



**Evaluation of co-operation between KEPA,
Finland
and CNS, Brazil**

Pekka Virtanen

KEPA

KEHITYSYHTEISTYÖN PALVELUKESKUS RY
SERVICE CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION, Finland

Pekka Virtanen
Evaluation of cooperation between KEPA, Finland and CNS, Brazil

Raporttisarja, 67

ISBN 951-8925-92-5
ISSN 1236-4797

Helsinki, 2003

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS:	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
1. INTRODUCTION	10
2. BACKGROUND	12
BRAZIL, THE AMAZON AND CNS	12
KEPA AND FINNISH NGO PROJECTS IN BRAZIL	15
3. THE KEPA–CNS PROJECT	17
OBJECTIVES AND RELEVANCE	17
IMPLEMENTATION: PHASE I (1997-1999)	18
IMPLEMENTATION: PHASE II (2000-2002)	20
FINANCIAL ASPECTS AND REPORTING	21
RESULTS FOR CNS	24
RESULTS FOR KEPA	28
4. CONCLUSIONS	32
5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE	35
ANNEXES	39
ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE	39
ANNEX 2. BIBLIOGRAPHY	42
ANNEX 3. PEOPLE INTERVIEWED	43

ACRONYMS:

ARPA	<i>(Projeto Áreas Protegidas da Amazônia)</i> Protected Areas in Amazon Project
BASA	<i>(Banco da Amazônia)</i> Bank of the Amazon
BID	Inter-American Development Bank
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CNPT	<i>(Centro Nacional de Populações Tradicionais)</i> National Centre for Traditional Populations/IBAMA
CNS	<i>(Conselho Nacional dos Seringueiros)</i> National Council of Rubber Tappers
COIAB	<i>(Coordenação dos Organizações Indígenas da Amazonia)</i> Coordination of the Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon
CUT	<i>(Central Única dos Trabalhadores)</i> National Workers' Centre
CV	<i>curriculum vitae</i>
DfID	Department for International Development (UK)
ED	Environmental Defence (USA)
EDF	Environmental Defence Fund (USA)
EU	European Union
EWGA	European Working Group on the Amazon
FLONA	<i>(Floresta Nacional)</i> National Forest
FUNAI	<i>(Fundação Nacional do Índio)</i> National Indian Foundation
GDI	gender development index
GDP	gross domestic product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GTA	<i>(Grupo de Trabalho Amazônico)</i> Amazon Working Group
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation
HDI	human development index
IBAMA	<i>(Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis)</i> Brazilian Institute for Environment and Renewable Natural Resources
INCRA	<i>(Instituto Nacional de Colonização e Reforma Agrária)</i> Brazilian Institute for Colonization and Land Reform
INSIST	Institute for Social Transformation (Indonesia)
ISA	<i>(Instituto Socioambiental)</i> Socio-environmental Institute
IUCN	World Conservation Union
KEPA	<i>(Kehitysyhteistyön Palvelukeskus ry.)</i> Service Centre for Development Cooperation
MAF	<i>(Ministério dos Assuntos Fundiarios)</i> Brazilian Ministry for Land Tenure
MDA	<i>(Ministério do Desenvolvimento Agrário)</i> Brazilian Ministry for Agrarian Development
MFA	Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs
MMA	<i>(Ministério do Meio Ambiente)</i> Brazilian Ministry of Environment
NGO	non-governmental organisation
NOVIB	Oxfam Netherlands
PAE	<i>(Projeto de Assentamento Agroextrativista)</i> Agro-extractivist settlement project
PDA	<i>(Subprograma Projetos Demonstrativos)</i> Demonstrative Projects Sub-Program/PPG7

PER	Project for Ecological Recovery (Thailand)
PNF	(<i>Programa Nacional de Florestas</i>) National Forestry Program
PPG7	Pilot Program to Conserve Brazilian Rainforest
PRODEX	(<i>Programa de Apoio ao Desenvolvimento do Extrativismo</i>) Support Program for the Development of Extractivism
PRONAF	(<i>Programa Nacional de Fortalecimento da Agricultura Familiar</i>) National Program for the Support of Family Agriculture
PT	(<i>Partido Trabalhista</i>) Workers' Party
PYM	(<i>Paikallisyhteistyön Määräraha</i>) Fund for Local Cooperation
RESEX	(<i>Reserva Extrativista</i>) Extractive Reserve
RDA	(<i>Reserva de Desenvolvimento Sustentavel</i>) Reserve for Sustainable Development
SASK	(<i>Suomen Ammattiliittojen Solidaarisuuskeskus ry.</i>) Trade Union Solidarity Centre of Finland
SCA	(<i>Secretaria de Coordenação da Amazônia</i>) Secretariat for the Coordination of Amazon/MMA
SDDH	(<i>Sociedade Paraense de Defesa dos Direitos Humanos</i>) Society for the Defence of Human Rights in Pará
SECTAM	(<i>Secretaria de Ciência e Tecnologia do Estado de Pará</i>) State Secretariat for Science and Technology
STR	(<i>Sindicato dos Trabalhadores Rurais</i>) Rural Workers Union
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
WB	World Bank
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Cooperation between KEPA and CNS started in the early 1990s in the form of joint campaign work about environmental and human rights issues in the Amazon region. This type of collaboration reached its peak in 1996 when representatives of CNS participated in a campaign “Justice to the Peoples of Amazonia” in Europe, and during that tour visited also Finland where they met some prominent representatives of KEPA’s member organisations. Subsequently a project document “Social Organisation, Environmental Protection and Human Rights in Brazilian Amazon” was drafted, and a three-year cooperation agreement (1997-1999) with a budget of Euro 227.690 for institutional support to CNS was signed in 1997. In addition to direct institutional support KEPA provided funds for placing a liaison officer at the new CNS office in Marabá, Pará. During 1997-1999 Euro 86.080 was used for this component. In 1999 KEPA decided to provide additional support for strengthening the CNS Women’s Secretariat, allocating Euro 47.852 for the period 1999-2001. In 2000 the project was extended for another three-year period with a budget of Euro 289.272, including support to the Women’s Secretariat agreed in 1999. According to the Terms of Reference (TOR) the purpose of this evaluation is to investigate the benefits and shortcomings of the cooperation to both CNS and KEPA, with a special emphasis on recommendations for the future.

Conclusions: In general the project can be considered relatively successful and well in line with KEPA’s policy and objectives. The main findings with regard to relevance, impact, effectiveness and sustainability of the project are the following:

Relevance: The development objective of the project was to promote the participation of civil society in the identification and implementation of a sustainable development model for the Amazon region. In the Brazilian context CNS has turned out to be a highly relevant partner for promoting this development objective under its ‘Ecological Agrarian Reform’ concept. The project has addressed relatively well many of the crucial needs of its grassroots members in the main activity areas, as well as the operational needs at the national level. By strengthening the operational and mobilization capacity of CNS it has contributed to strengthening the socio-economic and political position of the extractivist population in general. During the project period important socio-political changes, which culminated in the presidential elections at the end of the period, took place in Brazil. CNS was part of the political process that brought about the change, and at least in the Amazon region even a major actor. The project retained its political relevance throughout the period, but there is a need to re-consider its priorities in the present transition period.

Impact: By supporting the operational capacity of CNS the project has contributed to an impressive growth of different kinds of conservation areas in the Amazon. These include areas for sustainable use, that is areas where indigenous and traditional populations can exercise their traditional and ecologically sustainable livelihoods. CNS has also been active in developing new models of extractive areas and in influencing the contents of such major new environmental programs as Protected Areas in Amazon Project and National Forest Program. The lobbying work of CNS was crucial for securing the integration of sustainable use areas in these programs. Through institutional support to CNS the project has made possible establishing three regional offices in the state of Pará and the national office of the Women’s Secretariat in Tocantins. By supporting the operational costs of these offices and providing

support for small-scale activities in these regions the project has strengthened CNS and the local extractive associations and cooperatives both economically and politically. Support to the Women's Secretariat, which started in 1999, has contributed to more prominent position of women in CNS leadership. These activities are likely to strengthen the credibility of extractivism as an ecologically and socially sustainable livelihood and a solid basis for new conservation areas.

Increased operational capacity of CNS, which is partly a result of the KEPA project, has made it possible for CNS to access funding from other sources, both Brazilian and international. It must be noted, however, that the project did not succeed in establishing a functional and mutually useful monitoring and planning system during the project period. This would have had a positive impact on the administrative capacity of CNS, which is increasingly involved in project planning, monitoring and implementation. During the first phase of the project KEPA's support to active campaign work in Europe facilitated the international lobbying of CNS, and opened contacts with new partners. Unfortunately this activity was less successful in the second phase, even though some contacts to KEPA's Asian partners were created. The project's impact on KEPA's influencing work was important during the first phase, which was characterised by active campaign work and numerous exchange visits. This was despite weak planning and lack of clear objectives from the part of KEPA, language problems and confusion over the liaison officer. However, the relationship did not grow to sustained dialogue at institutional level.

Effectiveness: With the exception of the liaison officer component, which produced few results, the resources allocated for the project have generally been well used. The development objective of the intervention, understood as promotion of the Ecological Agrarian Reform with emphasis on the state of Pará, was achieved to a large extent. In the case of institutional support, and taking into account the shortcomings in the system of reporting, it is not possible to assess properly to what extent the achievements are the result of KEPA's project. It can, however, be stated that the project provided an important contribution towards reaching the objective established by CNS. The confused system of reporting does not allow for a detailed analysis of efficiency, but it can be noted that in relation to the scope of the geographical area and the complexity of the development objective the relatively limited means invested by KEPA have brought considerable results.

Sustainability: Due to its character as a social movement which seeks to mobilize poor and politically marginalized sections of the population, CNS does not have a self-financing capacity, and it is not likely to achieve such capacity in the near future. During the project period CNS has managed to expand its funding basis, but sudden withdrawal of KEPA's support would probably hamper CNS activities considerably, even though many of the concrete results already achieved would remain. While the new government is favourable towards the objectives of CNS, excessive reliance on government funding would compromise the critical dimension of its political advocacy work. Sustainability of the small-scale projects that KEPA has supported remains unsure.

Recommendations for the future: The operational context of CNS has become more favourable during the last few years, notably at the federal level with the new government, but also at lower levels in some regions. At the same time project monitoring and implementation have continued to increase their share along with advocacy work in CNS as funds are increasingly channelled through NGOs to small-scale projects in the Amazon region. This is an area where the capacity of CNS is not sufficient, and both CNS and its partners have

recognised the need for capacity building in planning and monitoring, including the level of grassroots organizations. As KEPA's new partnership approach emphasises the development of planning, implementation and monitoring tools and equal access to them, this could be an interesting area for future cooperation.

Increased responsibility for implementation should not, however, mean neglect of political advocacy work. While CNS has managed to secure basic resources for its operational work in some states, others lack resources for expanding the work. Effective lobbying at national and international levels is also not possible without external funding. Aside from financial support, KEPA's international network and knowledge of international trade issues could be used for both information sharing and influencing in such issues as the new market-based mechanisms.

According to recent plans KEPA will improve integration of the experiences from the South into the services offered to its member organizations. It will also systematize collection of information and make its distribution and use easier. These activities, if successfully carried out, will considerably improve KEPA's capacity to carry out its information sharing, networking and advocacy functions in possible future cooperation with CNS.

In the drafting of a new program for 2004-2006 it was underlined that KEPA's activities must have organic links to the realities of its member organizations and partners in the South, and there must be an active dialogue between them. The proposal mentions two key concepts: thematic areas and geographical micro-regions (*paikallisalue*). Thematic areas chosen by KEPA are 'Global economic structures and local economy', and 'Rights to natural resources and welfare'. Both of these are relevant for the problematics of Amazon, but especially the latter is highly relevant for KEPA's present cooperation with CNS. According to the proposal KEPA is expected to concentrate its activities in selected micro-regions, and it is worth studying whether the Amazon region would fulfil the established criteria.

It is crucial that preparation of possible new partnership agreement is done in collaboration with both CNS (and possible other Brazilian NGO partners) and interested member organizations of KEPA. It is also worth discussing the implications of the holistic approach that CNS promotes in the Amazon. In this context the heterogeneity of KEPA's member organizations and its network in the South should be viewed as richness, not a handicap. Like the Amazon it is rich and variable: the rainforest's enormous species diversity and the Nokia industrial unit in the Manaus Duty Free Zone are part of the same thing.

Two scenarios which mark the extremes in KEPA's future cooperation in Brazil can be visualised: i) KEPA does not manage to re-activate dialogue about the Amazon with its member organizations despite favourable political conditions in Brazil, and consequently the project continues with reduced budget for one more cycle before it withers away; or ii) KEPA manages to rekindle its member organizations interest in the Amazon, which leads to active dialogue and starting of new projects by the member organizations with both CNS and other Brazilian NGOs. As a result of increasing interest KEPA will provide additional resources for the Amazon work, including a liaison/information officer placed in the region, and will take a dynamic approach to facilitating South-South cooperation with active collaboration from CNS. Both of these scenarios, and many variations in between are possible. In the following a few possible areas for KEPA's future cooperation in Brazil are sketched:

1. Support to the CNS *Secretaria de Formação* to organize training in project planning and monitoring for local associations jointly with CNS and other interested donors;

2. Creating a joint fund for the management of resources allocated to CNS by different donors, using the Alexander von Humboldt Centre of Nicaragua as a model;
3. Directing KEPA's support to a new state such as Amapá, as Pará is largely covered by other donors and operational strengthening is needed in new regions;
4. Continuing support to the CNS Women's Secretariat, with emphasis on strengthening the secretariat, and continuation of the documentation campaign and training activities;
5. Creating a flexible mechanism for supporting small-scale projects implemented by associations in the Amazon, using the experiences in Brazil and KEPA's southern partners;
6. Placing a KEPA liaison/information officer in Manaus, Brazil to support Finnish NGO activities in the Amazon following the model of KEPA in Thailand and Indonesia;
7. KEPA should take an active role in circulating new project ideas among its member organizations and facilitate contacts with Brazilian partners;
8. KEPA could enter into cooperation with new NGO partners in Brazil, for example those supporting the struggle of indigenous groups for rights in land and natural resources;
9. Re-activating information and campaign work about the Amazon in Europe, and especially amongst KEPA's member organizations in Finland;
10. KEPA should take an active role in facilitating South-South networking between CNS and its other southern partners in Nicaragua, Indonesia, Thailand and India.

1. INTRODUCTION

The present report is the report of an evaluation of a six-year cooperation project between the Service Centre for Development Cooperation (KEPA), Finland and the National Union of Rubber Tapper's (CNS), Brazil. The evaluation was commissioned by KEPA's Resource Team and initiated in April 2003. Mr. Pekka Virtanen, an independent consultant, carried it out.

Cooperation between KEPA and CNS started in the early 1990s in the form of joint campaign work about environmental and human rights issues in the Amazon region. This type of collaboration reached its peak in 1996 when representatives of CNS and SDDH participated in a campaign "Justice to the Peoples of Amazonia" (which KEPA supported) in Europe, and during that tour visited also Finland where they met some prominent representatives of KEPA's member organisations. Already in the same year a representative of KEPA participated in the International Amazon Week in New York, where possible modalities of cooperation between CNS and KEPA were further discussed. Subsequently a project document "Social Organisation, Environmental Protection and Human Rights in Brazilian Amazon" was drafted, and a three-year cooperation agreement (1997-1999) with a budget of USD 258.200 (Euro 227.690) for institutional support to CNS was signed in May 1997. In addition to direct institutional support KEPA provided funds for placing a liaison officer at the new CNS office in Marabá, Pará. During 1997-1999 Euro 86.080 was used for this component. In 1999 KEPA decided to provide additional support for strengthening the CNS Women's Secretariat, allocating USD 51.010 (Euro 47.852) for the period 1999-2001. In 2000 the project was extended for a second phase (2000-2002) with a budget of Euro 289.272, including support to the Women's Secretariat agreed in 1999. For 2003 KEPA and CNS have signed a one-year agreement with a budget of Euro 65.000, out of which one half is directed to the CNS Women's Secretariat.

According to the Terms of Reference (annex 1) the purpose of this evaluation is to investigate the benefits and shortcomings of the cooperation to both CNS and KEPA, with a special emphasis on recommendations for the future. The main questions are the following:

- How has the cooperation reached the goals agreed in the partnership agreements?
- What has been the role of KEPA's support in the activities of CNS, both in terms of finances and activities in general?
- How has this cooperation contributed to Brazilian civil society at large and that in Pará especially?
- How has the programme strengthened the development of democracy, civil society and local communities in the Amazon region?
- How have the partner organizations taken advantage of the experience of each other and how is this experience shared among the members?
- How have the partners designed the programme to be effective?
- How have the partners taken into account the changes in the working environment of their cooperation, i.e. the bilateral programme between Finland and Brazil and changes in the political climate in Brazil?

- How has the information flow between the organizations functioned, and what has been the visibility of the cooperation partners in reports, publications and activities such as advocacy and lobby?
- How functional and relevant have the reporting practices been?

The evaluation is based on deskwork and data obtained in interviews in Finland in March-April 2003, and in interviews in Brazil in April 2003. In Brazil I had the chance to visit Brasília, the federal capital; Belem, Santarém, Alter do Chão, Marabá and Nova Ipixuna in the state of Pará; and finally São Miguel in the state of Tocantins. I met both CNS staff, members of local associations and government representatives. I visited also the extractive reserve of Tapajós-Arapiúns, National Forest of Tapajós, and various Agro-extractivist Settlement Projects around Nova Ipixuna and São Miguel. The material was collected through the following activities:

- Review of official documentation and correspondence from CNS and KEPA, and relevant research literature;
- Semi-structured interviews with key persons in Finland, including previous and present officials of KEPA and representatives of KEPA's member NGOs;
- Semi-structured interviews with key persons in Brazil, including CNS staff, representatives of other Brazilian NGOs and government agencies;
- Field visits to key sub-projects in the states of Pará and Tocantins, including observations at project sites and informal interviews with intended beneficiaries.

A list of persons interviewed and documentation consulted is presented in annexes 2 and 3.

2. BACKGROUND

BRAZIL, THE AMAZON AND CNS

Brazil is the world's fifth largest country by land area (8,5 million km²) and in 1996 its population was about 163 million. It has a relatively high annual Gross Domestic Product (GDP, above USD 6.500 per capita), and its overall Human Development Index (HDI) ranking is above average in the world. The same is true for its Gender Development Index (GDI) ranking, which is comparable with Thailand, and adult literacy rate, which is close to that of Indonesia (table 1). However, these figures hide a grossly unequal income distribution: in Brazil the share of the poorest 20% of the population in income consumption is only 2,5%, while the share of the richest 20% is 63,8%. The skewed distribution of income has a clear regional character: the North (the Amazon region) and the Northeast are the poorest regions with the lowest human development indicators.

Table 1. The human development indicators of selected developing countries in 1998

Country	HDI rank ¹	HDI value ²	GDI rank ³	GDI value ⁴	Adult literacy ⁵	GDP/ca pita	Income distrib. ⁶
Brazil	74	0,747	66	0,736	84,5 %	6.625 \$	2,5/63,8
India	128	0,563	108	0,545	55,7 %	2.077 \$	8,1/46,1
Indonesia	109	0,670	90	0,664	85,7 %	2.651 \$	8,0/44,9
Mozambique	168	0,341	139	0,326	42,3 %	782 \$	6,5/46,5
Nicaragua	116	0,631	97	0,624	67,9 %	2.142 \$	4,2/55,2
Tanzania	156	0,415	127	0,410	73,6 %	480 \$	6,8/45,5
Thailand	76	0,745	62	0,741	95,0 %	5.456 \$	6,4/48,4
Zambia	153	0,420	126	0,413	76,3 %	719 \$	4,2/54,7

¹ Out of 174 countries;

² Variation between 0,252 (Sierra Leone) and 0,935 (Canada);

³ Out of 143 countries;

⁴ Variation between 0,280 (Niger) and 0,932 (Canada);

⁵ Population over 15 years of age;

⁶ Per cent share of income consumption, poorest 20 %/richest 20 %.

Source: UNDP Human Development Report 2000.

The Amazon Tropical Rainforest represents 40% of all tropical rainforests; according to present estimates it has 10% of all living species, and 20% of the planet's fresh water. Its Brazilian portion corresponds to 65% of all Amazon. Twenty million people live in this territory of 3,7 million km². Among them are 80 indigenous peoples and millions of rural workers and extractivists. The population lives in three urban centres with more than one million inhabitants, 23 medium-sized cities of 50.000-500.000 inhabitants, and an enormous web of small communities, villages and municipality headquarters. Human development indicators are low and show grave distortions in access to basic rights in health, education and land ownership. In nearly 60% of the municipalities of Amazon the HDI value in 1991 was below 0,50, i.e. at the level of such African countries as Tanzania and Zambia, while the national HDI of Brazil was above 0,70. One reason for this is unequal distribution of land: in Brazil 2% of landowners occupy 52% of the available land. The *latifundio* system of large landed estates, which is prevalent in many parts of the Amazon, is linked to exploitation of rural workers and exclusion of extractivist populations from crucial natural resources.

In Brazil an environmental and human rights movement emerged in the 1970s out of three principal sources. The oldest was the conservation movement, whose thinking materialised in the creation of national parks already in the 1930s. In the 1970s new kinds of grass-roots organizations (neighbourhood associations and Church groups) in and around the cities were created as a response to the appalling poverty and inequality that has characterised Brazil's economic development. At the same time specifically ecological NGOs, whose membership were largely middle-class and which were based mostly in the industrialised south of the country, emerged also. The NGO movement was closely linked to the growth of political protest against the military government in the 1970s, which led to return to civilian rule after 1985. It is worth noting, however, that this early environmental movement in Brazil was politically rather weak, especially as regards the Amazon region.

In the late 1980s the conflict over access and title to land, fraudulent land sales and peasant evictions, and the invasion of indigenous lands by the military, gold prospectors and small-scale farmers intensified in the Amazon region. This led to increased political mobilization by the victims, such as formation of rural trade unions (e.g. *Sindicatos dos Trabalhadores Rurais*, STR), and social movements (e.g. CNS), the growth of Church groups, and the creation of indigenous groups. Significant ties developed between these groups and the major Brazilian opposition parties, notably the Workers Party (*Partido Trabalhista*, PT). At the same time close links grew also between these groups and the international NGO community, and the latter has been critical in publicizing the scale of the violence and environmental threat faced by the Amazonian population. Direct participation of Brazilian indigenous and rural groups in the lobbying process abroad has, on the other hand, formed a central part of numerous international rainforest campaigns.

The National Rubber Tappers Union (*Conselho Nacional dos Seringueiros*, CNS) of Brazil was established in 1985 after the First National Rubber Tapper's meeting at the University of Brasília. It is a national organisation that represents extraction workers and small-scale farmers gathered in associations, cooperatives and unions. They are rubber-latex tappers, collectors of palm heart and Brazil nuts, babacu-coconut crackers, agricultural and forestry workers, collectors of medicinal herbs, and vegetal-oil extractors. The Board of Directors of CNS is composed of 27 leaders chosen amongst the member organizations from the nine Amazonian states. Its objectives are to organise the forest peoples, to raise awareness about the negative consequences of unsustainable development over the environment and to influence regional and federal public policies. A central objective of CNS is to promote the implementation of an Ecological Agrarian Reform in the Amazon through the creation of extractive areas (RESEX, RDS and PAE) aiming at the demarcation of at least 10% of the Amazonian forest to ecologically sustainable and economically productive use. A specific feature of CNS among the Amazonian NGOs is its comprehensive view of development, which includes environmental, socio-political and economic issues and seeks to influence them at local, national and international levels.

During the first years the activities of CNS were concentrated mainly in the states of Acre, Amazonas and Rondônia, but by 2002 it had expanded to all Amazonian states except Roraima. Its social base has also grown considerably. In the first meeting about 50 associations and syndicates were present, but in the General Assembly meeting of 2002 more than 240 leaders representing nearly 180 associations, syndicates and cooperatives were present. The growth has been accompanied with diversification, and presently CNS represents various different extractivist groups in addition to rubber tappers.

In the 1995 National Meeting CNS established a special Women's Secretariat (*Secretaria da Mulher Trabalhadora Rural Extrativista*). Its objective is to strengthen women's participation in the activities and leadership of CNS, and influence the domestic distribution of workload and valuation of women in general through training.

In the early 1990s CNS was largely dependent on government sources for funding, with some support from such international NGOs as the Novib (Oxfam Netherlands) for the regional office in Acre (1991/2, 1996/7) and from the Ford Foundation even earlier. Some funding for specific activities like the 1996 Amazonas campaign in Europe was also received from international environmental NGOs such as Greenpeace (Netherlands) and the Environment Defence Fund (EDF, USA)¹. KEPA started supporting CNS directly in 1997, and during the late 1990s its contribution to CNS's total budget was close to 20%. In 1999 the annual expenditure of CNS amounted to about Euro 500.000. The distribution of CNS expenditure according to function during the late 1990s is presented in table 2.

Table 2. CNS expenditure according to function, 1996-1999 (of total annual expenditure)

Function	1996	1997	1998	1999
Administration and personnel	31,3 %	34,6 %	21,4 %	28,9 %
Operations	62,9 %	64,8 %	78,3 %	70,4 %
Other	5,8 %	0,6 %	0,3 %	0,7 %
Total	100,0 %	100,0 %	100,0 %	100,0 %

Source: CNS annual account books 1996-1999.

In the year 2000 CNS received support (in addition to KEPA) mainly from the Federal Government (MMA, MDA), the States of Acre (Euro 51.000) and Amapá (Euro 22.000). Since then CNS has become increasingly involved in project administration, and at present it is responsible for a number of small-scale projects implemented by local associations and cooperatives. It has also managed to secure institutional support for its activities in the states of Pará (MFA-Finland/UNDP, Euro 285.000 for four years) and Amazonas (Global 2000/Austria, about Euro 300.000 for three years). At the moment continuation of the support of the state government of Amapá is still open. The main partners of CNS in recent years include the following:

- Ministry of Environment (MMA): Several separate projects in support of CNS activities, including institutional support to CNS and its regional organs, as well as project support to local level associations;
- KEPA: Institutional support to the state of Pará, support to gender work and political lobbying at the national and international levels;
- MFA-Finland/ UNDP: Support to the Tapajós-Arapiúns RESEX and other CNS and government activities in the state of Pará;
- Acre State Government: Support to the CNS Regional Office in Acre;
- Ministry of Agriculture (MDA): Training for administration of small credits by PRONAF in the extractive reserves;
- MDA/INCRA: Institutional strengthening of PAE communities;

¹ EDF forms part of Environmental Defense, an American NGO based in New York. It is a leading proponent in issues concerning environmental pollution and climate change in the USA. It has over 300.000 members and in 2002 it had a budget of Euro 46,8 million, provided by members (67%), foundations (22%), investment income (6%), bequests (4%), and public grants (1%). Project services absorbs about 80% of its expenditure.

- IUCN/Netherlands, MMA: Support to CNS Regional Office in Rondônia for the consolidation of extractive reserves;
- Austria – Global 2000: Institutional support in the State of Amazonas;
- MMA/UNDP: Four separate agreements between MMA, UNDP and CNS to support extractive associations and NGOs;
- Ministry of Health: A campaign to combat AIDS;
- PPG7/Sub-program RESEX II: Capacity building in four extractive reserves.

KEPA AND FINNISH NGO PROJECTS IN BRAZIL

The Service Centre for Development Cooperation (*Kehitysyhteistyön Palveukeskus ry.*, KEPA) of Finland was founded in 1985 by 56 non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to act as an umbrella organisation of Finnish NGOs working in the field of development cooperation or otherwise concerned with issues to do with developing countries and globalisation. It is ideologically and politically non-aligned and non-denominational. Today the total number of KEPA's member organisations has grown to near 220. KEPA's task is to encourage, support and organize Finnish civil society to work to bring about global solidarity and a sense of collective responsibility. Its funding comes fully from the Government of Finland. In the last few years its annual expenditure has been about Euro 4,5 million, out of which slightly more than 50% has been spent on activities in the partner countries.

During the first decade of KEPA's work the organization's emphasis was on providing technical assistance in the form of Finnish volunteers/development workers to three partner countries: Zambia (since 1987), Nicaragua (1989) and Mozambique (1991). At the peak year in 1995 KEPA had altogether 72 volunteers in these countries. However, by the mid 1990s this mode of operation had become subject to increasing critique, and it was gradually discontinued after an organizational reform started in 1995/6. The new strategy emphasised KEPA's role as a North-South resource centre for NGOs, as a strong opinion leader in Finland, and as an interest group and cooperation forum for its member organizations. In addition to the three original partner countries, KEPA has extended its cooperation to new countries including Tanzania (1997), Brazil (1997), Uganda (1998), Thailand (1998), Indonesia (1998) and Dominican Republic (for the Caribbean region, 1999). There is also a partnership agreement with an Indian NGO called Lokayan. Since the latest organizational reform in 2001 the emphasis has been on partnership programs, while the number of Finnish volunteers (mainly liaison/information officers) has been reduced to 13, including 2-4 volunteers in the original partner countries and one in Tanzania, Thailand, Indonesia and Dominican Republic/the Caribbean. During 2001-2002 KEPA underwent a major restructuring process, which included a change from a unit-based to a team-based organization.

Finnish NGOs have not been very actively present in Brazil. In the context of the KEPA project the Society for the Defence of Human Rights in Pará (SDDH) received some support for a juridical campaign in Pará in 1997. The Finnish Human Rights Organization KIOS has also provided some support for SDDH. The Finnish Trade Union Solidarity Centre (SASK) has a longstanding relationship of collaboration with its Brazilian counterpart (*Central Única dos Trabalhadores*, CUT), and during the last six years it has supported various small-scale training activities and studies, including a study of social and labour performance of the Nokia Company's plant in the Manaus Duty Free Zone in 2001-2002. In 2002 SASK funded

two training projects with Brazilian trade unions with a combined budget surpassing Euro 60.000. In recent years Finnish NGOs have also supported two social projects working with street children in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro with about Euro 50.000 for each project in 2002. The WWF-Finland is funding three conservation projects in Fernando de Noronha and the Atlantic rain forest with more than Euro 150.000 for 2002. Finland-Brazil Society has a small ecotourism project in the south with a budget of Euro 40.000 for 2002. In Brazil Finnish NGOs' support to environmental projects is somewhat more active than elsewhere in the South, where three quarters of the activities deal with health care, support to disabled people and provision of social services.

A bilateral project between Finland and Brazil to support forest conservation and sustainable development in the state of Pará, implemented by a Finnish consultancy company (FTP International) through UNDP, started in 2002. CNS is the Brazilian counterpart of the project, and its linkage with KEPA was a crucial factor in the project initiation phase. The four-year project has a total budget of Euro 4.330.000 including support to CNS and both federal (CNPT/IBAMA) and state (SECTAM) organs in Pará. The main focus of the project is on the Extractive Reserve of Tapajós-Arapiúns in the state of Pará.

The Embassy of Finland has also supported various small-scale projects with Brazilian NGO's, including two projects with CNS and related associations in 1998-9. Prior to 2001 the funding remained very limited, hardly exceeding Euro 10.000 per year in total. Since 2001 a new kind of funding mechanism (*Paikallisyhteistyön Määräraha*, PYM) has been available for local cooperation. In the first year the Embassy used only about Euro 10.000 for PYM projects, but in 2002 the amount had surpassed Euro 40.000, and for 2003 Euro 100.000 has been requested by the Embassy. During the next two years the volume is expected to grow to Euro 150-200.000 per year. This far the funds have gone mainly to social and educational projects in the capital region, but the Embassy is open to proposals in other areas and by other organs, such as CNS.

3. THE KEPA–CNS PROJECT

OBJECTIVES AND RELEVANCE

According to the project document the development objective of the first phase (1997-1999) of the project ‘Social Organization, Environmental Protection and Human Rights in the Brazilian Amazon’ was to promote the participation of civil society in the identification and implementation of a sustainable development model for the Amazon region. This was further divided to two immediate objectives, namely: i) To consolidate and enhance the position of CNS as an intermediary between the government and the local NGOs and grassroots groups; and ii) To get financing for local projects of the grassroots groups, and support their implementation. The state of Pará was identified as the regional focus of activities.

During the first two years cooperation between CNS and KEPA was supported for part of the time by a Finnish liaison officer whose role, however, remained somewhat unclear. In KEPA’s 1997 plan of activities his tasks were described as: i) Strengthening the links between Amazonian and Finnish NGOs and looking for new partners; ii) Following the political, social and human rights situation in the Amazon and informing Finnish organizations about it, and iii) Informing Amazonian NGOs about Finnish and European campaigns and other activities of KEPA and its member organizations. He was also expected to support the work of CNS by participating in its current activities. In the view of CNS the liaison officer’s work was tied much more to CNS, with emphasis on the preparation of information material and project proposals, and practical support to CNS activities and fund-raising in the state of Pará. The liaison officer was placed in Marabá (the third largest city in the state of Pará), which is located in the interior.

In 1999 a new sub-project to support gender-activities in the Brazilian Amazon through the CNS Women’s Secretariat was started. Its objectives were: i) To increase the participation of women in organizational activities; ii) To influence the circumstances so that women can participate in local level organizations; iii) To obtain recognition for the women’s work and activities in extractivist communities; iv) To support those women who are already in leadership positions in CNS; and v) To try to influence the division of labour within families in order to reduce the domestic workload of women and improve their possibility to engage in income-generating activities.

The objectives of the second phase (2000-2002) of the project were described in the Partnership agreement. The main objective remained the same as during the first phase, but focus on the state of Pará, which had already emerged as the main area of activities, was now emphasised. Support to the CNS Women’s Secretariat to improve women’s participation in CNS and its leadership was now included among the core project’s immediate objectives, along with support to the national campaign to create new extractive reserves in Brazil, international lobbying and south-south collaboration, and exchange of information between KEPA and CNS to defend the nature in the Amazon region.

According to KEPA’s Plan of Activities (2002-2004) its objectives are: i) To strengthen democracy; ii) To improve fairness in global markets; iii) To promote sustainable development and eradication of poverty; and iv) To foster equality while taking into account the needs of local culture. The objectives of the cooperation between KEPA and CNS are relevant with respect to these objectives, but their high level of generality makes it impossible

to assess to what extent any individual partnership agreement has contributed to their attainment. As the project consists mainly of institutional support to CNS to pursue its own objectives, the project's general relevance for CNS is evident.

IMPLEMENTATION: PHASE I (1997-1999)

Even though the project proposal emerged from rather general and ambitious ideas about strengthening the development of democracy, civil society and local communities in the Brazilian Amazon and helping to protect the world's largest area of rain forests, the project document had a much more pragmatic tone. The overall objective referred in practice to the Ecological Agrarian Reform proposal, and the outputs and activities were quite pragmatic measures to strengthen the role of CNS as an intermediary organization between the state and grassroots organizations, and to channel funding to the grassroots level.

However, in retrospect it can be noted that at least from the part of KEPA the project preparation process was unduly hasty and based on grossly inadequate knowledge about Brazil, the Amazon region and the NGOs working there. Despite a suggestion within KEPA to use the year 1997 for doing a survey on the NGO field in the Amazon and subsequent preparation of a project proposal for 1998, KEPA decided to go ahead with the project already in 1997. While a clear articulation of practical needs from the part of CNS helped to put together a concrete proposal of expected outputs and activities according to traditional project format, the inadequate preparation process and language problems on both sides were probably important factors in the subsequent failure of the liaison officer component, and contributed to the chronic problems in planning and reporting that continue to plague the project even today. Lack of consistent vision is also evident in the project document itself, which jumps from a rather sporadic description of Brazil's general socio-economic situation to the pragmatic needs of CNS.

When the project started in 1997 CNS had already established offices in the states of Acre, Rondônia, Amapá and Pará, as well as a national office in Brasília. Even these offices, however, lacked infrastructure and institutional capacity to respond to the demands of the grassroots organizations and to coordinate the regional activities. As CNS had already managed to negotiate support for its office in Acre from the Dutch Novib, the state of Pará was selected as the priority area for KEPA's support. Pará is one of the largest states in the Brazilian Amazon, and also one of the most active areas in the struggle for the agrarian reform. The fact that the President of CNS at that time, Mr. Atanagildo de Deus Matos (Gatão), was based in Marabá was one crucial factor in favour of focusing project activities there. Even though the first payment of the KEPA project was made only in April 1997, planned activities started even earlier and by July CNS had organized a mass manifestation in Brasília to lobby the Federal Government for a new policy on natural rubber from the Amazon, held various meetings with federal level state institutions on new legislation, and realized three seminars in the Marabá region. In addition it had purchased a plot with a house in Marabá for office use, organised its rehabilitation and provision of basic office equipment, and contracted a secretary. By the end of the year the Marabá office was solidly established and operational. In 1997 representatives of CNS were also invited to visit Finland for two publicity and planning events.

Lobbying for support to extractivist communities with various federal ministries, notably IBAMA, Office of the President/*Comunidade Solidária*, and INCRA continued in 1998 along with organizing seminars and meetings especially in the state of Pará. The Fifth annual meeting of CNS was arranged in 1998. CNS also participated actively in the development of

the Program for Extractivism (PRODEX), which provides a special credit facility for extractivist communities, and in the development of a new technology for the production of natural rubber together with the University of Brasília to improve rentability of the production process. Other concrete achievements in which CNS was heavily involved were the creation of the RESEX of Tapajós-Arapiuns (covering 647.810 ha) and mobilisation, including preparation of surveys for the creation 12 new RESEX in the near future. CNS was also becoming increasingly involved in channelling funding to the local associations. It participated with CNPT/IBAMA and the UNDP in the monitoring and implementation of small-scale projects to support the production, commercialisation and distribution of extractivist products. In Pará 33 projects with a total value of Euro 208.000 were supported. In the whole Amazon region the number of projects was 100, with a total value of more than Euro 523.000. CNS also secured project funding from the Finnish Embassy (about Euro 17.000 for two projects in Acre), and from PDA/PPG7 (about Euro 50.000 for support to preparation of small scale projects by local associations).

Implementation of the other main component, the liaison officer placed in Marabá, turned out to be much more complicated. The concept 'liaison officer' (a new title at KEPAs) was still rather fuzzy, and no professional qualifications were specified. Initially the selection was done without the direct participation of CNS (they did not express preference for any candidate even though they received the CVs), and a candidate who did not speak Portuguese but had spent considerable time in Latin America and spoke Spanish was selected. Lack of clarity over the liaison officer's duties continued during the preparation phase, and his civil status changed during the interim period. It was not possible to get work permits from Finland as planned, and after five weeks of language training in Lisbon he travelled to Brazil with his new wife on tourist visas, hoping to settle the issue there. When the three-month tourist-visas expired the liaison officer returned to Finland with his wife, but they returned for another four-month period in the spring of 1998, even though the work-permit was still not in order.

Collaboration with the CNS leadership in Marabá, where the liaison officer was stationed, did not proceed smoothly. Activities in the Marabá region concentrated on political mobilization, and there seems to have been different expectations concerning the liaison officer's role from each side. According to CNS leadership the liaison officer did not grasp the socio-political context of the region (or interpreted it differently from CNS), and did not understand the dynamics of Brazilian social movements. On the other hand his placing in Marabá made establishing contacts with the broader NGO-field in Brazil rather difficult, with the exception of the SDDH, which shared the same office premises in Marabá. Short visits to regional extractive settlements (mainly Brazil-nut gatherers) and meetings in federal ministries and the Finnish Embassy while in Brasília helped him to familiarise with the Brazilian context. Aside from different views on the work approach between CNS and the liaison officer, the practical conditions (difficult climate and living conditions in the interior, failure to rent a suitable house, bureaucratic problems with work permits etc.) seem to have discouraged the liaison officer, who returned to Finland and continued with campaign work from there until the contract was discontinued by mutual agreement in 1998. While the liaison officer facilitated some contacts with Finnish media and supported the preparation of a large project proposal to the EU (which failed) and for small projects to the Finnish Embassy (with some success), the results from his contribution to KEPAs's support to CNS were relatively insignificant. For example the planned micro-fund never took off. In Finland he participated in some campaign work, including the Amazon tour in Finland in December 1998.

In 1999 running the Marabá office, organizing CNS regional meetings, mobilizing and training local communities, and lobbying at the federal level (SCA/MMA, CNPT/IBAMA,

INCRA/MAF, PRODEX, PPG7) continued to enjoy support from the project. The main NGO partners in Brazil included GTA (*Grupo de Trabalho Amazônico*) and the indigenous organization COIAB, while multilateral donors like the EU, the UNDP and the World Bank along with such bilateral donors as GTZ and DFID were also contacted. CNS representatives participated in a seminar on forests in Finland, and representatives of KEPA met CNS leadership during a visit to Santarém. The main new activities included acquiring office premises in Santarém, Pará, where CNS related cooperative has active production (including a rubber production plant), preparations for establishing a CNS training centre in Belterra or Alter do Chão near Santarém, and initiating separate support for the CNS Women's Secretariat operating from São Miguel, Tocantins, under the leadership of Dona Raimunda Gomes. In São Miguel the project supported the rehabilitation of a house to serve as office premises for the Women's Secretariat, contracting secretarial staff, as well as organizing regional seminars and local courses on gender and leadership in order to gradually create women's units in all nine states of the Amazon region.

IMPLEMENTATION: PHASE II (2000-2002)

For the second phase the focus of KEPA's support was clarified a bit: institutional support (section 1) was now focused on the state of Pará, and support to the Women's Secretariat was now incorporated into the main project as section 4. More emphasis was also laid on dialogue with KEPA and its member organizations, and on KEPA's obligation to support CNS in its international lobbying and information work, especially in liaising with Nordic NGOs.

Along with support to such annual political manifestations as *Grito da Amazônia*, organised by CNS jointly with various Brazilian NGOs, activities in the second phase included: support to creation of new RESEX and RDS like the Tucuruí; preparation of a proposal to Inter-American Development Bank (BID) for a community-based ecotourism project in the context of Extractive Reserves in Pará including discussions with SECTAM; participation in the development of a new type of a sustainable use conservation area (*Reserva de Desenvolvimento Sustentável*, RDS) together with MAF and MMA; participating with the government, the WB and WWF in the preparation of a project to create new conservation areas in the Amazon (*Projeto Áreas Protegidas da Amazônia*, ARPA) in order to secure the inclusion of extractive reserves in the project; participation in the preparation of the National Forest Program (*Programa Nacional de Florestas*, PNF); and lobbying to enlarge the scope of RESEX/PPG7 beyond the original four reserves, and to use more funds by PDA/PPG7 for supporting agro-extractive projects.

While liaising with other NGOs (such as the GTA), political mobilization work in extractive communities (now expanding the work to Marajó, where a new office was established) and administrative training (for example in the context of PRODEX) continued like in previous years, CNS was becoming increasingly involved in allocation of small-scale project funds to local associations, and in managing part of them on behalf of local extractive groups. These activities took place mainly under different agreements with SCA/MMA and UNDP. For example in the year 2000 CNS participated with SCA/MMA in the approval of 20 small-scale projects to support agro-extractivism in the Amazon region with a total value of about Euro 900.000. Introduction of new extractivist products and related training, purchase of equipment, and development of marketing and transport were some of the activities thus supported. Another major activity in 2000-2001 was support to the preparation of a project proposal for bilateral funding from the Finnish MFA. Support to the Women's Secretariat was used for organizing new women's groups, seminars on HIV/AIDS, to participate in various national and regional meetings on gender issues, and to lobby government agencies. In 2001-

2002 the major activity was the campaign to provide official documentation for extractivist women, which started in Pará, to secure their citizenship rights.

In the international arena CNS organized a number of meetings with Northern NGOs to solicit support for the creation of new conservation areas in the Amazon region, and in the year 2000 one representative of CNS visited KEPA's partner NGOs in Indonesia and Thailand in the framework of South-South cooperation. The latter was part of preparations for organizing a joint seminar in Pará, Brazil later in the year. The seminar was eventually cancelled due to unfavourable political situation in Pará. In 2000 there was a fund-raising campaign in Finland for establishing an Amazon-Prize, but the results were not very encouraging. Most of CNS's international lobbying concentrated on the issue of climate change, especially the role of forests in the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) of the Kyoto Protocol. Activities included participation in the Convention's meetings in the Hague (the Netherlands) and Marrakech (Morocco), and the 'Rio+10' follow-up meeting in Johannesburg (South Africa) in 2002. Funding for the latter activity was obtained mainly from other sources than KEPA, such as the European Working Group on Amazon (EWGA) and the ED (USA). The resources from KEPA not needed for this purpose were used for buying a motorboat to facilitate work in RESEX and with riverine populations in Pará.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS AND REPORTING

In the original partnership agreement of 1997 the responsibilities of KEPA include the obligation to transfer to CNS the amount of USD 258.200 (Euro 227.690) during a period of three years, and subsequently to evaluate, together with CNS, the results of the project. In the same document the responsibilities of CNS include the following: (i) to realise the project activities agreed in the project document; and (ii) to maintain accountability about the use of the resources, to give KEPA information about their use when requested and to transmit to KEPA bi-annually all the financial and operational reports. The agreement stipulates further that new resources shall be released only when an adequate report covering the previous six-month period has been delivered to KEPA. In the second agreement signed in 2000 it was maintained that CNS must propose any changes for the next annual plan of activities, if needed, in the previous November for KEPA to approve. Previously the right to re-allocate funds between different budget lines had been restricted to 10% of each six-month period's total budget. The amount to be transferred during 2000-2002 by KEPA was set at Euro 289.272. In 2000 it was also agreed that an external audit of the project (funded by KEPA) would be carried out each year.

The following assessment is based on the financial and activity reports available at KEPA's office in Helsinki and at the CNS national office in Brasília, as well as on discussions with a few key persons responsible for monitoring and financial aspects in both organizations. All the financial data are given in Euro. The figures should be considered as rough approximates, for in many cases the available financial data is not conclusive, and the selection of the conversion rate is by necessity somewhat arbitrary. In this report average annual exchange rates are used,² but actually there has been relatively large fluctuation on monthly basis. The figures in different tables are not strictly comparable, for some are based on annual transfers

² The following annual rates were used:

Euro	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
FIM	5,8806	5,9847	5,9457	5,9457	5,9457	5,9457
USD	1,1340	1,1204	1,0660	0,9240	0,8965	0,9359
Real	1,2227	1,2976	1,9152	1,6927	2,0866	2,6581

Source: InforEuro 2003.

by KEPA, while others are based on annual expenditure as declared by CNS. The source is, however, always indicated.

From the part of KEPA the overall transfers for institutional support during the first phase surpass those indicated in the original partnership agreement and subsequent support to the Women's Secretariat by Euro 18.371. Although in 1997 CNS received almost Euro 12.000 less institutional support than originally agreed, in the following year it received more than Euro 20.000 over the value budgeted. At the same time other expenses to CNS, mainly those of the liaison officer, were considerably higher than originally budgeted. For example in 1998 salaries, insurances, housing costs and international travel for the liaison officer were more than 40% higher than budgeted. In 1999 about Euro 10.000 more than originally budgeted was transferred as institutional support to CNS, in addition to the transfer of Euro 15.544 to the Women's Secretariat. The additional value seems to represent re-allocation of funds originally intended for the liaison officer's expenses after he was withdrawn from Brazil in 1998, but no formal agreement on the issue was available. During the second phase the difference in annual budget versus actual transfers was infinitesimal. Overall, it can safely be stated that KEPA has fulfilled this part of the partnership agreement. The annual figures are presented in table 3.

Table 3. KEPA's support to CNS, 1997-2002 (transfers according to KEPA, in Euro)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Total
Institutional support	84.537	86.748	95.301	87.680	100.912	100.904	556.082
Finnish personnel	25.242	54.150	6.610	-	-	-	86.002
Other	11.338	12.838	2.377	-	-	-	26.553
Total	121.117	153.736	104.288	87.680	100.912	100.904	668.637

For the part of CNS, in the first phase the flexibility rule (10% between budget lines) seems to have been discarded early on, but as the actual transfers from KEPA did not match the original budget, detailed analysis of actual expenditure against budget lines is not possible (table 4). In general it can be noted that considerably more resources were used for acquisition of office premises and equipment than originally budgeted. There seems to have been great problems in finding a mutually satisfactory format of financial reporting, for the format used is different each year. In 1998 the financial report did not specify expenditure by budget line or section: the report is merely a long list of undifferentiated expenditures. In a memorandum from the following year KEPA's Director of Development Coordination Unit (who was heavily involved in the administration of the project) even recommends continuing this practice, which she considered to be more compatible with the concept of institutional support. However, in the 1999 financial report expenditure is again specified by budget line, but instead of being bi-annual the report covers the whole year. In general it can be noted that financial reporting during the first phase was confused and often inadequate for monitoring purposes.³

Table 4. Budget allocations and expenditure, 1997-1999 (according to CNS, in Euro)

	1997 Budget	1997 Expend.	1998 Budget	1998 Expend.*	1999 Budget ^z	1999 Expend. ^z	Total Budget	Total Expend.
I Instit. support	44.444	36.067	44.984	n.a.	47.280	32.650	136.708	n.a.

³ It should be noted that CNS is required by Brazilian law to carry out a certain system of financial reporting, but as it is organised in a standard format which is not compatible with the structure of activities as defined in the project document, it is of little use for KEPA's financial monitoring needs. During the first phase the reports covered all CNS activities, but since 2000 they have been prepared separately for each major project.

II Office & equipm.	30.864	25.779	-	n.a.	-	20.007	30.864	n.a.
III Org. & training	21.164	22.165	21.421	n.a.	22.514	24.268	65.099	n.a.
Total	96.472	84.011	66.405	80.969	69.794	76.925	232.671	241.905

* The CNS financial report for 1998 does not provide separation of expenses per budget line or section.

^aIn 1999 an additional Euro 15.544 was used by the CNS Women's Secretariat under a separate cooperation agreement, bringing the total expenditure of KEPA funding by CNS in 1999 to Euro 92.469.

In the second phase transfer between budget lines was used very flexibly and apparently without the advance permission from KEPA stipulated in the new partnership agreement. The expenditure under the first section (institutional support in the state of Pará) has been consistently higher than budgeted, and the total difference was Euro 60.000. On the other hand, out of the Euro 27.000 reserved for international lobbying less than 10% was used for that purpose as funding was available from elsewhere (table 4). While the small discrepancies (after adding the allocation for external audit) between KEPA's transfer figures and CNS expenditure figures in 2000 and 2002 can be explained by differences in the exchange rates used, a major inconsistency is evident in the 2001 expenditure figures by CNS. They are Euro 18.000 (15%) higher than transfers indicated by KEPA. It should be noted, however, that in 2001 the value of Brazilian Real was very unstable, varying between 1,748 (January) and 2,561 (October) for one Euro. The financial reports by CNS were based on expenditure in Real. During the second phase financial reporting has been more consistent than during the first phase, even though some problems were still encountered for example in delivering the reports on time (e.g. reports for the year 2002). On the other hand, if KEPA had initially provided clear and consistent instructions, by the end of the six-year period they would most likely have developed into a mutually useful report format. In the present context use of external audit (they have been done annually as agreed) has clearly made financial monitoring less onerous for KEPA.

Table 5. Budget allocations and expenditure, 2000-2002 (according to CNS, in Euro)

	2000 Budget	2000 Expend.	2001 Budget	2001 Expend.	2002 Budget	2002 Expend.	Total Budget	Total Expend.
I Instit. Supp./ Pará	47.660	62.294	63.117	96.509	63.117	76.951	173.894	235.754
II Mobiliz. RESEX	9.685	10.087	8.677	5.363	8.677	3.130	27.039	18.580
III Int'l lobby	9.685	2.491	8.677	-	8.677	-	27.039	2.491
IV Women's Secret.	17.407	13.885	17.407	16.487	17.407	20.021	52.221	50.393
Total*	84.437	88.757	97.878	118.359	97.878	100.102	280.193	307.218

* The budget total does not include allocation for external audit, which was budgeted at Euro 3.027 per year.

KEPA's name is visible and its support is recognised in many reports, brochures, and info boards along with other donors. As CNS emphasises the institutional nature of the cooperation the relative importance of each partner does not come out, and often inclusion means support to CNS in general.

Concerning substantive reporting, no mutually agreed pattern seems to have developed between CNS and KEPA. As the project documents and agreements provide few if any clear, relevant and measurable indicators, it is difficult to monitor the process beyond the number of new CNS offices and extractive reserves. Most reports from CNS are an uneasy combination of political statements and lists of meetings or small-scale projects in which CNS was somehow involved. While this is partly a result of lack of planning and monitoring experience and capacity in CNS, it is also a result of KEPA's failure to identify with its partner what is needed from a monitoring report. The impression is that reporting is considered a useless bureaucratic obligation, which does not serve any functional purposes for either partner. This results in a vicious circle, for superficial reports without clear focus are difficult to use

consistently as a part of regular exchange of information and planning, and there has been very little effort to develop them in this direction. While CNS has tried to answer the additional queries from KEPA – although sometimes with a considerable delay – the present reporting system does not fulfil even the basic monitoring needs placed by the partnership agreements, not to mention the considerably more ambitious objective of active dialogue emphasised by both sides. Problems in the reporting system are linked to difficulties in finding a common language (in terms of both natural language and common basis of understanding) for a meaningful dialogue at institutional level. I will return to this issue later.

The fact that problems in reporting and dialogue have continued throughout the project period is partly linked to almost complete lack of evaluation in the process (previous to this report). Evaluations are done both to improve future cooperation through feedback of lessons learnt, and to provide a basis for accountability including the provision of information for the public, in this case principally KEPA's member organizations. Both of these functions would have needed strengthening. Evaluation was mentioned in very vague terms in the original project document, and at the end of the first phase it was strongly suggested inside KEPA. It was not done, however, except for a highly subjective memorandum from 1999, which was based on discussions between a few people heavily involved in the implementation process (from CNS the Executive Secretary, the President, the Treasurer - who was also ex-president - and the President of the Women's Secretariat; from KEPA the directors of Development Cooperation and Policy & NGO Services units, and one representative of the KEPA Board). While the memorandum provided a highly positive assessment of benefits to both partners during the first phase, except for the liaison officer component that was considered a failure, it can hardly be considered impartial or adequate. However, also this memorandum emphasised the need for more regular exchange of information between the two institutions.

RESULTS FOR CNS

According to the 1999 evaluative memorandum, the main benefit CNS saw in the three years of cooperation with KEPA was the development of a flexible model of institutional support. This made it possible to respond quickly to current needs for example in negotiations with the government and other international donors, or needs arising among the associations at the grassroots level. While this type of flexibility has continued up to present, and it is important to try to maintain its positive aspects in the future, the other side of the coin is weak planning capacity and insufficient monitoring of activities. The needs of CNS must also be analysed against the recent developments of its role and the operational context in Brazil. In the early 1990s CNS was heavily dependent on government funding, which was mainly in the form of small projects. While the tragic death of Chico Mendes, the first leader of CNS brought the role of rubber tappers and other extractive populations into international media, the actual support to CNS (from EDF, Novib, Ford Foundation, etc.) remained sporadic and small-scale, and mainly directed to specific project-type activities like climate change issues or social support to most vulnerable groups. However, during this phase the objectives of CNS were focused on political lobbying of Brazilian authorities at municipal, state and federal levels, as well as on influencing international donors to change their aid policies in a direction supportive to the cause of rubber tappers and other extractive communities of the Amazon region. For this kind of political work traditional project-type funding was not very useful. In this context the flexible modality of institutional support provided by KEPA was clearly more appropriate, and it made it possible for CNS to consolidate its presence especially in the state of Pará and in the federal capital, but also to strengthen its activities in the whole Amazon

region. At the same time it served as a basis for negotiating support from other potential donors.

However, the failure to consolidate the emerging model of flexible institutional support by developing a functioning planning and monitoring system to support it has become visible in the present phase of development of CNS, whereby project administration and implementation are taking an increasing part of its basic resources. This situation has come about for various reasons, ranging from the gradually strengthened role of CNS at the national level in discussions and activities concerning the Amazon region, to the recent change of political power at the federal level, whereby the new government is favourable to the objectives of CNS. In practice both CNS and its partners have found the organization's planning and administrative capacity weak in relation to its increasing participation in concrete policy formulation and implementation. Unfortunately the partnership with KEPA was not used to its full potential in developing the administrative capacity of CNS even with respect to the specific partnership agreement. As noted above, bilateral planning and monitoring activities remain confused and lack institutional basis, and they are of little value for the purposes of strategic planning or exchange of information.

Especially during the second phase of the project KEPA's role has become heavily bureaucratized, and is at present limited practically to sending money and receiving monitoring reports. After the initial phase of enthusiasm in the 1990s, which was supported by the various Amazon campaigns, the partnership arrangement with CNS failed to develop into a broad and dynamic institutional component within KEPA, and became instead personified to one or two individuals. For some reason it was even proposed in 1999 that communication between the two institutions should be fixed to the executive level, meaning in practice the Executive Secretary of CNS and the Director of the Development Cooperation Unit of KEPA. While these persons were practically the only representatives of their organizations who spoke English and Portuguese, respectively, this kind of communication culture was hardly conducive to strengthening the institutional basis of cooperation and widening the interface of dialogue with KEPA's member organizations. The lack of continuity inherent in this kind of arrangement became evident when both the original key persons in KEPA left the organization.

With respect to development of CNS local level organization in the state of Pará the support of the KEPA project has been crucial in helping CNS establish itself in new areas and in creating a stable basis for operating in the regions of Marabá, Santarém and Marajó. In addition to the creation of three regional offices (Marabá, Santarém, Marajó) in Pará, the support given to the Women's Secretariat for its campaign and training work, and for establishing a national office in São Miguel, Tocantins, have provided much needed resources for consolidating the key objectives of CNS. Acquisition of office premises, as well as equipment and means of transport (motorbikes, cars and a motor-boat) for these offices has provided an indispensable push for mobilization work at the grassroots level.

As the organization is not able to create regular income through membership fees or other similar means, the project has been crucial in securing the payment of recurrent operational costs of the four offices and supporting salaries, training and travel expenses of CNS leaders and technical staff. Funding for small-scale local projects has helped to increase the local credibility and influence of CNS, even though their sustainability has often been dependent on economic and policy factors such as government subsidies that are beyond its control. For example improvement of education and health facilities in extractivist communities depends almost exclusively on municipal level allocation of resources, which has generally ignored sparsely populated rural areas. In any case support to processing, transport and marketing

facilities for extractive products (rubber, Brazil-nut, Babaçu-coconut, oils and handicrafts) has improved the local communities' socio-economic situation, and has thus strengthened the credibility of extractivism as an ecologically sustainable livelihood strategy. At least in some regions such as Marabá and Pico de Papagaio the activity of women members has increased as a result of the mobilization work. By making possible such local and national activities KEPA's funding has undoubtedly had a major impact on the mobilization work of CNS.

It is somewhat more difficult to assess the contribution of the project in more general activities of CNS. With regard to promotion of CNS's main concrete political goal, the Ecological Agrarian Reform in the Amazon region, the results of its work have been remarkable. Since 1990, when the RESEX model was established, 16 extractive reserves have been created in Amazônia, and 33 new reserves are in the process. The existing reserves cover an area of 3.819.394 ha with 27.135 inhabitants. Nearly 50% of the land area and 65% of the population are due to the creation of four large reserves (Médio Juruá, Tapajós-Arapiúns, Lago do Cuniã, and Alto Tarauacá) since 1997. When the ongoing processes are terminated the total area will be over ten million ha with more than 80.000 people. The current objective of MMA/SCA is to expand the total area of extractive reserves to 30 million ha by the year 2010. In addition to extractive reserves seven marine reserves have been created and 28 new ones are in the process. Ten Agro-extractivist Settlement Projects (PAE), which cover about one million ha and support about 3.000 families were also created. At the same time CNS participated in the creation of a new modality, the Reserve for Sustainable Development (RDS) in collaboration with MAF and MMA. It is similar to RESEX, but while the latter must be proclaimed by the President based on painstaking technical studies by IBAMA and complicated political articulation with federal and state government institutions, the RDS can be created by the head of INCRA and is less bureaucratic.

CNS has also been able to exercise considerable influence on some important government programs, notably the PNF and the ARPA. The National Forest Program (PNF), has been developed since the year 2000. The work of CNS has been crucial for securing that the role of traditional populations and extractivism has now been officially recognised in the document, and support mechanisms for them have been established. Creation of new extractive reserves was also included in the objectives of PNF. The objective of the Protected Areas in Amazon Project (ARPA) is to create 18 million ha of protected areas in the region during the next four years, of which nine million of total protection and nine million of sustainable use. In ten years the total extension of protected areas in the Amazon should reach 50 million ha. The project concentrated originally on traditional protected areas, which exclude sustainable use and presence of local communities inside the conservation areas, but due to the efforts of CNS and other Brazilian NGOs (notably those representing indigenous peoples) the category of sustainable use was included. This category includes both RESEX and RDS. In addition to creation of new reserves the project aims to strengthen the sustainability of existing protected areas, including sustainable use areas. The project enjoys support from large international organizations such as the World Bank (through GEF) and the WWF. Its implementation is expected to start in 2003 with Euro 32 million from GEF, Euro 12,3 million from the WWF, and Euro 19 million from the Brazilian government.

In the case of some other programs the lobbying of CNS has been less effective. CNS was actively involved in the creation of the Extraction Development Support Program (PRODEX), a credit program of the Bank of Amazon (BASA) directed to extractive population. Access to the resources provided by the program, however, remains difficult and bureaucratic. In the case of the major international programme to protect the Brazilian Amazon, the PPG7, the impact of CNS on policy has been limited even though it and local extractivist associations

and cooperatives have benefited from funding, mainly from the RESEX and PDA sub-programmes. Especially in the case of RESEX the impact of CNS lobbying has remained insignificant even though it is well represented in CNPT/IBAMA.⁴ Increase of Brazilian influence within PPG7 cannot be credited to any single organization (such as CNS), but is the result of widespread pressure on donors by both the government and the civil society. It must, however, be noted that CNS is – together with the indigenous peoples' organization COIAB – a leading actor within *Grupo de Trabalho Amazônico* (GTA), which is the main NGO umbrella organization towards PPG7.

Increasing political influence of CNS is also manifested in the nomination of persons who support CNS or are favourable towards its objectives to important national offices. Aside from the present government, which is generally favourable towards the goals of environmental, human rights and other social movements, nomination of such persons as Ms. Marina Silva (previously Senator for Acre, now Minister of Environment), Dr. Mary Alegretti (Director of SCA/MMA), Dr. Ana Lange (Coordinator of Agroextractivism in SCA/MMA), Dr. Aurélio Vianna (Director of PPG7 and ARPA) can be mentioned. Some important CNS leaders like two previous presidents have gained high formal positions: Mr. Atanagildo de Deus Matos (Head of CNPT/IBAMA) and Mr. José Juarez Leitão dos Santos (Member of Parliament for Acre). CNS leaders have also served in important positions in the national NGO umbrella organization GTA. At the regional level the nomination of Mr. Geraldo Pastana to head IBAMA regional office in Santarém, and election of Mr. Livaldo Sarmento to Municipal Councillor in Santarém can also be mentioned. However, it should be noted that granting a formal position within a powerful organization could also reflect a strategy of co-optation by that organization.

While the support from KEPA has undoubtedly facilitated CNS's lobbying with government institutions and participation in meetings, and strengthened its capacity to organize meetings with other Brazilian NGOs in drafting joint political stands on important issues, it is hard to estimate the project's impact on this extremely complicated political process. The project's impact on accessing additional donor funding, notably from the Global 2000/Austria (supporting contacts with Austria, providing a model for cooperation) and the Finland/UNDP Project (establishing initial contacts and facilitating project preparation) is much more evident. By supporting the building of CNS network at the regional and federal levels the project has also improved its access to small-scale project funding from such sources as SCA/MMA, BASA, INCRA, UNDP, PDA/PPG7, and some state governments (Acre and Amapá).

The results of support on the international level are somewhat mixed. The project itself was one result of the active cooperation with international NGOs that CNS mobilized in the early 1990s, which materialised in the Amazon campaigns in which KEPA and some of its member organizations also participated. Subsequently the first phase of the CNS-KEPA project was characterised by relatively broad participation of various Finnish NGOs in the public discussions and in the campaign work, which continued until 1999. However, as the leading figures of the original campaign-level cooperation in the Nordic countries turned to new issues new activists did not replace them. According to both CNS and KEPA there was a decrease in active dialogue already between 1997 and 1999, even though the new project was supposed to strengthen it. While the 1999 memorandum blamed the liaison officer for decreasing communication between CNS and KEPA's member organizations (and other Nordic NGOs), the accusation does not seem to be fully justified, for the situation has grown

⁴ According to information from PPG7 the RESEX sub-program will continue to be restricted to the original four extractive reserves despite lobbying for its expansion.

worse during the second phase. This has happened even though the international liaisoning dimension of KEPA was emphasised in the second partnership agreement. While the stagnation may be partly due to CNS's increasing administrative burden caused by growing participation in implementation work and subsequent lack of resources for maintaining active dialogue with an increasing number of partners, it seems to originate more from the side of KEPA. I shall return to this issue in the following chapter. Anyhow, it should be noted that collaboration at international level actually continued relatively strong throughout the first phase in the form of CNS participation in international campaigns and seminars in Europe and Finland, and visits of KEPA staff to Brazil.

One factor for little collaboration at international level during the second phase has probably been CNS's focusing on climate change and the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) of the Kyoto Protocol in its international lobby. This is an issue in which the policy of CNS contradicts that of most Finnish environmental NGOs (at least those active in KEPA), and even more generally in Europe. While CNS (like the Finnish government) supports strongly the development of the CDM and inclusion of Amazon rainforests in it, Finnish and European NGOs (and at least the previous Brazilian government) have been critical of it, or at least the inclusion of developing countries in the system. As no common ground about the issue was found with KEPA and its member NGOs in the early meetings, CNS has proceeded with its international lobbying in favour of CDM mainly with funding and technical support from other sources such as the ED. After the international seminar, which was planned to take place in Pará in 2000 was cancelled, no major international activities between CNS and KEPA have been realised.

RESULTS FOR KEPA

According to its Plan of Activities for 2002-2004 the objectives of KEPA's development policy work are to influence Finland's global policy-making and especially its relations with developing countries, and to strengthen NGOs and social movements in the South in implementing their own agendas. Its principal tools for this work are institutional support, dialogue in different thematic areas of development policy with the partner organizations, and support to dialogue between NGOs in the South. In this context results for KEPA (in addition to results for the partner organization and its beneficiaries) are those of the second and third 'tool' categories that is lessons learnt from the cooperation process, exchange of information and sharing of ideas. All these can serve to make KEPA a more influential opinion-leader and resource centre in the North, and a more useful partner in the South.

In order to assess the CNS project's results for KEPA we must place it in the context of the organization's recent development history. In 1995 a very critical evaluation of KEPA's volunteer program was published, and subsequently KEPA started to search for new modalities of operation. The present partnership program has developed from that process through various steps. At that stage there were two lobbies of member organizations inside KEPA: i) those who wanted KEPA to become a service organization for its member organizations with projects in developing countries, and ii) those who felt that KEPA should move towards doing critical investigation and advocacy in such global issues as international trade regimes, environmental degradation and human rights. While the first group wanted to concentrate on existing partner countries (Zambia, Mozambique and Nicaragua) and possibly expand to such new countries as Tanzania where there was a strong presence of Finnish NGOs, the other group wanted to expand to new areas where the struggle over the global issues was currently fought, or was likely to be fought in the near future. It was the second lobby that proposed the inclusion of such new countries as Indonesia, Thailand and Brazil to

the partnership list. With these countries the mode of cooperation was planned to be institutional support, reinforced with a Finnish liaison or information officer.

While individual members of KEPA's member organizations had developed some contacts with NGOs in the proposed new countries during the dynamic environmental campaign work of the early 1990s, the knowledge basis for initiating any long-term partnership programs was felt to be insufficient. Even the new partnership concept was unclear, and especially the role of the liaison/information officers had not been thought through. After initial contacts with NGOs in the proposed new countries in 1996, fact-finding missions were sent to Indonesia and Thailand in 1997-1998, and after thorough consultations with the partner organizations agreements were prepared for sending an information officer to PER, a Thai NGO, and to INSIST, an Indonesian NGO, in 1998. The agreements comprised also institutional support to the partner organizations. The negotiations included detailed discussions with the partner organization about the role of the information officer. However, for some reason KEPA decided to proceed without such preparatory phase in Brazil, even against explicit proposals from active members recommending a fact-finding mission. Subsequently cooperation with the most prominent Brazilian partner candidate, CNS, started already in early 1997 without adequate preparation from the part of KEPA. The results of the hasty start are seen in the confused expectations placed on the liaison officer, and on the shallowness of the expected contribution of KEPA. For example in the first partnership agreement KEPA's role (in addition to providing the money and sending the liaison officer) is articulated only as "cooperate in the execution of the project".

Confusion over the role of the liaison officer is linked to the role of CNS in the Amazonian civil society. While CNS is a strong and respected representative of the region's traditional populations, and an indispensable channel towards the numerous grassroots groups (extractive associations and cooperatives) which are its main partners, its relationship with other national level NGOs is collaborative but reserved. It views most of them (perhaps correctly) as intermediate organizations which channel external funding to grassroots groups, which they do not necessarily represent. (The irony is that to some extent the same thing is happening to CNS, even though it might be more representative of grassroots interests than most other NGOs.) This issue received critical comments already during the preparation phase, and has been confirmed in subsequent discussions. However, with respect to the liaison officer, this situation meant that by placing him squarely inside CNS (and not just sharing common office premises), stationed in Marabá, KEPA practically precluded the broader aspect of liaisoning with other Amazonian NGOs from his role. On the other hand, from the point of view of CNS, the posting of the Finnish person in Marabá made sense, for it helped securing KEPA funding for the new office to be established there. It may also have served a useful purpose as a manifestation of the international support CNS enjoyed. For KEPA it must be seen as one part of the learning process for posting liaison/information officers in the future.

As a result of the active Amazon campaigns in the 1990s KEPA and the Finnish general public learnt about the social struggle of the peoples of the Amazon, and the campaigns probably increased KEPA's credibility in Finland on environmental and human rights issues. Learning from CNS how to do lobbying, which is referred to in some reports, seems to be limited to a few persons having constant contact with CNS leadership. Interface between the two organizations remained fairly narrow outside of thematic campaigns. In this context it is notable that the second partnership agreement highlighted KEPA's obligation to support CNS in its lobbying and information work, and liaisoning especially with other Nordic NGOs. When measured through the proposed indicators (number of new cooperative relationships between CNS and Nordic NGOs facilitated by KEPA, organizing the information and

monitoring system between CNS and KEPA in a mutually satisfactory manner) KEPA's performance in this sector must be rated low in the second period. This had a direct bearing on the present lack of active dialogue, which is one of the main results expected by KEPA in its new partnership approach.

In Brazil language is another complicating factor. While Portuguese is spoken widely in the world including Mozambique, which is KEPA's longstanding partner, communication with CNS at the Helsinki office has most of the time relied on one Portuguese-speaking person, and otherwise on Spanish-speakers only. The person who was initially responsible for starting the project spoke neither Portuguese nor Spanish. As the CNS staff did (until present) not speak English except for the previous Executive Secretary, communication between the two institutions remained very restricted and suspect to misunderstandings. CNS has recruited some new staff that is anxious to learn English, but this is not a sufficient basis for communicating with the extractive population and their leaders who speak only Portuguese.

As noted above, the problems with dialogue were not caused only by bad project preparation and failed recruitment and posting of the liaison officer, for similar problems – even though in a lesser scale – have persisted even in places where KEPA's partnership had a prolonged preparation phase (Indonesia), or where the recruitment of the information officer was considered exceptionally successful (Thailand). According to recent reviews it was felt that KEPA's partner-organization in Indonesia had remained distant to both KEPA staff in Helsinki and its member organizations. In Thailand sharing of experience and analysis with the partner was considered to be weak, even though especially development policy work could benefit greatly from it. Problems identified in these cases included weak reporting systems, lack of strong institution-level contacts with KEPA's home office, and KEPA's unclear organizational structure. The same issues were recorded in the recent environmental policy study, which noted further that KEPA lacks institutional structure for internal communication while its information work is directed outwards. All the same problems can also be identified in the partnership with CNS in Brazil, and should be seen as one factor in the ongoing restructuration process. Solving these problems is part of the challenge for KEPA's new team organization: How to improve mutual learning from the partners' experiences? How to utilise more effectively KEPA's contacts for South-South collaboration? How to disseminate the information from partnership projects to KEPA's member organizations and draw them to active and sustained dialogue?

However, while the new team organization is supposed to strengthen the integration of different functions within KEPA, as well as to create an institutional basis for active dialogue with its member organizations and partners in the South, the compatibility of each project's objectives with KEPA's focal areas remains crucial. Cooperation with CNS fits under various objectives pursued by KEPA, such as eradication of poverty or promotion of democracy, human rights and gender equality, but the emphasis has been on environmental conservation through ecologically sustainable and socially just development. The comprehensive approach developed by CNS was not made use of. In KEPA's Statement of Principles promotion of ecologically sustainable development and conservation of the environment are mentioned as crosscutting objectives of the organization. They are also included in subsequent key documents, such as the Strategy Plan for 2000-2005. Environment remained a key area for KEPA throughout the 1990s, but in the last few years new priorities such as globalisation have pushed it aside. As an organization KEPA is not actively involved in the work of international environment & development organizations, and there is nobody in the Helsinki office that works full time on environmental issues. KEPA does not have an environmental strategy or policy. At the same time environment (with a strong social linkage) has continued

to be an important component in cooperation with partners also in Nicaragua, Thailand and Indonesia. In Zambia and Mozambique land tenure and small-scale farmers access to natural resources are important areas of cooperation. But while there are concrete supportive elements it is hard to figure out how environment fits into KEPA's present strategy: it is there but its role is not articulated and it lacks resources. This was reflected in cooperation with Brazil, which was left to one person who does not speak Portuguese and who was loaded with various other responsibilities. In this context potentially valuable information and experience from the CNS project has fallen in abyss.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the discussion above, this chapter draws together the findings with regard to relevance, impact, effectiveness and sustainability of the KEPA-CNS project. In general the project can be considered relatively successful and well in line with KEPA's policy and objectives.

Relevance: The development objective of the project was to promote the participation of civil society in the identification and implementation of a sustainable development model for the Amazon region. In the Brazilian context CNS has turned out to be a highly relevant partner for promoting this development objective under its 'Ecological Agrarian Reform' concept. The project has addressed relatively well at least some of the crucial needs of its grassroots members in the main activity areas of Marabá, Santarém, Marajó and Pico de Papagaio, as well as the operational needs at the national level. By strengthening the operational and mobilization capacity of CNS it has contributed to strengthening the socio-economic and political position of the extractivist population in general. During the project period important socio-political changes, which culminated in the election of the candidate of the Workers Party to the Presidency at the end of the period, took place in Brazil. CNS was part of the political process that brought about the change, and at least in the Amazon region even a major actor. The project retained its political relevance throughout the period, but there is a need to re-consider its priorities in the present transition period.

Impact: By supporting the operational capacity of CNS the project has contributed to an impressive growth of different kinds of conservation areas in the Amazon. These include a large proportion of areas for sustainable use, that is areas where indigenous and traditional populations can exercise their traditional and ecologically sustainable livelihoods. Among the new sustainable use areas the project has contributed prominently in the creation of the extractive reserve of Tapajós-Arapiúns in the state of Pará, and in securing funding from the government of Finland for its consolidation and development. CNS has also been active in developing new models of extractive areas, such as Reserve for Sustainable Development (RDS), and in influencing the contents of such major new environmental programs as Protected Areas in Amazon Project (ARPA) and National Forest Program (PNF). The lobbying work of CNS was crucial for securing the integration of sustainable use areas (including extractive areas) in these programs. While CNS has been able to access resources from the sub-programs of the PPG7 program, its lobbying efforts for changing the Pilot Program's overall direction have been less successful.

Through institutional support to CNS the project has made possible establishing regional offices in Marabá, Santarém and Marajó, the national office of the Women's Secretariat in São Miguel, and starting the building of a CNS training centre in Alter do Chão. By supporting the operational costs of these offices and providing support for small-scale activities (processing and transport services, marketing, credit, social services) in these regions the project has strengthened CNS and the local extractivist associations and cooperatives both economically and politically. Support to the Women's Secretariat, which started in 1999, has contributed to more prominent position of women in CNS leadership, especially in the state of Pará and Pico de Papagaio region. Through various campaigns and training events the importance of gender issue is now recognised inside CNS. A new campaign on documentation for women and children in extractive communities has already contributed to women's self esteem, and will be an important step in securing their citizenship

rights in the future. These activities are likely to strengthen the credibility of extractivism as an ecologically and socially sustainable livelihood, and a solid basis for new conservation areas.

Increased operational capacity of CNS, which is partly a result of the KEPA project, has made it possible for CNS to access funding from other sources, both Brazilian and international. These include for example SCA/MMA, the state governments of Acre and Amapá, UNDP, Global 2000 in Austria and the Finnish government. It must be noted, however, that the project did not succeed in establishing a functional and mutually useful monitoring and planning system during the project period. This would have had a positive impact on the administrative capacity of CNS, which is increasingly involved in project planning, monitoring and implementation. During the first phase of the project KEPA's support to active campaign work in Finland and Europe facilitated the international lobbying of CNS, and opened contacts to new partners in Europe. Unfortunately this activity was less successful in the second phase, even though some contacts to KEPA's Asian partners were created.

The project's impact on KEPA's influencing work was important during the first phase, which was characterised by active campaign work and numerous exchange visits. This was despite weak planning and lack of clear objectives from the part of KEPA, language problems and confusion over the liaison officer. However, the relationship did not grow to sustained dialogue at institutional level. The interface remained narrow and individualised. Lack of institutional basis for the partnership became evident in the second phase, when KEPA's interests started to focus more on the issue of globalisation, and environment received less attention and resources. When the key individuals who had communicated with CNS left the organization the project became gradually sidetracked, and its impact on KEPA's other work has become marginal. Thus the external factor of KEPA's reorganization process had a negative effect on the project's benefits to KEPA in the short term, even though the process may be positive in the long term.

Effectiveness: With the exception of the liaison officer component, which produced few results, the resources allocated for the project have generally been well used. The development objective of the intervention, understood as promotion of the Ecological Agrarian Reform with special emphasis on the state of Pará, was achieved to a large extent. In the case of institutional support, and taking into account the shortcomings in the system of reporting, it is not possible to assess properly to what extent the achievements are the result of KEPA's project. There was no baseline study to compare with, either. It can, however, be stated that the project provided an important contribution towards reaching the objective established by CNS. The contribution of KEPA was also widely recognised by both CNS staff and beneficiaries at the grassroots level.

The confused system of reporting does not allow for a detailed analysis of efficiency, as expenditures are usually not traceable to specific activities. It can, however, be noted that in relation to the scope of the geographical area and the complexity of the development objective, the relatively limited means invested by KEPA have brought considerable results.

Sustainability: CNS remains dependent on external funding for its activities. Due to its character as a social movement, which seeks to mobilize poor and politically marginalized sections of the population, it does not have a self-financing capacity through for example substantial membership fees, and it is not likely to achieve such capacity in the near future. During the project period CNS has managed to expand its funding basis considerably, and while the new offices established in Pará with support from the KEPA project have thus far relied on project funding for operational expenses, they can probably be partly replaced with

funding from other sources such as the Finland/UNDP project. National level lobbying and the Women's Secretariat have also enjoyed support from KEPA, and its sudden withdrawal would probably hamper these activities considerably, even though many of the concrete results already achieved (new reserves, policy impact, etc.) would remain. While the new government is favourable towards the objectives of CNS, excessive reliance on government funding would compromise the critical dimension of its political advocacy work. Sustainability of the small-scale projects that KEPA has helped to initiate or has partly funded is unsure. A few of them are economically viable (like some processing activities) while others remain dependent on external support or government subsidies. Especially in the case of social infrastructure facilities like schools and health posts their sustainability is directly dependent on municipal authorities. An example of this dilemma is a primary school supported by the KEPA project in Cujatuba near Santarém, which was closed after the authorities decided to transfer the children to another school in the area.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

The operational context of CNS has become more favourable during the last few years, notably at the federal level with the new government, but also at lower levels where federal institutions such as IBAMA have changed leadership. At the same time project monitoring and implementation have continued to increase their share along with advocacy work in CNS as funds are increasingly channelled through NGOs to small-scale projects in the Amazon region. This is an area where the capacity of CNS is not sufficient, and both CNS and its partners have recognised the need for capacity building in planning and monitoring, including the level of grassroots organizations which are often formally responsible for implementing the projects under the guidance of CNS. As KEPA's new partnership approach emphasises the development of planning, implementation and monitoring tools and equal access to them, this could be an interesting area for future cooperation.

Increased responsibility for implementation should not, however, mean neglect of political advocacy work. Various interviewees from both inside and outside of CNS drew attention to the critical role of civil society organizations in checking the activities of public authorities, even if they are like-minded. For example some indigenous organizations in Brazil have already re-considered their increasing role as project implementators, and have subsequently given up project work and returned to their political advocacy role. In the case of CNS it might not be necessary to abandon the implementation role, which is important for the grassroots groups, but it is worth considering carefully the allocation of resources to different types of activities. Development of planning and administrative capacity in CNS and respective associations, and separation of administrative tasks from advocacy tasks is likely to minimise waste of limited resources. External funding for advocacy work is still needed, as well. While CNS has managed to secure basic resources for its operational work in the states of Pará and Amazonas, and probably Acre, other states such as Amapá have the political demand but lack resources for expanding the work. Effective lobbying at national and international levels is also not possible without external funding. Aside from financial support, KEPA's international network and knowledge of international trade issues could be used for both information sharing and influencing in such issues as the new market-based mechanisms (for example green certification).

According to the Plan of activities for 2002-2004, KEPA will improve integration of the experiences from the South into the services offered to KEPA's member organizations. It will also systematize collection of information and make its distribution and use easier. This will include establishing clear instructions for reporting and documentation so that they can be used effectively for program planning and management. These activities, if successfully carried out, will considerably improve KEPA's capacity to carry out its information sharing, networking and advocacy functions in possible future cooperation with CNS.

In the drafting of a new program for 2004-2006 it was underlined that KEPA's activities must have organic links to the realities of its member organizations and partners in the South, and there must be an active dialogue between them. The proposal mentions two key concepts: thematic areas and geographical micro-regions (*paikallisalue*). Thematic areas chosen by KEPA are 'Global economic structures and local economy', and 'Rights to natural resources and welfare'. Both of these are relevant for the problematics of Amazon, but especially the latter is highly relevant for KEPA's present cooperation with CNS. According to the proposal KEPA is expected to concentrate its activities in selected micro-regions where: i) It has

operational and knowledge based pre-conditions and resources to cooperate with NGOs and other civil society actors at the local level; ii) It has a strong knowledge basis about those national, regional and global processes that influence the living conditions and operational capacities of local populations; and iii) It has active network relations with organizations that deal with these issues. The Mekong river basin and the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua were given as examples of potential micro-regions. It is worth studying whether the Amazon region would also fulfil the criteria.

I would emphasize also active links to the interests of KEPA's member organizations, for without them KEPA can hardly maintain the dialogue it increasingly emphasises. It is crucial that preparation of possible new partnership agreement is done in collaboration with both CNS (and possible other Brazilian NGO partners) and interested member organizations of KEPA. It is also worth discussing the implications of the holistic approach that CNS promotes in the Amazon. As noted in the recent study on KEPA's environmental policy economic, social and environmental issues cannot be viewed separately. Global markets, environmental degradation and poverty are linked. While this is recognised in KEPA's policy documents, it must find ways to operationalize it through the partnership agreements. The development approach promoted by CNS offers a good basis for such work, but it must be enriched with active contributions from KEPA's own member organizations, possible new partners in Brazil, and sustained South-South dialogue which draws on KEPA's existing network. In this context the heterogeneity of KEPA's member organizations and its network in the South should be viewed as richness, not a handicap. Like the Amazon it is rich and variable: the rainforest's enormous species diversity and the Nokia industrial unit in the Manaus Duty Free Zone are part of the same thing.

In my view KEPA's member organizations have a crucial role in defining future cooperation with CNS and possible other NGOs in Brazil. I can see two scenarios which mark the extremes: i) KEPA does not manage to re-activate dialogue about the Amazon with its member organizations despite favourable political conditions in Brazil, and consequently the project continues with reduced budget for one more cycle before it withers away; or ii) KEPA manages to rekindle its member organizations interest in the Amazon, which leads to active dialogue and starting of new projects by the member organizations with both CNS and other Brazilian NGOs. As a result of increasing interest KEPA will provide additional resources for the Amazon work, including a liaison/information officer placed in the region, and will take a dynamic approach to facilitating South-South cooperation with active collaboration from CNS. With the present favourable political climate in Brazil the results could be remarkable. Both of these scenarios, and many variations in between are possible. In the following I shall sketch a few possible areas for KEPA's future cooperation in Brazil, which are based on the findings of this evaluation and discussions in both Finland and Brazil. The list is naturally not conclusive, nor exclusive. Many more ideas will surely come up, and some of those presented below will be found unviable. Identified concrete ideas include the following:

- Support to the CNS *Secretaria de Formação* to organize training in project planning, monitoring and administration for local associations. This could include drafting a common reporting format, and it should be planned and funded jointly with CNS, the SCA/MMA and other interested donors;
- Creating a joint fund for the management of resources allocated to CNS by different donors, using the Alexander von Humboldt Centre of Nicaragua as a model. KEPA could facilitate a visit of 2-3 representatives of CNS to Nicaragua for this purpose already in 2003;

- Directing KEPA's support to a new state such as Amapá, as the Finland/UNDP project is already covering much of the needs in Pará and operational strengthening is needed in other regions. Some parts of Marajó, where CNS activities were recently started with KEPA support, can actually be better covered from Amapá;
- Continuing support to the CNS Women's Secretariat, with emphasis on strengthening the secretariat in presently weakly covered states, continuation of the documentation campaign and reinforcing of training activities;
- Creating a flexible mechanism for supporting small-scale projects implemented by associations in different states of the Amazon, using the existing experiences in Brazil and those of KEPA's southern partners as a basis;
- Support to the process of certification of timber and non-timber forest products by extractivist communities. This could be done in collaboration with CNS offices in Acre and Rondônia, WWF-Brazil and WWF-Finland, and it could include a component of South-South collaboration for example with Mozambique, where the certification process is at an initial stage and needs technical support;
- Placing a KEPA liaison/information officer in Brazil to support Finnish NGO activities in the Amazon. The officer could be placed in Manaus where CNS is planning to establish a new office. However, while the officer could share office premises with CNS his/her mandate would be to cover a broader field of civil society organisations in the Amazon region (and Brazil) following the model of KEPA in Thailand and Indonesia;
- A liaison officer can be justified only if KEPA's member NGOs show increased interest for strengthening their activities in Brazil in various sectors such as social and environmental. Some organisations such as SASK have indicated such interest, but it is important for all those interested to take initiative already during the planning period in 2003, and to participate actively in the planning of the possible new phase of collaboration with CNS and other Brazilian NGOs. For this purpose CNS has proposed to arrange a visit for interested representatives of KEPA's member organisations to Brazil already in 2003;
- Various project ideas for collaboration with KEPA's member organizations have already come up. For example production of teaching material about environmental issues for schools in both Brazil and Finland based on CNS's experience in the Amazon was mentioned. There is also room for activities in such new areas as mixed research collaboration in the Amazon between NGOs and academic institutions. KEPA should take an active role in circulating such ideas among its member organizations and facilitate contacts between its member organizations and Brazilian partners;
- KEPA could enter into cooperation with new NGO partners in Brazil, for example those supporting the struggle of indigenous groups for rights in land and natural resources. Possible organizations include COIAB and ISA, among others;
- Re-activating information and campaign work about the Amazon in Europe, and especially amongst KEPA's member organizations in Finland;
- KEPA could re-open the dialogue with CNS on global themes – different views on climate change should not preclude debate, and there are various other relevant global issues such as the role of market-based mechanisms in environmental

conservation, or discussions related to the Social Forum. In the latter KEPA's links to Indian NGOs could provide interesting new insights;

- There is much potential for increasing exchange of experiences between CNS and KEPA's other southern partners in Nicaragua, Indonesia and Thailand. KEPA should take an active role in facilitating this type of South-South networking;
- KEPA should broaden and strengthen its institutional contact surface with CNS. This requires, among other things, systematic development of language skills in Portuguese.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Introduction

CNS and KEP A started their co-operation in the year 1996 in connection of a European tour "Justice to the Peoples of Amazonia". Representatives of CNS visited Finland and met some prominent organisations and individuals, as well as participated some Markets of Opportunities organised by KEP A and its members. Since then, KEP A has supported the activities of the CNS through two 3-year co-operation agreements, 1997-1999 and 2000-2002. This evaluation will analyse the gains and pitfalls of this co-operation. However, the focus is the future: the gained experience serves as the base for defining the forms of co-operation between the two organisations in the changed working environment.

2. Background

2.1 Partners in co-operation

KEP A (The Service Centre for Development Co-operation) is the umbrella organisation of Finnish non-governmental organisations working in the field of development co-operation or otherwise concerned with issues to do with developing countries and globalisation. It is ideologically and politically non-aligned and non-denominational.

When KEP A was founded in 1985, there were 56 participating organisations. Today the total has grown to near 220. All affiliated organisations do their own work independently, but under the umbrella of KEP A, they can unite their forces.

The basic values underpinning our work are sustainable development, environmental protection, justice, tolerance, equality, and desire for peace, human rights and democracy.

CNS (Conselho Nacional dos Seringueiros) is a non-governmental organisation founded in 1985 to represent rubber tappers' and similar communities, who inhabit the Amazon forest, and to develop and implement "extractive reserves", forest reserves to be managed by traditional forest communities.

2.2 Activities in co-operation

Information sharing, defining and attaining common political goals, and networking internationally were in the beginning the methods of the co-operation. The improvement of the living conditions of the inhabitants of Amazonia was the practical goal. During the years of co-operation between the CNS and the KEP A, some elements in the working environment have changed, some even through active participation of partners. The present political situation in Brazil and increased bi-lateral co-operation from Finland are some of these changes.

2.2.2. Forms of co-operation

The beginning of co-operation included posting of a liaison officer and institutional support to CNS, the focal area being the state of Par. The goal of this co-operation was to improve the capacities of the CNS, as well as increase links between the Finnish NGOs in the area and

information flow and awareness of the issues of Amazonia in Finland. Later co-operation has built mainly on institutional support, training and improvement of office facilities.

In 1999, a new element was integrated in the co-operation: The gender equity and increasing the participation of women in the activities of the CNS. The Women Secretariat of the CNS was the channel of this support.

2.2.3. Level of support

The changes in the original concept of co-operation have their reflection also in the financial status. The personnel costs had in the first years an important share, as did the costs of other activities. The institutional support reached its present level in 2001.

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	Total
Amazonas c.	12.700							12 700
Inst. support		83 611	87 316	95 301	87 680	100 913	100 904	555 725
Personnel		24 965	54 505	6 610				86 080
Others		11 214	12 922	2 377				26 513
Total	12 700	119 790	154 743	104 288	87 680	100 913	100 904	681 018

2.3 KEPA strategy

KEPA formed a new strategy during 1999, which was approved in April 2000. According to that strategy KEPA has three main visions: a) to serve as a North-South resource centre for non-governmental organisations, b) to be a strong opinion leader in Finland, and c) to serve as an interest group and co-operation organisation for its member organisations.

Presently, KEPA carries out a project to develop its programme policy towards a more coherent entity.

3. Organisation of the evaluation

The Resource Team of KEPA is the responsible unit to organise this evaluation. A consultant will be recruited to carry out the task.

3.1 Issues to be studied

The evaluation should answer to questions on the benefits and shortcomings to both partner organisations. Thus, the main questions are:

- How has the co-operation reached the agreed goals (cf. Partnership Agreement)
- What has been the role of KEPA's support in the activities of CNS, both in terms of finances and activities in general?
- How has this co-operation contributed to the Brazilian civil society at large and that in Par especially?
- How has the programme strengthened the development of democracy, civil society and local communities in the Amazonia?
- How have the partner organisations taken advantage of the experiences of each other and how is this experience shared among the members?
- How have the partners designed the programme to be effective?
- How have the partners taken into account the changes in the working environment of their co-operation, i.e. the bilateral programme between Finland and Brazil and changes in the political climate in Brazil?

- The information flow between organisations and its visibility in reports, other publications and activities like in advocacy and lobby may be studied.
- The reporting practices and their relevance should be evaluated.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

Based on the findings and analysis the evaluator will draw conclusions of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the actions under evaluation. These should include e.g.:

- the major achievements of the co-operation, its strengths and weaknesses
- the main reasons for successes and failures seen by the stakeholders
- an analysis of KEPA's relevancy in financing the CNS
- the possible forms of co-operation in the future, taking into account the political and other changes in the working environment

On these, the evaluator should make his/her recommendations on different options regarding KEPAs and CNS's future co-operation within this sector and their foreseen implications.

The partner organisations should then discuss any policy, organisational and operational lessons that can be drawn from this evaluation in order to use this information in overall planning process of the CNS and KEPA.

5. Required expertise

The evaluator should possess knowledge in social inquiry and reporting. He/She should have knowledge in Portuguese and preferably also in Finnish language and familiarity with Brazilian society and especially civil society.

6. Methodology and work plan

The evaluator will present a work plan with a schedule and a tentative budget. The following elements will be included in this work plan:

- a briefing at the KEPA Helsinki office in March
- a desk study phase with documented material on the co-operation, in March-April
- interviews with some present and previous Board Members and Brazil desk officers of KEPA, in March-April
- a field study phase including interviews with CNS's executive, personnel and some activists, visits in the HQ in Brazil, womens' secretariat in So Miguel, and offices in Maraba and Santrarem, in April- May
- presentation of the first draft with main findings by the end of May
- preparation of the evaluation report by mid-June 2003.

7. Administration

In practical issues, the contact persons in Helsinki will be programme adviser Mr Matti Lahtinen of KEPA's Resource Team and programme officer Ms Anne Romar of KEPA's South Team. In Brazil, the contact person in the CNS is the International Secretary, Sr. Juan Carlos Carrasco Rueda

ANNEX 2. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Avonius, Leena, 2002, An evaluation of Kefa/Insist cooperation 1997-2002. KEPA fact finding report.
- Conselho Nacional dos Seringueiros (CNS), 1997-2003, Annual (1999, 2002) and bi-annual (1997-1998, 2000-2001) activity reports for KEPA.
- Conselho Nacional dos Seringueiros (CNS), Secretaria da Mulher Trabalhadora Rural Extrativista, 1999, Ações de gênero na Amazônia Brasileira: Apoio a secretaria da mulher trabalhadora rural extrativista. Identificação do Projeto.
- Hurrell, Andrew, 1992, Brazil and the international politics of Amazonian deforestation, pp. 398-429 in Hurrell, A. and Kingsbury, A. (eds) The international politics of the environment: Actors, interests and institutions. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskus ry (KEPA) - Conselho Nacional dos Seringueiros (CNS), 1996, Social organization, environmental protection and human rights in the Brazilian Amazon. Project Document.
- Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskus ry (KEPA) - Conselho Nacional dos Seringueiros (CNS), 1997, O termo de cooperação 1997-1999.
- Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskus ry (KEPA) - Conselho Nacional dos Seringueiros (CNS), 2000, Yhteistyösopimus 2000-2002.
- Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskus ry (KEPA), 1997, Toimintasuunnitelma vuodelle 1997.
- Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskus ry (KEPA), 2001, Toimintasuunnitelma vuosille 2002-2004.
- Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskus ry (KEPA), 2003, Toimintakertomus vuodelta 2002.
- Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskus ry (KEPA), 2003, Kepan kevätkokous 29.4.2003: Ohjelmapolitiikka-aineisto.
- Mallea, Sirpa - Kämppe, Riikka, 1999, Memorandum of the meeting between CNS and KEPA, Santarém and Rio Tapajós, 8-11.4.1999.
- Mallea, Sirpa - Kämppe, Riikka, 1999, Arviointi KEPAn ja Brazilian kuminkeraajaliiton CNS:n välisestä yhteistyöstä 1997-99.
- Ministério do Meio Ambiente (MMA), 2002, Amazônia: Reservas extrativistas. Ibama: Brasília.
- Ministério do Meio Ambiente (MMA), 2000, Programa Nacional de Florestas, PNF. PNF: Brasília.
- Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA), 2000, Guidelines for programme design, monitoring and evaluation. MFA: Helsinki.
- Mustavuori, Jaana-Mirjam, 2001, Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskus: Ympäristöpoliittinen selvitys.
- Rönkkö, Mika, 2002, Internal review of PER and Kefa partnership.
- Sangkoyo, Hendro, 2002, In good company: Insist-Kepa collaboration 1999-2002. A reflection from the Indonesian end.
- Sawyer, Donald, 2001, Evolução demográfica, qualidade de vida e desmatamento na Amazônia, pp. 73-90, in Causas e dinamica do desmatamento na Amazônia. MMA: Brasília.
- Tapaninen, Sirpa, 2000, Internal review of KEPA's liaison services in Tanzania. Kepan raporttisarja 37/2000.
- Ulkoministeriö (MFA), 2003, Kansalaisjärjestöhankkeet 2002. MFA: Helsinki.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2001, Human development report 2000. UNDP: New York.

ANNEX 3. PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Aguilar, Carla Verónica Carrasco, Brasília, DF, Biologist, CNS
Aguilar, Pablo Leonardo Carrasco, Brasília, DF, Executive Secretary of CNS
Ahteela, Reijo, Parikkala, Director of church recreation centre, Previously KEPA liaison officer in Brazil
Belo, Joaquim Correia de Souza, Brasília, DF, Chairman of CNS
Rueda, Juan Carlos Carrasco, Brasília, DF/Santarém, PA, CNS Adviser for International Relations, Previously Executive Secretary of CNS
Carvalho Rosas, Maria de (Mariquinha), Marabá, PA, Regional coordinator of CNS in Marabá, Coordinator of the CNS Women's Secretariat in Pará
Cunha, Janaina Albuquerque de Lima, Marabá, PA, SDDH human rights lawyer
Espírito Santo da Silva, Maria do, Nova Ipixuna, PA, Chairwoman of APAEP - Nova Ipixuna
Farias, Rosária Sena Cardoso, Santarém, PA, Chief of CNPT/IBAMA - Santarém
Fonseca, Francisco, Belem, PA, Coordinator of PPG7/SPRN in Pará
Freixinho, Francisco, Santarém, PA, IBAMA technical officer
Gomes da Silva, Raimunda, São Miguel, TO, Coordinator of CNS Women's Secretariat
Isomäki, Risto, Helsinki, activist of Ympäristö ja Kehitys ry., Previously vice chairman of KEPA board
Kyllönen, Simo, Helsinki, Researcher, University of Helsinki, activist of Dodo ry.
Kämpfi, Riikka, Helsinki, Coordinator, Ylenhyva, Previously director of KEPA Policy and NGO Services Unit
Lahtinen, Matti, Helsinki, Programme adviser, KEPA's Resource Team
Lameiras, Valdenira, Brasília, DF, Support to Agroextractivism in Amazônia Project, SCA/MMA
Lange, Ana, Brasília, DF, Coordinator of Agroextractivism, SCA/MMA
Leal, Carlos Chagastelis, Brasília, DF, Technical Adviser of CNS
Lima, Erismar Sousa, Buriti, TO, Municipal Councillor
Luukkanen, Ville, Helsinki, KEPA Programs Director
Mallea, Sirpa, Helsinki, Consultant, Mundo Development Services, Previously director of KEPA Development Cooperation Unit
Matos, Atanagildo de Deus (Gatão), Brasília, DF, Chief of CNPT/IBAMA, Previously Chairman of CNS
Mustonen, Eija, Helsinki, Project adviser, KEPA's Resource Team
Oliveira, Antonio de, Santarem, PA, Administrator for PRODEX, Previously treasurer of STR/Santarem
Oliveira, Nazareno José de, Santarem, PA, Coordinator of CNS - Santarem
Oliveira, Natalina de Carmo, Santarem, PA, Coordinator of the women's unit of the Women's Secretariat of CNS, Santarem
Pastana de Oliveira, Geraldo Irineu, Santarém, PA, Director of IBAMA - Santarém
Pääkkönen, Jukka, Helsinki, Project coordinator, SASK ry, member of KEPA board
Ribeiro da Silva, José Claudio, Marabá, PA, Monitor of the CNS Marabá office
Rodrigues, Emilia Alves da Silva, São Miguel, TO, Chairwoman of Women's Association
Romar, Anne, Helsinki, Programme officer, KEPA's South Team

Rönkkö, Mika, Alter do Chão, PA, Finland/UNDP Project Coordinator, PUXIRUM.
Previously KEPA Programme officer

Santilli, Márcio, Brasília, DF, Coordinator, Instituto Socioambiental

Santos, José Juarez Leitão dos, Brasília, DF, MP for Acre, Previously Chairman of CNS

Sardar, Ari, Helsinki, NGO activist

Sarmiento da Silva, Livaldo, Santarém, PA, Municipal Councillor

Silva, Fátima Cristina da, Belem, PA, Technical Adviser of CNS

Sundman, Folke, Helsinki, KEPA Executive Director

Uusi-Videnoja, Hannu, Brasília, DF, Ambassador of Finland in Brazil

Vianna, Aurélio Jr., Brasília, DF, Director of PPG7 and ARPA

Vieira, Francisca Pereira, Buriti, TO, Chairwoman of the CNS Women's Association of Buriti

Zimmerman, Jorg, Brasília, DF, Coordinator, PPG7/PDA (Demonstrative projects sub-program)