



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

# Annual Progress Report Amerindian Land Titling (ALT) Project January- December 2015

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Project name/ acronym</b>      | Amerindian Land Titling Project /ALT   |
| <b>Project number/ code</b>       | 00077798   |
| <b>Implementing Organizations</b> | Ministry of Indigenous People's Affairs / United Nations Development Programme |
| <b>Project period</b>             | 2013-2016  |
| <b>Total project budget</b>       | USD 10,755,990   |
| <b>Reporting period</b>           | Jan 2015- Dec 2015   |

## List of acronyms and abbreviations

---

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| ALT   | Amerindian Land Titling                       |
| COT   | Certificate of Title                          |
| DR    | Dispute Resolution                            |
| FPIC  | Free, Prior and Informed Consent              |
| GFC   | Guyana Forestry Commission                    |
| GL&SC | Guyana Lands & Surveys Commission             |
| GGMC  | Guyana Geology and Mines Commission           |
| MOAA  | Ministry of Amerindian Affairs                |
| MoIPA | Ministry of Indigenous People's Affairs       |
| PMU   | Project Management Unit                       |
| SESP  | Social and Environmental Screening Procedures |

## CONTENTS

---

|   |    |
|---|----|
| List of acronyms and abbreviations.....   | 1  |
| CONTENTS.....   | 2  |
| NAME OF PROJECT.....  | 3  |
| Implementation Modality.....  | 3  |
| Implementing Partner .....  | 3  |
| Key Information:.....   | 3  |
| Project Description: .....  | 4  |
| Programme of work and activity results for 2015.....  | 5  |
| Output 1- Land titles issued and demarcation process completed for all Amerindian villages that submit requests . | 5  |
| Output 2: Increased access to existing and alternative mechanisms for resolving land titling disputes.....        | 6  |
| Output 3: Revised Communication Strategy including handbook .....   | 9  |
| Social and Environmental Impact Screening Procedures (SESP) .....   | 10 |
| Reporting on implementation of UNDP safeguards and standards .....  | 9  |
| ALT 2016 integrated approach to delivering land tenure security to Amerindian communities.....                    | 11 |
| Key elements of implementation approach to address emerging risks:.....   | 11 |
| ALT Output 1 .....  | 11 |
| ALT Output 2 .....  | 12 |
| ALT Output 3 .....  | 12 |

**NAME OF PROJECT:** Amerindian Land Titling Project / UNDP Atlas Project Number: 00077798

## Implementation Modality

---

National implementation, with implementation support from UNDP for FPIC, and Outputs 2 and 3.

## Implementing Partner

---

Ministry of Indigenous People's Affairs (formerly, Ministry of Amerindian Affairs or MOAA)

## Key Information:

---

- ▶ Project duration: 21 October 2013 - 20 October 2016 (3 years)
- ▶ Project budget: USD10,755,990
- ▶ As of 2010, there were 96 Amerindian villages that had received Absolute Grant of land, of which 77 were demarcated and issued Certificate of Title (COT)
- ▶ The intervention of the ALT project (2013-2016) led to an increase in the number of titled Amerindian villages by 10 to 106 (Absolute Grants), nine more villages were demarcated, bringing the total to 86, and a previously demarcated village received Certificate of Title
- ▶ Further, under the ALT project, another 11 Amerindian villages are currently under consideration for Certificate of Title, and 16 for boundary extension (Absolute Grants)
- ▶ A total of 210 persons from Amerindian communities/villages were trained in FPIC & Dispute Resolution
- ▶ A team of three consultants has started to draft the Communications Strategy & handbook
- ▶ Risks to ALT project was further assessed using the UNDP Social and Environmental Screening tool
- ▶ Project management was provided by a 3-member Project Management Unit (PMU) up to June 2015. Thereafter, MoIPA and UNDP co-supported the PMU functions
- ▶ Projected financial delivery in 2015 – USD 946,682.31
- ▶ Anticipated financial delivery in 2016 -USD 4,626,600

## Project Description:

---

Guyana's [Low Carbon Development Strategy](#) (LCDS) emphasizes the importance of protecting indigenous land rights and opening windows of opportunities for Amerindians, especially those that depend on forest resources as a means of livelihood. The objective of the Amerindian Land Titling (ALT) project is to facilitate the Amerindian Land Titling process.

The ALT project has the following outcomes, outputs and targets:

**Outcome 1:** Secured land tenure for Amerindian villages and communities

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

**Targets:**

- 45 Absolute Grants issued for villages / communities that have submitted requests
- 68 communities/villages to be demarcated

**Outcome 2:** Increased use of existing and alternative mechanisms to resolve titling disputes

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

**Target:**

- **220 persons trained in mediation**

**Outcome 3:** All relevant stakeholders better informed about Amerindian rights and the land titling mechanism

**Output 2:** Communications strategy, including a handbook describing the process of titling, demarcation and on the social and economic impacts of secure land tenure

**Target:**

- Revised communication strategy tailored to include appropriate and relevant communication methods to increase awareness on Amerindian land titling, and reaching 68 villages by year 3

The ALT project operationalises the development framework of the Government of Guyana as reflected in the LCDS. The strategy of the project is to implement the activities in accordance with the UNDP safeguards and standards, cognizant of the regulatory and legal provisions governing Amerindian rights, land titling and demarcation in Guyana. Government of Guyana and UNDP are strongly committed to the effective engagement of all relevant stakeholders in the process of land titling, demarcation and related project activities. Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) holds the promise of strengthening the legitimacy, efficacy, ownership, sustainability and longevity of the actions on the ground under the project.

An independent capacity assessment of the Ministry was carried out in 2012, one year before the signing of the ALT project document. It established relative Ministry strengths in areas of leadership, stakeholder engagement and project delivery. Findings also indicated capacity needs in the areas of accounting and knowledge management, with particular focus on the functional areas of monitoring and evaluation, analysis and visioning, and development of policy and strategy. Enabling environment issues that tend to influence many of these findings are related to national regulatory context, the comparable isolation of Guyana's hinterland areas and the national political agenda. Recommendations for the capacity development plan concentrate generally on:

- Strengthening financial and informational reporting at all levels
- Expanding knowledge management and communications systems
- Incorporating international norms for analysis and administration, and
- Institutionalizing mechanisms for retention and transfer of training and reference material.

A decision was taken to implement the capacity development plan under the Amerindian Development Fund project.

## Programme of work and activity results for 2015

---

2015 was the second year of the implementation of the ADF II project, during which the PMU with implementation support from the UNDP strove to ensure land tenure security for Amerindian communities through investigations, titling and demarcation processes, the latter through cadastral surveys.

The number of cadastral surveys increased, and communities were issued COT. At the end of 2015, the ALT project financed and supported 11 cadastral surveys, of which nine are current ongoing and two have been completed. 10 COTs were issued.

Investigations into 16 villages' boundary extensions requests were carried out.

FPIC and DR workshops were conducted and risks to the ALT process assessed.

Communications Strategy and accompanying handbook for Land Titling is being developed.

A summary of achievement of activity results for all three ALT project outputs follows.

### Output 1- Land titles issued and demarcation process completed for all Amerindian villages that submit requests

Output 1 activities were led by MoIPA.

► **Activity Result 1:1-** Absolute Grants for 16 Communities/Villages

**Achievement:** Consultations and investigation missions conducted in 16 villages:

Region 1: Hotoquai, Little Kaniballi, Red Hill, Santa Rosa

Regions 7: Arau, Karrau

Region 8: Monkey Mountain

Region 9: Sand Creek, Potarinau, Moco Moco, Awarewanau, Maruranau, Karaudaranu, Karasabai

**Achievement:** Absolute Grants issued to eight communities:

Region 1: Four Miles, Little Kaniballi Extension, Kariako, Santa Rosa Extension

Region 7: Batavia

Region 8: Karisparu, Tuseneng

Region 9: Potarinau Extension

► **Activity Result 1:2-** Demarcation –COTs issued for 20 Villages

**Achievement: 11 cadastral surveys in process;**

Region 1: Kariako

Region 7: Arau, Batavia, Kaikan

Region 8: Chenapau, Chinoweing, Paramakatoi, Taruka, Karisparu, Tuseneng, Kato Extension

**Achievement: 11 COTs issued**

Region 1: Baramita, Manawarin, Waramuri

Region 2<sup>1</sup>: Wakapao, Akawini

Region 8: Kambaru, Karisparu, Tuseneng,

---

<sup>1</sup> The two Region 2 villages were identified for demarcation of extended boundary but the investigation mission discovered that the demarcation process for the originally titled lands was never completed. The ALT project supported the completion of demarcation and issuance of COTs. The villages would have to reapply for extension.

Region 9: Kanashen, Massara Extension

Region 10: Riversview

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

▶ **Activity Result 2.2:** A cadre of skilled mediators

**Achievement:** Training in FPIC and Dispute Resolution conducted for 210 persons from Regions 1, 2, 7, 8, 9 & 10

▶ **Activity Result 2.2.1:** Carry out baseline assessment of existing capacities, capacity needs and entry points for training in DR & FPIC

**Achievement:** Baseline survey and corresponding report completed. Social and Environmental Screening Procedures (SESP) applied and reported

▶ **Activity Result 2.2.2:** Conduct four training workshops on dispute resolution

**Achievement: Four training workshops held.** 201 stakeholders trained in FPIC & DR. Workshop manual produced.

The key findings from the baseline assessment (March 2015), carried out by an international consultant, are as follows and reflect the views of the survey participants, community and village leaders, and government officials:

- Only 16.5% [n=73/443] of respondents recalled hearing of FPIC.
- Over half (50.2%, n=103) of respondents who Agreed [n=205] to the project stated that although they agreed to communal land titling, they were not entirely clear on what the advantages and disadvantages of the ALT Project were. 56.2% [n=249] stated that the information provided was too technical and 51.5% [n=228] recommended that information pertaining to the ALT project should be broken down into simple language.
- 87% [n=341] of respondents did not understand the difference between demarcation and titling nor did they understand the process through which the Amerindian Land Titling Project would be carried out. 52.6% of those who did not understand stated that they were not informed.
- In all communities, information about the ALT Project were communicated solely through verbal communication by the Implementers of the Project and the Village Council. Over three-fourths (82%, n=363) of respondents recommended that they have other forms of communication for more effective learning about the project, especially as announcements for meetings were seldom presented early enough for community members to prepare.
- Internal disputes surrounding Amerindian Land Titling occurred mainly in Four Miles and Rockstone between Amerindians who were in favour of the ALT Project and non-Amerindian and Amerindian Residents who see more security in having individual land leases through the GLSC. Those who favoured the latter believed that by giving ownership of land to the Village Council any internal conflict between the Council and opposing members of the community will influence their access to land tenures. Others posed the issue of not having assets through which they could use as collateral when applying for loans when pursuing growth in income generating activities.

## Recommendations based on baseline survey (Jan-Mar 2015)

| Issue   | Impact  | Recommendation  | Potential Outcome   | Risks   | Entry Points  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Amerindian fearful of losing their right to reside in community | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Potential Ethnic divisions that may escalate to violence and discrimination.</li> <li>-Displacement of people</li> <li>-Loss of Resident Identity</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implementation of Legally recognised documents that give Non-Amerindians the right to reside within the community through enclaves of leased land.</li> <li>- Villages Gazette rules that stipulate Non-Amerindians rights</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Co-existence amongst ethnic groups</li> <li>- All members have equal status as residents of community</li> <li>- Sense of security for Non-Amerindians</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conflicting with the Amerindian Act 2006 and the definition of a legal resident of an Amerindian Village</li> <li>- Amerindians lose ancestral land</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GLSC</li> <li>- Independent Legal Advisor</li> </ul>                         |
| Lack of understanding of Project components by Toshao               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Leader misguides community</li> <li>- Toshao inadequately equipped to inform community on Project to ensure FPIC is established</li> <li>-Community becomes confused by Project</li> <li>- Leader burdened by own limitations in understanding, and may not attempt to widen</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Train active and respected members within the community to ensure that FPIC is being maintained</li> <li>-Support the production of materials and various modes of communication to keep community members informed of</li> <li>- Relieve Toshao from the burden of being the sole bearer of information on project, and encourage members from community to</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Multiple community members tasked with learning components of the Project [shared responsibility of disseminating information]</li> <li>- More accurate information reaches community</li> <li>-More information reaches community</li> <li>- Community can be more objective in decision</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Selection of members from community may not be adequate</li> <li>- Multiple messengers may confuse community with mixed messages</li> </ul>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MoAA</li> <li>- FPIC Expert</li> </ul>                                       |
| Lack of understanding of Project components by Community            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Decisions made based on misinformation</li> <li>-Community members feel pressured to agree or disagree with more knowledgeable people</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provide various forms modes of communicating information on the ALT Project, e.g. Pamphlets, posters, etc.</li> <li>- Establish a Community Resource Officer who manages information on the project, and can answer questions community members may have</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Community members better informed</li> <li>- Community can make own decisions based on accessibility of information and being well informed.</li> <li>-Information easily accessible</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Costs of making resources for all communities may be high, especially those that may be translated</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FPIC Expert</li> <li>- Communications Expert to develop materials</li> </ul> |
| No access to bank loans   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Solely dependent on Funding coming from Government for large scale economic development activities</li> <li>-Non-Amerindians have no access to funding through MoAA</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provide Small Government Grants to residents within Amerindian Communities based on set of criteria</li> <li>-For non-Amerindians already residing in community allow individual leases to be held</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Greater investment into communities</li> <li>- Economic development of community</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Accrue debt and loss of properties</li> <li>- Logistics may be considered too complex</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MoAA</li> <li>- National Bank [Initially as advisor]</li> </ul>              |
| Presence of Forestry Concessions within proposed areas              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unworkable Forested areas due to exhaustion of resources</li> <li>- Forestry concessions in ancestral lands</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Map out current concessions in proposed areas, and come up with relocation strategy</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Smoother transition for Amerindian Communities gaining access to applied lands</li> <li>- Protection of ancestral lands from forestry degradation</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Forest concession holders become disgruntle for being moved</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GFC</li> </ul>   |



| Issue   | Impact  | Recommendation  | Potential Outcome  | Risks   | Entry Points   |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Presence of Mining Concessions within proposed areas          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental Degradation</li> <li>- Communities have no veto power over Large Scale Mining</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Map out current mining concessions in proposed areas, and come up with relocation strategy for SMEs</li> <li>- MoAA &amp; GGMC to work out CSR strategy for large scale mining ventures within Amerindian Areas</li> <li>- Work towards not</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Greater control and management over sustaining ancestral lands</li> <li>- Communities can ensure</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CSR Strategy may not be robust enough</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GGMC</li> <li>- MoAA</li> <li>- Village Council</li> </ul>      |
| Presence of Protected Areas within proposed areas             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limit of Indigenous use of Protected Areas</li> <li>- Protected Areas decreases due to ALT implementation</li> <li>- Reduction of grants to protected areas</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitor use of PAs by Amerindians</li> <li>- Initiative that trains local community members in tour guides and Protected Areas Officer</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sustainable use of land</li> <li>- Shared knowledge of protecting land</li> <li>- Creates new income generating activity for communities</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tourism idea may need a lot of time to set up</li> <li>- Not enough funding</li> <li>- Decrease in Protected Areas</li> <li>- Conflict between UN-REDD projects</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PAC</li> <li>- Elders</li> </ul>                                |
| Lack of understanding all impacts associated with the Project | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community members make decisions based on one-sided information</li> <li>- Community may suffer in long run</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Workshop on ALT Impacts</li> <li>- Provide handouts with pros and cons</li> <li>- Hold consultation to brainstorm impacts community members may foresee</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fully aware to make own decisions</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Workshops may turn into consultations as is prevalent</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ALT PMU</li> <li>Senior Suppliers</li> <li>FPIC Expert</li> </ul> |
| Politically driven Community Leaders                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decisions on the appropriation of land driven by political affiliation</li> <li>- Decision made by communities based on Political affiliation of leaders</li> </ul>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear system for application of land to ensure political affiliations and bias do not play a part in land distribution</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Application goes through systematic process for access to local communal land in order to remove politically-driven decision.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Politics will still play a heavy role in how Leaders view members of the community</li> </ul>  |  |
| Inter-Community claims to same land                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Animosity arises between communities</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of group of Tosaos to help mediate dispute</li> <li>- Use of MoAA</li> <li>- Use of Courts [extreme cases]</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compromise of use of land</li> <li>- Avoidance of violence or schism between communities</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of Courts may cost too much money</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MoAA</li> <li>- NTC</li> </ul>                                  |
| Lack in diversity of communication strategies                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monotonous/One note communication of information fails to convey message</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Variety of communication tools, such as fliers and posters (e.g.)</li> <li>- Consult with communities on best tools</li> <li>- Include translated versions of tools</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community Members benefit from various learning strategies</li> <li>- ALT Project can facilitate better understanding</li> <li>- Less time spent repeating and explaining concepts</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Costs of creating tools</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communications Expert</li> <li>- ALT PMU</li> </ul>             |
| Consultation vs Consent                                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community members are forced to make decisions during consultations without going through the process of FPIC</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Train MoAA Staff, PMU and Village Council on process of FPIC</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Better equipped members of the MoAA, ALT PMU and Village Council</li> <li>- Community members make decisions through FPIC</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Indigenous Peoples rights are not being observed under UNDRIP and the Amerindian Act 2006</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FPIC Expert</li> </ul>  |

### Output 3: Revised Communication Strategy including handbook

- ▶ **Activity Result:** Detailed information on the land titling process available to stakeholders
- Achievement:** Three consultants recruited and work ongoing on ALT communication strategy and handbook

## Reporting on implementation of UNDP safeguards and standards

In the discharge of the project assurance function, in carrying out the project’s objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions, the following activities in the table below were completed during the period under review with a view to ensuring the maintenance and adherence to UNDP’s fiduciary, environmental, social safeguards and standards.

### Summary of the safeguard mechanism framework

| Safeguard Type           | Actual Tools/ Measures applied  | Framework/ Specific Standards  |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| Fiduciary                | <p>Application of UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules (FRR) 125.06 for Project Cash Advances in support of scoping and training missions</p> <p>Cash transfer modality – Direct payment and Funding Authorisation and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE)<sup>2</sup></p> <p>Procurement Plan development</p> <p>Annual Workplan development and approval by the Project Board</p> <p>Payments through UNDP Atlas system, included checks such as Vendor input,</p> <p>Asset inventory, asset verification and spot check exercises conducted at the PMU</p> <p>Labeling of assets for visibility and traceability</p> <p>Sharing Combined Delivery Reports<sup>3</sup> (CDR) and Accounts Activity Analysis (AAA) reports with MoIPA and MoF</p> <p>Project Board meetings</p> <p>Risk Logs updated and maintained</p> | <p>Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) assessment<sup>4</sup></p> <p>Operational Standards</p> <p>Financial Regulations and Rules</p> <p>Internal and External Audits</p> <p>UNDP Procurement principles and standards</p> |
| Social and Environmental | <p>Observance of FPIC. Training was carried out for community leaders and residents.</p> <p>Community consultations</p>   | <p>Compliance with the <a href="#">United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples</a> and</p>  |

<sup>2</sup> Funds are paid by UNDP directly to vendors and other third parties for obligations and expenditures incurred by the IP to support activities agreed in the work plan. The purpose of the FACE form is to establish a simplified and harmonized tool that replaces agency-specific reporting formats and requests for expenditure supporting documentation from Implementation Partners

<sup>3</sup> The International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) was adopted by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) 1 January 2012. CDR presents expenses that reflect costs related to goods delivered and services rendered (recorded in Atlas) of a project during a period (quarterly and at the end of each year). **This report is prepared by UNDP, using Atlas financial system and is UNDP official financial statement.**

<sup>4</sup> The HACT framework represents a common operational (harmonized) framework for transferring cash to IPs. The objective of the HACT framework is to: 1. support a closer alignment of development aid with national priorities; 2. and to strengthen national capacities for management and accountability, with the ultimate objective of gradually shifting to national systems.

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>A Social and Environmental Screening was done by UNDP in collaboration with the Project Board and other stakeholders (see below).</p> <p>Inclusion of Senior Suppliers and Beneficiaries in decision making (Project Board)</p> | <p>Other relevant UN human rights instruments;</p> <p>Social and Environmental Screening Procedure</p> |
| <p>Monitoring framework and evaluation</p> | <p>Project Review meetings conducted with PMU, including half-year review</p> <p>Back to Office field mission reports</p> <p>Quarterly Reports</p> <p>UNDP Atlas monitoring</p>  | <p>Bank reconciliation statements</p>  |

Additional:

#### *Fiduciary*

UNDP provided training on financial management for NIM projects, and M&E to the PMU.

#### *Social*

Participatory approach to decision making, and observance of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC).

#### *Technical & Environmental*

Utilization of technical expertise present in State agencies in the investigation missions to communities and villages.

#### *Monitoring and Evaluation*

UNDP personnel accompanied all field missions to provide implementation support as well as quality assurance. In addition, attention was paid to:

- FPIC
- Upholding the rights of indigenous peoples
- Ensuring respect for fiduciary safeguards

### Social and Environmental Impact Screening Procedures (SESP)

The application of SESP (October 2015) identified four issues, as follows:

- (1) The need for clarified and strengthened stakeholder engagement, representation structures and decision making processes at all levels;
- (2) The need for a clear process and criteria for investigations (in the context of the titling process) pursuant to the Amerindian Act of 2006;
- (3) The need for additional/new dispute resolution processes to address conflicts that exist within and among Amerindian communities, as well as between Amerindian communities and various other parties asserting claims to lands and resources claimed by Amerindian communities;
- (4) The need for adequate acknowledgement and protection in the Amerindian Act of 2006 of rights of Amerindian communities to lands and resources traditionally used and occupied

The strategy to address these key issues involves two parallel tracks of work – one for issues that can be addressed in the short term (Issues 1 to 3 for consideration by the ALT project), and one for issues that likely will take a longer period of time.

#### **Shorter-term solutions**

- Facilitation of an in-country process to **identify a working group to examine and validate guidelines** to ensure a shared understanding of how the following three key project components are to be

implemented: (1) Stakeholder Engagement; (2) Criteria and Process for Titling; and (3) Process/mechanism for responding to grievances/resolving disputes. Terms of reference for the group will outline criteria for membership. Recommend broader representation than project board, and including people who can engage on these issues with a view to finding solutions (including Independent Advisors)

- Prepare **draft guidelines for discussion, revision, and approval by the working group and others** through the following process:
  - Develop an **annotated outline of possible guidelines** based on discussions, information, and literature gathered to date.
  - In consultation with project suppliers/beneficiaries, **identify a process through which these annotated guidelines can be further consulted upon and elaborated**. The process document will describe who will be consulted in Georgetown, the hinterland, etc. and why; who organizes; who joins mission; set of questions, proposed outcome of the process.
  - Organise a **2-3 day information sharing and consultation** meeting with the working group to discuss the draft annotated outline, key issues, and next steps – including the process elaborated pursuant to the second bullet. (Possibly when the NTC executive meeting is happening).
  - Immediately following the information sharing/consultation meeting with the working group, initiate the **process to consult on the annotated guidelines**, including some meetings in the hinterlands (2 weeks). Possibly focusing on areas in which efforts to title would serve as good examples for titling elsewhere.
  - **Draft guidelines**, based on feedback in response to the annotated outline -gathered from the 2-3 day workshop and meetings in the hinterland - and share for comments.
  - **Revise and seek approval** of new guidelines on a no objections basis

The longer-term issues are under consideration by the MoIPA. The SESP document and presentation were shared with all stakeholders, including Project Board members.

## ALT 2016 integrated approach to delivering land tenure security to Amerindian communities

---

### Key elements of implementation approach to address emerging risks:

- ▶ Stakeholder engagement at all levels, including components of a communication strategy (in line with output 3 of ALT)
- ▶ Representative platforms
- ▶ Decision making processes
- ▶ Schedule of project board meetings
- ▶ FPIC for communities
- ▶ Information sharing and dissemination (horizontal and vertical), languages and formats to improve community understanding of process and rights
- ▶ Roles and responsibilities
- ▶ Clarify shorter term solutions through a set of guidelines

### ALT Output 1

- ▶ Complete demarcations (22 - year 3 communities, 16 - year 2 communities, 15 - year 2 communities)

- ▶ Complete investigation missions (20 more investigations for Absolute Grants) –June 2016
- ▶ Process to demarcate, delimit and title including recommendations to improve investigation guidelines, including: process for joint mapping ; means for ensuring accurate base information; process to ensuring final agreement among all relevant parties on boundaries; procedures on sequencing of demarcation and extension ; criteria to determine whether proposals for extensions / titles are accepted/rejected; process for sharing of maps and title/extension claims across ministries, sector agencies, communities; proposals for improved guidelines for investigations

### ALT Output 2

- ▶ Implement & mainstream SESP shorter term solutions
- ▶ Conduct training of Village Councils in land issues and demarcation
- ▶ Conduct training and awareness sessions for senior beneficiaries (DR & FPIC)
- ▶ Address key issues including: Identification and assessment of what is currently in place to resolve conflict (within communities; between communities; between communities and mining sector; others) ; proposed measures to strengthen existing mechanisms as well as create new ones ; roles and responsibilities at all levels: Community/village; Min of Indigenous Peoples Affairs; Min of Agriculture, Min of Forestry, GGMC
- ▶ Capacity building needs at all levels to implement agreed guidelines, including, e.g.: (in line with Output 2 of the ALT), including Government, NTC, and others' capacities to understand and exercise responsibility to protect rights of IPs and related implications; Indigenous Peoples' organizational capacity to disseminate information to local communities and ensure informed engagement

### ALT Output 3

- ▶ Complete Communications Strategy and handbook
- ▶ Roll out and test Communications Strategy and handbook