries. They also praised the presenters and the experiences they brought to the course.

The commentary provided by participants on the modules illustrates some of their perceived highlights:

- “Concepts/practices are very clear and applicable. Very good methodology. Educational and clear.” (Land Module)
- “Great information on the need to highlight women’s rights and their role in these processes. Wonderful session.” (Women and Vulnerable Populations Module)
- “Great, holistic presentation.” (Conflict Module)
- “In most cases, the experience of our presenters contributed to clarify our doubts and questions.” (general comment)

Regarding criticism, the most common comments related to time constraints—that the presentations were too detailed for the time available, that the presenters had to speak too rapidly, etc.

The course received an average score of 4.33 regarding quality of the trainers and facilitator. The participants rated the overall relevance of the course to their work at 4.37. The modules on conflict and concepts and definitions were rated highest regarding relevancy.

The last day of the course was dedicated to country teams working together to discuss the specific land tenure and natural resources management constraints faced in each of their countries, determine and sequence appropriate actions to address those issues, and present their action plans in plenary.

3.2 OVERALL COURSE

With the exception of two, all elements of the course received average rankings between 4 and 5 in the overall evaluation. The two elements with the lowest scores were the gender and vulnerable populations module (3.82) and the natural resources module (3.93). Average scores on the modules, relation of content to course objectives, logistics coordination, and other aspects ranged from 4.00 to 4.72. Together with a score of 4.41 on the overall training experience, this suggests that the vast majority of participants came away from the course satisfied with their experience.

Logistics factors were evaluated highly. Logistical coordination during the course indicated satisfaction with the average score of 4.72. The quality of the conferencing rooms and conference services received average ratings of 4.59 and 4.66 respectively.

The Latin American training course maintained the same modular structure as the previous regional course held in Rwanda in 2007 and Kenya in 2009. The cost of conducting the Ecuador workshop was reduced through pro bono contributions by UN-Habitat and USAID/Ecuador through respectively financing the course facilitator and the opening night session. Nonetheless, the cost of executing these courses remains much higher than the U.S. courses offered for U.S. government personnel. Identifying regional government officials with financing to travel to a course in another country remains challenging.

Table 3.1. Overall Course Evaluation Results

Criteria	Weighted Average
Modules	
Module 1: Introduction to Land Tenure and Property Rights (LTPR) Concepts	4.36
Module 2: Natural Resource Rights and Biodiversity Protection	3.93
Module 3: Governance, Administration and Land Markets	4.25
Module 4: Rights to land and Natural Resources for Women and Vulnerable Populations	3.82
Module 5: Resource-Based Conflict and Post Crisis Land Issues	4.03
GLUT Simulation	4.55
Country Team Working Groups – LTPR Assessments and Action Planning	4.14
Relevance of Module Content to Course Objectives	
Exchange experiences, deepen discussion and strengthen understanding of land tenure and property rights issues	4.22
Learn land tenure and property rights approaches, best practices and tools aimed at improving programmatic interventions	4.37
Develop a country action plan that can be used to guide government and donor investments	4.00
Overall Program Content	
Course module and objectives clearly stated	4.41
Content of the training program	4.33
Relevance of program content to your work	4.37
Effectiveness of training methods for achieving course & mod objectives	4.11
Appropriate balance—presentation, discussion, group exercises	4.15
Quality of resource persons and facilitators	4.33
Quality and sufficiency of course materials	4.37
Logistics Coordination	
Logistics coordination during course	4.72
Quality of conferencing rooms	4.59
Quality of conferencing services	4.66
Quality of the food	4.59
Overall training program experience	4.41

APPENDIX I. BEST PRACTICES FOR LAND TENURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE GOVERNANCE IN LATIN AMERICA TRAINING COURSE ANNOUNCEMENT



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

USAID Short Course Announcement

Best Practices for Land Tenure and Natural Resource Governance in Latin America

Dates: June 13-17, 2011 in Quito, Ecuador

USAID/Washington is pleased to announce the USAID *Short Course on Best Practices for Land Tenure and Natural Resource Governance in Latin America* scheduled for June 13-17, 2011 in Quito, Ecuador. The course will host approximately 35 decision makers and USG foreign assistance practitioners interested in strengthening their knowledge and skills in applying land tenure and property rights (LTPR) in their economic, governance, and natural resource (biodiversity) portfolios. The course will provide participants with the opportunity to:

1. Exchange experiences, deepen discussion and strengthen understanding of land tenure and property rights issues, and their application to government and USAID programming;
2. Learn land tenure and property rights approaches, best practices, and tools aimed at improving programmatic interventions on critical issues in the region related to natural resources, agriculture and economic growth, and governance and conflict; and
3. Develop a country action plan that can be used to guide government and donor investments.

The course will host approximately 35 decision makers from Latin America to share best practices in land and natural resource management and rights.

The target audience is government policymakers and USG foreign assistance practitioners who address issues of land/natural resources and property rights in their work. The course will be conducted in Spanish.

Illustrative evaluation comments by participants of past land training courses:

"I'm glad I had the opportunity to take this course. I wish I had taken it 15 years ago."

"It was a success at every level"

"It has been very useful for me and my delegation"

Focused on land and resource governance issues, the course aims to introduce LTPR concepts, approaches, and tools aimed at improving programmatic interventions in economic growth, governance and natural resource management. Likewise, the course will teach participants tools to address land tenure and property rights issues and how to use land tenure and property rights interventions to strengthen economic, governance, and natural resource management objectives. The course also includes crosscutting foci on women's rights and indigenous rights.

This interactive training course will be delivered through lectures by regional and international experts combined with participatory activities including a multi-round land markets simulation and

development of country action plans.

USAID officials should register through USAID's Learning Management System (LMS). Registration will close on May 31, 2011. To register host-country government participants, please email Roberto Prado below. For questions on how to use LMS or any other course queries, feel free to contact the course coordinators.

Timothy Fella
COTR, PRRGP Task Order
tfella@usaid.gov

Roberto Prado
ARD Short Course Coordinator
rprado@ardinc.com

APPENDIX 2. BEST PRACTICES FOR LAND TENURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE GOVERNANCE IN LATIN AMERICA TRAINING COURSE AGENDA



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Best Practices for Land Tenure and Natural Resource Governance in Latin America

**Short Course Agenda
June 12-17, 2011**

**Venue: Sheraton Hotel
Quito, Ecuador**

This short course will provide 35 national decision makers and USAID or MCC Mission staff working on land issues in Latin America the opportunity to:

1. Exchange experiences, deepen discussion and strengthen understanding of land tenure and property rights issues, and their application to government and USAID programming.
2. Learn land tenure and property rights approaches, best practices and tools aimed at improving programmatic interventions on critical issues in the region related to natural resources, agriculture and economic growth, and governance and conflict.
3. Develop a country action plan that can be used to guide government and donor investments.

This interactive training course will be delivered through lectures by regional and international experts combined with participatory activities including a multi-round land markets simulation, and development of country action plans.

Sunday, June 12

16:00 – 19:00 Course registration, introductions and reception hosted by USAID/Ecuador

Monday, June 13

8:30 – 8:50 Welcome and course introduction (Beth E. Cypser, Director, USAID/Ecuador)

8:50 – 9:10 Course overview and objectives (Claudio Acioly)

Module 1: Introduction to Land Tenure and Property Rights (LTPR) Concepts

Objectives: Provide participants with: 1) A common understanding of LTPR terms and concepts, and 2) Orientation around common LTPR constraints faced in countries of the region.

9:10 – 9:20 Introduction to module and objectives (Claudio Acioly)

9:20 – 10:20 Presentation: Land tenure concepts and definitions: "Property rights and land tenure" (René Salomón)

10:20 – 10:35 Ecuador case study: Major constraints to the legal and institutional framework (Manolo Morales)



Land Tenure and Natural Resource Governance Short Course Agenda

- 10:35 – 10:50 Coffee and tea
- 10:50 - 12:00 Interactive discussion on LTPR constraints in all participant countries (Claudio Acioly)
- 12:00 – 1:00 Lunch

Module 2: Natural Resource Rights and Biodiversity Protection

Objectives: Help decision-makers understand and address: 1) Why property rights over natural resources are important; 2) Mechanisms that can be used to formalize rights to natural resources; 3) Policy and administrative approaches that have been effective for equitably devolving resource rights to local levels; and 4) Options governments can pursue to strengthen local governance systems to better manage and enforce property rights to land and natural resources, 5) Challenges posed by climate change and the way land tenure might affect carbon markets.

- 1:00 – 1:10 Introduction to module and objectives (Claudio Acioly)
- 1:10 – 1:40 Strengthening property rights to improve natural resource governance (Manolo Morales)
- 1:40 – 2:20 Climate change, carbon and land tenure (Manuel Estrada)
- 2:20 – 2:40 Discussion
- 2:40 – 3:00 Coffee and tea
- 3:00 – 4:45 Country team action planning (see box)
- 4:45 – 5:00 Reflections on the day (Claudio Acioly)

Country Team Action Planning -- Situation Assessment: Natural Resource Rights and Biodiversity Protection

Participants will form into their country groups. Drawing on key elements of the “Quick Sheets” participants will characterize the property rights issues surrounding natural resource rights in their own contexts, locate these geographically, and select key actions that can be employed to address these issues. Each group will prepare an overview of the key issues and actions for “publication” at the end of the exercise. Each workshop output will be used for presentation and further analysis on Day 5.

Tuesday, June 14

Module 3: Land Governance, Administration and Markets

Objectives: Help decision-makers understand and address: 1) The links between property rights, access to capital, investment, and economic growth; 2) The pros and cons of registering property rights to individuals, households, groups and communities, and when it is likely to be appropriate; 3) How to stimulate land rental and sales markets that will support both economic growth and equity objectives; and 4) Current technologies used in land administration.

- 8:30 – 8:40 Introduction to module and objectives (Claudio Acioly)
- 8:40 – 9:10 Land titling, registration and economic growth (Kevin Barthel)
- 9:10 – 9:40 Land administration technologies (Kevin Barthel)
- 9:40 – 10:15 Questions and discussion
- 10:15 – 10:30 Coffee and tea
- 10:30 – 12:00 Urban land markets (Carlos Morales)
- 12:00 – 1:00 Lunch



Land Tenure and Natural Resource Governance Short Course Agenda

1:00 – 4:30 Gaining with Land Use Transactions Simulation (Round 1) (Carlos Morales)

Participants will engage in three-afternoon educational simulation (*Gaining with Land Use Transactions* —GLUT) which illustrates the way land markets operate. Within the simulation, players will be organized into teams representing commercial land users, social classes (rich, middle and poor), speculators that own undeveloped land, government that collects taxes and invests in specific public land uses, and NGOs. Each team will have a specific set of goals to meet and scores points accordingly. Rules governing play are designed to resemble land markets operating in many developing countries with strong asymmetric information, weak taxation, outdated zoning regulations, informal settlements, and a general weakness on the part of the government to provide urban services. This simulation was developed by the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and has previously been utilized in more than 35 training courses with participants from around the world. It will be run by one of the simulation's developers from the Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies of Erasmus University.

4:30 – 4:45 Reflections on the Day (Claudio Acioly)

Wednesday, June 15

Module 4: Gender and Vulnerable Population Issues in Land and Natural Resource Rights

Objectives: Help decision-makers understand and address: 1) Why women's property rights over land and natural resources are important, and how they differ from property rights for other vulnerable populations; 2) What do we mean by vulnerability in the context of land tenure and property rights; and 3) Options that exist for strengthening women's and other vulnerable groups rights to land and resources while still respecting local institutions and customs.

8:30 - 8:40 Module Introduction (Claudio Acioly)

8:40 - 9:10 Presentation: Women's property rights (Diana Fletschner)

9:10 – 9:40 Indigenous and Afro-descendant peoples: Rights to land and natural resources (Janis Alcorn)

9:40 – 10:00 Discussion

10:00 - 10:15 Tea break

10:15 - 12:15 Country Team Action Planning (see box).

12:15 – 1:30 Lunch

1:30 – 4:30 Gaining with Land Use Transactions Simulation (Round 2). See simulation description included on June 14 (Carlos Morales).

4:30 – 4:45 Reflections on the day (Claudio Acioly)

Country Team Action Planning -- Situation Assessment: Gender and Vulnerable Populations

Again working as country teams, participants will draw on key elements of the "Quick Sheets" to identify property rights issues related to inequitable access to land and natural resources. Each country team will identify the connections between vulnerable groups and property rights in their own contexts. Groups will document and publish their team results at the end of the morning. Reports will be used to contribute to country action planning on day 5.

Thursday, June 16

Module 5: Resource Based Conflict and Post Crisis Land Issues

Objectives: Help decision-makers understand and address: 1) Resource-based conflict and how resources either prompt or become the focus of conflict; 2) Options that exist for mitigating disputes over resources and for preventing escalation to violent conflict; 3) IDPs and refugee resettlement and restitution in a post-conflict environment in a way that diminishes the probability for conflict to re-erupt;



Land Tenure and Natural Resource Governance Short Course Agenda

and 4) Policies, actions, and processes that are important for engaging civil society in land policy formulation in partnership with governments.

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| 8:30 – 8:40 | Introduction to module and objectives (Claudio Acioly) |
| 8:40 – 9:10 | Understanding resource-based conflict (Manolo Morales) |
| 9:10 – 9:40 | Post conflict land resettlement and restitution (Edgardo Forero) |
| 9:40 – 10:10 | Discussion |
| 10:10 – 10:25 | Coffee and tea |
| 10:25 – 12:30 | Country team action planning (see box) |
| 12:30 – 1:30 | Lunch |
| 1:30 – 4:30 | Gaining with Land Use Transactions. Simulation (Round 3). See simulation description included on June 14 (Carlos Morales) |
| 4:30 – 4:45 | Reflections on the Day (Claudio Acioly) |

Country Team Action Planning -- Situation Assessment: Conflict and Post-Conflict Land Issues

Again working as country teams, participants will draw on key elements of the “Quick Sheets” to identify property rights issues arising from existing land/resource-based dispute or wider conflicts. Each country team will identify the connections between conflict or post-conflict situations and property rights in their own contexts. Groups will document and publish their team results at the end of the morning. Reports will be used to contribute to country action planning on day 5.

Friday, June 17

Country Group Proposals – LTPR Assessments and Action Planning

Objectives: Utilizing a land tenure and property rights situation assessment tool, country teams will have the opportunity to analyze the property rights issues surrounding natural resource rights, land administration and market, land/resource based disputes or wider conflicts in their own countries. Teams will identify key sets of actions to address these issues over the next one to three years and present their proposed action-plan in plenary.

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 8:30 - 9:10 | Overview of country working group objectives and tasks (Claudio Acioly) |
| 9:10 – 9:30 | Case Study Ecuador: Solutions to conflicts over land (Manolo Morales) |
| 9:30 – 12:00 | Country team action planning: Country teams will conduct analyses using the situational assessment tool to identify LTPR issues, what actions should be taken, and then will sequence selected actions/interventions. Each team will present on its country action plan. |
| 12:00 – 1:00 | Lunch |
| 1:00 – 2:00 | Wrap-up action planning by country teams |
| 2:00 – 3:00 | Country team presentations |
| 3:00 – 3:30 | Discussions and feedback |
| 3:30 – 3:45 | Course evaluations |
| 3:45 – 4:00 | Closing remarks (Claudio Acioly) |



APPENDIX 3. TRAINING COURSE PARTICIPANTS



USAID
DEL PUEBLO DE LOS ESTADOS
UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA

Curso sobre Mejores Prácticas en la Tenencia de Tierras y la Gobernabilidad de Recursos Naturales en América Latina

Del 12 al 17 de junio del 2011
Hotel Sheraton, Quito, Ecuador

	Nombre	Título/organización	Dirección electrónica	País
1	Andrew McCown	Oficial de Agricultura / Desarrollo Económico y Medio Ambiente/ Desarrollo Alternativo Integral / Bolivia	amccown@usaid.gov	Bolivia
2	Marcela Chaves	Oficial Financiera/Equipo de Tierras. USAID/Colombia	mchaves@usaid.gov	Colombia
3	Liliana Vega Zuluaga	Directora Nacional de Titulación de Baldíos INCODER Colombia	lilianavegaz@hotmail.com	Colombia
4	Margarita Varón Pera	Asesora de la Dirección de Desarrollo Rural Sostenible, Dirección Nacional de Planeación, Colombia	mvaron@dnpc.gov.co	Colombia
5	Indira Oñate	Asesora de Formalización de Tierras, Ministerio de Agricultura. Colombia	indiraonate@hotmail.com	Colombia
6	Liliana Andrea Giraldo	Asesora Jurídica, Área de Formalización. Proyecto de Protección de Tierras y Patrimonio de la Población Desplazada (MADR). Colombia	Lilianagirald50@gmail.com	Colombia
7	Henry Quiroga	Profesional especializado. Subdirección de Catastro. IGAC. Colombia	hquiroga@igac.gov.co	Colombia
8	Rocio Cedeño	Especialista de Proyectos Oficina de Crecimiento Económico, Desarrollo y Ambiente USAID/Ecuador	rcedeno@usaid.gov	Ecuador
9	Alberto Andrade	Director Técnico, Programa Sistema Nacional de Información y Gestión de Tierras Rurales e infraestructura tecnológica	alberto.andrade@sigtierras.gob.ec	Ecuador
10	Camilo González	Técnico Dirección Nacional Forestal/ Ordenamiento Territorial y Bosques Protectores. Ministerio del Ambiente. Ecuador	cgonzales@ambiente.gob.ec	Ecuador
11	Shannon Cadena	Coordinadora de la Unidad Desconcentrada Imbabura y Carchi. Secretaría Técnica de Plan Ecuador	sashaec@yahoo.es	Ecuador

	Nombre	Título/organización	Dirección electrónica	País
12	Jhonny Hidalgo	Director Ejecutivo, Unidad Ejecutora MAGAP-PRAT, Programa SIGTIERRAS. Ecuador	jhonny.hidalgo@sigtierras.gob.ec	Ecuador
13	Camila Ribadeneira	Abogada, Unidad de Territorios Ancestrales y Comunas, Plan Tierras, Subsecretaría de Tierras y Reforma Agraria, Ministerio de Agricultura. Ecuador	cribadeneira@magap.gob.ec	Ecuador
14	Félix Fernando Guillén	Analista legal, Proyecto Socio Bosque, Ministerio del Ambiente de Ecuador	fguillen@ambiente.gob.ec	Ecuador
15	Stephanie Arellano	Especialista en mitigación del Cambio Climático a nivel de Ecosistemas. Ministerio de Ambiente. Ecuador	sarellano@ambiente.gob.ec	Ecuador
16	Lester Gudiño Landeta	Técnico Socio-organizativo. Plan Tierras MAGAP. Ecuador	lesterprimero@hotmail.com	Ecuador
17	Jack Wong López	Técnico Productivo. Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería, Acuacultura y Pesca. Ecuador	jack.wong.lopez@gmail.com	Ecuador
18	Mercedes Ortiz	Técnico Jurídico. Subsecretaría Tierras MAGAP. Ecuador	mercylegal@hotmail.com	Ecuador
19	Alejandro Castillero	Administrador General Autoridad Nacional de Administración de Tierras ANATI. Panamá	acastillero@pronat.org.pa	Panamá
20	Luis Pimentel	Especialista en Monitoreo y Control del PRONAT. Panamá	lpimentel@pronat.org.pa	Panamá
21	Carlos Pimentel	Jefe de Zona 4 (Panamá y Colón) del PRONAT. Panamá	cpimentel@pronat.org.pa	Panamá
22	Abdiel Campos	Jefe Regional de Herrera del PRONAT. Panamá	acampos@pronat.org.pa	Panamá
23	Liliana Gimenez de Castillo	Asesora Jurídica Dirección General de los Registros Públicos, Corte Suprema	dgrppylcastillo@hotmail.com	Paraguay
24	Lilia Añazco	Consultora. Paraguay	lilivictoria@hotmail.com lilivictoria@gmail.com	Paraguay
25	Elvira Herebia Frutos	Funcionaria del área de Catastro Rural del Servicio Nacional de Catastro. Paraguay	elvira_herebia@hotmail.com	Paraguay
26	Claudia Rohrhirsch	Coordinadora de Proyectos Oficina de Iniciativas democráticas USAID / Perú	crohrhirsch@usaid.gov	Perú
27	Joshua Templeton	Economista, PDP. USAID/Peru	jtempleton@usaid.gov	Perú
28	Agliberto Paredes Piña	Coordinador de la Dirección de Titulación, Reversión de Tierras y Catastro Rural Dirección Regional de Agricultura del Gobierno Regional de San Martín. Perú	aglipapi@yahoo.es	Perú

	Nombre	Título/organización	Dirección electrónica	País
29	José Raúl Cachay	Asesor Proyectos Productivos Gobierno Regional de Loreto. Perú	ppra.1@hotmail.com	Perú
30	Luis Armando Pasquel	Director de la Oficina de Saneamiento Físico Legal de la Propiedad Agraria, Región de Ucayali. Perú	paquelu@hotmail.com	Perú
31	Patricia Luna	Bióloga, Dirección General Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre (DGFFS), Ministerio de Agricultura. Perú	pluna@minag.gob.pe	Perú
32	Alejandro Bernilla	Representante de la Región Madre de Dios. Perú.	b_alejo25@hotmail.com	Perú

Instructores y equipo de trabajo

Nombre	Dirección electrónica
Claudio Acioly	Claudio.Acioly@unhabitat.org
Janis Alcorn	janisalcorn@yahoo.com
Cristina Alvarez	cristina.alvarez@tetrattech.com
Kevin Barthel	kevin.barthel@gmail.com
Manuel Estrada	mporruacop9@gmail.com
Diana Fletschner	Dianaf@landesa.org
Edgar Forero	edgarforero891@gmail.com
Cecilia Lincango	clincango@ecolex-ec.org
Carlos Morales	c.morales@ihs.nl
Manolo Morales	mmorales@ecolex-ec.org
Amy Regas	amy.regas@tetrattech.com
René Salomón	renesalomon@gmail.com

APPENDIX 4. BIOGRAPHIES OF TRAINING RESOURCE PERSONS

INFORMACIÓN BIOGRÁFICA SOBRE LOS INSTRUCTORES

CLAUDIO ACIOLY

El Sr. Claudio Acioly se desempeña como Jefe de la Sección de Políticas de Viviendas de HÁBITAT/ONU y como Coordinador del Programa de Derechos de Vivienda de las Naciones Unidas. El Sr. Acioly se encarga de programas globales que se centran en reformas institucionales y de políticas relativas a las viviendas, derechos afines y desalojos forzados, al igual que en la modernización de tugurios. Él cuenta con más de 25 años de experiencia y ha trabajado en más de 20 países como profesional en estos campos, asesor técnico, consultor de desarrollo y experto en formación y desarrollo de capacidades. Como experto en el campo de la vivienda, el Sr. Acioly posee experiencia relevante en el diseño, la ejecución y la gestión de programas de modernización de tugurios en las ciudades. Asimismo, él ha escrito documentos sobre políticas de vivienda y ha gestionado procesos participativos de planificación con base en áreas específicas. Él ha trabajado para una serie de organizaciones, tales como del Instituto para Estudios de Vivienda y Desarrollo Urbano (IHS), el Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo (PNUD) y el Banco Mundial. Asimismo, el Sr. Acioly ha trabajado con municipalidades en Brasil y Bolivia, al igual que con varias ONG en Brasil y Filipinas, y diversas instituciones en Cuba, centrándose en temas tales como el desarrollo de capacidades de personal municipal, análisis institucional y multisectorial como apoyo a los programas municipales, sistemas de información municipal y un programa de rehabilitación urbana y de vivienda. El Sr. Acioly también ha emprendido proyectos de investigación aplicada y se encargó de un proceso de investigación y mapeo en siete ciudades, a raíz del cual se publicó el libro titulado "Knocking at the mayor's door: Participatory urban management in seven cities", el cual se lanzó durante la Tercera Sesión del Foro Mundial Urbano (2006). Él también ha publicado diversos documentos y escrito cinco libros que abordan diferentes temas, tales como la densidad urbana, la modernización de los barrios y la gestión urbana participativa.

JANIS ALCORN

La Dra. Janis B. Alcorn es consultora independiente con más de 30 años de experiencia en el campo del desarrollo internacional, lo que incluye experiencia de campo tanto en América Latina como en Asia y en África. Después de desempeñarse como voluntaria del Cuerpo de Paz, la Sra. Alcorn recibió su Doctorado en Botánica y Antropología en la Universidad de Texas en Austin. Su experiencia como consultora abarca el diseño y la evaluación de proyectos/programas, el análisis de políticas, la gestión de subvenciones y el desarrollo de capacidades. Entre sus clientes se encuentran USAID, la Fundación MacArthur, el Fondo Christensen, la Fundación Garfield, la Fundación Ford, el Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo, IRG, ARD, MSI, CIFOR, WWF y RRI, entre otras. Ella se desempeña como Profesora Adjunta en el Instituto de Recursos Naturales de la Universidad de Manitoba, Becaria de la Iniciativa de Derechos y Recursos (Washington, D.C.), de la Fundación Urundeí (Salta, Argentina) y Copresidenta del Tema de Gobernabilidad, Equidad y Derechos de la Comisión de la UICN sobre Políticas Ambientales, Económicas y Sociales. Ella ha publicado diversos artículos y documentos sobre desarrollo internacional, biodiversidad, pueblos indígenas, gestión ambiental y gobernabilidad de los recursos naturales. Recientemente, la Dra. Alcorn elaboró un documento informativo sobre conservación y pueblos indígenas para IFIP, y un documento sobre pueblos indígenas y tenencia para el Programa Global de USAID sobre Derechos de Propiedad y Gobernabilidad de los Recursos.

KEVIN BARTHEL

Kevin Barthel es geógrafo de profesión y actualmente trabaja como Especialista Superior de Propiedad en la Corporación del Desafío del Milenio (MCC por sus siglas en inglés) del gobierno de los Estados Unidos. Asimismo, el Sr. Barthel trabaja como consultor privado con diversas organizaciones internacionales, tal como el Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo. Él cuenta con más de 20 años de experiencia en el diseño, ejecución y supervisión de proyectos de catastro, regularización de tenencia de tierra y modernización de los sistemas de administración. Como consultor privado, él ha asesorado a los gobiernos de las Bahamas, Costa Rica, Turcos y Caicos, Ecuador y Paraguay en asuntos relativos a la tierra. Él ha participado en el diseño, el funcionamiento y la supervisión de inversiones de casi \$1,000 millones de dólares destinados a proyectos de tierras y bienes de dirección a lo largo de América Latina, el Caribe y más recientemente en África Occidental. El señor Barthel empezó su carrera como cartógrafo y agrimensor con la Administración Nacional Oceánica y Atmosférica, Levantamiento Geodésico y de la Costa (NOAA-NGS) del Gobierno de los Estados Unidos y después de realizar sus estudios de postgrado en la Universidad de Wisconsin-Madison, trabajó once años como especialista en recursos naturales especializado en asuntos de tierras en el Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo, con sede

en Washington, D.C. Durante este tiempo, el Sr. Barthel trabajó en cada país de Suramérica y el Caribe y desempeñó un papel decisivo en el cambio del enfoque del Banco, pasando de sólo el mapeo, el catastro y la asignación de tierras agrícolas a una mayor atención a la seguridad de la tenencia de la tierra, el acceso a ésta y la modernización del sistema de administración de la tierra como apoyo fundamental al desarrollo económico de los propietarios y de los países.

MANUEL ESTRADA

El Sr. Manuel Estrada ha trabajado en el tema de bosques y cambio climático desde hace más de 15 años. A lo largo de este tiempo ha estado involucrado en una gran variedad de iniciativas y proyectos dentro de este campo, yendo desde participar en las negociaciones sobre cambio climático en Naciones Unidas hasta el desarrollo de estándares para el desarrollo de proyectos forestales en el mercado voluntario de carbono, lo cual lo ha llevado a explorar, entre otras cosas, los vínculos entre las opciones de mitigación del cambio climático en el sector forestal y la tenencia de la tierra y las políticas públicas que conciernen dicho sector.

DIANA FLETSCHNER

La Sra. Diana Fletschner es Especialista en Género y Directora de Investigaciones en la organización denominada 'Landesa Center for Women's Land Rights'. Ella es experta en economía del desarrollo y cuenta con más de 15 años de experiencia en enseñanza, investigación, diseño de programas, y monitoreo y evaluación con especialización en las mujeres rurales. Actualmente, la Sra. Fletschner está trabajando en varios proyectos relacionados con el acceso y los derechos de propiedad de las mujeres. La Sra. Fletschner posee un doctorado en Agricultura y Economía Aplicada de la Universidad de Wisconsin-Madison, y ha trabajado y conducido investigaciones en varios países, tales como Paraguay, Perú, Colombia, India, Nicaragua, Uganda, Vietnam, China y los Estados Unidos. Sus estudios y artículos se han publicado en varias revistas, especialmente en 'the American Journal of Agricultural Economics', 'Journal of Socio-Economics', 'World Development', 'Journal of Development Studies', Revista Paraguaya de Sociología y 'Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics'.

EDGAR FORERO

El Sr. Edgar Forero es asesor y consultor en políticas públicas para la prevención del desplazamiento interno forzado y la atención a las víctimas del desplazamiento debido a los conflictos armados. El Sr. Forero se ha desempeñado como consultor de diversas organizaciones, tales como el Alto Comisionado de las Naciones Unidas para los Refugiados (ACNUR), USAID, Management Systems International y el Banco Mundial. Él tiene experiencia en temas de desarrollo, medio ambiente y gerencia integral de organizaciones, y su trabajo profesional se ha centrado principalmente en Colombia y en otros países de América Latina. El Sr. Forero tiene un grado de Maestría en Desarrollo Regional y ha estado vinculado al mundo académico, pues fue Director del Centro de Estudios para el Desarrollo Regional (CIDER) de la Universidad de Los Andes y actualmente es profesor de postgrado en la Pontificia Universidad Javeriana. Él ha dirigido investigación en desarrollo territorial, medio ambiente y desarrollo de las pequeñas y medianas empresas, y es autor de numerosas publicaciones en estas materias.

CARLOS MORALES

El Sr. Carlos Morales es egresado de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) y de las Universidades de Edimburgo y Birmingham de Gran Bretaña. Actualmente, el Sr. Morales es académico del Instituto para Estudios de Vivienda y Desarrollo Urbano (IHS) de la Universidad Erasmus en Rotterdam, Holanda y colabora con el Instituto Lincoln de Políticas Agrarias de los Estados Unidos, en temas relacionados con políticas, mercados, financiamiento, impuestos, acceso y gestión del suelo urbano y de vivienda. Él ha escrito 23 artículos y capítulos de libros sobre estos temas, ha impartido cursos por 25 años, ofrecido asesoría y dictado conferencias en foros internacionales en 24 países, tales como México, Centro y Suramérica, Cuba, Egipto, Kenia, Ghana, Sudáfrica, Arabia Saudita, Albania, China, Países Bajos y los Estados Unidos). El Sr. Morales se desempeñó como profesor durante 22 años en la UNAM, impartiendo cursos de grado y posgrado sobre estos temas. Durante 13 años ocupó cargos públicos en México, tanto en el Gobierno Federal (SAHOP, SEDUE, Coordinación de Proyectos de la Presidencia) como en el Distrito Federal (Programación y Presupuesto, Tesorería, Catastro) relacionados con estos mismos temas. Asimismo y por un período de diez años, el Sr. Morales ocupó puestos en las áreas hipotecarias y de valuación inmobiliaria en la Banca de Desarrollo (BANOBRA, NAFINSA) y en la banca privada (Banco Mexicano, Banco Santander). El Sr. Morales también ha llevado a cabo labores de asesoría y consultoría para las Naciones Unidas, USAID, CEPAL y varios gobiernos locales mexicanos y de América Latina, entre otros.

MANOLO MORALES

El Sr. Manolo Morales es el Director Ejecutivo de ECOLEX, un servicio informativo sobre derecho ambiental que busca lograr el desarrollo de capacidades al ofrecer información global integral sobre derecho ambiental. El Sr. Morales es experto en temas relativos a la tierra y los conflictos, y ha trabajado ampliamente en diversos asuntos agrarios. Su experiencia profesional no sólo incluye a Ecuador, su país de origen, sino también otros países de la región de América Latina y el Caribe. El Sr. Morales es abogado de profesión y también posee una Maestría en Derecho Ambiental. Asimismo, él ha estudiado políticas ambientales, temas relativos a la tenencia de tierras y la biodiversidad en España, Francia, Israel y Ecuador. El Sr. Morales ha conducido investigaciones en gestión ambiental y de conflictos, tenencia de tierras, derecho ambiental y asistentes legales comunitarios. Él ha publicado varios documentos y ha llevado a cabo varias consultorías para diversas organizaciones de cooperación internacional. El Sr. Morales es miembro de las redes de la ELAW, la UICN y AIDA.

RENÉ SALOMÓN

El Sr. Salomón es economista agrícola y se ha especializado en desarrollo rural y reformas a los derechos de propiedad tanto del sector público como del privado. Él se desempeñó como asesor principal del Ministerio de Agricultura de Bolivia y como Director Ejecutivo del Instituto Nacional de Reforma Agraria (INRA). Durante su cargo en el INRA, el Sr. Salomón supervisó la titulación de tierras y la demarcación de millones de hectáreas que beneficiaron a diversas poblaciones indígenas y pequeños agricultores. Su experiencia en administración pública incorpora el desarrollo rural y la aplicación/modernización de catastros rurales, lo que incluye el tratamiento adecuado de los territorios indígenas, los bosques nacionales y los parques nacionales. Él formó parte de un grupo consultivo al cual se le encomendó la elaboración de un plan de USAID para el fortalecimiento de los derechos de propiedad real, una herramienta analítica para que los países monitorearan sus sistemas de derechos de propiedad en el transcurso del tiempo. Para la Cuenta Reto del Milenio en Nicaragua, él prestó apoyo a la supervisión del proyecto de catastro y regularización en Nicaragua, con el financiamiento de MCC. Para Chemonics International, el Sr. Salomón condujo un análisis sobre el marco jurídico de Bolivia y de sus procedimientos catastrales y de registro. El Sr. Salomón ha efectuado presentaciones sobre tenencia de tierras en varios países, tales como Bolivia, Argentina y los Estados Unidos.

APPENDIX 5. SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS

MODULE I: Concepts					
Question	Individual scores	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
Session 1: Land tenure concepts and definitions (René Salomón)		123	28	4.39	He is very knowledgeable. Not enough time. There is the need to define more concepts and standardize them for Latin America. Feed back the matrix with characteristics of each type of natural resource property. Excellent presentation. It was abstract because it was very general; therefore, it should not be that long. I did not go to this session. His presentation was very clear.
Session 2: Case study on Ecuador: Constraints to the legal and institutional framework (Manolo Morales)		114	28	4.07	Too fast. He knows about the topic and its content. It should have been given more time. Too much information, too little time, too many slides. He talked too fast, so it was hard to follow everything. It became too didactic. He did not include land survey methods. He should have referred to mechanisms for improving/overcoming those constraints. He needed more time to explain these issues with examples. It was an excellent presentation. Too many topics, too little time. I did not go to this session. Good presentation on the Ecuador case. Very complex.
Session 3: Interactive discussion on LTPR constraints in all participant countries (Claudio Acioly)		121	29	4.17	Illustrative. He should have referred to more mechanisms for overcoming obstacles. Excellent! One of the presenters was not clear. Presentations were too fast. Because of my lack of experience in this issue, I did not have enough information to contribute more to the group.
Terms and concepts		117	29	4.03	It could be more in-depth. Terms should be standardized in Latin America. Terms vary in each country. Participants could contribute to the glossary.
Orientation around common LTPR constraints faced in countries of region		108	28	3.86	Not enough time. Improvement mechanisms were not highlighted. It illustrated the constraints faced by the region.
Relevance of module content to your work		123	29	4.24	Exchange of rights-related criteria (7). All this helps me at work. There were no people from the countries we were asked to analyze.
Relevance to your personal and professional learning goals		118	28	4.21	It provided more knowledge and best practices related to land tenure. I acquired new knowledge. A better understanding of land tenure-related issues.
				4.14	Support for land tenure of formalization processes. A better understanding of land tenure-related issues.

MODULE 2: NRM					
Question	Individual scores	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
Session 1: Strengthening property rights to improve natural-resource governance (Manolo Morales)	5	103	27	3.81	Too fast. There should be less information so that the presenter can slow down. Excellent presentation. It was too general. It could be more illustrative and include cases.
Session 2: Climate change, carbon and land tenure (Manuel Estrada)	3	108	28	3.86	He should have focused on land. It was hard to hear the presenter. I didn't fully understand the relevance. Land-related conflicts should be covered in greater detail. It would be helpful to first conceptualize the session. Excellent presentation. It allowed me to link issues that are not usually interconnected.
Session 3: Country team action planning	5	109	28	3.89	Very good discussion. It was hard to understand some of the questions included in the quick sheets. The documents should include more clear questions. It would be great if teams were made up of all countries, if possible. Lack of time. Very good session. Lack of time. The questions led to their own answers.
Importance of the link between property rights and natural-resource management	3	111	28	3.96	
Mechanisms that can be used to formalize rights to natural resources	3	101	28	3.61	This varies in each country.
Policy and administrative approaches that have been effective for equitably devolving resource rights to local levels	4	97	28	3.46	This varies in each country.
Options governments can pursue to strengthen local governance systems to better manage and enforce property rights to land and natural resources	4	98	28	3.50	It could be cover in greater detail.
Challenges posed by climate change and the way land tenure might affect carbon markets	4	105	28	3.75	
Relevance of module content to your work	5	114	28	4.07	
Relevance to your personal and professional learning goals	5	113	27	4.19	
				3.81	In general, it was great. I would allocate more time so that we are not always in such a hurry with the agenda. The learning level was

MODULE 2: NRM

Question	Individual scores	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
					<p>satisfactory, as well as knowing more about the experience in other countries. I wish USAID accepted proposals for implementing similar projects in each country, in order to avoid duplicating/repeating the same actions and to improve outcomes and products in each implementing country. Goals established should be differentiated and effective. Some presentations were very interesting. It would ideal to allocate more time to each presentation. There should be a similar GLUT game for natural-resource rights.</p>

MODULE 3: Land Administration					
Question	Individual scores	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
Session 1: Formalizing real property rights and land administration (Kevin Barthel)	3	130	29	4.48	Very knowledgeable of all these issues. Great methodology. Very clear.
Session 2: Urban land markets (Carlos Morales)		134	29	4.62	Great presenter. Concepts/practices are very clear and applicable. Excellent. Very clear methodology. He has extensive experience regarding this issue in different places. Very good methodology. Educational and clear.
The links between property rights, access to capital, investment, and economic growth	3	125	30	4.17	It should be covered in greater detail, taking into account time constraints.
The pros and cons of registering property rights to individuals, households, groups and communities	3	122	30	4.07	Basic property rights, necessary for any project in Latin America, were not identified.
How to stimulate land rental and sales markets	3	119	28	4.25	Although it was a good presentation, it should be more in-depth.
The importance of land administration, and related challenges and solutions	3	126	30	4.20	ok
Relevance of module content to your work	4	125	29	4.31	
Relevance to your personal and professional learning goals	4	127	30	4.23	It may be interesting to better link certain concepts at the beginning, especially for those colleagues (including myself) who don't have any training on these issues, but we need to gain knowledge on them. I am working on all this.
				4.29	

MODULE 4: Vulnerable Groups					
Question	Individual scores	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
Session 1: Land rights for women (Diana Fletschner)	1	114	29	3.93	Great information on the need to highlight women's rights and their role in these processes. Wonderful session. This session could be improved.
Session 2: Indigenous and Afro-descendent peoples: Rights to land and natural resources (Janis Alcorn)	1	83	29	2.86	The presentation was not too didactic. Janis demonstrated that she has extensive experience. She should modify her presentation. Too general. It needs to include specific proposals. It would be ideal to allocate more time to these issues. The presentation could show more conflicts and responses to address them.
Why women's property rights over land and natural resources are important, and how they differ from property rights for other vulnerable populations	1	116	29	4.00	
What do we mean by vulnerability in the context of land tenure and property rights	1	115	29	3.97	
Options that exist for strengthening women's and other vulnerable groups rights to land and resources while still respecting local institutions and customs	1	111	29	3.83	
Relevance of module content to your work	5	113	28	4.04	
Relevance to your personal and professional learning goals	5	116	29	4.00	
				3.80	My expectations regarding this issue were high, but the content was not as good. The presentation did not show what is happening in reality. In general, I believe that presentations should last longer. Most presenters could not finish. For those presenters who don't speak Spanish very well, I suggest that they use interpreters. It is not only a matter of reading the slides but they should also be able to answer our questions.

MODULE 5: Conflict					
Question	Individual scores	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
Session 1: Understanding resource-based conflict (Manolo Morales)	5	114	26	4.38	Great, holistic presentation. It was fast but good, I look forward to the case study.
Session 2: Post conflict land resettlement and restitution (Edgar Forero)	5	107	26	4.12	The presenter is knowledgeable. Lack of time.
Resource-based conflict and how resources either prompt or become the focus of conflict	5	111	26	4.27	
Options that exist for mitigating disputes over resources and for preventing escalation to violent conflict	5	108	26	4.15	It would be ideal to include more solutions.
IDPs and refugee resettlement and restitution in a post-conflict environment in a way that diminishes the probability for conflict to re-erupt	5	105	26	4.04	
Relevance of module content to your work	5	107	25	4.28	
Relevance to your personal and professional learning goals	5	111	26	4.27	
				4.22	The level of presenters is very important. In general, we should focus less in details, because presentations are too long and information is not fully captured. Generally speaking, these presentations were good, but they were given too little time; therefore, presenters were in a hurry on the second half of their presentations. These should focus on two or three issues. Questions were too long and sometimes lacked clarity. Carlos and Kevin were great presenters. Due to the lack of time, there were a number of issues that were not discussed/ addressed. These are very interesting issues but there is not enough time to address them all.

Overall Content				
Question	Individual scores	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score
Module 1: Introduction to land tenure and property rights concepts	4	122	28	4.36
Module 2: Natural resource rights and biodiversity protection	2	114	29	3.93
Module 3: Land governance, administration and markets	3	119	28	4.25
Module 4: gender and vulnerable population issues in land and natural resource	2	107	28	3.82
Module 5: Resource-based conflict and post-crisis land issues	3	117	29	4.03
Simulation exercise: GLUT	4	132	29	4.55
Country teams – Assessment and Action Plan	3	120	29	4.14
Exchange experiences and strengthen understanding of land tenure and property rights issues, and their application to government and USAID programming	4	114	27	4.22
Learn land tenure and property rights approaches, best practices and tools used in these fields, aimed at improving programmatic interventions on critical issues in the region related to natural resources, agriculture and economic growth, and governance and conflict	3	118	27	4.37
Develop a country action plan that can be used to guide government and donor investments	3	108	27	4.00
Course and module goals were stated clearly	4	119	27	4.41
Content of the training program	3	117	27	4.33
Relevance of program content to your work	3	118	27	4.37
Efficiency of methods used (presentations, discussions, group exercises) for achieving the goals of each module and the overall course	4	111	27	4.11
Appropriate balance between presentations, time allotted to discussions and group exercises	4	112	27	4.15
Quality of specialists and facilitators	5	117	27	4.33
Quality and adequacy of materials received	4	118	27	4.37
Logistics coordination during the course	4	137	29	4.72
Quality of conference venue	4	133	29	4.59
Quality of services	4	135	29	4.66
Quality of food	3	133	29	4.59
Overall, how would you rate your training program experience?	3	119	27	4.41

What were the highlights for you from the 5-day short course on Best Practices for Land Tenure and Natural Resource Governance in Latin America?

- A new experience with other countries.
- Property rights. Tenure efficiency for managing natural resources, gender, land markets and concepts.
- The first module was important because a number of needs from many countries arose.
- The exchange of experiences around these issues.
- The presentation on land formalization, restitution and markets, as well as the GLUT game.
- Land tenure concepts that each country uses.
- The quality both of presentations and presenters.
- The chance to share experiences from each country regarding NRM.
- Manolo's presentations and the GLUT game.
- The rural development implementation program.
- Climate change.
- Land titling.
- The chance to exchange local and regional experiences around these topics.
- The chance to exchange ideas and experiences. Similarities between our institutional problems in each country.
- The correlation between our experiences and those from other countries.
- The issues included in module 3.
- The situation of other participating countries.
- Learning about the experience of other countries and presenters.
- Learning about concepts and experiences. The importance of having a formalization program.
- In most cases, the experience of our presenters contributed to clarify our doubts and questions.
- The excellent quality of our presenters, and how dynamic the course was.
- The GLUT game and the reading material (Palas case).
- The course methodology and the way the issue of land tenure (not property) right was addressed.
- The opportunity to share experiences with other countries, and the presentations. Both presenters and facilitators have extensive experience. Thank you.
- Learning about the experiences acquired in other countries.
- EVERYTHING! It would be ideal to develop a matrix so that countries standardize their development and outcomes.

What topics (if any) would you have liked for us to have covered in greater detail?

- Statistics cited by the trainers during their presentations.
- Land tenure, natural-resource management, and conservation.
- Conflict mediation, particularly in ancestral and communal lands.
- Bi-national conflicts.
- Formalization, restitution, institutional coordination, security.
- Land tenure.
- Land administration and markets.
- Greater details in anthropological/sociological/geographical terms.
- Ancestry and self-determination parameters. Gender equality related to land access.
- Land tenure and carbon.
- Geographic information systems.
- Land tenure related to gender equity.
- Economic concepts related to land use. Land markets.
- An analysis per country based on the experience we have, and then identify the most successful experiences, so that we can use them as benchmarks.
- Cover in greater detail the experience acquired in other countries.
- The rural part of the GLUT exercise.
- An analysis of land tenure in the region. What have we done? What is the methodology applied?

- Every single presentation. There was an overall time constraint. The game should not be as long.
- The experience of each presenter is so enriching that they should have had more time to transmit more knowledge to us.
- Land management in conflict areas.
- Climate change and environmental services.
- The rural part of the GLUT exercise.
- Data gathering for decision making (physical data, photographs, etc.).

What topics (if any) did we spend too much time on?

- None.
- None. On the contrary, we needed more time to cover them in greater detail.
- The document read by the presenter on indigenous issues. I don't think it contributed much.
- Maybe we could include presentations on other countries.
- Although it was interesting, the GLUT game. More time should have been allotted to issues related to land tenure.
- None.
- The REDD presentation.
- None.
- None.
- None. There was a lack of flexibility regarding our panelists.
- The general presentations on procedures and rights.
- The game
- None
- The game was excessive and the last session didn't catch our attention.
- The game
- I think time is never enough.
- None. Time was not enough.
- None. Everything was good.
- The GLUT game.
- None.

Did you feel that the 5-day training course encompassing a broad array of themes was helpful, OR would you prefer that future course offerings be focused on specific topics? If so, which topic(s)?

- Very useful.
- It was very useful to get familiar with the issue and understand/link it to my work and actions for future projects.
- It was interesting to share experiences with other countries. Unfortunately, there are many similarities and these countries face the same situation, except for Colombia. But it was an interesting exchange of experiences with more advanced countries.
- Regarding gender: Inter-generational and multicultural aspects in a real approach. You distorted reality and covered it up.
- Yes.
- Issues related to titling and regularization should be covered in greater detail.
- The broad array of topics was very important because it allowed us to develop a broader perspective.
- On projects related to land management.
- It should be more focused. There was too much information included in all presentations and this represented a disruption.
- Although it was satisfactory, it would be better to cover one theme per course; for instance, the new indigenous integration.
- It was very useful.
- Simplified titling processes.

- It should not be as broad. Actually, this course could be taught during an entire semester. Although it was very useful, a specific workshop should be developed around land use. I would like to see this issue be addressed specifically for the Colombian case.
- Some topics could be covered in greater detail; for instance cadastre, and titling processes and requirements.
- The course was useful to be applied in my country, particularly in Loreto, Peru.
- Five days suffice and a number of important topics were covered.
- All topics covered were appropriate and related to the main theme of the course. However, the issue related to indigenous communities could be included in a new course because its application is very broad.

Please feel free to provide any additional suggestions regarding how this training could be improved

- A very tight schedule.
- A field trip to visualize the issues studied. A presentation on different tools such as GIS, maps, etc. Another presentation with updated, recent data, since each country faces a different reality. A presentation should not only be about reading something.
- I am very happy I was invited, and I will report back on the importance of this course.
- I suggest that a course takes place in Panama.
- I hope that we keep in touch so that we can continue sharing our successes and experiences.
- The game should be played with smaller groups. Rules should be explained clearly in order to motivate all participants.
- Trainers should speak the local language better or make use of interpreters. Finally, thanks for everything.
- Everything went well.
- We could work with decentralized autonomous governments (GAD) in Ecuador and apply the GLUT exercise to their territories.
- If possible, *in situ* experiences should be included. Time should be optimized. The time allotted to ask questions was very limited.
- The level of organization and logistics of this course should be maintained in future courses.
- On USAID's webpage, please include a column with steps we could take to guide ourselves at the regional level in Latin America regarding these different issues, so that we can compare them and know if there is something missing while developing these projects.

U.S. Agency for International Development

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

www.usaid.gov