COOPERATIVE EVALUATION OF WOODS HOLE RESEARCH CENTER ACTIVITIES UNDER THE USAID/BRAZIL GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE PROGRAM

Donald Sawyer
Consultant

Instituto Sociedade, População e Natureza - ISPN
CLN 202, Bloco B, Salas 101-106
70832-525 Brasília - DF, Brazil
Tel. 55-61-321-8085
Fax 55-61-321-6333
e-mail: ispn@brnet.com.br

Consultancy report for the
United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
for Part A of Purchase Order 512-0784-0-00-5924-01

August 7, 1997

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

1 Introduction

1.1 USAID Global Climate Change Program

1.2 WHRC activities within the USAID/GCC Program

2 Methodology

3 Findings and Recommendations

3.1 Findings

3.2 Recommendations

4 Conclusions and Lessons Learned

Annexes

1 Statement of Work

2 Individuals Consulted during the Evaluation

filename: aidwhrc

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AMA	Apoio a Monitoramento e Análise (Support for Monitoring and Analysis)
APA	Área de Proteção Ambiental (Environmental Protection Area)
ASPTA	Assessoria e Serviços a Projetos em Agricultura Alternativa (Advice and Services for Projects in Alternative Agriculture)
BDFFP	Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project
CI	Conservation International
CNPT	Centro Nacional de Desenvolvimento Sustentado das Populações Tradicionais (National Center for Sustainable Development of Traditional Populations)
CNS	Conselho Nacional dos Seringueiros (National Rubber Tappers' Council)
CPATU	Centro de Pesquisa Agroflorestal da Amazônia Oriental, ex-Centro de Pesquisa Agropecuária do Trópico Úmido (Eastern Amazon Agroforestry Research Center, former Humid Tropics Agricultural Research Center)
CTA	Centro de Trabalhadores da Amazônia (Amazon Workers' Center)
ELI	Environmental Law Institute
EMBRAPA	Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária (Brazilian Corporation for Agricultural Research)
EU	European Union
FASE	Federação de Órgãos para Assistência Social e Educacional (Federation of Organizations for Social and Educational Assistance)
FIOCRUZ	Fundação Oswaldo Cruz (Oswaldo Cruz Foundation)
FUNATURA	Fundação Pró-Natureza (Pro-Nature Foundation)
FVA	Fundação Vitória Amazônica (Amazonian Victory Foundation)
GCC	Global Climate Change
GTA	Grupo de Trabalho Amazônico (Amazon Working Group)
IBAMA	Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis (Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources)
IBGE	Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics)
IDB	Interamerican Development Bank
IMAFLORA	Instituto de Manejo em Certificação Florestal e Agrícola (Institute of Management of Forest and Agricultural Certification)
IMAZON	Instituto do Homem e Meio Ambiente da Amazônia (Institute of Man and Environment in the Amazon)
INPA	Instituto Nacional de Pesquisa da Amazônia (National Institute of Amazon Research)
IPAM	Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia (Institute of Amazon Environmental Research)
IPHAE	Instituto de Pré-História, Arqueologia e Ecologia (Institute of Pre-History, Archaeology and Ecology)
ISA	Instituto Socioambiental (Socioenvironmental Institute)

ISPN	Instituto Sociedade, População e Natureza (Institute for Society, Population and Nature)
MMA	Ministério do Meio Ambiente, dos Recursos Hídricos e da Amazônia Legal (Ministry of Environment, Water Resources and the Legal Amazon)
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPEG	Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi (Emílio Goeldi Museum of Pará)
NAEA	Núcleo de Altos Estudos Amazônicos (Center for Advanced Amazon Studies)
NGO	non-governmental organization
ODA	Overseas Development Administration
PID	Programa Integral de Desenvolvimento (Integrated Development Program)
PMFS	Plano de Manejo Florestal Sustentável (Sustainable Forestry Management Plan)
PNMA	Programa Nacional de Meio Ambiente (National Environment Program)
PPG-7	Pilot Program to Conserve the Brazilian Rain Forest
REBRAF	Rede Brasileira Agroflorestal (Brazilian Agroforestry Network)
RPPN	Reserva Particular do Patrimônio Natural (Private Reserve of Natural Patrimony)
SAE	Secretaria de Assuntos Estratégicos (Secretariat of Strategic Affairs)
SNUC	Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação (National System of Conservation Units)
TFF	Tropical Forest Foundation
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
UFMG	Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (Federal University of Minas Gerais)
UFPR	Universidade Federal do Paraná (Federal University of Paraná)
UFRJ	Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro)
UnB	Universidade de Brasília (University of Brasília)
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USP	Universidade de São Paulo (University of São Paulo)
WHRC	Woods Hole Research Center
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

1 INTRODUCTION

This report was prepared for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in compliance with Part A of Purchase Order 512-0784-0-00-5924-01. The Statement of Work is in Annex 1.

1.1 USAID Global Climate Change Program

In 1990 the U.S. Congress authorized the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to implement a program to address important global climate change issues in "key" countries, including Brazil. In response to the Congressional mandate and to the Brazilian Government's interest in addressing the issues, USAID launched a Global Climate Change Program (GCC) in Brazil. The primary goal of the program was to reduce Brazil's contribution to global emissions of greenhouse gases by abating deforestation in Brazil's Amazonian states. Toward this end, the GCC program promoted the development of ecologically and economically sustainable policies and activities to manage forest resources in the region.

The GCC Program included activities in three main areas: 1) applied research on and practical demonstrations of ecologically and economically sustainable forest management and conservation practices; 2) human resources training and institutional strengthening; and 3) policy analyses and environmental impact assessments.

Recently, the GCC Program was expanded to include biodiversity conservation issues. The proposed new activities build on the success of the existing GCC Program by including new partnerships in the most highly threatened ecosystems of Brazil, the Atlantic Forest and the Cerrado.

1.2 WHRC Activities within the USAID/GCC Program

The Woods Hole Research Center has received an allocation of US$1,322,581 in order to develop natural resource management tools for an emerging network of forest-margin farm communities and to expand and strengthen a network of Amazonia-based scientists trained in ecology and interested in intervening in public affairs.

The activities have been carried out primarily in the states of Pará and Acre through research-based workshops, courses and publications, through formal university training and through participation in current regional debates regarding the utilization of Amazonian natural resources.

The activities include agricultural intensification and land-use planning along the Capim River, predicting forest fire risk, preventing accidental forest fires, steps toward a functioning extractive reserve, a resource inventory of the Rio Gelado Settlement Project, improving the planning of industrial mining in Pará and training in forest utilization, forest recovery and biotic impoverishment.

2 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was conducted in the context of WHRC's contribution to AID/Brazil's strategic objective of "environmentally and socioeconomically sustainable alternatives for sound land use adopted beyond target areas". The overall objectives of the evaluation were:

- assess the continuing validity and relevance of project components.
- assess the effect of external and unanticipated actions and/or events on project effort.
- review and analyze progress to date in execution of WHRC's activities as specified in the grant documents.
- evaluate whether performance to date is consistent with expectation and if changes are needed to sustain the positive effects.
- review and analyze current project indicators and log-frames.

Evaluation of the WHRC activities involved site visits in Pará and Acre. The various evaluation activities are summarized below.

During a trip to Massachusetts, Donald Sawyer visited the team of Brazilian researchers working at headquarters of the WHRC in Woods Hole in September of 1996. He met with Paulo Moutinho, Cláudia Azevedo Ramos, Cássio Pereira, Osvaldo Carvalho and Ana Cristina Fonteles, who are involved in training and research at the main offices in Woods Hole.

Subsequently, Donald Sawyer traveled with Eric Stoner to Belém between October 14 and October 16, 1996, specifically to visit the main WHRC site in Brazil. The evaluation team began its work in Belém with a visit to the offices of the WHRC and its Brazilian affiliate Instituto de Pesquisas Ambientais da Amazônia (IPAM) at the Center for Advanced Amazon Studies (NAEA), which is part of the Federal University of Pará (UFPa). On October 14, the team met with José Heder Benatti, the Executive Director of IPAM, as well as Daniel Nepstad and David McGrath.

On October 15, the meetings were held at the WHRC offices at the Centro de Pesquisa Agroflorestal da Amazônia Oriental (CPATU). In the morning, there were presentations and discussion of projects in the Forest Ecology program, which is coordinated by Daniel Nepstad. The presentations were made by José Henrique Cattânio, on gases, Suzana Kettelhut and Kemel Kalif, on saúva ants, and Moira Adams, on bats and colonization of secondary forest. A visit was also paid to the specialized laboratory where Louis V. Verchot, a visiting scientist, is working on biogeochemistry of greenhouse gases as part of the Forest Ecology program.

In the afternoon, the focus was on the Forests and Communities Program, led by David McGrath. The presentations were made by Rosana, on intensification of agriculture

in areas of secondary growth, Everaldo, on subsistence plots, Westphalen, on rural extension, Lêda Luz, on the Rio Gelado project, and Marli Mattos, on fire control and the kaolin project.

On the morning of October 16, the team visited the Coordination of NAEA and spoke with Teresa Ximenes, Vice Coordinator, who discussed the insertion of WHRC/IPAM in the university and the institutional relations between ecology and social science. In the afternoon, the team interviewed Jorge Alberto Gazel Yared, the Adjunct Chief of Research and Development of the Centro de Pesquisa Agroflorestal da Amazônia Oriental (CPATU). Later, there was time to attend part of the Seminar on Açai at the Emílio Goeldi Museum of Pará (MPEG).

The WHRC team has produced numerous publications, many of which were collected in Belém and examined in Brasília. Others were collected in Brasília. The publications provided more complete understanding of the research and its possible implications. Other documents examined in Brasília included project files and trip reports.

Donald Sawyer visited Tucuruí, a base for the Rio Gelado project of WHRC, in November, 1996, and March, 1997, at which time he was able to become more familiar with the area of new settlement west of Tucuruí into which WHRC is now moving. He discussed the Rio Gelado project with Jéferson Barata Maciel Ferreira of the Programa Integral de Desenvolvimento (PID), who worked with WHRC in Paragominas, where he had visited previously, and with Raimundo Nonato Carmo Silva, also of PID.

During his trip to Acre in January of 1997, Donald Sawyer visited the WHRC/IPAM project there. The first meeting was in Rio Branco on January 21 with Foster Brown, Carlos Valério Aguiar Gomes, Andréa Silva Alechandre, Hiromi Sassagawa, Maria Araújo (CNS) and Anatália Antonieta dos Santos (CNS). The latter two participants traveled with Donald Sawyer and Marco van der Ree (ISPN researcher) to Xapuri and Brasiléia, respectively. In Brasiléia, the Colocação Porongaba site was visited. A second meeting in Rio Branco was held at the Parque Zoobotânico at the Federal University of Acre on January 25, with the above-mentioned researchers, except for the two from CNS.

In Brasília, contacts were maintained with Carlos Klink, Vice-President of IPAM, and Adriana Gonçalves Moreira, who now works with WHRC/IPAM in the national capital, especially on the ecology of the Cerrado. Júlio César Roma, an ornithologist who worked with Ima Vieira on the WHRC project in Peixe-Boi, Pará, at the site which Donald Sawyer visited following the GCC meeting in Belém in January of 1994, was interviewed in Brasília in May of 1997, at which time the respective theses were examined. Júlio Roma's thesis won a prize from the Nature and Society Program.

The consultant also maintained contacts with Carlos Aragón, of the Centro Nacional de Desenvolvimento Sustentado das Populações Tradicionais (CNPT), the Remote Sensing Laboratory at IBAMA and Wim Groeneveld of IPHAE, among numerous other institutions and individuals who interact with WHRC and IPAM.

3 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Findings

The evaluation indicates that the project components continue to be valid and relevant. The activities included in the log-frame were successfully completed or appropriate adjustments were made. The exercise also led to the following specific findings with regard to the three main areas considered in the evaluation:

3.1.1 Effective partnerships and capacity building

Local partnerships. Partnerships by means of covenants (convênios) with federal government institutions including the Brazilian Corporation for Agricultural Research (EMBRAPA) and the Federal University of Pará (UFPa), in Belém, the Federal University of Acre (UFAc), in Rio Branco, and the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), in Brasília, provide for numerous advantages for the GCC Program including scientific exchange, multiplication of research results, official backing and lower infrastructure costs. The scientists bring expertise, research experience and credentials to the host institutions. They have helped bring an ecological perspective to EMBRAPA, which is generally more concerned with productivity, and to UFPa, traditionally more concerned with regional development. By providing the extra funds for travel, equipment, field work and farm trials, the project potentializes fixed government investments in personnel and infrastructure. Inevitably, the NGO-government and US-Brazilian relationships involve occasional tension on policy and administrative issues. For example, CPATU management feels that WHRC's presence is based to a large extent on personal friendships and that the project has become isolated within the host institution. However, such problems, while deserving attention, are minor as compared to the mutual advantages and as initial suspicion of foreign NGOs is overcome due to growing familiarity.

Co-financing. WHRC has been very pro-active in seeking other sources of funds. Problems with discontinuity of funding and losses in real value of dollar grants due to rising local costs and unfavorable exchange rate fluctuations made it necessary to seek co-financing from sources such as the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the Ford and MacArthur foundations and the Overseas Development Administration (ODA). Within Brazil, funding has been obtained from the National Environmental Fund (FNMA) and the National Research Council (CNPq).

Brazilian NGO. The Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia (IPAM) was established in May of 1995 as a local WHRC partner in order to operate in Brazil in full compliance with Brazilian law, free of the unworkable bureaucratic restrictions which hinder better performance of government agencies. IPAM contributes significantly to greater local legitimacy and improved sustainability of WHRC efforts and to USAID efforts in general. Full institutionalization of an NGO requires considerable effort, and IPAM has made good progress. In the future, there may be some parent-child tensions between WHRC and IPAM.

Integration into universities. The move into the university setting at UFPa is promising in that it may be more conducive to environmentally and socially oriented research and action than was the case when WHRC was housed exclusively at EMBRAPA. It also provides a strategic opportunity for multiplication through teaching classes, advising student theses and participating in (perhaps "greening") the administration of the graduate training program at the Center for Advanced Amazon Studies (NAEA), which has 60 students and now includes a doctoral program in sustainable development. These graduate-level university activities in turn have an impact on multiple cohorts of undergraduate students in various programs in the interior of Pará (9 UFPa campi), all over the Brazilian Amazon and even in other Amazonian countries (through UNAMAZ). The administration of NAEA at UFPa expects that WHRC participation will contribute to interdisciplinarity in general, to stronger links between theory and practice and to greater integration between the natural and social sciences. It has learned that human ecology is "nothing to be afraid of". In Rio Branco, the pioneering WHRC activities at UFAc emphasize scientific rigor and field work. In addition to students and faculty, the university centers at which WHRC works provide orientation for social movements, labor unions, government agencies and local mayors who are seeking advice on issues of sustainable development. In sum, the university setting provides a strategic insertion of the utmost importance.

3.1.2 Institutional capacity and participation of government and civil society

Combination of research and action. WHRC provides a unique combination of work of highly qualified scientists with community-level advocacy and support of social/environmental movements. The best examples are the work at the Rio Capim, the Rio Gelado and the Chico Mendes Extractive Reserve. The most dramatic action involved the public hearings about the environmental impact of the kaolin mine on the Capim.

Training. WHRC contributes indirectly to institutional strengthening through training of individuals who later influence their institutions, most of which are governmental (universities, research institutes, ministries, state secretariats, etc.). It involves numerous student research assistants, many of which are supported by CNPq, in hands-on field research of high quality and in preparation of scientific publications. They also participate in project design through logical framework exercises. The project also provides opportunities for training in the United States, at WHRC and in synergy with the SUNY training program. In addition to scientific training in ecology, especially in the ecosystems approach, this exchange also provides vital skills in computing, English and proposal writing. It is important to point out that a significant proportion of the trainees are from the Amazon region, which contributes to strengthening of local scientific capacity.

Government participation. Interaction between WHRC and government at various levels has been limited but is growing rapidly. An important step was taken in involving public attorneys (*Ministério Público*) in the kaolin mine campaign. There is practically unlimited potential for interaction with government because of the need for technical expertise of the kind which WHRC can offer. The clearest example is the Pilot Program to Conserve the Brazilian Rain Forest (PPG-7), for which IPAM staff members have carried out a commissioned study on burning in the region, as well as helping design the

projects on land degradation/fire control and on monitoring and analysis (AMA).

Participation of civil society. WHRC is outstanding for having built close ties with key segments of civil society. The most noteworthy is with rural labor unions in Paragominas and recently in the Rio Gelado area. Such ties led to pathbreaking public hearings in the case of the environmental impact of the Capim River kaolin mine. In IPAM, through the Executive Director, the group has formed ties with the human rights movement. So far, it has been successful in managing the potential conflict between scientific research and political involvement.

3.1.3 Impact and presence

Wide geographical scope. WHRC has wide regional reach within the Amazon through its on-going activities in Belém, Paragominas, Peixe-Boi, Santarém and Rio Gelado in Pará as well as its base in Acre. Its has marked occasional presence in other places such as Amapá, Manaus and the Rio Negro as well as having a base in Brasília. It also does general studies on the region as a whole.

Pathbreaking research. WHRC has carried out highly original and important research on subjects such as deep roots, water balance, forest fires and greenhouse gases. It is noteworthy for its high-quality publications. It might also be pointed out that the WHRC team wrote three of the five chapters of the LBA project, a major new scientific initiative to study interactions between the biosphere and the atmosphere in the Amazon.

Conservation and development. WHRC has played an important role in linking conservation to development rather than dealing with conservation units or biology in isolation from the economic and social context. It is particularly noteworthy for its work with small farmers, both in agriculture and extraction. Intentionally, no work was done on agroforestry systems, seen as too far removed from community context and farming systems. This is an area in which CPATU expressed interest in collaboration.

Dissemination. The WHRC team publishes articles in important scientific journals and in more popular journals such as **Ciência Hoje**. At the same time, it publishes pamphlets for use at the community level, such as the fire guidelines, a manual on how to calculate wood volumes of standing trees and illustrated instructions for use of medicinal plants by illiterates. At the scientific level, it participates in scientific meetings, university teaching and thesis advising and involves dozens of student trainees. On the other hand, relatively little use has been made of more wide-reaching dissemination channels such as print or electronic mass media.

Links to government programs. The study on fire done for the PPG-7, which also led to an invitation from the Secretariat of the Amazon (SCA) in the Ministry of Environment (MMA) to continue the work, is a perfect example of impact far beyond target areas, reaching the Amazon region as a whole.

Links to civil society. Among other initiatives, the establishment of IPAM, work with rural labor unions and connection with the local human rights movement, as

mentioned above, were important steps in the direction of strengthening links with civil society.

3.2 Recommendations

The evaluation exercise led to the following specific recommendations:

Strategy. The project should avoid opening too many fronts to handle, involving too many people at great distances, with difficulties in communication, and think strategically about how to achieve the broadest impact with limited resources. The temptation to disperse, while necessary for broad impact, should be held in check. To the extent possible, the project should concentrate on its specific contributions in terms of the science/community link. It would be best to avoid taking on public sector functions as might occur in the case of training, in which it would be appropriate to limit the project's role to hands-on experience in projects that address key questions.

Institutionalization. The project should continue consolidation of IPAM and make further progress in terms of formalizing institutional relationships among WHRC, IPAM and the various host institutions, which are governmental and must obey certain official procedures. While formalization has costs and risks, informal arrangements involve vulnerability. In order to improve compatibility with the host institutions, the project should make efforts to present proposals, participate in or influence the planning of the host institutions, in particular CPATU, which has difficulty dealing with activities which are not part of its formal plannnig.

Civil society. WHRC and IPAM should strengthen and amplify existing links with civil society, in particular with small farmers and the rural poor, through participation in networks and working groups, not just direct work with single communities or individual organizations. This will enhance its important role in informing the social-environmental movement in the Amazon region about the scientific aspects of sustainable development in the Amazon. Such information is essential as the movements pass from a stage of denouncing governmental and business initiatives to one of constructive participation with concrete proposals about what should be done.

Messages. So far, there are too many questions and too few answers to provide to the clientele that could use them in numerous settings around the Amazon region. In addition to promoting sound research in the field and laboratory, it would be useful for the project to strive to develop clear and practical messages regarding environmentally and socioeconomically sustainable alternatives for sound land use. There is a strong demand for solutions.

Wider dissemination. WHRC could seek to make better use of a level of dissemination that lies between elite (scientific publications) and community levels (direct interaction, materials developed with community participation but restricted to that community). Such a level involves using institutional channels and existing media. The

project should seek to reach a broader audience of potential users of research results, using, for example, EMBRAPA diffusion mechanisms.

4 CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

In concluding this analysis it is useful to return to the questions and measures of success identified in the scope of work for this evaluation. For the WHRC component of the GCC Program to be successful it must accomplish the following:

- create effective partnerships in Brazil, that build capacity and expertise for resolving Brazilian environmental problems:
- contribute to increase local institutional capacity and participation of governmental bodies and the civil society;
- make more effective use of the existing mechanisms to increase impact and presence in Brazil.

In the case of the WHRC project, the three points are closely interrelated. With regard to partnerships, considerable progress has been made in the transition from being a highly independent unit responsible only to headquarters to organization of an institution with diverse local commitments. Reconciliation of the various vertical and horizontal partnerships will still take some work, but is imperative for achieving broader impact and sustainability.

More effective use of existing mechanisms involves increasing involvement with government agencies of various kinds. Even in the Amazon, the Brazilian government has financial, human and physical resources that are infinitely greater than those involved in international cooperation. The outside resources should be used to catalyze changes that influence more appropriate allocation of national resources.

More effective use of existing mechanisms should also involve non-governmental organizations or networks that operate above the community level. The community level may be necessary for developing new approaches, but it is not sufficient for achieving impact in a region the size of the Amazon.

Work with a variety of governmental and non-governmental organizations is time-consuming and therefore has direct and indirect costs, which need to be covered by the projects. Especially as the project moves from a more or less pilot phase to full operation, USAID should not hesitate to allow for such transaction costs.

The general lesson that can be drawn from WHRC experience is that science and community action can be combined. The challenge at this point is to achieve results that have broader impact beyond the immediate community or organization with which the scientists work.

ANNEX 1

STATEMENT OF WORK

The Statement of Work of Part A of Purchase Order 512-0784-0-00-5924-01 is as follows:

Activities to be Evaluated

The evaluations will focus on the activities of the following projects under the USAID Global Climate Change (GCC) Program in Brazil:

Woods Hole Research Center (WHRC)
Grant No. 512-0784-G-00-3007
Authorized and obligated on Sep 28, 1993
Project assistance completion date (PACD) - Sep 30, 1996
Funds obligated to date - US$ 722,581,00

Smithsonian Institution
Grant No. 512-0784-G-00-3008
Authorized and obligated on Sep 28, 1993
Project assistance completion date (PACD) - Sep 30, 1996
Funds obligated to date - US$215,172

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
PASA No. 512-0784-P-EP-1045-00/512-0784-P-EP-3006
Authorized and obligated on Aug 30, 1991
Project assistance completion date (PACD) - Sep 30, 1996
Funds obligated to date - US$122,000

Purpose of the Evaluations

The evaluations of the above institutions' activities, under GCC funding, are intended to be a collaborative participatory process involving staff, field personnel responsible for project implementation, AID/Brazil project officers and an external specialist, as members of the evaluation panel. These evaluations will be conducted as a component activity of the overall AID GCC Program performance evaluation. The actions should be evaluated in the context of their contribution to the AID/Brazil strategic objective of environmentally and socioeconomically sustainable alternatives for sound land use adopted beyond targeted areas.

The overall objectives of the evaluations can be summarized as follows:

1) Assess the continuing validity and relevance of project components, and suggest such modifications as may be required to increase the likelihood that the

efforts will achieve their objectives in a sustainable manner.

2) Assess the effects of external and unanticipated actions and/or events on project effort.

3) Review and analyze progress to date in execution of the institution's activities as specified in existing grants documents.

4) Evaluate whether performance to date is consistent with expectations and if changes are needed to sustain the positive effects of these efforts.

5) Review and analyze current project indicators and log-frames.

The following are some key questions to be answered by the evaluation team:

. Are the projects achieving satisfactory progress toward their stated objectives? What are the positive and negative effects resulting from the projects?

. Are the effects of the projects likely to become sustainable, will they continue after the end of the projects?

. Should the EPA and Smithsonian establish a full-time presence in Brazil? Should these institutions strive to strengthen the capacity of a sister institution (NGO) in Brazil?

. How is the technical assistance and training being utilized? What are the specific results in this area?

. What is the degree and effectiveness of the interaction of the institutions and local implementators?

. What are the results of the partnerships established in Brazil? How can these grantees become more relevant within the context of the GCC objectives?

. Are the projects cost-effective? Are there alternative approaches to accomplish the same objectives at lower costs?

. How effective is their collaboration with other CGG grantees and AID?

Each evaluation report should provide empirical answers to these questions, conclusions (interpretations and judgments) that are based on the findings, and recommendations based on an assessment of the results of the evaluation exercise. For projects which involve scientific research, the report should evaluate how relevant the research is to USAID’s development objectives and indicate how well this research is being tested in field/community situations. It also should identify what further research areas, if any, have become relevant as a result of the grantee’s work. The reports should provide the "lessons learned" that might emerge from the analysis.

Methods and Procedures

These evaluations are timed as mid-term evaluations, intending to provide guidance in how project implementation could be improved over the remaining life of the projects.

The evaluations will be conducted through field visits and interviews with all grantees' counterparts in Brazil. The evaluation team will have preparatory meetings in Brasília to review the available documentation and discuss procedures and organization.

Evaluation Team Composition

The core evaluation team will be composed of the grantees' coordinators, AID/Brazil Environmental Advisor and a consultant (external evaluator). Portuguese fluency is highly desirable for all members of the team.

The team will be led by the external evaluator, who will be responsible for compiling and synthesizing individual sections of the final evaluation reports. The entire team will participate in interviewing, debriefing, review of drafts and final discussion of the findings, conclusions and recommendations, so that the final product will be a consensus piece.

ANNEX 2

LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Eric Stoner
Adriana Gonçalves Moreira
Ana Cristina Fonteles
Anatália Antonieta dos Santos (CNS)
Andrea Silva Alechandre
Carlos Klink
Cássio Alves Pereira
Cláudia Azevedo Ramos
Daniel Curtis Nepstad
David “Toby” McGrath
Everaldo
I. Foster Brown
Hiromi Suzana Y. Sassagawa
José Heder Benatti
José Henrique Cattânio
Júlio César Roma
Kemel Kalif
Lêda Luz
Louis V. Verchot
Maria Araújo “Leide” de Aquino (CNS)
Marli Maria de Mattos
Moira Adams
Osvaldo de Carvalho Jr.
Paulo Moutinho
Reginaldo
Rosana
Suzana Kettelhut
Carlos Valério Aguiar Gomes
Westphalen ...
Carlos Aragón, CNPT
Jéferson Barata Maciel Ferreira, PID in Tucuruí
Jorge Alberto Gazel Yared, Adjunct Chief of Research and Development, CPATU
Raimundo Nonato Carmo Silva, PID in Tucuruí
Teresa Ximenes, Vice Coordinator of NAEA
Remote Sensing Center, IBAMA
Wim Groeneveld, IPHAE