



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# PROPERTY RIGHTS AND RESOURCE GOVERNANCE ISSUES AND BEST PRACTICES

WASHINGTON, DC, TRAINING COURSE SUMMARY AND PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS



OCTOBER 17-19, 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—  
I-00-06-00008-00, Property Rights and Resource Governance (PRRGP) Task Order 2 under the  
Prosperity, Livelihoods, and Conserving Ecosystems (PLACE) Indefinite Quantity Contract (IQC).  
Implemented by:

Tetra Tech ARD  
P.O. Box 1397  
Burlington, VT 05402

**COVER PHOTO:** A course participant records the Kenya working group's roadmap for addressing land  
tenure and property rights issues. Photo courtesy of Tetra Tech ARD.

# PROPERTY RIGHTS AND RESOURCE GOVERNANCE ISSUES AND BEST PRACTICE

WASHINGTON, DC, TRAINING COURSE SUMMARY  
AND PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS

OCTOBER 17–19, 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.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>II</b>
<b>PREFACE</b> .....	<b>III</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>2.0 COURSE OVERVIEW</b> .....	<b>3</b>
2.1 MODULES .....	4
2.2 TOOLS .....	4
2.3 COURSE MATERIALS .....	5
2.4 COURSE CONTENT .....	5
<b>3.0 EVALUATION METHODS AND RESULTS</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: COURSE ANNOUNCEMENT</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: COURSE AGENDA</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: PRESENTER BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS</b> .....	<b>23</b>

# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

COTR	Contracting Officer's Technical Representative
EGAT	Bureau of Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade (USAID)
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
LMS	Learning Management System
LTPR	Land Tenure and Property Rights
MCC	Millennium Challenge Corporation
NRM	Natural Resources Management
PRRGP	Property Rights and Resource Governance Project
TO	Task Order
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government

# PREFACE

There is a continuing need to understand and communicate how property rights issues change as economies move through various stages of economic growth and democratization, and (in some cases) from war to peace; and 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;
- Food security;
- Governance and the rule of law;
- Incidences of HIV/AIDS;
- 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.

The United States Agency for International Development (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 that 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 countries where USAID has a presence, it is the main focus of this Property Rights and Resource Governance Project (PRRGP) Task Order (TO) under the Prosperity, Livelihoods, and Conserving Ecosystems (PLACE) Indefinite Quantity Contract.

PRRGP is a five-year initiative implemented by Tetra Tech ARD. The project was launched in September 2008, and is expected to be completed by September 11, 2012. The TO 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](mailto:gmyers@usaid.gov)) is the TO’s operating Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative. PRRGP’s mission is to:

1. Expand analytical methodologies, tools, and training on property rights issues such as 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; and
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 PRRGP TO is to build the capacity of United States Government (USG) staff and host-country counterparts to address effectively property rights and resource governance issues in order to promote equitable economic growth, sustainable resource management, and poverty reduction. Training is a central component of the PRRGP strategy to attain that goal, with more than 20 percent of the TO's core budget dedicated to a Washington, D.C.-based training of USG staff (Task 1) and courses in USAID regions of support (Task 2).

# I.0 INTRODUCTION

Under the Property Rights and Resource Governance Project (PRRGP) Task Order (TO), Tetra Tech ARD organized and conducted a three-day short course on “Property Rights and Resources Governance: Issues and Best Practices” at Tetra Tech ARD’s training facilities in Rosslyn, Virginia, on October 17–19, 2011.

The course was intended for 35–40 USG foreign assistance practitioners interested in strengthening their understanding of land tenure and property rights (LTPR) issues and best practices internationally, and their application to United States Government (USG) programming. The short course was intended to provide the USG foreign assistance community in Washington, D.C., and on United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Missions with concepts, approaches, and tools for improving the programming of LTPR in USAID programs involving agricultural and economic growth, natural resources, health, and democracy and governance. This was the sixth LTPR course offered in Washington, D.C., by PRRGP and its predecessor task order.

The course had three main objectives:

1. Exchange experiences and strengthen understanding of LTPR issues, best practices, and their application to USG programming;
2. Introduce LTPR concepts and approaches aimed at improving programmatic interventions in economic growth, food security, governance, natural resource management (NRM), conflict mitigation, and climate change; and
3. Teach USG foreign assistance practitioners tools to address LTPR issues or use LTPR interventions to strengthen economic development, governance, conflict mitigation, and NRM objectives.

This course also included a cross-cutting focus on women’s rights and linkages between property rights and HIV infection.

Tetra Tech ARD organized the short course. This included developing the agenda and announcement, organizing content, selecting presenters, coordinating participants, and implementing the short course and follow-up. Tetra Tech ARD, with assistance from the USAID Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative (COTR) for the PRRGP TO, took responsibility for announcing the short course, posting the short course on USAID’s internal Learning Management System (LMS), and circulating the course agenda and announcement among selected USAID Bureau, Office, and Mission staff, as well as within the State Department, Central Intelligence Agency, Department of Defense, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC). A total of 37 participants completed the short course.

The present document reports on this three-day course (see Appendices A and B for the training announcement and agenda, respectively) and provides an overview of the course and its structure and a review of participant evaluation. Feedback from the participants can be used to inform future USAID-sponsored LTPR training events.

Course materials and presentations are available at: <http://usaidlandtenure.net/ltpertools/training-documents>.



## 2.0 COURSE OVERVIEW

Tetra Tech ARD utilized three primary methods for advertising the course:

1. Official USAID training notices were distributed worldwide through USAID's internal notification system;
2. An announcement for the course was circulated via e-mail by Tetra Tech ARD to its updated distribution list of USG contacts; and
3. The course was announced in conjunction with the offering of the Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation's Conflict 102 course.

Tetra Tech ARD conducted registration through USAID's internal LMS. This system is free of charge and easily accessible by USAID staff. Those who utilize it receive credit on their USAID university transcripts. Tetra Tech ARD staff have been trained in this system, and USAID provided the firm with access to it for the management of course participants.

A total of 37 participants (18 men and 19 women) attended the course. Eight were from USAID Missions (Cambodia, Colombia, Ethiopia, Honduras, Liberia, Tajikistan, and Ukraine), two were from the State Department, and one was from the MCC. The remaining 26 participants represented several USAID Bureaus (e.g., Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade [EGAT] and Global Health) and Offices (Policy/Bureau of Planning, Policy, and Learning; and Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance). One participant was from the Cloudburst Consulting Group. See Appendix C for a list of participants.

The course agenda was developed based on lessons learned from the five courses offered between 2007 and 2010 in Washington, D.C., and on participant feedback received from those courses. Building upon the success of past courses, a professional facilitator was again hired. The organizers also took into consideration emerging themes in LTFR such as climate change, food security, HIV/AIDS, and land grabbing.

The October 2011 training course was composed of seven modules, several of which represent key areas of USAID programming. These modules are described in Table 2.1 on the following page.



A course participant records information as part of the country case study working groups.

## 2.1 MODULES

**TABLE 2.1: MODULES AND THEMES PRESENTED**

<b>MODULE</b>	<b>THEME</b>
Module 1	Introduction to Land Tenure and Property Rights (LTPR) Concepts
Module 2	Competing Priorities for Land: Food Security, Climate Change, and Commercial Pressures
Module 3	Gender and Vulnerable Populations: Strengthening Access to Land and Resources
Module 4	Land Policy and Administration: A Tool for Managing Property Rights
Module 5	Land and Natural Resource Conflict: How Rights and Access to Land and Resources Can Be the Cause of Conflict and Can Fuel Conflict
Module 6	Natural Resource Management: How Tenure Security Can Promote Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources
Module 7	Wrapping It All Up

Each thematic module incorporated formal presentation(s) on various sub-themes of the module, usually in the form of PowerPoint presentations and discussions. Three modules included short films. USAID Land Tenure Division team members made presentations on economic impacts of LTPR programming, property rights in wildlife, and property rights and artisanal diamond development. In addition, participants applied knowledge and problem-solving in group exercises surrounding four country case studies: Colombia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan/Tajikistan, and Liberia.

## 2.2 TOOLS

As in previous short courses, instructors employed a variety of learning tools to transfer knowledge and maintain a motivated training audience. Those tools are summarized in Table 2.2 below.

**TABLE 2.2: TRAINING TOOLS**

<b>TRAINING TOOLS</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b>
PowerPoint Presentations	Presenters used PowerPoint to speak on specific LTPR issues and interventions, incorporating examples from around the world.
Facilitated Group Discussion	Facilitated plenary discussions took place around each of the thematic technical modules.
LTPR Framework and Matrix	A presentation describing LTPR tools (LTPR Framework, Matrix, and Assessment Tools) was delivered.
Group Exercises	Broken out into four self-selected country case study working groups (Colombia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan/Tajikistan, and Liberia), participants conducted a series of exercises. For each of three technical modules, working groups read two-page briefing materials on the actual country situation and then identified existing constraints and potential interventions to address those constraints. In a wrap-up exercise, each country group presented those constraints, interventions, and a roadmap of steps they would take as the USAID Mission addressing these LTPR issues.
Video Presentation	Videos were used to illustrate real-world examples dealing with women's rights to land in Africa, ways in which USAID is addressing conflict diamonds in Sierra Leone, and impacts of land formalization and community organization in an urban neighborhood in the Philippines.

For this course, the instructors were a mix of new presenters (Deborah Porte, Elisa Scalise, and Kirk Talbott) and experts who had participated in previous training courses (John Bruce, Mark Freudenberger, Peter Rabley, and Jolyne Sanjak). Gary Forbes returned to facilitate the fourth consecutive Washington LTPR course.

## 2.3 COURSE MATERIALS

With good conservation in mind, organizers minimized handouts. At the end of the course, the participants received flash drives that contained all course presentations and case exercises, and dozens of technical briefs, reports, and reading lists (divided by subject matter) of further studies and relevant documents and websites.

## 2.4 COURSE CONTENT

**Module 1** provided an introduction to LTPR concepts (*presented by Dr. John Bruce*):

Dr. Bruce provided an overview of LTPR terms, concepts, and definitions through an interactive presentation followed by an exercise where participants identified constraints in their own countries and used the LTPR Matrix to group the issues. Dr. Mark Freudenberger also introduced the suite of LTPR tools.

### Quotes from 2011 course participants:

“This was one of the best trainings I’ve attended while at USAID.”

“Really great course. One of the best I’ve attended so far. Made me reconsider—re-vision—the role of economic development in a land context. High quality of experts.”

**Module 2** addressed competing priorities for land, including food security, climate change, and commercial pressures (*presented by Dr. Jolyne Sanjak*):

This module conveyed the implications of the emerging phenomenon of competing priorities for land and linkages among LTPR, food security, conservation, energy, and development. Dr. Sanjak shared emerging ideas and approaches for how to address these competing land uses. This module also introduced the four country case studies with brief presentations on each, following which participants broke out into their first working group session.

**Module 3** focused on LTPR in the context of gender and vulnerable populations (*presented by Kirk Talbott and Elisa Scalise*):

Mr. Talbott provided an overview on LTPR issues in the context of vulnerable populations. He defined vulnerability in the context of evolving property rights and resource management, provided examples of law and policy in action that address vulnerability, and discussed best practices in LTPR programs. Participants were shown the BBC video “Villages on the Front Line: Niger” that illustrates the precarious tenure status of a group of village women in Niger. Ms. Scalise then made a presentation on constraints associated with protecting and strengthening land and property rights of women. Her presentation focused on the need to focus specifically on strengthening women’s land tenure and property rights. The module wrapped up with the second country case study working session.

**Module 4** addressed land policy and administration as tools for managing property rights (*presented by Peter Rabley*):

Mr. Rabley discussed the purpose and elements of sound land policy and legislation, as well as the pros and cons of customary and statutory land governance institutions. After a discussion period, Mr. Rabley presented on many of the common challenges facing land administration and available solutions, such as flexible cadastral systems, appropriate technology, modernization of public institutions, and increased public awareness. Participants viewed and discussed “Hidden Paradise Water Resources and Transformation of a Slum in the Philippines,” a video demonstrating the impacts of land titling on an urban village in Asia.

**Module 5** focused on resource-based conflict over land and natural resources and post-conflict stabilization (*presented by Dr. John Bruce*):

Dr. Bruce presented on issues and opportunities associated with tenure reform in post-conflict environments. Specifically, he discussed the linkages among land tenure and conflict, common post-conflict challenges, common LTPR interventions in post-conflict situations, challenges to restitution of property rights (of internally displaced persons [IDPs], refugees, returnees, and ex-combatants), and options for donor

programming. Following Dr. Bruce's presentation, a 22-minute video was shown on how USAID is addressing conflict diamonds in Sierra Leone. Country work group sessions also took place.

**Module 6** focused on LTPR implications for NRM and biodiversity conservation (*presented by Dr. Mark Freudenberger*):

Utilizing visuals and a narrative that led participants on a virtual walk through the forests of Madagascar, Dr. Freudenberger illustrated the important linkages between natural resource issues and land tenure. His presentation highlighted the long histories of contested struggles for access to land and other resources, and he discussed how the USG often has competing objectives related to conservation, food security, and climate change. The third country working group session was held on NRM-related issues in each of the four countries under analysis.



**Module 7** constituted the final course activity.

During the final afternoon of the course, country working groups prepared and presented on constraints identified in each country, proposed priority interventions, and developed a roadmap for how USAID might tackle the issues facing each case study nation.

The course ended with USAID handing out course completion certificates and flash drives to each participant.

# 3.0 EVALUATION METHODS AND RESULTS

Participant evaluations were administered throughout the training. Participants were asked to complete evaluation forms for each module and then complete an overall evaluation of the whole course. The evaluation forms requested participants to rate their satisfaction with each presentation and module on a scale from 5 to 1, as follows: 5 (high), 4 (somewhat high), 3 (satisfactory), 2 (somewhat low), and 1 (low). The evaluation also asked participants to score each module on improved knowledge, improved understanding of interventions and best practices, and relevancy to work. The evaluation provided space for comments and suggestions for improvements to the course. Table 3.1 provides an average of all of the rankings received by each module of the training course. It must be noted that people have a tendency to avoid extremes in the ranking scale and particularly the high extremes (e.g., 5s). The scores should be assessed from that perspective. On the final course evaluations, the average score for the course overall was 4.18.

**TABLE 3.1: INDIVIDUAL MODULES SCORES FROM FINAL OVERALL EVALUATION**

MODULE	RANKING
Module 1: Introduction to LTPR Concepts	4.18
Module 2: Competing Priorities for Land	4.18
Module 3: Gender and Vulnerable Populations	4.27
Module 4: Land Policy and Administration	4.09
Module 5: Land and Natural Resource Conflict	4.30
Module 6: Natural Resource Management	4.33
Module 7: Wrapping it All Up	3.94
<b>Overall course evaluation score given on relevancy of program content</b>	<b>4.35</b>

Natural Resource Management (Module 6) was the highest-ranked module. With respect to individual pieces of the training program, the presentations on the use of spatial data and the opening presentation on concepts and definitions were the highest-ranked presentations. The three videos on women’s land rights in Niger, formalization of land rights in the Philippines, and conflict diamonds scored equally or higher than those presentations.

On the overall evaluation, the question on the content of the training program scored highly (4.22). Participants indicated that the format was appropriate (4.19) and that objectives were stated clearly (4.38). Relevancy of program content scored 4.35—the third year in a row that this important category showed an improved score. In general, participants noted the following as particular strengths of the course: the case studies, the presenters, and the movie clips. Students indicated a wide variety of topics that they would have liked to have been covered in greater detail, including: difficulties in

**Additional quotes from course participants:**

*“It is clear that the content and learning approaches were well thought through.”*

---

*“The case studies were very rich.”*

---

*“The course provided a solid intro to LTPR, especially good for someone like myself with no background in the field.”*

---

*“Too much talk, zero interaction.”*

---

using land as collateral for credit, agriculture and the productivity increase resulting from improved land tenure, vulnerable populations, ethnicity in conflict, project design, royalty payments and relationships to major oil companies, and ways to address gender.

A summary of participant evaluations and specific attendee comments can be found in Appendix E.

# APPENDIX A: COURSE ANNOUNCEMENT

## USAID Short Course Announcement

### *Property Rights and Resource Governance Issues and Best Practices*

Dates: October 17-19, 2011

Venue: 1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 700, Arlington, VA

USAID/Washington is pleased to announce the USAID *Short Course on Property Rights and Resource Governance Issues and Best Practices*, scheduled for October 17-19, 2011. The course is intended for approximately 35 USG foreign assistance practitioners interested in strengthening their knowledge and skills in applying LTPR in their economic, food security, governance, climate change, and natural resource portfolios. The course has three objectives:

1. Exchange experiences and strengthen understanding of LTPR issues, best practices and their application to USG programming;
2. Introduce LTPR concepts and approaches at improving programmatic interventions;
3. Teach USG foreign assistance practitioners tools to address land tenure and property rights issues, or use land tenure and property rights interventions to strengthen economic, food security, governance and natural resource management objectives. This course also includes cross-cutting foci on the rights of women and other vulnerable populations.

This short course will provide the USG Foreign Assistance Community in Washington DC and posts with concepts, approaches and tools aimed at improving the programming of land tenure and property rights in donor programs involving natural resources, climate change, economic growth, food security and governance.

Through presentations, video, discussion and practical exercises based on country case studies, participants will share experience and strengthen their skills and expertise in the following:

- LTPR concepts, current issues and interventions
- Land and resource tenure for women and other vulnerable groups
- Secure land rights as a critical factor for land markets, investment and agricultural growth
- LTPR in natural resource management, biodiversity conservation, and climate change
- Land and resource-based conflict and post-conflict stabilization
- Competing priorities for land (food security, climate change and commercial pressures)

#### Participant Comment on the LTPR Course

*"I enjoyed the course more than any other training I've had in Washington thus far."*

This course is being offered in conjunction with the Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation's *Conflict 102* course, which will be offered on October 13-14, 2011, so that interested participants have the opportunity for a full week of related training.

Please register through USAID's Learning Management System (LMS). Registration will close on October 7, 2011. For questions on

how to use LMS or any other course queries, feel free to contact the course coordinators.

**Benjamin Linkow**  
USAID  
Land Tenure Economist  
[blinkow@usaid.gov](mailto:blinkow@usaid.gov)

**Roberto Prado**  
Tetra Tech ARD  
Course Coordinator  
[rprado@ardinc.com](mailto:rprado@ardinc.com)

# APPENDIX B: COURSE AGENDA



Property Rights and Resource Governance Issues and Best Practices  
October 17–19, 2011  
Venue: 1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 700, Arlington, VA  
AGENDA

This short course will provide 40 USG foreign assistance practitioners training that strengthens their knowledge and skills in addressing land tenure and property rights (LTPR) challenges in their portfolios. The key objectives include:

1. Exchange experiences and strengthen understanding of LTPR issues, best practices internationally and their application to USAID programming;
2. Introduce LTPR concepts and approaches aimed at improving programmatic interventions in economic growth, food security, governance, natural resource management, conflict mitigation and climate change; and
3. Teach USG foreign assistance practitioners tools to address land tenure and property rights issues, or use land tenure and property rights interventions to strengthen economic development, governance, conflict mitigation and natural resource management objectives.

## DAY ONE

8:30 – 9:00 Welcome by USAID’s Land Tenure and Property Rights Unit Staff (Timothy Fella, Benjamin Linkow and Karol Boudreaux)

9:00 – 9:40 Course overview, objectives, and participant introductions (Gary Forbes, facilitator)

Module 1: Introduction to land tenure and property rights (LTPR) concepts

Objectives: (1) Develop common understanding of terms and concepts; (2) Introduce LTPR tools that will be used throughout course.

9:40 – 9:50 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)

9:50 – 10:20 Presentation on concepts and definitions (John Bruce)

10:20 – 10:30 Coffee break

10:30 – 11:00 Introduction to LTPR tools (Mark Freudenberger)

11:00 – 12:00 Discussion on LTPR constraints in participant countries (John Bruce)

12:00 – 1:00 Lunch

Module 2 - Competing priorities for land: Food security, climate change and commercial pressures  
Objectives: (1) Convey implications of the emerging phenomenon of competing priorities for land and linkages between LTPR, food security, conservation, energy and development; (2) Share emerging ideas and approaches for how to address these competing land uses; (3) Introduce and build interest in country cases.

1:00-1:10 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)

1:10-1:30 Presentation on competing priorities for land (Jolyne Sanjak)

1:30 – 1:45 Discussion

Introduction to Country Case Studies

1:45 – 2:15 Country case studies

- Liberia (Mark Freudenberger)
- Colombia (Deborah Porte)

2:15 – 2:45 Country case studies

- Kenya (John Bruce)
- Kyrgyzstan/Tajikistan (Peter Rabley)

2:45 – 3:00 Coffee break

3:00 – 4:30 Explanation of country case study group exercises, division into country groups, and first country case working session to identify LTPR constraints that impede security of tenure and determine potential interventions.

4:30 – 4:45 End day wrap-up

## DAY TWO

8:30 – 8:40 LTPR film clips

8:40 – 9:10 Economic impacts of LTPR programming by USAID LTPR staff member (Benjamin Linkow)

Module 3: Gender and vulnerable populations: Strengthening access to land and resources  
Objectives: (1) Convey the meaning of vulnerability in the context of LTPR, why women's land rights matter, and the linkages between LTPR and HIV/AIDS; (2) Share the various policy, administrative, judicial, institutional and programmatic options for strengthening women's and other vulnerable groups' rights to land and resources.

9:10 – 9:20 Introductions to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)

9:20 – 9:40 Presentation on understanding vulnerability and property rights (Kirk Talbott)

9:40 – 9:55 Video Villages on Front Lines: Niger

- 9:55 – 10:10 Discussion
- 10:10 – 10:25 Coffee break
- 10:25 – 10:45 Presentation on protecting property rights of women (Elisa Scalise)
- 10:45 – 11:00 Discussion
- 11:00 – 12:00 Second country case study group working session to identify constraints to women's and vulnerable groups' access to land and resources, and potential interventions.
- 12:00 – 1:00 Lunch
- 1:00 – 1:30 Property rights in wildlife – CBNRM in Namibia— by USAID LTPR staff member (Karol Boudreaux)

#### Module 4 - Land policy and administration: A tool for managing property rights

Objectives: (1) Convey the process, purpose and elements of a sound land policy and legislation, and articulate the pros and cons of both customary and statutory land governance institutions; (2) Share programmatic interventions related to land policy and administration, and successful methods and technologies used in land administration.

- 1:30 – 1:40 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)
- 1:40 – 2:10 Presentation on land policy and administration (Peter Rabley)
- 2:10 – 2:40 Video: Hidden Paradise Water Resources and transformation of a slum in the Philippines
- 2:40 – 2:50 Discussion
- 2:50 – 3:10 Coffee break
- 3:10 – 3:40 Presentation on use of spatial data (Peter Rabley)
- 3:40 – 4:00 Discussion
- 4:00 – 4:15 End day wrap-up

#### DAY THREE

- 8:30 – 8:40 LTPR film clips

Module 5 – Land and natural resource conflict: How rights and access to land and resources can be the cause of conflict and can fuel conflict

Objectives: (1) Convey what we mean by resource-based conflict and how resources either prompt or become the focus of conflict; (2) Share programmatic options for managing conflicts over resources and for resettling IDPS in a post-conflict environment.

- 8:40 – 8:50 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)
- 8:50 – 9:20 Presentation on land, natural resources and violent conflict (John Bruce)
- 9:20 – 9:45 Video: PRADD Conflict Diamonds

9:45 – 10:15 Property rights and artisanal diamond development (PRADD), by USAID LTPR staff member (Timothy Fella)

10:15-10:30 Coffee break

Module 6– Natural resource management: How tenure security can promote conservation and the sustainable use of natural resources

Objectives: (1) Convey why property rights over natural resources are important to biodiversity conservation, good governance, economic growth, and adaptation and mitigation of climate change; (2) Share tenure related programmatic interventions to promote sustainable resource uses.

10:30 – 10:35 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)

10:35 –11:10 Presentation of LTPR Issues in NRM, biodiversity conservation, and GCC (Mark Freudenberger)

11:10 – 11:30 Discussion

11:30 – 12:30 Third country case study group working session to identify LTPR constraints to sustainable use of natural resources, and potential interventions.

12:30 – 1:15 Lunch

Module 7 - Wrapping it All Up

Objective: Allow participants to present their case study conclusions and ask any remaining questions to the expert trainers.

1:15 – 1:25 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)

1:25 – 2:45 Final country case study group working session to develop country roadmap of actions and prepare for presentations. Participants will develop a roadmap of steps they would take as the USAID/Country Mission to address LTPR issues in their particular case study countries.

2:45 – 3:45 Presentations by each country group on their roadmap, country constraints and priority interventions.

3:45 – 4:15 Discussion

4:15 –4:30 Evaluations, diplomas, closing

# APPENDIX C: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Property Rights and Resource Governance Issues and Best Practices**  
**October 17–19, 2011**  
**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title/organization</b>	<b>Email address</b>
1. Aaron Bennett	Engineer Officer EGAT/I&E/ES	<a href="mailto:aabennett@usaid.gov">aabennett@usaid.gov</a>
2. Anthony Piaskowy	Program Analyst/USAID Contractor Cloudburst Consulting Group	<a href="mailto:anthony.piaskowy@cloudburstgroup.com">anthony.piaskowy@cloudburstgroup.com</a>
3. Brian Enslein	Foreign Service Officer EGAT/USAID	<a href="mailto:benslein@usaid.gov">benslein@usaid.gov</a>
4. Bryan Byrne	Private Enterprise Officer EGAT/USAID	<a href="mailto:bbyrne@usaid.gov">bbyrne@usaid.gov</a>
5. Bryan Gillooly	Agriculture Development Officer BFS/USAID	<a href="mailto:bgillooly@usaid.gov">bgillooly@usaid.gov</a>
6. Caitlin Hall	Desk Officer for Nepal, Sri Lanka and Maldives SCAA/USAID	<a href="mailto:cahall@usaid.gov">cahall@usaid.gov</a>
7. Christopher Adams	Private Enterprise Officer EGAT/USAID	<a href="mailto:cadams@usaid.gov">cadams@usaid.gov</a>
8. Christopher Powers	Private Enterprise Foreign Service Officer EGAT/USAID	<a href="mailto:cpowers@usaid.gov">cpowers@usaid.gov</a>
9. Cristina Barrera	Local Government Official USAID/Colombia	<a href="mailto:cbarrera@usaid.gov">cbarrera@usaid.gov</a>
10. Cynthia Berning	Program Officer Agriculture/Land Department, MCC	<a href="mailto:berningcc@mcc.gov">berningcc@mcc.gov</a>
11. Dennis Knecht	Foreign Service Officer EGAT/USAID	<a href="mailto:dknecht@usaid.gov">dknecht@usaid.gov</a>
12. Elisa Zogbi	Democracy and Governance Officer DCHA/USAID	<a href="mailto:ezogbi@usaid.gov">ezogbi@usaid.gov</a>
13. Evgenia Malikova	Project Management Specialist Regional USAID Mission for Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus	<a href="mailto:emalikova@usaid.gov">emalikova@usaid.gov</a>
14. Finley Karngar	Rule of Law Advisor USAID/Liberia	<a href="mailto:fkarngar@usaid.gov">fkarngar@usaid.gov</a>

Name	Title/organization	Email address
15. Geeta Uhl	Foreign Service Officer EGAT/USAID	<a href="mailto:guhl@usaid.gov">guhl@usaid.gov</a>
16. Gina Krump	Environment Foreign Service Officer EGAT/NRM/USAID	<a href="mailto:gkrump@usaid.gov">gkrump@usaid.gov</a>
17. Heather D'Agnes	Environment Officer EGAT/USAID	<a href="mailto:hdagnes@usaid.gov">hdagnes@usaid.gov</a>
18. Heather Kalmbach	Western Hemisphere Program Officer PRM/ECA, Department of State	<a href="mailto:KalmbachHE@state.gov">KalmbachHE@state.gov</a>
19. Janet Lawson	Agriculture Officer USAID/Cambodia	<a href="mailto:jlawson@usaid.gov">jlawson@usaid.gov</a>
20. Jennifer Karsner	Agriculture Development Officer BFS/USAID	<a href="mailto:jkarsner@usaid.gov">jkarsner@usaid.gov</a>
21. Laura Berger	Democracy Officer USAID/Honduras	<a href="mailto:lberger@usaid.gov">lberger@usaid.gov</a>
22. Laura Cizmo	Agriculture Development Officer BFS/USAID	<a href="mailto:lcizmo@usaid.gov">lcizmo@usaid.gov</a>
23. Lisa Walker	Private Enterprise Officer EGAT/EG/USAID	<a href="mailto:liwalker@usaid.gov">liwalker@usaid.gov</a>
24. Michael Donovan	Advisor Office of Policy/Bureau of Planning, Policy and Learning USAID	<a href="mailto:mdonovan@usaid.gov">mdonovan@usaid.gov</a>
25. Miranda Jolicoeur	Crisis, Stabilization and Governance Officer DCHA/DG/USAID	<a href="mailto:mjolicoeur@usaid.gov">mjolicoeur@usaid.gov</a>
26. Nancy Iris	Deputy Director PRM/ECA, Department of State	<a href="mailto:irisnr@state.gov">irisnr@state.gov</a>
27. Nathaniel Bills	Private Enterprise Foreign Service Officer EGAT/USAID	<a href="mailto:nbills@usaid.gov">nbills@usaid.gov</a>
28. Paul Rivera	Economist/AAAS Fellow EGAT/EG/TI/USAID	<a href="mailto:parivera@usaid.gov">parivera@usaid.gov</a>
29. Robert Pierce	FS Engineer EGAT/I&E/USAID	<a href="mailto:rpierce@usaid.gov">rpierce@usaid.gov</a>
30. Ryan Raleigh	Program/Project Development Officer PPL/SPP/USAID	<a href="mailto:rraleigh@usaid.gov">rraleigh@usaid.gov</a>

Name	Title/organization	Email address
31. Sidi Maghraoui	Foreign Service Officer CFO/USAID	<a href="mailto:smaghraoui@usaid.gov">smaghraoui@usaid.gov</a>
32. Stephen Little	Private Enterprise Officer USAID/Ukraine	<a href="mailto:slittle@usaid.gov">slittle@usaid.gov</a>
33. Suhrob Tursunov	Project Management Specialist USAID/Tajikistan	<a href="mailto:stursunov@usaid.gov">stursunov@usaid.gov</a>
34. Teresa Bernhard	Environmental Protection Specialist GH/HIDN/USAID	<a href="mailto:tbernhard@usaid.gov">tbernhard@usaid.gov</a>
35. Terhi Majanen	Environmental Officer EGAT/USAID	<a href="mailto:tmajanen@usaid.gov">tmajanen@usaid.gov</a>
36. William Hall	Economist EGAT/USAID	<a href="mailto:whall@usaid.gov">whall@usaid.gov</a>
37. William Hughes	Agriculture Development Officer USAID/Ethiopia	<a href="mailto:chughes@usaid.gov">chughes@usaid.gov</a>

# APPENDIX D: PRESENTER BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

## KAROL BOUDREAUX

Ms. Karol Boudreaux joined USAID from George Mason University (GMU) where she was Instructor at the GMU School of Law (previously Assistant Dean of the School). At GMU, she taught a seminar on Law and International Development and was a Senior Research Fellow at the Mercatus Center. The focus of her research for the past six years has been institutional arrangements in sub-Saharan Africa with a focus on property and land tenure institutions, natural resource management, and varieties of entrepreneurship. She has conducted field research in eight African countries and has published over 25 articles, policy papers, and book chapters, as well as a monograph on property rights. Ms. Boudreaux also served as a member of the Working Group on Property Rights of the Commission on Legal Empowerment of the Poor. Her J.D. is from the University of Virginia, where she concentrated on international law, and her B.A. is from Douglass College, Rutgers University.

## JOHN BRUCE

Dr. John W. Bruce, SJD, has worked on land policy and law in developing countries for 40 years, primarily in Africa and East Asia. He began work on land tenure in the late 1960s as a Peace Corps legal advisor to the Ministry of Land Reform in Ethiopia, and later did research for his legal doctorate on customary land tenure in Ethiopia's Tigray region. He spent five years in Sudan as the Ford Foundation's representative in the 1970s, teaching Property at the Faculty of Law of the University of Khartoum and coordinating the Faculty's Sudan Customary Law Research Project. He returned to the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1980, serving as the African Program coordinator and then director of the Land Tenure Center, an interdisciplinary research center working on land tenure issues in developing countries. In 1996, Dr. Bruce left the university to join the legal department of the World Bank, where he served as senior counsel (Land Law) and as the land tenure expert for the Bank's Rural Development Department. Dr. Bruce retired from the World Bank in 2006 and now heads a small consulting firm, Land and Development Solutions International. He has published extensively on land policy and law, most recently *Land Law Reform: Achieving Development Policy Objectives* (World Bank, 2006), *Land and Business Formalization for Legal Empowerment of the Poor, Strategic Overview Paper* (ARD for USAID, 2007), and, with Anna Knox, *Structures and Stratagems: Decentralization of Authority over Land in Africa*, *World Development* 37(8): 1360-1369 (2009). Dr. Bruce holds his J.D. from Columbia University and his S.J.D. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

## TIMOTHY FELLA

Mr. Timothy Fella is the land tenure and conflict specialist with USAID in Washington, D.C. He provides technical assistance on tenure and property rights challenges as they relate to conflict over natural assets, governance, and humanitarian crises. He also is managing the team's climate change and tenure portfolio. Mr. Fella has worked on the design and implementation of land tenure and property rights programs for more than six years in over a dozen countries. Prior to joining USAID in January 2010, Mr. Fella worked with the Property Rights and Land Policy team at the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) where he participated in the development and implementation of comprehensive land administration reform projects in Lesotho, Burkina Faso, and Liberia totaling over \$88 million. He has a Master's degree in Social Sciences for International Development from the University of Aalborg, Denmark, and has conducted research into the

formalization of informal settlements in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and communal land tenure insecurity in Sri Lanka.

#### GARY FORBES

Mr. Gary Forbes is a facilitator and organizational consultant with more than 25 years of experience. As a specialist in participatory methods, Mr. Forbes has provided conference and workshop facilitation for Tetra Tech ARD projects during the last 15 years, and has helped bring together stakeholder groups and create networks among local governments, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and community leaders. He is a founding member and past president of the International Association of Facilitators (IAF), and has provided training in Advanced Participation Methods (APM) in over 20 countries. These methods are highly successful in developing active participation when applied to strategic and multi-sectoral planning, organizational development interventions, and development of shared-responsibility teams. Mr. Forbes has also facilitated workshops and conferences, and conducted training sessions for a number of organizations and agencies, such as Mercy Corp and USAID. He holds a Master's degree in International Management from the American Graduate School of International Management, and a Bachelor's degree in History from Macalester College.

#### MARK FREUNDEBERGER

Dr. Mark S. Freudenberger is the Chief of Party for USAID's Property Rights and Resource Governance Project (PRRGP) Task Order implemented by Tetra Tech ARD. He brings to this position over 30 years of field experience in natural resource management in Sahelian West Africa and Madagascar. Tenure and resource management issues have long been the focus of his work in Africa. Dr. Freudenberger returned to take on the management position with PRRGP after 11 years of managing USAID eco-regional conservation and development programs in Madagascar. Over the past four years, he has developed a new country specialization on tenure issues in the Central African Republic, Kenya, and Liberia. Previous to this position, he was a senior social scientist for the World Wildlife Fund in Washington, D.C., where he led a population-environment program but also launched the first field studies on the social and ecological impacts of diamond mining in national parks of the Central African Republic. During five years at the Land Tenure Center of the University of Wisconsin, he pioneered the use of RRA/PRA tools to analyze the evolution of tenure institutions in Senegal, The Gambia, and Guinea. He was a Peace Corps volunteer in Togo. After these first two formative years, he implemented agricultural education programs for Catholic Relief Services in south central Burkina Faso. Dr. Freudenberger grew up as a child in the southern Katanga of the Democratic Republic of Congo. He holds a Ph.D. in Regional Planning and Natural Resource Management from the University of California in Los Angeles.

#### BENJAMIN LINKOW

Dr. Benjamin Linkow is a development microeconomist with a specialization in land tenure issues and agricultural development. His areas of focus include quantitative impact evaluation and economic analysis of property rights reforms, and the links between land tenure and property rights issues, investment incentives, and economic outcomes at the household level, with particular reference to sub-Saharan Africa. Prior and ongoing research topics include: the intersection between traditional and legal inheritance practices and the implications for women's access to land in rural Kenya, the economic impacts of land conflict and tenure insecurity in Burkina Faso, and the role of property rights and access to credit in artisanal diamond mining in Liberia. Dr. Linkow has previously held positions at MCC and Miami University of Ohio, and holds a Ph.D. in Agricultural and Applied Economics from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

#### DEBORAH PORTE

Ms. Deborah Porte specializes in land tenure, property rights, land management, and legal, regulatory and institutional land reform in developing and conflict countries. For over 20 years, Ms. Porte has provided advisory/technical services on land and multi-disciplinary projects funded by both the private and public sectors. Clients include USAID, the World Bank Group, the Asian Development Bank, the EOC (BKK),

DFID, UKAID, and MCC, as well as national governments and private companies. Ms. Porte has worked throughout Latin America, Asia, Africa, the South Pacific, and the Middle East. Currently, she is involved in land-related projects and providing training in Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan, Tanzania, and Lebanon. Prior to becoming an independent consultant, Ms. Porte was Vice President at AECOM and The Services Group, responsible for the company's Land Portfolio, as well as managing the firm's Asia specific projects. During this period, Ms. Porte conducted numerous evaluations of critical land issues in Colombia, Thailand, Armenia, India, Jordan, Kuwait, Sierra Leone, Senegal, and Peru. Before AECOM, Ms. Porte was a Senior Urban Planner/Architect at the City of Toronto's Planning and Development Department and an Associate at Berridge Lewinberg Greenberg, a leading development firm in Toronto Canada. As well, Ms. Porte was an Adjunct Professor at the University of Toronto in the Graduate Planning Department. She holds Master's degrees in Architecture, Urban Planning, and Urban Design with an emphasis on international development from the University of Washington.

#### PETER RABLEY

Mr. Peter Rabley founded International Land Systems (ILS) in September 1996 to focus on delivering high quality, appropriate, and sustainable solutions for land administration worldwide. As part of ILS, MR Rabley invested in and established wholly owned subsidiary offices in Kyiv, Ukraine, and Cochabamba, Bolivia. Mr. Rabley sold ILS to Thomson Reuters in July 2011. He has more than 25 years of experience working in the US and Western Europe, as well as in emerging economies throughout the world. Mr. Rabley has designed, developed, and implemented information technology applications with a particular focus on land registries and cadastral applications in a variety of working and data conditions. Mr. Rabley attended Queens College, Nassau, Bahamas, and Douai School, Newbury, UK, and received his degrees in geography and economics from the universities of Michigan and Miami.

#### JOLYNE SANJAK

Dr. Jolyne Sanjak is the Managing Director for the Technical Services Division in the Department of Compact Operations at the MCC. She leads teams covering a range of topics such as agriculture, land tenure, social and gender assessment, financial and private sector development, and human development, as well as the Contracts Section. Previously, she served as Senior Director leading the Agriculture and Land teams and was MCC's Practice Leader for Property Rights and Land Policy. She joined MCC in February 2005, bringing close to 20 years of experience related to land tenure, property registration, and land markets, as well as to broader themes related to rural development and economic growth. Prior to joining MCC, Dr. Sanjak worked as lead specialist on property rights and land policy and on rural development in USAID's Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean. She also contributed significantly to USAID global efforts on special themes such as remittances and land conflict management. Dr. Sanjak holds a Ph.D. in Agricultural Economics with a specialization in development economics from the University of Wisconsin. She also holds an M.S. in Agricultural Economics with a specialization in natural resource management from Penn State University.

#### ELISA SCALISE

Ms. Elisa Scalise is a land law and policy attorney for Landesa, formerly Rural Development Institute (RDI) who specializes in women's land and property rights. She is also the Director of the Landesa Center for Women's Land Rights, which was launched in 2009. Ms. Scalise has provided legal and policy assistance on women and land for a number of USAID projects in Rwanda, Burundi, Afghanistan, and Liberia, and has lead other projects in other countries such as Kyrgyzstan, China, and Uganda.

#### KIRK TALBOTT

Mr. Kirk Talbott consults and teaches in the fields of international development, law, environmental security, and natural resources management. He has more than 25 years of experience in designing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating multi-disciplinary programs, primarily in Africa and Asia/Pacific. These national and regional initiatives, funded by USAID, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, EU bilateral agencies, foundations, and other donors, focused on community-based resource management, tenurial

reform, civil society building, and good governance in forestry and environment. After practicing international law and training developing country officials at the International Law Institute, Mr. Talbott conducted policy research and extensive field work for ten years at the World Resources Institute. He worked with USAID and World Bank National Environmental Action Plans in 18 African countries and later directed the tenurial rights and community forest management program in Asia and the Pacific. He then led the Asia/Pacific team at Conservation International before starting a new NGO—First Voice International—that utilized satellite and community radio to support demand-driven development and information access to vulnerable populations across remote regions of Africa and Asia. Currently, Mr. Talbott works on the Post-Conflict Peace-Building and Natural Resources Management initiative with the ELI and partners. A member of the D.C. Bar, he has a J.D. and an M.Sc. in Foreign Service from Georgetown University, and a B.A. from Yale University. He also has published widely and served on several NGO boards.

# APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS

<b>MODULE 1: Concepts</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Total Points Received</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1: Concepts and definitions</b>	142	33	4.30	Useful, concise; Great way to start, good foundation setting session; Clear exercise.
<b>2: Introduction to LTPR tools</b>	135	33	4.09	Not sure of the value; Ok could have been done at the end of the course; Good to see these upfront.
<b>3: Discussion on LTPR constraints in participant countries</b>	141	33	4.27	Shorter, tables w/ relevant data – "Tell me in five minutes," briefing style; This was a tad brief; Liked this session – helped to bring matrix to life; Interesting to see real examples; Good sample of different experiences.
<b>4: Improved knowledge and understanding of LTPR terms and concepts</b>	140	33	4.24	I've had some experience in this area before, but it was a good intro; Already familiar with many concepts – interested in how USAID is approaching it; Good overview.
<b>5: Improved your understanding of common LTPR constraints faced in developing nations</b>	136	33	4.12	This topic could have been expanded upon; Not "new" issues revealed really, but solid presentation.
<b>6: Relevancy to your work</b>	141	32	4.41	My impression is that a greater focus will be spent on Africa, which is not my region, but, still, that's AID's major focus; All important for my future assignment; Relevant to B5-11; Not sure.
			4.24	

<b>MODULE 2: Competing Priorities</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Total Points Received</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1: Presentation on competing priorities for land</b>	125.5	31	4.05	Great, clear overview of issue; Carbon sequestration presented as negative when it's not necessarily so; Really, really good – appreciated seeing land tenure linkage – isn't always a part of the dialogue; Lots of info in very little time; A little slow but informative and useful; Make more time for this – or delete slides rather than skipping them; Less reading of the slides would be better; Would have liked to hear more on the "menu" of interventions & more specific examples overall of competing priorities.

<b>MODULE 2: Competing Priorities</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Total Points Received</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>2: Country case study presentations</b>	127	32	3.97	Too long, five minutes with data handouts; These were unnecessarily long; Colombia was a bit long and repetitive; Very much enjoyed content, however, was a bit dry; Case studies were not all presented in the same format, with same content; Lots of info in very little time; Lots of information to take in at once!; A little painful...time would have been better spent on session 3; Some of them ran over time and seemed less prepared than others; Could be a bit more focused and just hit the highpoints, no need for melodramatic selling; Good examples to sink our teeth into.
<b>3: First country working group session</b>	130	31	4.19	I had to leave early, so I shouldn't comment; Good activity, groups a bit large. Appropriate time allocated. Great expert resource; Good to have expert for questions; Having a resource person is nice, but they shouldn't dominate discussion and provide "answers" to the group; Great country expert!
<b>4: Improved your understanding of linkages between LTPR, food security, conservation, energy, and development</b>	132	32	4.13	Case study materials provided excellent context of land policies both historical and current, but there was very little connecting to food security, HIV/AIDS, climate change, energy, economic development.
<b>5: Improved your knowledge about approaches for how to address these competing land issues</b>	132	32	4.13	Did we ever cover any emerging ideas? I may have missed this.
<b>6: Relevancy to your work?</b>	132	31	4.26	
			4.12	Agree fisheries from a food security and property rights issue is a must for our purposes. Coastal and catch quantity ownership.

<b>MODULE 3: Gender and VP</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Total Points Received</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1: Understanding vulnerability and property rights</b>	120	31	3.87	Liked incorporation of governance and rule of law components; This session was confusing to me and I had a hard time getting the take-home points; A little too high-level view to be practically valuable, but optimistic, which was helpful; Too general, poor contextualization; Circular, felt like low relevance.
<b>2: Video: "Villages on the Front Line: Niger"</b>	137	31	4.42	Video was good, but there was no discussion; Liked incorporation of videos and case studies; Great idea to show this video.
<b>3: Protecting property right of women</b>	127	30	4.23	Very useful.
<b>4: Second country working group session</b>	129	31	4.16	I think it would be better if the expert facilitated discussion – they can ask the right questions to encourage more substantive discussion; A different task would be nice; I felt there were many redundancies. Also with such broad issues and little personal research, I feel like the interventions were arbitrary and general: "capacity building," improve with implementation, etc.; Feels like a time killer; Good discussion, contribution from Liberia group (Mark F.).

<b>MODULE 3: Gender and VP</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Total Points Received</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>5: Improved knowledge and understanding of vulnerability in the context of land tenure and property rights</b>	125	31	4.03	Not sure it changed what I knew already; Discussion on UN definition of IDP in working group session most useful.
<b>6: Helped you understand why women's land rights matter, and the linkages between LTPR and HIV/AIDS</b>	132	31	4.26	I know why they're important, why don't the target communities? That's the gap in understanding.
<b>7: Improved your knowledge of policy, administrative, judicial, institutional and programmatic options for strengthening women's and other vulnerable groups' rights to land and resources</b>	124	31	4.00	Wish this was much more the case, would like more examples of what to do in the field as a practitioner; More on this would be helpful – more practical options – more on the "how."
<b>8: Relevancy to your work?</b>	117	29	4.03	Not sure.
			4.13	

<b>MODULE 4: Land Administration</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Total Points Received</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1: Presentation on land policy and administration</b>	121	31	3.90	It would be more interesting to see examples of land administration structure/ operationalization; Good overview; Good presenter, somewhat "lecture" style topic; Good stuff, but pedagogical suicide.... Too much talk, zero interaction; Very basic and descriptive; Clear, but not particularly well-presented.
<b>2: Video: "Hidden Paradise"</b>	135	31	4.35	Again – discussion would be nice; Interesting though raises some questions about the tragedy of commons; But would be good to tie back to USAID roles and resources; Great videos, especially commercial movie clips.
<b>3: Presentation on the use of spatial data</b>	135	31	4.35	Very interesting. Probably something I know the least about this but presented clearly; Very interesting; This was very interesting!; The examples were very vivid; Clear, but relevance questionable;
<b>4. Discussion</b>	80	20	4.00	
<b>5: Helped you understand the process, purpose and elements of a sound land policy and legislation</b>	127	29	4.38	Small group discussion would have been useful.
<b>6: Improved your understanding of LTPR programmatic interventions for land policy and administration</b>	117	29	4.03	It would be good to present interventions in use by USAID and use them as examples to illustrate the interventions; Could have used a critical evaluation; May be a little bit more on the how, but there were a good number of examples.

<b>MODULE 4: Land Administration</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Total Points Received</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>7: Relevancy to your work?</b>	115	28	4.11	
			4.16	The property rights in wildlife – CBNRM in Namibia was excellent and a good presentation for right after lunch; Too much talk, zero interaction. This would be my one major critique of the course overall. We need much more interaction. Hands-on. Discussion and Q&A should not feel so rushed; Presentation on community-based NRM was fantastic – engaging and a great case study to learn from.

<b>MODULE 5: Land and Natural Resource Conflict</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Total Points Received</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1: Presentation on land, natural resources, and violent conflict</b>	129	32	4.03	I would like more background on how the artisanal miners were exploited. At the sales point, forced labor, what?; Sound was an issue, difficult to hear/understand; Good example that we can sink our teeth into.
<b>2: Video: “PRADD Conflict Diamonds”</b>	148	32	4.63	Elegant and well done; A little more political background would be helpful; Interesting example of the community process; Very interesting, more discussion on environment and conflict issues would be good.
<b>3: Improved your understanding of resource-based conflict and how resources either prompt or become the focus of conflict</b>	131	31	4.23	
<b>4: Improved your knowledge about programmatic options for managing conflicts over resources and for resettling IDPS in a post-conflict environment</b>	121	31	3.90	Didn't talk about resettling IDPs really. Need more how and more implementation examples; We didn't get much information on resettling IDPs in a post-conflict environment.
<b>5: Relevancy to your work?</b>	121	29	4.17	
			4.19	

<b>MODULE 6: Natural Resource Management</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Total Points Received</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1: LTPR issues in NRM, biodiversity conservation, and global climate change</b>	131	31	4.23	Could have been more illustrative and broken down to understand parts; I liked providing a specific case study for Madagascar; Excellent presentation!

<b>MODULE 6: Natural Resource Management</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Total Points Received</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>2: Third country case study working group</b>	120	31	3.87	Still interesting, but felt like we were rehashing yesterday's ideas; We had a hard time determining what we would do differently from the other two session interventions that were identified; Similar to previous working group sessions; Having someone from the country in our group turned the session into story time. The group also did not focus on the task and many constraints were just circular thinking; Good group discussions and shared experiences.
<b>3: Improved knowledge and understanding of why property rights over natural resources are important to biodiversity conservation, good governance, economic growth, and adaptation to and mitigation of climate change</b>	132	30	4.40	Great use of Madagascar as the case study – very understandable; I wish the class would have spent a bit of time giving examples of customary tenure in different countries to give us an understanding.
<b>4: Improved understanding of LTPR programmatic interventions related to conservation and sustainable NRM</b>	119	29	4.10	A handout that provides information on programmatic interventions would be helpful.
<b>5: Relevancy to your work?</b>	125	29	4.31	Very much so – was helpful to understand in field issues.
			4.18	

<b>USAID Presentations</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Total Points Received</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Economics impacts of LTPR programming</b>	133	31	4.29	
<b>Property rights and artisanal diamond development</b>	135	30	4.50	

<b>Overall Content</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Total Points Received</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1: Introduction to Land Tenure and Property Rights (LTPR) Concepts</b>	138	33	4.18	I felt like I knew most of this before I came; This module was a solid introduction to LTPR, but was very dry and not very hands-on.
<b>2: Competing Priorities for Land: Food Security, Climate Change and Commercial Pressures</b>	138	33	4.18	I might be biased, but I wish there was more time to discuss the issues around REDD, carbon markets, and how to deal with them; This module was more interesting, especially the introductions to the case studies.
<b>3: Gender and Vulnerable Populations: Strengthening Access to Land and Resources</b>	141	33	4.27	Good take-home interventions came out of this session; Elisa Scalise's presentation was one of the best, providing a good introduction to women & PR.
<b>4: Land Policy and Administration: A Tool for Managing Property Rights</b>	135	33	4.09	Most interesting topic, though presentation was a little dry; This section was a bit of a let-down: had hoped land policy/admin section would've been stronger. Too many diagrams.
<b>5: Land and Natural Resource Conflict: How Rights and Access to Land and Resources Can be the Cause of Conflict and Can Fuel Conflict</b>	142	33	4.30	Timothy gave a great presentation and movie on PRADD was very good.
<b>6: Natural Resource Management: How Tenure Security Can Promote Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources</b>	143	33	4.33	
<b>7: Wrapping It All Up (Final case study group work and country presentations)</b>	130	33	3.94	I did not find group useful. It was interesting to have folks talk about what is going on at the missions; Bit repetitive and long; Interesting to see the "formula" emerge spontaneously from the groups; Could use a little more direction or clarity of direction on roadmap. Steps – nonspecific to the country it should be or if generic; Might be good to enable the groups to flush out the designs more fully using the illustrative interventions discussed in training; Some of the instructions were confusing; The design would be, I think, more helpful if it were less about USAID general process and more on the specific program design level. OR provide time for both; Very good discussions at country case studies, good background information and good role of the facilitator.
<b>8. Country Case Study Groups</b>	121	31	3.90	
<b>9. Discussion Sessions</b>	112	28	4.00	
<b>10: Objectives were stated clearly</b>	140	32	4.38	
<b>11: Content of the training program</b>	135	32	4.22	
<b>12: Relevancy of program content to your work</b>	135	31	4.35	
<b>13: Format for presentations and discussions was appropriate to the material</b>	134	32	4.19	

<b>Overall Content</b>				
<b>Question</b>	<b>Total Points Received</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Average score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>14: Country case study working groups effectively allowed you to apply the information you learned to USAID programming scenarios</b>	131	32	4.09	
<b>15: Overall, how would you rate your training program experience?</b>	129.5	31	4.18	
			4.17	

---

**What were the highlights for you from the three-day short course on LTPR—Issues and Best Practices?**

---

**Comments:**

---

- Drop small groups and change – a few folks dominated it;
  - Enjoyed continuity of case study – really learned about country issues and having a country expert enhanced this experience;
  - Lots of good information;
  - Initial group-work sessions – Mark F. was really knowledgeable, useful session on property rights in wildlife;
  - Presentations by experts;
  - Case study work;
  - Land and natural resource conflict module and movie clips;
  - Hearing examples from the past, looking forward and how future, upcoming issues (and funding) might impact current efforts, trainers taking time to interact with participants;
  - Movie clips!;
  - NRM discussions/movie clips/documentaries;
  - Very much enjoyed group discussions;
  - Case studies/interaction with Mark;
  - Last day – PRADD, Madagascar – really brought the issues home. PRADD in particular showed concrete, tangible steps to effect positive change that is responsive and relevant and USAID specific. Really great course. One of the best I've attended so far. Made me reconsider – re-vision – the role of economic development in a land context. High quality of experts. Appreciated positive/optimistic view despite daunting challenges;
  - The detailed descriptions of projects and success stories;
  - Mark Freudenberger, Ben Linkow, John Bruce, Tim Fell, and Peter Rabley presentations;
  - The amount of detail in the country case studies was very interesting. Learning about issues from multiple countries on different continents was great!;
  - As far as a ? class goes – you are there. I just want more – details, budgets, cultural context, research;
  - Learning about the mutual relationship between DG and land;
  - Discussions on NRM and Namibia;
  - The people were amazing and thoroughly knowledgeable. The presenters knew the material and presented well;
  - The use of LTPR Matrix as a very important tool in dealing with land programs and other materials (USAID LTPR portal, country briefs);
  - Very good pool of practitioners that presented interesting information. Very good administration – great work;
  - This was one of the best trainings I've attended while at USAID. It is clear that the content and learning approaches were well thought through. I really appreciated the country case studies – the materials, the expert as part of our group, the way the exercise mirrored what we were learning, the video clips, the examples provided from actual USAID program experiences;
  - Exposure to the subject matter;
  - The course provided a solid intro to LTPR, especially good for someone like myself with no background in the field;
  - In addition to excellent agenda and presenters, it was a great opportunity to discuss and consult with seasoned experts on my projects land issues. I appreciated the condensed, highly efficient manner in which the course was conducted;
  - LTPR staff presentation.
-

---

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

---

**Comments:**

---

- Discovery of natural resources and royalty payments and relationships to major oil company's etc.;
- Specific programs;
- More specifics on interventions, what has not worked, how it has changed;
- What is actually happening in missions? What is USAID doing? How do we, for example, engage communities? Governments? etc.;
- The case studies were very rich, especially the diamond mining case;
- More coverage of the difficulties associated with using land as collateral for credit;
- NRM;
- Make sure to incorporate USAID's approach to all topics;
- Addressing gender appropriately in programming;
- Policy;
- More case studies of effective and ineffective land tenure projects problems/challenges encountered in program and solutions;
- Understanding various cultural views toward land tenure;
- USAID program details (lessons learned);
- More specific info about what USAID is doing, slightly more practical guidance for new COTRs;
- Wildlife;
- Perhaps the challenges of working in post-conflict environments with unwilling or nefarious elements in the government or elite structure;
- Corruption/natural resource governance;
- Given the significance of feed the future, it would be good to focus more on agriculture and the productivity increase that results from increased land tenure;
- None;
- Vulnerable populations;
- More on implementation options – project design;
- Strengthening gov't. capacity and developing sustainable process;
- As I said before, the issues around carbon rights, REDD+, etc., and how we work on them in the context of mitigation and adaptation programs we are in charge of designing and implementing;
- Introduction to land tenure and property rights concepts;
- The issue of ethnicity in conflict;
- Health, more intervention examples in module presentations.

---

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

---

**Comments:**

---

- Groups;
  - Spatial data presentation;
  - Land administration was really broad – I would have liked more examples;
  - Presentation on spatial data;
  - Some presentations were too theoretical – less jargon, more about practice;
  - Basic intro – spent a lot of time on easy concepts;
  - Conflict – a broad and superficial symptom of underlying issues;
  - Seemed like we spent a little too much time on very broad concepts, very broad terminology. When we got to specific projects, design, indicators = helpful. Most of us know the problems but not what we can do about it. More case studies?;
  - Balance was appropriate;
  - Roadmaps – there were many experienced officers in the group, not just DLLs;
  - None;
  - History of course, tenure of presenters.
-

---

**Did you feel that the 3-day training course encompassing a broad array of themes was helpful, OR would you prefer that future course offerings be broken down into separate 1-day modules and participants attend the theme/module directly relevant to their area of interest?**

---

**Comments:**

---

- 3 day;
- GIS;
- Prefer 3-day format to cover all topics, many are related and it would be tough to break up;
- After a while, persistent themes emerge. I would have liked a 2-day course;
- I'd prefer broken down 1-day modules. There was a lot of basic knowledge that I already knew. Perhaps there could be a beginning and an advanced class;
- 3 days OK;
- 3 day – good;
- Good to have overall understanding of all themes;
- 3-day training was helpful to fully understand LTPR programming;
- I can see it both ways, but it almost might be better to deal with these topics on a regional basis because many regions have similar issues;
- I really liked the three-day format – get to know participants and staff well;
- The broad training is better as long as the individual modules don't overlap. There's always overlap in real life but it's impossible to discuss if people always come back to “don't forget about this” factor;
- A lot of material could have been covered on online training;
- I think that would make it really hard for overseas staff to attend;
- 3-day;
- Prefer one-day module;
- I like the 3-day course format in order to provide a comprehensive overview of all the issues in land tenure;
- I appreciated the 3-day course;
- Think you need broader based themes together;
- No, all is better;
- 3-day is helpful, more detailed separate course for specific modules would be helpful especially different approaches on land tenure, rights production, registration;
- No – I think the 3 days and the topics built on one another;
- I prefer a longer training time on specific issues;
- For me personally, the 3-day framework is preferable;
- Broad array was useful;
- 3 days was good.

---

**How did you like the venue as a training facility?**

---

**Comments:**

---

- Very poor, inconsistent sound and microphones;
  - Good, the main facilitator was very good;
  - Good;
  - Venue was great;
  - Excellent!;
  - Great, only problem was the sound system;
  - Great;
  - Great;
  - Venue was nice and view was great!;
  - Great – couldn't be better;
  - Great!;
  - Very nice venue. I would like to come back;
-

- 
- Don't need a microphone. The static is counter-productive;
  - Very nice, just try to improve consistency of sound system;
  - Sound system and room set up was distracting;
  - Beautiful, comfortable, nice set up – only complaint = sound system (eesh);
  - Good;
  - Nice;
  - Great;
  - It was nice;
  - Easy to locate;
  - I did like it, it was fine;
  - Great;
  - Great venue – comfortable, good break-out rooms;
  - It is satisfactory;
  - Very good;
  - Great, lovely view;
  - Liked everything except the locked toilet which did not seem to make sense;
  - Very good.

---

**Have you ever rated a USAID course a perfect score (e.g., 5 out of 5)? If so, why?**

---

**Comments:**

---

- No;
- No, is it possible to be perfect?
- No;
- This is my first USAID course;
- No. Experts and tech folks aren't always perfect trainers/educators;
- No, always room for improvement;
- No. No training is ever perfect;
- No;
- No;
- Yes, because I have found several USAID courses to be of similar high quality as this one;
- Yes – good mix of content and training methodology;
- No;
- I'm a nice and generous person. I'm also judging on relevance, not details;
- No, high expectation??;
- No – there is always something that can be improved on;
- No;
- No.

---

**Please provide any additional suggestions regarding how this training could be improved.**

---

**Comments:**

---

- Success/failure examples in countries – Part implementation;
  - More informal time. Networking;
  - Great facilitator!;
  - Excellent training;
  - Many thanks!;
  - Make it regional;
  - Fewer lecture-type presentations, more interactive tasks, smaller group discussions;
  - Think about coastal rights;
-

- 
- Work on case studies. The discussion seemed to cover the same issues over and over. Also the 6 steps wasn't clear. "Resource People" could be too involved and prescriptive and not give group chance to talk through issues. In some cases, they didn't seem to understand the point of the assignment either;
  - More tools in how to deal with these issues and how to do interventions;
  - Link MSRP-BSRP Process to the exercise;
  - More learning options besides PowerPoint – maybe group activities;
  - I would like more examples in different geographical areas of customary land rights and projects that address them. I would like to see more on gender analysis and land rights. I would like to see more on non-land property rights, livestock, water rights, hunting rights, fishing rights, non-timber forest product rights, jewelry, and on response to shocks. I would like to see something on property rights and response to shocks. How have our projects fared in the face of conflict or other duress?;
  - Some reading information can be sent in advance, e.g., cases and info on countries that will be reviewed. More professionals with broad experience to make presentations;
  - I wish we had used the matrix and tools on the website more to inform our group exercise;
  - Please fix speaker system. It was very distracting;
  - I was quite disappointed with the Colombia case study. The facilitator's daily handouts included dated information and barely touched on the exciting new developments with regard to land legislation made by the GOC. The facilitator had been in Colombia some years ago, but appeared to make no effort to find updated information to share with our group.
-

**U.S. Agency for International Development**

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

[www.usaid.gov](http://www.usaid.gov)