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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>AMERINDIAN LAND TITLING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFC</td>
<td>GUYANA FORESTRY COMMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGMC</td>
<td>GUYANA GEOLOGY AND MINES COMMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLSC</td>
<td>GUYANA FORESTRY COMMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCDS</td>
<td>LOW CARBON DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOIPA</td>
<td>MINISTRY OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES’ AFFAIRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTC</td>
<td>NATIONAL TOSHAO COUNCIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>PROTECTED AREAS COMMISSION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Background

The Amerindian Land Titling project seeks to enable Amerindians to secure their lands and natural resources with a view towards sustainable social and economic development. It is expected that titling of communities will strengthen land tenure security and expansion of the asset base of Amerindians, enabling improved long term planning for their future development.

The Project was initially slated to run from 2013 to 2016, however due to setbacks, including a late start to the project and a change in Administration at the national level, delays occurred. A request for extension was granted in 2016 for two more years.

During 2018 project execution was severely impacted by lack of agreement between major stakeholders – the Ministry of Indigenous People’s Affairs (MoIPA) and the Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission (GLSC) on required procedures. Following the GLSC’s disagreement with the methodology and approach to Land Titling as outlined in the project document, protracted discussions aimed at resolving the issues ensued with the MoIPA. This resulted in a very late approval of the 2018 work plan and a five month delay in executing the year’s programme. However, further delays were experienced due to non acceptance by the GLSC of the Standard Letter of Agreement (LOA) for services to be provided to the project. With the intervention of the Ministry of Finance and UNDP, this matter was resolved resulting in GLSC commencing participation in the project implementation in September, 2018.

At the Project Board meeting in May 2018 it was agreed that another extension request would be required in order to continue to fulfil the objectives of the Project. In October 2018, UNDP requested and received an interim extension until December 31, 2018 and in December 2018 an assessment of the status of the project was submitted for a longer-term extension. This was complemented by an elaborated request for extension up to December 2021.

2. Summary of Project Outputs to Date

As at December 2018, the following were achieved:

**Output 1: Land Titling**

- ALT guidelines were drafted and revised through stakeholders’ consultations and endorsed by the Project Board in May 2018.
- 25 investigation reports were completed by the MoIPA, with approximately 14-17 repatriated back to the communities; the remaining approximately 8 require additional input.
- To date 7 absolute grants were issued and 20 demarcations were completed, with the most recent being Paramakatoi (Region 8) in 2017 and Four Miles (Region 1) in December 2018.
- GPS training of 51 villages with 698 participants were conducted.

**Output 2: Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)**

- The Grievance Redress Mechanism was established in 2017.
- 23 Persons were trained as GRM Liaisons.
- GRM Outreach was made to all relevant agencies on its existence and function.
- 7 Grievances (2018) submitted; 2 were referred; 1 resolved; and 4 ongoing.
- Mediation was suggested for one dispute between 2 villages, to which GRM is awaiting consent letters from the villages to start the process.
• 54 community members trained in mediation in Region 9 in 2018.

Output 3: Communications

• Print and audio-visual materials were prepared in English and translated into 9 Indigenous languages.
• Audio-visual materials were broadcasted on national and community radios and TV stations countrywide.
• ALT vinyl banners and posters were created and dispersed and mounted through all villages in Region 9.
• A short Documentary was created and circulated showcasing the Demarcation of Paramakatoi.
• A two-day communications workshop was held for 7 villages in Region 2.
• GRM Brochures were created and shared at various events and in communities.

3. Major Changes to Project Design

• 2017- A decision by GLSC to change the land titling procedures that was initially adopted by the Project. This change will see the Output of Demarcation, preceding that of Absolute Grants due to the suspension of the process of issuing Absolute Grants with a ‘save and except clause’ based on the Special Provisions Act. The issuance of Certificates of Title after the completion of demarcation will be dealt with independently by the MOIPA.
• 2017- Adoption of the Guidelines on Amerindian Land Titling saw the introduction of some new procedures such as Pre-demarcation visits, repatriation of reports to the villages, revisits to explain and agree on reports, and obtain additional data to satisfy FPIC.
• 2017- Adoption of recommendations of the Mid-term evaluation saw the introduction of a Gender Specialist with reports and minutes of past meeting being reviewed for input; and commencement of a search for Anthropologist and Forest Agronomist.
• 2018- GLSC was not in agreement with the proposed work plan, again citing reasons of procedures, capacity, and time. After several rounds a new position paper was proposed by MoIPA and accepted by GLSC, which will see any “Newly Approved” lands being subject to demarcation before any formal title is presented. The GLSC also proposed to stop any further work on Certificate of Titles and preparation of the Survey plans under the Land Registry Act.
• 2018- GLSC disagreed with the formal Letter of Agreement being used to render demarcation services. The Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Indigenous Peoples’ Affairs, UNDP and GLSC came to an agreement on the LOA and the processes to be followed. The new LOA was accepted.
• 2018- MoIPA received “Bill of Quantities” for demarcation of Four Miles which was eventually signed off by MoIPA following initial concerns on pricing issues.
4. Progress Towards Development Results

4.1 Contribution to longer term results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Multi-country Sustainable Development Framework (UNMSDF)/Country Programme Document (CPD) Outcome 2: Access to equitable social protection systems and quality services and sustainable economic opportunities improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary achievements based on MSDF/CPD Outcome**

The issuance of Absolute Grants to date to 7 new communities that occupied State Land allows these groups of Indigenous people to establish legal rights to the land they occupied for the first time, thus providing new opportunities for secured investments while protecting existing ones.

**CPD Output 2.1: National and subnational institutions, private-sector and civil society capacities strengthened to deliver effective entrepreneur programmes to women, youth and Amerindians and develop related policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPD output Indicator</th>
<th>Output Target</th>
<th>Summary achievement</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2. Number of Amerindian communities with institutional measures in place at the subnational levels to generate and strengthen employment and livelihoods (Strategic Plan output indicator 1.1.2)</td>
<td>Baseline: 96 (2013) Target: 141</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty (20) villages now have security of tenure that contributes to the framework for improving living standards. The protection of the land rights of the people who depend on the forests and savannahs for their livelihood underpins the security of this population and opens new windows of opportunity for their development. This also allows them to develop sustainable plans for the future.
4.2 Progress Towards Project Outputs

**Project Output 1: Land titles issued and demarcation process completed for all Amerindian villages that submit requests**

*Summary achievement against 2018 Annual Work Plan (AWP) target*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of village maps produced and certified by sworn land surveyors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Partially achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(demarcation for new applications and extensions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four villages were targeted for demarcation in 2018. One (Kambaru) subsequently refused consent for demarcation citing the following reasons: presence of mining blocks on village land; the perception that the land they applied for was not the land given; they needed to have an extension before they allow for demarcation (although an extension was not applied for); and “political interference” in the process. While in the case of another (Arau), the GLSC wrote the MOIPA noting that “the plan for Arau cannot be legally superseded to include additional land onto the Absolute Grant”. GLSC was requested to provide the cost for the demarcation of a third village (Karasabai) but this was not submitted. Hence only one village (Four Miles) was demarcated in 2018.

While not an indicator, GPS training for Indigenous Communities was included in the 2018 workplan and a total of 698 participants from 51 villages benefited.

**Project Output 2: Increased access to existing and alternative mechanisms for resolving land titling disputes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of persons trained with mediation skills for land related</td>
<td>10 persons</td>
<td>54 persons</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disputes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of resolved Land titling disputes that have been referred to</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>7 Grievances (2018)</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trained mediators.</td>
<td></td>
<td>submitted; 2 were</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>referred; 1 resolved;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and 4 ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2018 workplan targeted 3 workshops for mediation training in Regions 2, 7 and 9. However, one workshop was held in Region 9 where 54 community members participated. Toshaos, village council representatives and Community Development Officers participated in the two-day training which was facilitated by local representatives of Mediation Services International. The training enhanced the capacity of participants to resolve conflicts through mediation and facilitated increased sensitization about the GRM since most of the Toshaos were newly elected. Further, the training provided an opportunity for the GRM to log grievances and as a consequence of the comprehensive knowledge of mediation and its benefits received, participants are more likely to consent to mediation should the GRM recommend it for their dispute. This complemented the training of 200 persons in 2015 and surpasses the project target of 210 persons.

In addition, a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) unit was established in 2017. The GRM functions by engaging its Liaisons who are employed by various land administration institutions to participate in the grievance resolution process. 20 persons were trained as GRM Liaisons. Its collaborative approach to grievance resolution also involves the engagement of stakeholders who have an interest in land as well as the National Toshao Council (NTC) that represents Amerindians nationally and NGOs that also represent Amerindians. In 2018, 7 grievances were submitted, 2 were referred, 1 resolved and 4 are ongoing. Of the ongoing disputes, mediation has been recommended for one grievance. This has not yet been achieved due to the awaiting of a consent letter from the complainant as required by the GRM process.

**Project Output 3:** Revised Communication Strategy, including a handbook describing the process of titling, demarcation and on the social and economic impacts of secure land tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicators:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Communities that take part in the Land Titling process</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extent to which revised Strategy includes all appropriate and relevant forms of communication</td>
<td>Revised Communication Strategy tailored to include appropriate and relevant communication methods to increase awareness on Amerindian Land Titling</td>
<td>Communications Strategy was reviewed and areas to be updated for harmonization with revised guidelines were identified. Materials would be amended and produced upon approval of project extension. Communications materials amended to reflect changes in the land titling process.</td>
<td>Partially Achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This output was specifically detailed to review any communication strategy that existed and to develop a plan of action to ensure that all villages as well as stakeholders and the Indigenous Peoples generally fully understand the process of Land Titling and what it entails. There was, however, no strategy in place so one was developed from start - materials that spanned the audio-visual spectrum were developed with some translated into 9 indigenous languages, and all areas of Land Titling were covered in a handbook. This strategy was piloted at 8 workshops in 2017. Relevant Audio materials were aired on Hinterland and National airwaves as well as local Television. Additionally, a banner competition for the project was held among the Indigenous peoples and launched during the 2017 NTC conference. Over 100 banners were erected across the Country in 2017.

However, given the approved changes in the ALT procedures, in 2018, the Communications Strategy was further reviewed and areas to be updated for harmonization with revised guidelines were identified. These would be validated at a review workshop in 2019, upon approval of the project extension, and the materials would be amended and produced accordingly.

It should be noted that the revised strategy was used to engage the village of Four Miles as part of the pre-demarcation meeting and in promoting a better understanding of the land titling process in the villages of Santa Rosa and Waramuri in Region 1 during the GPS training conducted by the Guyana Forestry Commission.

5. Issues

A number of critical issues existed in the ALT Project:

1. Staffing:
Following the recommendations of the ALT mid-term evaluation a gender specialist was recruited in 2017 and the services of a forest agronomist were secured on an as needed basis from a Government institution. However, efforts to recruit an anthropologist have so far been unsuccessful. A temporary project coordinator was hired in 2018 but a secretary for the Grievance Mechanism remains to be employed. Additionally, the gender specialist, communications associate and surveyor resigned their positions. A communications associate was recruited whilst the other positions will be recruited once approval has been received for the project extension.

2. Stakeholder participation:
Efforts were made to forge a greater level of stakeholder involvement from key agencies such as the GLSC. To this effect GLSC’s changes to the procedures for Land titling to see demarcation taking place before the issuance of an Absolute Grant and their non-issuance of Certificates of Title as well as changes to the letter of agreement for their services were accommodated notwithstanding the protracted discussions involved. It is now expected that this agreement which guided the successful demarcation process for Four Miles will be applied to those slated for 2019 upon the granting of the project extension.

3. Lack of Consent by Villages:
So far 6 villages in the Upper Mazaruni sub-region have not given consent for demarcation due to pending legal matters in relation to their lands while one refused demarcation on the grounds they did not request an extension. One of the four villages slated for demarcation in 2018, refused consent to demarcation claiming that: mining blocks are present on the village land; the land they applied for was not the land given; they needed to have an extension before they consent to demarcation (although an extension was not applied for); and “political interference” in the process. It is anticipated that upon an extension of the project, joint pre-demarcation visits would be undertaken to address the concerns of villages. This would be complemented by communications and awareness engagements and the attention of the GRM unit where required.
4. Major Encumbrances on Indigenous lands
Encumbrances through mining, agriculture leases and forestry permits have been proving difficult and time consuming to eliminate. The request for extension of the ALT recommends that 19 additional demarcations be completed by December 2021 (this would reduce the project overall target from 68 to 39) while the investigations to address encumbrances would be undertaken for all the remaining villages under the original project scope. A strategy of revisits to the villages and discussing the issues while seeking options was successful in Region 2 and would be on-going upon the continuation of the project.

5. Untimely Approval of AWP
The late approval of the 2018 AWP saw delayed movements in the demarcation process for the identified villages. Indeed, Karasabai was not completed because the GLSC was unable to submit the estimated cost given time constraints.

6. Human Interest Story
GPS Training in collaboration with Guyana Forestry Training Center

GPS training sessions were undertaken in collaboration with the Forestry Training Center Incorporated. The training commenced on October 1 and concluded on December 10, 2018. The main objectives of the training were:

- To ensure that Amerindian villages are better equipped to locate their land boundaries and to maintain the integrity of those boundaries over time;
- To ensure that their capacities are built to foster participation of the villages in any future demarcation exercise;
- To ensure that Amerindian Villages are better equipped to assist in the reduction of disputes relating to boundaries with concession holders adjoining their titled lands and other land agencies regarding resource use and boundaries.

12 participants from Santa Rosa and its 10 satellites and 12 from Waramuri and its satellite Haimaracabra participated fully in the exercise. Speaking on the importance of this exercise, Florrie Harris, a 16 years old participant from Waramuri said “Waramuri is a small village, with about 200 residents. In my village there are two schools; a Nursery and a Primary and recently an Upper Secondary was established to cater for students that cannot afford to attend Secondary School in Santa Rosa Village. There is not much opportunities for the youth in my village after they graduate. This GPS Training came to my village to offer an opportunity for us to get trained and to provide more employment opportunities. I am now able to set up a GPS and to track points in my village. I can now be able to help the residents of Waramuri to have a better understanding of our boundaries and also use my knowledge gained during the training and apply for jobs.”

Figure 1: Florrie Harris setting up a GPS unit during a training workshop
7. Cross Cutting Issues

a. Gender results

Based on the mid term evaluation recommendation a gender specialist joined the project late in 2017. During 2018 the gender specialist conducted 18 reviews of minutes and attendance sheets for meetings and investigations undertaken during the course of the project to identify key issues that were raised from a gender perspective. These issues will be followed up where necessary for those villages that consent to demarcation. It is intended that the gender specialist will also participate in re-visits to communities during all future engagements to provide support on gender issues. The investigation reports for each village will also include a component where gender disaggregation and issues will be identified. The specialist will advise the project on a strategy to allow for inclusiveness and gender mainstreaming. This position is currently vacant and would be filled upon the project extension.

b. Partnerships

The project has seen significant collaboration between the MoIPA, UNDP, GGMC, GFC, PAC, NTC, and GLSC. This collaboration led to the production of the document “A guideline to Amerindian Land Titling in Guyana”¹ in 2017. The guidelines sought to address the strengthening of stakeholder engagement including FPIC; clarify processes for demarcation and titling and develop grievance and dispute resolution mechanisms to address conflicts. This resulted in the birth and operations of the ALT GRM in 2017. Given the approved changes to the ALT procedures, the guidelines would be formally updated upon the approval of the project extension.

UNDP has also provided necessary technical support and assistance to the project for procurement of the services of required specialists for Mediation, Communication and Evaluation.

c. How Security of Tenure impacts the Indigenous People

The Central Housing and Planning Authority is currently implementing a Project which seeks to assist Indigenous People in various community with housing solutions; this ranges from roof replacement to new low cost homes. The village provides equity through labour while the project provides materials. Selection was based on field assessment of those in need.

Funding agencies require proof of ownership of the lands so as to avoid being supportive of squatting as well as to ensure that the beneficiaries will in fact be able to enjoy the assistance without hindrance. For 2018 the CH&PA has identified 168 houses to be built in Amerindian Villages of these 90 have been completed so far. The communities of Shirri and Katuur have been withdrawn from the project due to a lack of Security of Tenure. This application is delayed because of encumbrances with leases in part of the extension of Potarinau (the mother village).

ALT was approached by the CH&PA to provide this input through verification of the various lists of communities that stand to benefit. GPS Coordinates were also provided for the locations in some cases. ALT was able to verify 100% of the information provided and advise the CH&PA that in one case all of the villages listed are titled and have secured titles while in another case verification of an application for extension was provided with a very small number of potential beneficiaries (3) being found outside of the boundary. These would be encouraged to move within the titled lands and still benefit.

The project would have addressed some of these villages by completing the demarcation and titling aspect. Examples of villages that benefitted would be Katoka and its satellite village Simonie, Potarinau and its satellite villages of Katu’ur and Siriri and Massara and its satellite of Kwaimatta. The beneficiaries of this assistance will now be able to have a proper dwelling constructed for their family and improve their standard of living.

The village of Konashen was demarcated under this project and has since gone into partnership with Conservation International where the entire village of over 600,000 hectares has been declared a conservation area making it one of the largest and only such area that is not state land.

d. Social and Environmental Considerations

A Social and Environmental Assessment of the Project was conducted in 2015 and the project was identified as having some amount of risks. The production of the new guidelines for land titling followed on this as a recommendation so too was the formation of the GRM. This has led to a more participatory approach to land tiling and significant movement towards achieving full FPIC compliance.

e. Innovative approaches

The introduction of a pre-demarcation exercise was tested with one survey in 2017 at Paramakatoi village. ALT, MOIPA and the GLSC surveyors spent time in the village prior to the commencement of the demarcation exercise. In the presence of village representatives and neighbouring villages, the boundary points were visited, agreed on and placed on the map for discussions at a village meeting. The village was also asked to provide personnel for participation in the demarcation exercise. All issues were cleared up to the satisfaction of all the parties, the surveyors subsequently returned to conduct the demarcation with active participation by at least 30 villagers.

At the end of the demarcation the boundary was revisited and checked and the village issued a letter of clearance. This procedure has the potential to prevent any recurrence of past issues whereby surveyors were accused of doing surveys without consultation and getting the results incorrect. Such a pre-demarcation exercise was also conducted in Four Miles in 2018 and led to the successful demarcation of this village.

f. Sustainability

Issues related to sustainability are as follows:

- Future funding for Amerindian Land Titling
- Slow rate of approval for titles and extensions
- Conflicts between Government agencies and villages over land and resources
- Overlapping land use
- Environmental degradation of lands claimed by Amerindians.
- The resource-based claims for land

Should the ALT’s application for extension be granted, a strategy for sustainability would be implemented as an added output to the project. This would aim at the creation of policies to support the sustainability of ALT institutionally within MoIPA and would benefit from other jurisdictions with similar agency structures. A permanent ALT Unit will be established within the MOIPA and the principal focus of this Unit will be to equip the MoIPA to perform its legal functions in relation to ALT matters across all 215 Indigenous Communities and Villages, especially beyond the GRIF funded Amerindian Land Titling Project.
g. Visibility
Banners and posters highlighting the project were erected across Region 9, and in front of the MOIPA compound in Georgetown in 2017. Banners were mounted in Region 7 and 1 for 2018.

h. Reports & Publications
Guidelines for Amerindian Land Titling in Guyana\(^2\). As was noted earlier, this document would be formally revised to incorporate the approved changes to the ALT process, upon approval of the project extension request.

8. Monitoring and Evaluation

The following key recommendations from the ALT midterm evaluation in 2016 were actioned in 2017 and 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;E activity (ALT midterm evaluation)</th>
<th>Key outcomes/ observation</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>UNDP’s Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and Social and Environmental Standards (SES) are a good example of the necessary safeguards and resulted in the creation of the representative platform that formulated the ALT guidelines</td>
<td>Implement the Guidelines for the ALT</td>
<td>In use however, GLSC has raised objections to aspects of the procedure based on the State Lands Act i.e. the development of a special provisions plan and issuing of certificate of title should be replaced by demarcation and issuing of an absolute grant. ALT PMU / MoIPA has therefore revised the process in agreement with the GLSC position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Engage a specialist on indigenous gender approach into the MoIPA team.</td>
<td>Prepare terms of reference for a specialist on indigenous gender approach to Amerindian land titling and role of women in land management; And Assist MoIPA to develop capacity in the area of indigenous gender and land management.</td>
<td>Specialist was hired, but resigned. Investigation reports were reviewed to incorporate gender provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Make institutional arrangements with letters of understanding between institutions.</td>
<td>Draft memoranda of agreement between State agencies highlighting the statutory separation of function for the titling of Amerindian lands - Institutional roles and responsibilities for Amerindian Land Titling will be clarified.</td>
<td>LOAs are signed with key stakeholder, the GLSC, for the provision of demarcation services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A draft of the investigation report must be returned to all the stakeholders participating in the process for comments and validation.</td>
<td>Develop and implement a strategy for the repatriation of investigation reports to Amerindian communities and villages. The format of the investigation repatriation of investigation reports is ongoing. Format adjusted to capture historical information and gender considerations. A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Risk management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Environmental: Risk of Flooding due to extreme rainfall preventing Field work</td>
<td>Use of Dry season for work in areas prone to flooding while higher areas are done during the rainy season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Communities do not give consent for demarcation</td>
<td>This is the highest risk so far in the project and so far 11% of the villages are yet to give consent. Several outreaches and workshop sensitization exercises aimed at defusing situations of doubts and explaining the process were made. Changes in the approach to demarcation to involve more inclusiveness and pre-demarcation visits have been adopted with fair results in that villages are more receptive to the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Operational capacity of Implementing agency</td>
<td>The MOIPA experienced some capacity issues that resulted in cancellations of some communication Field based activities, these have been addressed through the recruitment of additional persons with direct responsibilities for the specific project output. The ALT project was without a project Coordinator immediately after the AWP 2018 was approved as such only Output 1 saw any movement. The application for extension of the ALT included an additional output to establish a permanent ALT unit within the MoIPA. This will greatly enhance capacity and ensure sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Financial risk: Procedures for obtaining funds to pay for Field activities in the hinterland, use PCA’s were discontinued by UNDP and this has been the source of some discomfort to Field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Lessons

Several valuable lessons have been learnt including, these include:

1) Indigenous Land Titling cannot be rushed. It is a very tedious exercise to establish and prove rights while determining competing rights. Original timeline of 3 years was definitely unrealistic and even the two years extension was overambitious considering that from 1967 to 2012 approximately 96 demarcations were completed. The application for extension has reduced the number of demarcations to be completed under the project and has assigned funds for the establishment of a permanent ALT unit at the MOIPA.

2) The importance of the communications output to the success of the project. Such communication at the onset of the project would have been helpful in addressing issues arising from a lack of knowledge and trust among indigenous people, due to many previous bad experiences with demarcations. Visits made subsequent to the Communication workshops were found to yield better results, allowed more time for work rather than project background explanations and saw greater participation in finding solutions to issues.

3) The introduction of the GRM was also late and this could have prevented disputes from dragging on to the end stages. This should have been placed at the commencement of the project. For example, in 2018, 7 grievances submitted; 2 were referred; 1 resolved; and 4 are ongoing.

4) A conscious decision could have been taken to exclude villages with pending land disputes in the courts from the Land Titling project as these villages have clearly indicated that they are awaiting the result of the case. This would have allowed for savings in time by not pursuing investigation missions and other related activities with these villages.

5) The introduction of a pre-demarcation field exercise and consultation where the entire boundary is revisited, discussed, adjusted where necessary and cleared by the village as well as neighboring villages has proven to be successful in Paramakatoi and Four Miles (the two most recent demarcations). Full participation in the exercise through the provision of labour and observers then makes demarcation a routine exercise. This should always be part of any demarcation of Amerindian lands. Time and cost spent during such consultations are seldom wasted.

6) A full year of preparation such as Communication, dispute resolution and demarcation procedures and consultations before venturing into actual demarcation would have benefited the project immensely. Stakeholder participation and buy into a project must include acceptance of procedures and methodologies adapted in the design stages, though small changes based on experiences and
Lessons learned are fully expected. Whilst the agreement on the procedures with the GLSC in particular took some time, it is now expected that said agreements are sufficient for the acceleration of the demarcation process once the project extension is granted.

11. Conclusions
A critical assessment of the status of the ALT Project indicates that the pace of implementation of the project has been extremely slow. This has been to the detriment of the direct beneficiaries, the indigenous people.

Given the renewed commitment of the key stakeholders, including the Government of the Cooperative Republic of Guyana, Government Agencies, the National Toshaos’ Council and Amerindian NGOs; the revised Amerindian Land Titling procedures (which was tested in the successful demarcation of one village in 2018 – Four Miles, Region 1); and the proposed revision in the scope of the project to be more realistic and factor in sustainability, it is expected that once an extension is granted, the revised workplan would be supported and implemented in a timely and cost effective manner.

12. Recommendations
The following recommendations are based on the assumption that the request for extension would be approved:

1) Recruitment of suitably skilled and competent project coordinator with the capacity to maintain strategic relationships with key stakeholders, lead the Project Team and lead engagements with the communities to address issues and concerns that can delay solutions to encumbrances, consent and hence demarcation;

2) Timely establishment of an Amerindian Land Title Unit in the MoIPA. An early establishment of this unit would allow for capacity building and knowledge transfer for optimum results post project

3) In going forward and streamlining ALT in Guyana, relevant legislation should be reviewed for possible revision to remove conflicts and provide clarity in the legal process as this was one of the main issues that delayed the project and caused the MOIPA to undertake a position paper which highlighted their willingness to arrive at a compromise in the interest of project implementation;

4) Design a strengthened governance framework that links ALT to a Cabinet sub-committee (or alternative body) for advisory support and potentially to empower the Project Manager to enforce implementation.
## 13. Financial Summary

The financial status of the project as at December 31, 2018 were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Total expenditure as at 31 December 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1 - Land titles issued and demarcation process completed for all Amerindian villages that submit requests</td>
<td>163,825.53</td>
<td>73,224.93</td>
<td>333,436.83</td>
<td>146,709.82</td>
<td>395,934.78</td>
<td>1,772,156.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2 - Increased access to existing and alternative mechanisms for resolving land titling disputes</td>
<td>20,277.23</td>
<td>157,825.74</td>
<td>83,281.05</td>
<td>26,870.07</td>
<td>39,086.2</td>
<td>327,340.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3 - Revised Communication Strategy, including a handbook describing the process of titling, demarcation and on the social and economic impacts of secure land tenure</td>
<td>4,324.93</td>
<td>105,429.1</td>
<td>147,633.85</td>
<td>43,107.6</td>
<td>300,495.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 4 – Project Management</td>
<td>152,058.15</td>
<td>95,773.77</td>
<td>130,072.02</td>
<td>276,019.77</td>
<td>182,363.38</td>
<td>836,287.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>336,160.91</td>
<td>990,173.74</td>
<td>652,219.00</td>
<td>597,233.51</td>
<td>660,491.96</td>
<td>3,236,279.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[1\) a request was submitted – March