

Environmental Sustainable Support to Civil Society in Asia, Africa and Latin America

**– Results and Effects of Sida's Framework Agreement with the
Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNC) 2005–2007**

**Hans Peter Dejgaard
Hans Hessel-Andersen
Maria del Socorro Peñaloza
Emelia Arthur
Sunitha Bisan**

Environmental Sustainable Support to Civil Society in Asia, Africa and Latin America

**– Results and Effects of Sida's Framework Agreement with the
Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNC) 2005–2007**

**Hans Peter Dejgaard
Hans Hessel-Andersen
Maria del Socorro Peñaloza
Emelia Arthur
Sunitha Bisan**

Sida Evaluation 2008:38

Sida

This report is part of *Sida Evaluations*, a series comprising evaluations of Swedish development assistance. Sida's other series concerned with evaluations, *Sida Studies in Evaluation*, concerns methodologically oriented studies commissioned by Sida. Both series are administered by the Department for Evaluation, an independent department reporting to Sida's Director General.

This publication can be downloaded/ordered from:
<http://www.sida.se/publications>

Authors: Hans Peter Dejgaard, Hans Hessel-Andersen, Maria del Socorro Peñaloza, Emelia Arthur, Sunitha Bisan.

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Evaluation 2008:38

Commissioned by Sida, Department for Democracy and Social Development

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Registration No.: 2008-000361

Date of Final Report: September 2008

Printed by Edita Communication, 2008

Art. no. Sida47017en

ISBN 978-91-586-8120-0

ISSN 1401—0402

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: sida@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms	5
Executive Summary	7
1. Introduction	14
1.1. Objective of the Evaluation.....	14
1.2. The Work of the Evaluation Team	14
1.3. The Evaluation's Methods and Approach.....	15
1.4. Collection and Validation of Information.....	15
1.5. Selection of Countries/Partners for Field Visits	16
1.6. Limitations of the Evaluation.....	17
1.7. Report Outline	17
1.8. Acknowledgements	17
2. SSNC Mandate and Strategies	18
2.1. Mandates and Constituency.....	18
2.2. The International Programme	18
2.3. SSNC's Policy Documents and Guidelines	20
2.4. SSNC Human Resources and Budget.....	20
3. Outcomes and Achievements in Eight Selected Countries	21
3.1. Summary of Visits to Peru and Ecuador.....	21
3.2. Summary of Visits to Five African Countries	25
3.3. Summary of Visits to Thailand and Malaysia	30
4. SSNC Working with Partners in the South	33
4.1. Relevance of SSNC Programme.....	33
4.2. Partner Selection, Partnerships and Civil Society	34
4.3. Linkage Between Poverty and Environment	37
4.4. Advocacy and Role of SSNC Partners within Civil Society	38
4.5. Capacity Building and Advisory Services.....	40
4.6. Cross-cutting Issues: Gender, HIV/AIDS and Indigenous People's	42
5. SSNC Aid Management	44
5.1. Approaches and Relevance of Selected Environmental Themes in Relation to Local Environmental Problems.....	44
5.2. SSNC's Capacity at the Country Level.....	46
5.3. SSNC Staff Resources.....	49
5.4. Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	51
5.5. Organisational and Financial Sustainability.....	54
6. Conclusions of the Evaluation	55
6.1. Overall Conclusions of the evaluation	55
6.2. Relevance of the South Programme	56
6.3. Impact and Effectiveness of the Programme	57
6.4. Efficiency of the Programme.....	57
6.5. Sustainability of the Programme.....	58
6.6. Cross-cutting Issues.....	59
6.7. Summarising SSNC's 'Added Value'	59

Annex A. Terms of Reference	61
Annex B. Ecuador Visit Report	66
1. Introducción	66
2. Conclusión General.....	67
3. El Contexto del Ecosistema Manglar en Ecuador.....	67
4. Logros del Trabajo	71
5. Que Opciones Estratégicas Existen?	73
6. Áreas Para Posibles Mejoramientos.....	75
7. Comentarios Para Planificación e Informes	76
8. Aprovechar la Agenda de Paris	77
9. Sostenibilidad y Replicación.....	77
10. Valor Agregado por Parte de SSNC.....	78
11. Resumen de ‘Valor Agregado’ por Parte de SSNC que ha Sido Identificadas durante la Evaluación en Ecuador y Perú	79
12. Recomendaciones.....	81
Annex C. Peru Visit Report.....	83
1. Introducción	83
2. La Cooperación Entre SSPN y PRATEC.....	84
3. El Contexto de los Kechua Lamas	86
4. Logros del Trabajo	88
5. Áreas para Posibles Mejoramientos.....	91
6. Comentarios para planificación e informes.....	94
7. Sostenibilidad y Replicación.....	95
8. Valor Agregado por Parte de SSPN	95
9. Conclusión General.....	96
10. Recomendaciones.....	97
Annex D. Informe RAP-AL Network	99
1. Introducción	99
2. Conclusión General.....	99
3. Logros de RAP-AL.....	100
4. Relacionamiento entre RAP-AL y SSPN.....	100
5. Áreas para Posibles Mejoramientos.....	100
6. Recomendaciones.....	100
Persons Met in Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia	102
Team Schedule	103
Annex E. Malaysia Study Report.....	104
1. Introduction and Background	104
2. Outcomes, Achievements, Constraints and Challenges	105
3. SSNC Working with Partners.....	111
4. Recommendations and Way Forward	113
Malaysia Persons Met.....	114
Team Schedule	114
Annex F. Thailand Field Visit Notes.....	115
1. Introduction and Background	115
2. Outcomes, Achievements, Constraints and Challenges	116
3. Outcomes & Achievements	118
4. SSNC Working with Partners.....	123

5. Recommendations and Way Forward	123
Persons Met	124
Team Schedule:	125
List of Documents Used.....	125
Annex G. Senegal Field Visit Notes	126
1. Introduction and Background	126
2. Outcomes, Achievements, Constraints and Challenges	127
3. SSNC Working with Partners.....	128
4. Recommendations and Way Forward	130
List of People Met	130
Summarizing added Values of SSNC	131
Recommendations and Ways Forward	132
Annex H: Note from Visit to Kimwam in Tanzania.....	134
1. Introduction.....	134
2. Organization.....	135
3. Partnership with SSNC	135
4. SSNC Aid Management.....	136
5. Recommendations for Consideration.....	137
Persons Met	138
Annex I. Note from Visit to EMG in South Africa	139
1. Introduction.....	139
2. Cooperation with SSNC.....	140
3. Meetings with SSNC	142
Annex J. Note from Visit to ECO Ethics in Kenya.....	143
1. Introduction.....	143
2. Organisation	143
3. Partnership with SSNC	144
4. SSNC Aid Management.....	145
5. Recommendations for Consideration.....	145
Persons Met	146
Annex K. Note from Visit to Pelum Kenya	147
1. Introduction and Background	147
2. Outcomes, Achievements, Constraints and Challenges	148
3. SSNC Working with Partners.....	151
4. Recommendations and Way Forward	152
Annex L. Key Questions for Visiting Selected SSNC's Partners	154
3. Outcomes and Achievements in Visited Countries	154
4. SSNC Working with Partners in the South	154
5. SSNC's Aid Management	155
6. Conclusions.....	157
7. Recommendations and Ways Forward	157
Annex M. Overview of Themes and Number of Countries in SSNC Project Portfolio	158



The photo is from indigenous Kechua Lama communities located in the province of San Martin in Upper Amazon in Peru.

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
AIPP	Asian Indigenous People's Pact
ANPE	Peruvian Association of Organic Producers (Asociación Nacional de Productores Ecológicos del Perú)
BIOTHAI	Biodiversity Action Thailand
CAFTA	Tratado de Libre Comercio de Centro América y Estados Unidos (Central American Free Trade Agreement)
CAP	Consumers Association of Penang
CCB	Coalition Clean Baltic
CDRA	Community Development Research Association. Based in Cape Town, South Africa
C-CONDEM	National Coordinating Committee for the Defence of the Mangrove Ecosystem (Coordinadora Nacional para la Defensa del Ecosistema Manglar)
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBOs	Community Based Organisations
CDM	The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) under the Kyoto Protocol
CODESEN	Coordination des Organisations de la Société civile pour la Défense de l'Environnement et le Développement du Bassin du fleuve Sénégal
CODDEFFAGOLF	El Comité para la Defensa y Desarrollo de la Flora y Fauna del Golfo de Fonseca (in Honduras)
COP	Conference of the Contracting Parties (to convention)
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DFID	The Department For International Development (UK)
EEIU	Eco-Ethics International Union (EEIU) in Mombassa Kenya
EMG	Environmental Monitoring Group (South African NGO)
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreements (EU)
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FBOs	Faith Based Organisation
FUNDECOL	Fundacion Ecologica de Muisne (in Ecuador)
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HIVOS	Dutch development NGO
IFS	NGO Secretariat on Acid Rain
INTRAC	UK based Research NGO
IPEN	International POPs Elimination Network
IIED	The International Institute for Environment and Development
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ILO	International Labour OrganizationW
IUCN	The International Union for Conservation of Nature
JAS	Joint Assistance Strategies
Keml	Swedish Chemicals Agency
KIMWAM	Kikundu Mwavuli Mtwara (Mtwara People's Umbrella Organization) in Tanzania
LDC	Least Developed Countries
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation

MDG	Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
MS-TCDC	MS-Denmark's Training Centre for Development Cooperation situated in Tanzania.
NACAS	Núcleos de Afirmación Cultural Andina (local NGOs in Peru)
NEPAD	The New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
NORAD	Norwegian Development Agency
OECD/DAC	The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OD	Organisational Development
OMVS	Senegal River Basin Development Authority (Organisation pour la Mise en Valeur du Fleuve Sénégal)
PACOS	Partners of Community Organisations Trust in Malaysia
PELUM	Participatory Ecological Land Use Management (regional and Kenya)
PME	Planning Monitoring and Evaluation
PRATEC	Andean Farming Technology Project (Proyecto Andino de Tecnologías Campesinas) in Peru
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
PORINI	Porini Trust is an environmental conservation organization in Kenya
RAMSAR	The Convention on Wetlands, signed in Ramsar, Iran, in 1971.
RAP-AL	Network for Action on Pesticides and Their Alternatives in Latin America (Red de Acción en Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas para América Latina)
Red Manglar	Latin American regional network working with mangroves
SAM	Sahabat Alam Malaysia (Friends of the Earth Malaysia)
SCC	Swedish Cooperative Centre
SEARIN	South East Asian Rivers Network (Living River Siam)
SEKA	NGO Division at the Department for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance and Conflict Management, Asdi/Sida
SEK	Swedish Kronor
Sida	Swedish Agency for International Development Cooperation
SSNC	Swedish Society for Nature Conservation
SUSALI II	Sustainable Agriculture and Livelihood Improvement
TERRA	Towards Ecological Recovery and Regional Alliance
TWN	Third World Network (Malaysia)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	US Dollar
Waman Wasi	Local organization in San Martin in Peru, collaborating with PRATEC
WIOMSA	Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association (regional network registered in Zanzibar, Tanzania)
WB	The World Bank
WCD	The World Commission on Dams
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

Executive Summary

Chapter 1 and 2: Introduction and SSNC's mandate

1. The Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNC) is one of 14 Swedish NGOs that have entered into framework agreements with Sida. The current agreement between Sida and SSNC is in force until December 2008. During the financial year 2008, SSNC's framework agreement with Sida amounts to *SEK 21 million* for the South Programme.
2. According to the Terms of Reference issued by Sida, the overall *purpose* of this evaluation is to assess the relevance and results of SSNC's development cooperation in relation to the objectives of Sida/SEKA and of SSNC. Moreover, the evaluation should serve as a learning tool, suggesting possible improvements.
3. SSNC is Sweden's largest and oldest environmentalist organisation with some *178,000 individual members*. Under the Swedish name 'Naturskyddsföreningen', it is organised as a national democratic membership organisation with 24 county federations and 269 local branches all over the country.
4. The *vision* of SSNC's South Programme is to: *"contribute, in cooperation with other environmental organisations around the world, to environmentally, socially and economically sustainable development based on respect for human rights in democratic societies."*

Chapter 3: Main achievements and relevance of the projects visited

(according to the eight country studies: Thailand, Malaysia, Senegal, Kenya, Tanzania, South Africa, Ecuador and Peru).

5. The projects examined by the evaluation team seem to be effective, relevant and sustainable to varying degrees, as explained in more detail both in this main report (and in the reports in annexes from each of the visited projects).
6. In all the eight countries, the activities of SSNC-supported projects are clearly orientated towards reducing poverty and strengthening civil society. The achievements generally seem satisfactory, given the relatively modest budgets of the various projects. There are abundant examples of how Southern partners operationalise the *linkages* between poverty reduction and improved natural resource management, while enhancing the local civil society. SSNC's partners generally know how to facilitate community participation.
7. In Ecuador, poor coastal communities, working alongside C-CONDEM, organised to defend the local ecosystem and obtain the Ministry of Environment's recognition of their participatory management plans. Ecuador has *lost 70% of its precious mangrove*, and C-CONDEM has built strong advocacy to address this problem, building on its roots in the communities to reach the national level, and to lobby international institutions. Support from SSNC has strengthened the C-CONDEM's civil society advocacy work.
8. The SSNC support channelled through the organisation PRATEC to a local implementing organisation in Peru seems highly relevant to the strengthening of civil society, appreciating the cultures and knowledge of local indigenous communities. The project has also contributed towards strengthening the Kechua Lama population's management of agro-biodiversity in small-scale farming in Upper *Amazonas*, which suffers from the advance of the agricultural frontier.
9. Another SSNC project supports the RAP-AL network composed of NGOs in 18 Latin American countries. RAP-AL is a key player in spreading knowledge and raising awareness about the *hazards of*

pesticides, taking advantage of its close connections to international networks in combination with strong links to local civil societies.

10. Thailand is hosting many *regional organisation in South East Asia* (BIOTHAI, SEARIN, TERRA and AIPP). The study in Thailand confirms that SSNC has made a relevant selection of civil society partners with strong advocacy skills. SEARIN gives the local community in Northern Thailand the confidence to fight against the construction of dams. Meanwhile, Asian Indigenous Peoples' Pact (AIPP) has built a strong regional platform for pushing the indigenous and biodiversity agenda in South East Asia and at the United Nation.

11. In Malaysia, SSNC has selected SAM, PACOS and Third World Network (TWN) as very strong and relevant civil society partners. These organisations are, on the one hand, strengthening local community organisations, and, on the other, conducting *excellent advocacy* at the national, regional and international level. Such NGOs are presently promoting sustainable development and democratic space for civil society and in Malaysia.

12. PELUM Kenya has clearly made headway in its vision and objectives of empowering communities to be self-sustaining, as community farmer groups have adopted an integrated agricultural system, raising livestock for household and market purposes. PELUM Kenya also works with organisational strengthening of their affiliated farmer groups. *Farmer-to-farmer extension* has been applied successfully, and a significant proportion of agricultural producers are committed to organic farming.

13. Other projects are Eco-Ethics (EEIU), based in Mombassa, Kenya, and KIMWAM, located at the Mtwara coastal area in Tanzania, both of which focus on improving the livelihoods of *poor fishing communities* while strengthening their organisations. SSNC has also entered into long-term cooperation with the Cape Town-based organisation EMG, which has been important in establishing the *African Rivers Network*, which conducts advocacy and provides capacity building to its national member organisations. EMG is also active in the development of water resources, as well as in the formulation of dam policies and regulation in South Africa.

14. CODESEN works on issues related to the *dam project of the Senegal River* basin for irrigation and hydropower. CODESEN Senegal is a membership organization, which has been successful in engaging with governments and organising a credible civil society voice with grassroots foundation.

Chapter 4: SSNC working with partners in Asia, Africa and Latin America

15. The important *Millennium Ecosystem Assessment* clearly confirms the relevance of SSNC's five themes: 1) tropical forests, 2) sustainable agriculture, 3) climate change and watersheds, 4) marine and coastal environments, and 5) chemicals. The MDG 7 on environmental sustainability is, according to studies from UNDP and the World Bank, among the eight Millennium Development Goals receiving the least attention. SSNC contributes to strengthening civil society organisations working towards MDG 7 with emphasis on poverty alleviation and sustainable development.

16. *SSNC's geographical presence coincides with some of the world's most valuable ecosystems* threatened by the highest rates of deforestation and land degradation as documented in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment published in 2005. Reversing environmental degradation is important in Africa, and the relevance is further borne out by SSNC addressing the protection of valuable ecosystems in middle-income countries in South East Asia and Latin America. These ecosystems are valuable global public goods. Many poor people's livelihoods depend on these fragile ecosystems, and the most disadvantaged families are often first hit by ecological degradation. SSNC, for example supports interventions in areas of Borneo and the Amazon with extremely rich biodiversity, and alarming rates of deforestation. For instance, in Borneo, only half of the original forest cover remains today, down from 75% in the mid-1980s.

17. SSNC's *selection of partners* is strongly linked to its own identity as the leading environmental NGO in Sweden. SSNC has proved highly capable of selecting relevant partners in Asia, Africa and Latin America, making use of clear selection criteria. A key aim of the SSNC programme is to foster partnership and alliances between Northern and Southern NGOs on the environment. All the partners visited have expressed their appreciation of the strong partnership with SSNC. The visited NGOs perceive the partnership as "*Southern environmentalist teaming up with Swedish environmentalists*" around shared values and positions on the global environmental agenda.

18. The majority of SSNC's partners have built capacity among hundreds of local civil society organisations and community groups as reported in SSNC's reports. At the same time, *good advocacy* features prominently in the work in Sweden, as well as among many Southern partners. Partners, particularly in South East Asia and Latin America, have highly developed skills in this field, linked to a rights-based approach, allowing for mutual learning by partners and SSNC. Conversely, however, many of the African NGOs visited have yet to develop significant advocacy skills.

19. In none of the eight countries visited did the evaluation team see *any* project in which SSNC has had *systematic capacity development* of the partner built into the cooperation. Most organisational strengthening proceeds in an ad-hoc manner. Particularly in Africa, the evaluation team has observed scope for enhancing the partners' performance through more substantial advisory services and capacity building, including partnership activities. In these cases, SSNC has so far not provided substantial advisory services and/or capacity building.

20. SSNC is very successful in integrating *indigenous peoples'* concerns, applying a rights-based approach. This work involves poor communities, national agendas, and partners recognised by the UN, as demonstrated by the recent appointment of the AIPP secretary general as an expert to UN's Human Rights Council.

21. Regarding *gender equality*, the evaluation exercise showed mixed achievements in terms of integrating gender aspects into the work of the NGOs visited. Gender is dealt with as a "women's issue" (Women in Development approach), i.e. as a need to organise activities specifically for women, rather than to address strategic gender-based interests. There is scope for strengthening gender integration into the SSNC's programmes, also given the fact that very few project documents have incorporated gender-sensitive indicators.

22. Regarding the *HIV/AIDS* epidemic, SSNC has started a dialogue with African partners about the integration of HIV/AIDS into the projects. SSNC has initiated collaboration with two Swedish NGOs with extensive expertise in this field in Africa, namely RFSU and the Africa Groups of Sweden. The struggle against HIV/AIDS is an area that needs to be strengthened, in particular when SSNC is working in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Chapter 5: SSNC Aid Management

23. *SSNC's division of its work into five themes* seems well suited to international, regional and national advocacy work, and to bring the various issues to the forefront of the Swedish debate. The themes often match those of the numerous Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), where NGOs in the South and in the North have a shared agenda. This has functioned very well with the strong NGOs from middle-income countries in South East Asia, South Africa and Latin America. However, the thematic approach is not well geared to address a combination of environmental problems, poverty and development needs in local communities. In general, experience shows that this requires a far more *integrated approach*, including insights into the context in the country, as well as the in districts/municipalities. This problem manifests itself most clearly in cooperation with partners from poor African countries, who express a need for more support for their capacity building and more frequent contacts to SSNC.

24. Regarding the staffing, the programme is rather efficient, as only 7.5 full-time positions at SSNC headquarters are handling the extensive South Programme. The evaluation team has met SSNC staff members, who are dedicated, motivated, *competent* within the themes, and hardworking in their jobs. The International Department has a mismatch between the tasks defined and the actual staff available to perform them. Staff members are currently spending a significant proportion of their working time on administrative task, which is undermining the chances of adding value to the partnerships and developing the thematic areas.

25. SSNC is sponsoring projects with almost 60 partners in about 28 countries spread across three continents (not counting the numerous countries affiliated to the networks). It is fairly clear that SSNC has not made the expected progress towards the “*gradual concentration both thematically and geographically*” that was announced in the 2005–07 programme document. Nearly all partners interviewed, in particular the locally based NGOs and CBOs in Africa, pointed to a need for greater interaction with SSNC. One consequence of the unfocused SSNC strategy is that insufficient time is allocated to dialogue with Southern partners on matters of strategy and substance. SSNC needs to go through a process of concentrating on fewer countries while up-scaling its activities, both in terms of increased budget allocations and in terms of expanding its staff (possibly including the employment of regional programme officers in Africa).

26. In the view of the evaluation team, the annual budget of SEK 21 million is insufficient to unleash processes that meet the ambitions of a programme spanning three continents. This also springs from the fact that, of the total annual budget for the framework agreements of 14 Swedish NGOs, Sida/SEKA has only allocated approx. 3% to environmental NGOs¹. This is surprisingly little, not least in view of the significant challenges posed by climate change affecting developing countries today.

27. As for the monitoring and reporting, SSNC has made an effort to develop and apply a system. This has improved several partners’ reporting to Stockholm. The evaluation team has visited many Southern partners complaining of being overburdened by different donor requirements. The partners’ monitoring/reporting to their various donors is frequently not integrated into the organisations’ own governance systems, due to lack of harmonisation among the various donors to the same Southern NGOs. Unfortunately, Sida is not allowing sufficient flexibility to enable reporting to also improve *downward accountability* to the partners’ constituencies. The development agencies, especially the Nordic+ donors, ought to harmonise reporting criteria.

28. In its South Programme 2005–2007, SSNC has placed insufficient emphasis on *indicators* and baseline data, which, in the majority of the projects visited by the evaluation team, constitutes an obstacle to measuring the impact, effect and outcomes compared to what was planned in the various projects. This highlights the importance of developing better indicators for the 2009–2011 programme and associated project documents.

29. With its follow-up to the 2004 system revision, SSNC has lived up to Sida’s requirements for auditing and financial controls. Nevertheless, further risk management is needed, as mentioned by Sida in the appraisal of SSNC’s 2008 application. It would be worthwhile for SSNC to look more closely at ways to *strengthen the financial control systems* of the partner organisation as part of capacity building with particular African partners. Possible collaboration could be considered with existing Swedish field offices in Nairobi, e.g. the Swedish Cooperative Centre’s regional office in Nairobi. Such a solution would also respond to the African partners’ request for more frequent contact.

30. SSNC has not worked much with its partners on financial and organisational sustainability and the evaluation team has not seen any ‘exit strategies’ among the partners visited. The *sustainability and exit*

¹ SSNC is the only framework organisation working directly with environmental issues. A simple equation of their budget allocation of 28 MSEK, divided by the total Swedish Government 2008 NGO budget of 1 200 MSEK gives 2,3%

strategies are particularly crucial in middle-income countries, where SSNC could also help the partners to pursue strategies for greater mobilisation of domestic resources.

Chapter 6: Conclusions of the evaluation

31. SSNC's programme is highly relevant to the objectives of the partners, of SSNC and of Sida/SEKA. The NGOs visited by the team in eight countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America are contributing to sustainable development, linking this goal to the improvement of communities' livelihoods and strengthening of civil society organisations. Almost all NGOs visited were focusing their efforts on poor and marginalised communities affected by the degradation of natural resources. In particular as regards the cooperation with relatively strong NGOs from Asia and Latin America, the advocacy and public campaigns appear to be important and effective. The conclusion is that, within selected themes and countries, the SSNC programme is contributing to "*a vibrant and dynamic civil society as expressed in Sida's policy for support to civil society*" (2007).

32. SSNC is perceived as a loyal, credible and trustful partner, whose values regarding pro-poor sustainable development are shared by its partners. The SSNC support does seem unfocused with about 60 projects within five themes in as many as 28 countries on three continents. SSNC representatives have themselves pointed to a need to concentrate their efforts. The *lack of focus* has inhibited SSNC's creation of 'added value (beyond the money), in particularly in terms of building the capacity of the weaker, locally-based NGOs and CBOs in Africa. Here, the partnerships are affected by SSNC having no field officers, as the organisation runs its international operations out of Stockholm (this, however, may function well in relation to partners in South East Asia and Latin America). In the view of the evaluation team, SSNC could increase quality by focussing on fewer projects in fewer countries, while enhancing coordination with other donors within this field.

33. SSNC is implementing an important South Programme in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is a relevant and useful contribution to the pursuit of the *MDG 7 on environmental sustainability*, which is strongly linked to advocacy as well as poverty reduction in poor communities affected by the degradation of natural resources. Thus, by being rooted in direct collaboration with Southern CSOs on three continents, SSNC's environmental development aid programme is rather unique in a Nordic context. It is also interesting how SSNC is respecting and actively learning from its Southern partners.

The evaluation's recommendations

This chapter provides suggestions and recommendations for improvement of SSNC's cooperation programme based on the findings and conclusions presented in this report. If agreed, it will be up to SSNC to formulate a follow-up action plan with milestones aimed at operationalising the recommendations below.

The evaluation's recommendation is that, over the next 3–4 years, the budget for SSNC's South Programme be gradually increased to a level about twice as high as today. This scale should be accompanied by a more focused strategy to enable SSNC to deliver the necessary increase in its 'added value' to Southern partners, in particular to emerging CSOs. It should also allow for an expansion of SSNC's portfolio in Africa, while continuing the cooperation in Asia and Latin America.

Below, a number of *specific recommendations* are issued to SSNC and Sida/SEKA, summing up the evaluation team's suggestions on how to respond to the aforementioned findings and conclusions.

1. *Recommendation:* SSNC could strengthen a joint *Swedish NGO platform* for sustainable development by:
 - doing more to integrate international issues into the domestic part of SSNC's work.
 - approaching the preparation of the COP 15 Climate Summit in 2009 by proposing and working towards a Swedish coalition for sustainable development (separately or within Forum Syd) that would unite Swedish development and environmental NGOs, enabling more effective participation in European and international negotiations and monitoring of sustainable policies.
2. *Recommendation:* SSNC should refine its partnership with African NGOs by seeking their active involvement in advocacy and campaigning at the national, regional and international level. This effort could also benefit from more active use of the thematic structure of SSNC's programme, with enhanced South-South partner collaboration.
3. *Recommendation:* Several Southern partners could benefit from *capacity-building* efforts being built into the next phases of the projects, aimed at increasing partner organisations' effectiveness at national, district and community levels (e.g. strategic planning, leadership, management, communication, staff and volunteer policies, financial management, systems, etc.). When planning the budget for the next project phases, SSNC could include a specific budget line for 'advisory services and capacity building' to be spent in accordance with Terms of References suggested by the partners, while building a good resource base of regional/national facilitators of OD and change processes.
4. *Recommendation:* Gender perspectives should be more focused and integrated as part of the SSNC partners' institutional strategies. This can be accomplished with the development of *gender-specific* indicators for monitoring and evaluation of focus areas, such as biodiversity, forestation etc. Furthermore, partners need to know concrete methods and other experiences of putting the gender approach into practice.
5. *Recommendation:* SSNC should broaden the scope of its *climate-change* work by including it in all its themes, ensuring that it is not confined to CDM, but rather sets greater store on adaptation to climate change, technology transfers etc.
6. *Recommendation:* SSNC should strike a balance between thematic focus and country insights if the organisation wants to provide 'added value' to the weaker NGOs in Africa. Over the next three years, it is strongly recommended that the South Programme's current 28 countries of cooperation be *gradually reduced* to:
 - Option a:* If maintaining the current budget about of about SEK 21 million: a maximum of 12 countries in the prioritised sub-regions in South East Asia, Latin America and Africa (not counting global projects and the countries in regional networks).
 - Option b:* If the future budget is doubled to about SEK 40 million: a maximum of 16–18 countries in the prioritised sub-regions in South East Asia, Latin America and Africa (not counting the countries in regional networks).
7. *Recommendation:* SSNC could add a new position as '*methodological specialist*' to the staff. Both programme officers and partners would be assisted by this professional on issues such as capacity building, LFA, monitoring and results-based management, trends in development aid, the Paris aid-effectiveness agenda, poverty-environmental linkages, etc. This person could also be in charge of organising the realisation of external evaluations as well as papers on good practices.
8. *Recommendation:* In close collaboration with its partners, SSNC could seek to enhance the results-based management of each partner (and project), setting qualitative and quantitative *indicators* for the planned outcomes, while also measuring the baseline. This could be based on Logical Framework, and, if possible, complementary methods like 'Most Significant Change', structuring of the target group's narrative stories, participatory self-evaluations and applied research experiences.

9. *Recommendation:* SSCC could do more to provide advice and *written feedback* to its partners to progress reports and about how to improve project documents, including the use of LFA and indicators. A first step would be to *change the language* of the International Department's documents and travel reports into English (Spanish in the case of Latin America and French in West Africa). Furthermore, the reporting system could benefit from more focus on mutual consolidation of results, learning and systematisation of good practices within each of the five themes.
10. *Recommendation:* Hopefully, SEKA/Sida will be willing to translate the agenda of the Accra Aid Effectiveness High-Level Forum, to be held in September 2008, into a revision of the *reporting requirements* in Sida's guidelines for NGO support, so that Swedish NGOs are allowed to make greater headway towards applying the five principles of the Paris Declaration. It is of particular importance that Swedish support be built on the partner organisations' existing results-based management performed by their own governance structures, including their Board/management, strategic plans, internal democracy and downward accountability to their constituencies.
11. *Recommendation:* SSNC should step up efforts for *harmonisation* with other international NGOs/agencies on shared planning and monitoring and reporting. This could alongside with other donors include joint core-funding based on *alignment* to the partners' strategic plans, relying on its partners' governance structures, annual work plans and reports to their own annual assembly or board. A greater part of the dialogue should move from the activity to the strategic level, where it may be useful if each partner convenes an annual meeting of all its donors.

Another option for reducing the workload could be *delegated cooperation* arrangements, where one donor takes the lead on contracts and project administration, while SSNC could still be involved in the actual contents. An example could be HIVOS taking the lead on cooperation with Ecuadorian C-CONDEM, WWF or Swiss Aid taking lead on Tanzanian KIMWAM and IWGIA taking lead on Asian Indigenous Peoples Pact AIPP.
12. *Recommendation:* SSNC should consider an arrangement with another international NGO with an *office in Nairobi* (e.g. another Swedish organisation with a framework agreement with Sida) as a cost-effective way of sharing financial control, as well as office space, possibly staffed by two regional programme officers. The aim would be to improve SSNC's liaison with partners in Africa. This could also help reduce the workload of project administration at headquarters in Stockholm. Meanwhile, the tasks related to partners in Latin America and Asia could continue to be undertaken in Stockholm.
13. *Recommendation:* SSNC should agree with partners on adequate replicability mechanisms, *sustainability criteria and exit strategies*. Even when new partnerships are forged, these issues should be addressed in the dialogue at an early stage. In addition, organisational and financial sustainability should be a constant concern in future project documents and reporting from partners (and SSNC reports to Sida). Obviously, the desire for sustainability must be tempered by a realistic view of what is achievable.

1. Introduction

1.1. Objective of the Evaluation

Sida's NGO cooperation is focused on the development and strengthening of civil society. Since a considerable part of Swedish development cooperation is channelled via Swedish NGOs, it is of growing interest to ascertain the degree to which Swedish NGO development cooperation contributed to the overall objective of SEKA, i.e. towards strengthening a dynamic and democratic civil society in partner countries, as well as enabling poor people to improve their living conditions.

The Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNC) is one of 14 Swedish NGOs that have entered into framework agreements with Sida. The current agreement between Sida and SSNC is in force until December 2008. During the financial year 2008, SSNC's frame agreement with Sida amounts to 28 million SEK for development cooperation.²

This evaluation is part of the general follow-up to programmes supported by Swedish NGOs and co-financed by Sida/SEKA. As such, it is an input to the dialogue between Sida and each organisation with a framework agreement. According to the Terms of Reference from Sida (Annex A), the overall *purpose* of the evaluation is to assess whether SSNC's development cooperation contributes to Sida's objective of strengthening civil society and enabling poor people to improve their living conditions.

The specific objective is to evaluate the effectiveness, impact, relevance, sustainability and efficiency of the SSNC's programmes financed by Sida/SEKA. Of these five aspects, particular attention should be paid to effectiveness, relevance and sustainability, although all the five areas mentioned are interrelated.

Moreover, the evaluation should serve as a learning tool for both SSNC and Sida/SEKA, and it should suggest improvements in the SSNC's planning, implementation and monitoring of its development cooperation.

1.2. The Work of the Evaluation Team

The evaluation was undertaken in three phases. The first phase was spent on general data gathering about the projects and preparation for the field trips. The second phase consisted in field visits to selected countries, while the third phase was used to carry out the analysis and write this report.

The evaluation started in April 2008, and the field trips were undertaken in May–June 2008, involving visits to selected projects and partners, which concluded with debriefing meetings with the local partners' senior management. Upon return, the team leader presented a working paper with the preliminary findings and recommendations, which served to substantiate valuable discussions with all staff in Stockholm involved in SSNC's international programme. The open and constructive manner in which the SSNC staff and partners participated in this evaluation bodes well for further improvements of the South programme. SSNC must present its application for the next 3-year programme to Sida/SEKA in October 2008, which has provided the evaluation team with a special opportunity to contribute to the SSNC's on-going formulation.

The present evaluation was carried out by the following five consultants: Sunitha Bisan, Maria del Socorro Peñaloza, Emelia Arthur, Hans Hessel-Andersen and Hans Peter Dejgaard (team leader from the Danish company INKA Consult).

² 28 MSEK annually divided with 21 MSEK to the South, 3 MSEK to Eastern Europe, 2,6 MSEK to Swedwatch and 1,4 MSEK to information work. Additionally, SSNC receives in 2008 4 million SEK from Sida's Environmental Policy Unit.

1.3. The Evaluation's Methods and Approach

The evaluation team has sought to ensure the overall quality of its work as defined in the Sida evaluation guidelines: “*Looking Back, Moving Forward, Sida Evaluation Manual*” (2nd revised edition 2007). This includes the accuracy and relevance of findings.³

The evaluation team has given priority to identifying “lessons learned”, while still carrying out a documentary evaluation to the extent possible with the available documentation and time.

The focus has been on the active participation of SSNC and visited Southern partners. The evaluation team has – to the extent possible within three months – ensured the use of *dialogue and participatory methods* throughout the evaluation. The process has been transparent, and included an ongoing dialogue with SSNC, Sida/SEKA and partners selected for visits in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The team has shared its working papers with SSNC and partners visited, as one way of validating findings and receiving feedback. Debriefings were conducted with the partner organisation on the last day of each visit, and written debriefing notes have been made available to all visited partners to invite comments.

A considerable part of the field visits were spent visiting rural communities together with SSNC partners. The consultants sought to interview local communities to observe the grassroots effect and day-to-day collaboration with SSNC partners. Efforts were made to include the opinions of both women and men.

1.4. Collection and Validation of Information

The most important way to ensure the validity of this evaluation's findings has been various types of triangulation, which involves the systematic use and comparison of data and information collected with independent methods. The consultants have, to the greatest extent possible, tried to get “second opinions” from other informants that are independent of the SSNC support. Four tools were used for collection and validation of information during the evaluation:

- 1) *Sample of projects and countries.* The evaluation consultants have met 1 to 3 sample projects/NGOs in each of the selected countries to be able to paint a picture that represents the main working areas/themes in SSNC's programme in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Given the high number of countries and organisation included in the programme, it has been a challenge to visit a representative cross-section of organisations within the given timetable and budget. The selection criteria and their final application were consulted with SSNC and approved by Sida as part of the Inception Report.
- 2) *Sources of data.* This evaluation has consulted both primary and secondary sources of data. During the fieldwork, the team has included four types of interviewees:
 - selected SSNC partner organisations in Asia, Africa and Latin America;
 - beneficiary community-based organisations, farmer groups, etc.
 - other stakeholders and independent informants in the visited countries;
 - cooperation partners in the countries (Swedish embassies, international NGOs, etc.).
- 3) A *questionnaire* was drawn up for the staff at SSNC's international department, and formed the basis for *semi-structured interviews*. Furthermore, the staff were asked to fill in a short information sheet on their use of time. In addition, the consultants have pursued their country studies through semi-structured interviews with members and leaders of the partner organisations, as well as with local

³ Findings should be assessed with reference to standard criteria of reliability and validity.

Reliability: Consistency or dependability of data and evaluation judgments, with reference to the quality of the instruments, procedures and analyses used to collect and interpret evaluation data.

Validity: The extent to which the data collection strategies and instruments measure what they purport to measure (page 114).

authorities, international agencies and NGOs. These interviews were based on a modified version of the questionnaire used for the interviews with SSNC that help the team members in securing a uniform assessment (see Annex L). Furthermore, direct observations were made by the consultants at project locations.

- 4) *Meetings in Stockholm.* The team leader spent 3–4 days in Stockholm on meetings/interviews with management and staff at SSNC and with Sida/SEKA. As SSNC does not operate with field offices in the South, these meetings in Stockholm have been of particular importance to this evaluation. Prior to the field trip, the team leader held discussions in Stockholm with SSNC and Sida about the inception report as well as the selection of countries and organisation for field visits. And after the field visits, the team leader discussed preliminary findings (in writing) with SSNC and Sida, focusing on constructive exchanges aimed at formulating the lessons learned and possible adjustments to be made by SSNC.

1.5. Selection of Countries/Partners for Field Visits

SSNC is engaged in more than 60 projects spread across 28 countries (without counting Eastern Europe and Southern regional networking partners).

Although the ToR only prescribes the examination of a sample of projects in “at least two countries”, the evaluation team found this to be insufficient to make the evaluation representative of SCNN’s overall programme. There are typically only 1, 2 or 3 relatively small projects/supported NGOs in each country. Furthermore, there are major differences between the numerous countries of cooperation in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Based on the Inception Report’s criteria, the evaluation team selected a number of countries and partners for field visits. The chosen interventions cover fieldwork in at least two countries in each of the three continents, and a mix of middle-income and least developed countries. This resulted in visits to eight countries: Thailand, Malaysia, Senegal, Kenya, Tanzania, South Africa, Ecuador and Peru.

	Sustainable agriculture	Forest	Climate & water	Marine & fishery	Chemical
Peru	xx				x
Ecuador				x	x
Senegal			x		
Kenya	x	x		x	
Tanzania				x	
Thailand	x	x	x		
Malaysia		xx			x
South Africa			x		

The above table illustrates how the selection has covered projects within the SCNN’s five thematic priorities in the countries visited. Stakeholders from a total of 17 supported projects have been interviewed during the evaluation.

It became possible to cover this relatively broad cross-section of SSNC’ portfolio by hiring three regional consultants (one for each continent), who also provided insights into the local context. Furthermore, the team leader visited South America, and the other international consultant went to Africa.

1.6. Limitations of the Evaluation

This study did not experience any major limitations. The team did not have the time and resources to carry out in depths evaluation of the longer term impact of the support on the ground.

The three regional consultants were unable to read many of the documents about the programme, as SSNC communicates with Sida in the Swedish language. This limited their chances of preparing their field visits. During the visits, they found that many Southern partners are facing the same language barrier.

Another constraint was the evaluation team's inability to gather physically on any occasion, due to geographical distances. This has to certain degree been compensated by emails and internet-based telephone meetings. The evaluation team advises that more time be allocated to analysis of documentation and to field visits in future evaluations in order to ensure more detailed documentation and participation.

1.7. Report Outline

This evaluation report is organised with an Executive Summary, the main report and a number of annexes.

This main report encompasses the following: An introduction in Chapter 1, followed by a description of SSNC's mandates and strategies in chapter 2. Chapter 3 contains an overview of the outcomes and achievements in visited projects/countries, which is explained in greater detail in the country studies (Annex B to K).

Chapter 4 offers an assessment of SSNC's work with partners "on the ground" in the South, while Chapter 5 analyses the 'added value' and presents other findings related to SSNC's operations. Finally, Chapter 6 concludes by outlining a number of lessons learned and conclusions. The Executive Summary comprises the main findings, conclusions and recommendations.

The present document is a *draft report*. The upcoming final version of the report will take account of comments from SSNC and Sida/SEKA.

1.8. Acknowledgements

The views expressed in this report are those of the consultancy team, and do not necessarily reflect those of the organizations that have commissioned this study, nor those of the team's interviewees or other persons consulted during the evaluation.

The Team would like to express its gratitude to the staff at SSNC and to the civil society organizations and individuals interviewed for their kind support and valuable assistance afforded during the consultants' work in Asia, Latin America and Africa.

2. SSNC Mandate and Strategies

2.1. Mandates and Constituency

Founded in 1909, the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNC) is Sweden's largest and oldest environmentalist organisation with some 178,000 individual members. Using the Swedish name 'Natur-skyddsföreningen', it is organised as a national society, 24 county federations and 269 local branches all over the country.

SSNC is a Swedish membership organisation with democratic governance. It is directed by a National Board appointed at the bi-annual assembly of elected representatives from the local branches. Except for the assistance of some 60 full-time employees, almost all activities in the branches are conducted on a voluntary basis. The organisation depends on membership fees and private donations to fund its core activities, but accepts both government grants and private sector sponsorship of specific projects.

SSNC started out as a strictly conservationist group, but has, in the last two decades, expanded its scope to encompass most fields of environment and sustainable development.

SSNC's priorities and emphasis are based on the "Verksamhetsriktlinjerna för 2007–2010" that is the overall business plan approved by the General Assembly. Three overarching objectives are outlined:

- To save wildlife – addressing issues within primary-sector production, such as agriculture, forestry and fisheries, including the spread of chemicals and climate change, which pose a serious threat to biological diversity.
- To promote human health, including the experience of nature as a healing force, combating the spread of chemicals and climate change, which constitute the greatest threat to all living creatures, including human life and health.
- To work for global solidarity, defending justice and solidarity between generations, economising resources for sustainable development, addressing relevant consumption patterns and political systems, such as international trade rules.

In the view of the evaluation team, the successful partnerships with Southern NGOs are made possible by the SSNC's view that "over-consumption in rich countries and an unjust economic world order are the fundamental causes of the global environmental crisis." Furthermore, SSNC expresses that, "when ecosystems are impoverished, the poorest are hit the hardest. They rarely have any alternative livelihood, and depend wholly on what nature provides where they live. Their chances of survival and basic human rights are intimately related to the right to natural resources, the right to land, as well as the right to have access to forest and other local nature, to genetic resources, and to participation in decision-making regarding natural resources."

2.2. The International Programme

2.2.1. From two to one programme

In 1990, SSNC launched the North/South programme and another programme supporting environmental NGOs in Central and Eastern Europe. Until 2004, these two programmes supported by Sida were administered separately. However, in the wake of a management audit commissioned by Sida, it was decided to merge the two programmes. Thus, since 2005, the two programmes have been integrated into one International Programme of SSNC – although the evaluation team has not observed much synergy between the East Europe part and the part working with countries in the South.

Among the other recommendations from this management audit were:

- to improve the definition of objectives and indicators, in order to better evaluate and report results;
- to improve the integration of SSNC's work on international and national issues; and
- to improve the procedures for administration of programmes and projects.

2.2.2. The South Programme 2005–2007

The vision of SSNC's International Programme, as it was submitted to Sida in the application for 2005–07 and prolonged for year 2008, was to: *“contribute, in cooperation with other environmental organisations around the world, to an environmentally, socially and economically sustainable development based on respect for human rights in democratic societies.”*

Being partly funded by Sida, the programme matches the Policy for Global Development adopted by the Swedish Parliament in 2003. This SSNC programme document defines a common goal for all policy areas, namely *“to contribute to equitable and sustainable global development from the perspectives of poor people.”*

The South programme (also called the North/South programme) has two immediate objectives:

Objective 1: During the programme period SSNC shall have established cooperation with organisations in the South that promote sustainable development.

Objective 2: The positions of SSNC's partner organisations on sustainable development have been presented clearly in the Swedish and international discussions, in order to increase awareness of both the underlying causes of environmental destruction and poverty, and of the importance of taking action to reduce environmental degradation and poverty.

SSNC has defined five priority areas for SSNC's activities: 1) tropical forests, 2) sustainable agriculture, 3) climate change and watershed, 4) marine and coastal environments, and 5) chemicals (these are the same as the priorities in Sweden). Consumption and lifestyle issues feature as crosscutting concerns.

The programme has planned to work towards consolidation along three main lines:

- gradual concentration both thematically and geographically,
- deeper integration of the programme into the major fields of activities of the SSNC at large, and
- closer cooperation with programme partners in the fields of capacity-building, sharing of information and experiences, advocacy and joint campaigning.

In 2008, the South Programme portfolio covers almost 60 projects in about 28 countries (without counting regional networks).

Programme partners are selected on the basis of sharing a set of organisational values and aims, as well as an activity profile that largely corresponds to the priorities and aims of SSNC. The South Programme is also influenced by the local experiences and needs of its partners, the rights and interests of the poor, and the active participation of local communities.

The South Programme 2005–2007 was planned in order to strengthen the work on organisational capacity-building, focusing even more on poverty and marginalized groups, while integrating gender and HIV/AIDS issues through mainstreaming based on analysis and dialogue with partners. In addition, the programme was to focus more on cooperation with partners in Africa.

2.3. SSNC's Policy Documents and Guidelines

SSNC has prepared the following key documents guiding the implementation of the South programme⁴:

“Swedish Society for Nature Conservation International Program 2005–2007”. This document lists the priorities of the South Programme, guidelines for selecting partners, administrative routines etc.

“Procedures for cooperation with partners in SSNC's International Program 2005–2008” contains procedures and a short description of the various support and cooperation modalities, in addition to a standard outline of project proposals. There is also a version in Spanish: *“Procedimientos para la cooperación de la SSPN con las contrapartes del Programa internacional 2005–2008.”*

“Genus och jämställdhet i Svenska Naturskyddsföreningens internationella avdelnings arbete” and the English version: *“Gender issues in SSNC's International Co-operation.”*

2.4. SSNC Human Resources and Budget

The highest authority is the General Annual Assembly, which elects the 14 members of the Board. The Board appoints the Managing Director.

The total number of staff is about 80 persons, of whom 11 are working in the International Department spread among the various programmes:

- North/South: 7.5 full-time positions
- Chemicals: 0.5 position
- Eastern Europe: 0.5 position
- Environmental Policy: 2.75 positions

All contact with Southern partners is conducted from the headquarters in Stockholm. SSNC has not entered into a decentralisation process, which sets it apart from the majority of the Swedish NGOs with framework agreements. A main reason for this decision has been the global character of the environmental issues which the SSNC programme addresses, e.g. tropical forests, climate change and chemicals. A number of these issues are related to Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).

SSNC's programmes are mainly financed by Sida under a framework agreement in force until December 2008. During the financial year 2008, this agreement with Sida amounts to SEK 21 million to the South Programme, of which SSNC contributes 10% itself. In addition, official Swedish government support has been given to information work, Eastern Europe, SwedWatch and environmental policy project as outlined in the table.

Amounts in SEK	2006	2007	2008
Development cooperation	24,674,000	25,000,000	24,000,000
SSNC Information	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,400,000
SwedWatch	2,130,000	2,800,000	2,600,000
Environmental Policy project	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000

⁴ In addition, relevant Sida manuals are used and disseminated to partners, such as: i) “Sharpening the poverty focus in programmes and projects supported by Sida – preliminary guidelines from POM.”, ii) “Manual for Conflict Analysis”, iii) “Audit Guide” and iv) *“Genus och jämställdhet i Svenska Naturskyddsföreningens internationella avdelnings arbete”* translated into the English version: *“Gender issues in SSNC's International Co-operation.”*

SwedWatch is a non-governmental organisation that reports on Swedish business relations with developing countries. SwedWatch uses SSNC as its administrative channel to Sida.

The SSNC's programme for Eastern Europe involves close cooperation with three networks: Coalition Clean Baltic (CCB), Taiga Rescue Network (TRN), and the Swedish NGO Secretariat on Acid Rain (IFS). SSNC is challenging funds to these entities.

Although the South Programme and the Eastern Europe Programme were merged in 2005, the evaluation team has not observed any significant advantages of handling them together. The evaluation team has instead suggested the option of unifying SSNC's management of SwedWatch, IFS, CCB and the support from the Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI)⁵.

3. Outcomes and Achievements in Eight Selected Countries

The Evaluation Team has selected eight countries/projects for field visit in dialogue with SSNC and Sida/SEKA. This chapter contains summaries of the achievements and outcomes that were identified in Thailand, Malaysia, Senegal, Kenya, Tanzania, South Africa, Ecuador and Peru. More detailed information can be found in the notes from the visits to the eight countries (annexes B to K).

The assessment of projects in this chapter concludes that SSNC's programme is relevant to the objectives of the partners, of SSNC and of Sida/SEKA. Many of the partners visited seem to be running cost-effective operations with considerable outreach and a high profile at local, national and regional levels.

The civil society organisations visited by the team in eight countries seem to be contributing to sustainable development and to the improvement of communities' livelihoods. Moreover, the selection of Southern partners is strongly linked to SSNC's own identity as an environmental movement that is strongly committed to environmental causes in Sweden and internationally.

3.1. Summary of Visits to Peru and Ecuador

3.1.1. Selected projects

The evaluation team undertook fieldwork in Peru and Ecuador, where interviews were conducted with people involved in the following three national and two regional projects:

1. Peru: Andean Farming Technology Project (*Proyecto Andino de Tecnologías Campesinas PRATEC*) and its implementing partner agency Waman Wasi (WW). Supported by SSNC: 1st phase 2002–2005, 2nd phase 2005–2008.

Peruvian Association of Organic Producers (*Asociación Nacional de Productores Ecológicos del Perú*, ANPE). SSNC supported the 2007 national meeting of Peruvian organic producers.
2. Ecuador: National Coordinating Committee for the Defence of the Mangrove Ecosystem (*Coordinadora Nacional para la Defensa del Ecosistema Manglar C-CONDEM*).
SSNC supporting mangrove areas in Ecuador's north-western region in 2006–2008.

International Mangrove Network. Supported by SSNC 2001–2008.

⁵ KemI has allocated an annual budget of SEK 2.6 million to SSNC for the period 2006–2008. This includes funds for IPEN (International POPs Elimination Network) and ChemSec (the International Chemical Secretariat).

3. Regional: Network for Action on Pesticides and Their Alternatives in Latin America (*Red de Acción en Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas para América Latina*, RAP-AL), operating in 16 Latin American countries with support from SSNC since 1998. Interviews conducted in Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia.

In the table below the budgets for the projects that the evaluation team has considered in Latin America.

Organisation	Country	Period	Total budget in period (SEK)	Average annually (SEK)
PRATEC	Peru	2005–2008	1.325.000	330.000
ANPE	Peru	2007–2008	300.000	150.000
C-CONDEM	Ecuador	2006–2008	770.000	250.000
Red Manglar	Regional	2006–2008	950.000	316.000
RAP-AL	Regional	2005–2008	1.760.000	440.000

Source: Bilaga IV Plan för verksamhetsområden 2008 and 2005–07.

It should be mentioned that the budgets for these projects have been with amounts in average between 150.000 to 440.000 SEK per year.

The more detailed notes from the consultant's visits can be found in Annex B, C and D.

3.1.2. Main achievements of the projects in Ecuador

a. Context: Four decades of destruction of the mangrove ecosystem along the Ecuadorean coast have impoverished almost a million people who had, since time immemorial, eke out a living from small-scale fishing and gathering of molluscs, crustaceans and mangrove wood. Out of the 363,000 hectares of Ecuadorean mangrove declared as protected area in 1987, today only 108,000 hectares are left, i.e. the country has lost 70% of its precious mangrove ecosystem. This stems primarily from industrial shrimp-farming. The mangrove is a food source for coastal populations of every ethnicity and culture, from Afro-Ecuadorean to indigenous communities.

b. C-CONDEM is an NGO with a well-defined strategic plan, an annual assembly and a governing board. It is composed of federations of peoples dependent on the mangrove ecosystem in five provinces along the Ecuadorean coast: El Oro, Guayas, Santa Elena, Manabí and Esmeraldas. The membership amounts to about 2,200 families. C-CONDEM's staff along with community leaders have successfully disseminated and replicated their experiences among other mangrove peoples, communities and women in the other coastal provinces.

c. The conclusion of the evaluation team is that the Swedish-sponsored project is highly relevant, creating sustainable development by linking mangrove conservation to improvement of the poor coastal population's living conditions. The families inhabiting mangrove areas, working alongside C-CONDEM, have organised their communities to defend the local ecosystem and obtain recognition of their management plans from the Ministry of Environment.

d. The support from SSNC is contributing towards Sida's objective of strengthening a dynamic and democratic civil society in Ecuador. C-CONDEM has built excellent advocacy capacity, including skilful presentation of proposals, lobbying, good media access, public information and campaigns, as well as a widely known public stance on the mangrove issue. An example is the highly active participation by C-CONDEM and its local organisations in presenting a proposal to the National Constitutional Assembly.

The project is an advocacy showcase, with its community work well linked to regional and international efforts by means of C-CONDEM's leadership of the International Mangrove Network, which has

acted in forums such as RAMSAR, the World Bank and FAO. C-CONDEM has been at the forefront of this endeavour by coordinating the Mangrove Network in Latin America for four years.

e. C-CONDEM has provided methodological support towards the preparation of participatory community management plans in three protected mangrove areas. This effort has succeeded in having 20,000 hectares of mangrove handed over to community custody through agreements on sustainable management undertaken by 19 organisations. Initial results indicate that the felling of mangrove forest has been halted, but that local conflicts remain over the access to and control over territory, mainly involving shrimp producers.

f. Production alternatives are being developed in the communities dependent on the mangrove ecosystem, such as mangrove restoration, agriculture in pursuit of food sovereignty, and community tourism. Furthermore, the ministerial department of fisheries (*Subsecretaría de Pesca*) has adopted the proposal of the ancestral mangrove peoples to declare an open-ended close-season for shell species.

g) C-CONDEM clearly takes a gender-conscious approach. Some of the women's groups visited by the team hold economic power even greater than the men in the communities. It is the female "concheras" (gatherers of molluscs) who steer the course of local development processes in many communities. Community leaders have also been empowered by getting involved in C-CONDEM's advocacy at the national level.

h. The organisational model of C-CONDEM is innovative. Based on the work of several local organisations from the coastal areas, led by FUNDECOL, C-CONDEM has been set up as a Quito-based NGO to undertake coordination, exchange of experiences and national as well as international advocacy. Moreover, it has a bottom-up structure with democratic governance and accountability towards the constituent local organisations, unlike the case of many "self-contained" foundations without popular constituencies found in Latin America. C-CONDEM has a good relationship with the grassroots.

3.1.3. Main results and achievement of the projects in Peru

a. Context: The communities assisted in Peru are located in the Province of San Martín in Upper Amazonia. Due to factors such as the armed conflict in the 1980s – which decimated the indigenous Kechua Lama communities, among others – as well as migration and Andean settlers, this part of the Amazonia has suffered from the fast going deforestation and ecosystem degradation, leaving only secondary forest. In addition, there has been erosion, desertification, changes in the courses of rivers and decreasing soil fertility.

This aggravates the problem of an advancing agricultural frontier, which encroaches on more protected areas and impels the original inhabitants to migrate. Rural production in the region has been concentrated on a few crops, such as banana, coffee, rice and maize. At present, soil productivity is low, which causes a high incidence of chronic malnutrition (including pregnant women and schoolchildren).

b. General conclusion: SSNC's support – channelled through the organisation PRATEC to the local implementing organisation called "Waman Wasi" – is relevant. The support for the Kechua Lama communities is also fully justified. The work respects and appreciates the cultures and knowledge of local communities, adhering to the principle of boosting agro-biodiversity. PRATEC has become recognised in Peru and South America for its capacity for analysis, reflection and publication of books about biodiversity and indigenous wisdom, which can help recover the diversity of agricultural produce that had been lost.

c. PRATEC has provided technical advice and strengthens civil society, permanently accompanying the local implementing organisations, the so-called NACAS⁶. One of these is supported by SSNC. This is Waman Wasi, which has earned a high degree of credibility in the indigenous communities. The project counts on local trust and ownership, and the implemented activities have been fully accepted by the communities.

d. The project has contributed towards strengthening the Kechua Lama population's knowledge of agro-biodiversity on small plots (vegetable gardens). Thus, the integrated approach addresses the socioeconomic issue of poverty in combination with environmental concerns, such as recovering seeds and agricultural species, protecting water sources, and ensuring sustainability in small-scale farming. This has been important for the indigenous communities' risk management, leaving them better equipped to confront the food crisis caused by low productivity and, recently, rising food prices, while reaffirming the value of local knowledge. It should be mentioned that, given the limited budget, only eight Kechua communities have been assisted, thus reaching 170 families.

e. The preservation of cultural values and traditional wisdom is another important achievement, passing on this heritage to the children through the state education system, where some local schools combine the normal teaching with the inclusion of indigenous culture in their curriculum. Students are encouraged to pursue small-scale farming as well as agricultural and biological diversity.

f. Training has been conducted for women and men in the communities, but it will be necessary to focus more on capacity-building in community leadership, and obviously on women's role. The project has successfully promoted the participation of women, who remain, however, at the margin of decision-making and power-broking.

g. Weakness: Although PRATEC is a member of the National Desertification Commission, its advocacy remains poorly developed. PRATEC carries a great baggage of academic knowledge and a track record of publications, which holds potential for collaboration with NGOs and organisations of farmers and indigenous peoples aimed at boosting advocacy nationally and in the provinces.

In order to strengthen sustainability, it is important to consolidate and encourage the progress taking place between Waman Wasi and the Municipal Government of Lamas. Approaches have already been made with a view to coordinating efforts, considering future co-funding, i.e. municipal contribution towards the work of Waman Wasi currently supported by SSNC. These advances have yet to be consolidated, but at least there is a point of departure.

h. SSNC has also supported the Peruvian Association of Organic Producers, ANPE, focusing on market certification. This partner is totally market-orientated, whereas PRATEC gives priority to food sovereignty, considering local market outlets only when this ideal has been accomplished. ANPE concentrates more on market exchange in the context of organic product certification and income generation aimed at improving the living standards of producers.

3.1.4. Network for Action on Pesticides and Their Alternatives in Latin America, RAP-AL

a. The RAP-AL network has member organisations in 18 Latin American countries. They conduct activities aimed at contributing towards the ratification, implementation and monitoring of international conventions on pesticides and chemical security, namely the Rotterdam Convention, the Stockholm Convention, the Montreal Protocol (methyl bromide) and FAO's Code of Conduct.

The network's core mission is to identify pesticide problems, conduct research, communicate the findings to the public, while disseminating worldwide advances in the field of sustainable agriculture.

⁶ For two decades, PRATEC has accompanied various indigenous NGOs (Núcleos de Afirmación Cultural Andina, NACAS) and groups of indigenous peasants with emphasis on indigenous culture and agriculture. PRATEC is a Peruvian NGO composed of a core of professionals dedicated to working with the communities.

b. General conclusion: As the only network addressing the pesticide issue, RAP-AL is playing a key role in Latin America, by spreading knowledge and raising awareness about the hazards of pesticides, especially to vulnerable population groups, such as child-bearing women and children. RAP-AL has achieved considerable clout in many of its 18 member countries, by exerting influence on pesticide policies, demonstrating the adverse impacts and drawing attention to tested alternatives. In this regard, RAP-AL's work matches Sida's objective of strengthening a democratic civil society, allowing poor people to improve their own living conditions.

c. The most relevant achievements concern the generation of discussion and awareness of the dangers of pesticides, often getting some of them specifically banned from the market. Furthermore, ideas for solutions and alternatives have been developed, which have been very useful for national member organisations presenting proposals to legislators and ministries. In addition, the documentation of health effects and environmental harm has attracted significant media coverage.

d. RAP-AL is cooperating with other international alliances, including the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN). RAP-AL also appears to be close to its member organisations, but less so to the grassroots level. This may stem from the relatively low priority attributed to strengthening national networks and certain alliances with popular organisations, while advocacy towards external actors has taken centre stage.

e. There have been opportunities to exchange valuable experiences between countries. For instance, in the Bolivian region of Chapare, giant posters were produced, showing what RAP-AL is doing. This experience has been replicated in other countries, and seems to have yielded good advocacy results.

g. The funding received by RAP-AL from SSPN amounts to 22% of the network's total budget for the period 2005–2008. Although the evaluation team finds it relevant to continue support for this regional network, it is nevertheless necessary to discuss a plan for sustainability with RAP-AL that includes an exit strategy.

3.2. Summary of Visits to Five African Countries

3.2.1. Selection of projects in Africa

a. SSNC cooperates with 20 national and regional organizations within 10 African countries. The main thematic focus is on coastal areas and water resources, with fewer activities on agriculture and forestry. There is no support for the chemical thematic area. The evaluation team has visited 6 of SSNC projects in 4 African countries. The budgets are relatively modest and vary in size and contractual duration between the organisations:

The following projects in Africa were selected for the study:

1. Kenya: Scaling Up Sustainable Agriculture for Livelihoods Improvement (SUSALI) II.
 PELUM Kenya. Supported by SSNC: 1st phase 2003–2006, 2nd phase 2007–2008.

 Institutional support for community ecological governance and forest protection.
 PORINI. Supported by SSNC since 2007.

 Marine-coastal project with the Mombasa Chapter of Eco-Ethics (EEIU). Supported
 by SSNC since 2007.
2. Senegal: National and Sub-regional Mission Capacity-Building Project. CODESEN Senegal.
 Supported by SSNC since 2004.
3. Tanzania: Support to KIMWAM groups and Strategic Plan. Supported by SSNC since 2007.

4. South Africa: Water Justice Africa Programme. Communities, Rivers & Dams. EMG in South Africa. Supported by SSNC since 2004.

In the table below the budgets for the projects that the evaluation team has considered in the four African countries.

Organisation	Country	Period	Total budget in period (SEK)	Average annually (SEK)
PELUM	Kenya	2005–2008	1.305.000	326.000
PORINI	Kenya	2007	250.000	250.000
Eco-Ethics	Kenya	2007–2008	300.000	150.000
KIMWAM	Tanzania	2007–2008	355.000	177.000
CODESEN	Senegal	2005–2008	934.000	233.000
EMG	South Africa	2005–2008	2.200.000	550.000

Source: Bilaga IV Plan för verksamhetsområden 2008 and 2005–07.

It should be mentioned that the budgets for these projects – with the exception of EMG – have been relatively modest with amounts in average between 150.000 to 300.000 SEK per year.

The more detailed notes from the consultants visits can be found in Annex G, H, I, J and K.

3.2.2. General findings in the four countries

b. In general it seems as if the partners are well chosen and the themes of work are relevant both for the SSNC programme and for finding solutions to environmental problems within the national contexts. The supported organizations are diverse and differ in perspective and nature. They span from NGOs like Environmental Monitoring Group in South Africa, a group of highly professional individuals with capacity to engage in international and regional debates on Dams; to national member organizations like PELUM in Kenya and CODESEN in Senegal deeply engaged in changing productive and water management activities; and a local organization like KIMWAM from Tanzania with activities related to a few local fishery communities in Southern Tanzania. However the support for these different organizations requires much differentiated responses and qualifications from SSNC.

c. The NGO's from the four countries visited are happy for the cooperation with SSNC, although for most organizations it is having a more a donor/recipient relationship. Only in few cases as with EMG and CODESEN, there are some joint activities. Most of the other organization are more focused on service delivery and have little capacity for international advocacy work. It is clear that thus far SSNC has not been able to provide sufficient support and perspective to these types of NGOs. A much closer interaction is needed if SSNC would provide any added value to these organizations. There is a need to build the capacity within the organizations, support them with strategic development and in building broader networks. As witness in some case there are good opportunities to have partnership e.g. about agricultural policies or fishery policies. SSNC should develop a modality to work with these issues in situations where there are not discussions about conventions, international meetings etc. SSNC has to realize that the work with many of these NGO is not only thematic and require insight into cultural, political and economic situation. For example, sustainable fishery is far more in-depth than new fishnets.

d. In order to be more effective within limited resources SSNC could consider focusing its activities in Africa around some of the most important regional networks and their member organisations. PELUM could e.g. be a point of departure for support within forestry, agriculture, pesticides and adaptation to climate change. CODESEN and African Rivers Network could be entry point for regional work with water resources and energy and within this context agriculture, climate change and forestry.

3.2.3. Participatory Ecological Land Use Management (PELUM Kenya)

a. Although having an agrarian economy like many African countries, Kenya's agricultural policies are not as favourable. It lacks the required focus in supporting small scale farmers whose livelihoods are severely threatened. An important element imperative towards creating this policy change is the creation of space for farmers' participation.

b. PELUM Kenya is a member-based national organization with membership from NGOs and community-based organizations. PELUM Kenya whose vision is *"to see communities are self-organised to make informed choices towards improved quality of life that is socially and economically sustainable"* is organised around a 7-member country secretariat. It is accountability to a Board and an Annual General Assembly composed by farmer groups and individual farmers. PELUM Kenya raises membership subscription fee from its members.

c. SSNC has supported PELUM Kenya's activities since 2003. The yearly budget is in average 326.000 SEK. Currently SSNC is together with HIVOS, EED and Bread for the World (Germany) co-funding PELUM Kenya's Sustainable Agriculture and Livelihood Improvement (SUSALI II) Programme, an upscale of a successfully piloted project in sustainable agriculture with three main areas: i) Campaign and advocacy; ii) Capacity building and iii) Research and information management.

d. Swedish support to PELUM Kenya has contributed to strengthening technical and institutional capacity. In particular, its governance systems and structures as well as member organisations' has improved through training for the Boards of member organisations. There have been increases in projects, membership and networking activities. Member organisations pass on acquired training to their constituent farmer groups in sustainable agriculture.

e. PELUM Kenya itself is a member of the parent organization PELUM-Africa, a regional organisation founded in 1995 with membership in East, Southern and Central Africa. In the view of the evaluation team, it seems obvious that more support is given to PELUM networks in other African countries so learning and successes are pooled together at the centre (regional network) for greater effect.

3.2.4. PORINI in Kenya

The evaluation team only had a brief meeting with PORINI jointly with PELUM. PORINI is a small Kenyan organization, working with sacred places as means to protect forest areas. They have little contact with SSNC. The support is one year with a budget of app. SEK 250.000. Although from the same country and working with similar issues, they had never met before.

Both partners requested a much more proactive approach from SSNC with regards to linking them to sister NGO's supported by SSNC or known by SSNC and to establish link between local issues as organic farming and GMO, access to markets and EU Agricultural policies and regulations. It could be explored further why SSNC are not focussing on one of the organisations, or why PORINI is not a member of PELUM.

3.2.5. Eco Ethics, EEIU in Kenya

a. The Mombasa Chapter of Eco-Ethics International Union (EEIU) is a small NGO with focus on livelihood projects in poor fishing communities south of Mombassa in Kenya. This includes sustainable fishery, alternative livelihood (in particular with women).

b. EEIU is by regulation a small member organization, but functions in reality as a semi-professional network with very 5 low paid staff members and 1–2 volunteers. They have a strategic plan from 2007–12, and focus their activities on small fisheries communities with alternative production often involving women, sustainable fisheries and Eco-clubs in schools. Further they are involved in new national Coastal Zone Management policies and EIA processes in the Mombasa region. Although the

activities seem fairly dispersed, EEIU has achieved some tangible results in particular with Eco-Clubs, woman productive groups and landing sites for fishermen.

c. Since 2007, they have received support from SSNC (annual budget of 150.000 SEK). The support does not include support for salaries and capacity building. SSNC has not provided technical input to EEIU and did not visit EEIU during preparation and implementation of the support. Contacts between EEIU and similar organizations have not been facilitated. If the support for EEIU shall be extended, it should have duration of three years and include capacity development. Although EEIU has achieved some tangible results, e.g. in organising eco-clubs in schools, building landing sites for fisherman and funding of female productive groups, it would be important to focus on fewer issues, more in depths and scaling up of activities.

d. Building of networks of fishery communities and linking EEIU to other coastal NGO's would be an important part of a future support and fisheries need to be supported from catch to market. SSNC need to engage more in active dialogue and support, this is also requested by EEIU.

3.2.6. KIMWAM in Tanzania

a. KIMWAM located in Southern Tanzania has a main focus the unsustainable artisanal fishery at the Mtwara coastal area and with regeneration of mangroves. Artisanal fishery is currently not sustainable and fish seize has diminish due to over fishing. The mangroves have been destroyed due to in particular cutting for firewood and to make room for salt production.

b. KIMWAN is a small umbrella organization for the Mtwara people. It has 19 member organizations from the fisher communities around Mtwara. Members pay a small fee. It has 8 paid staff members. KIMWAM was established as an implementing organization for Suisse Aid. However since 2000 they have become independent but with financial support from Suisse Aid. Today they also receive support from SSNC and are discussing cooperation WWF. The SSNC support is for one year with a budget of SEK 240.000, and additional 64.000 SEK for training and preparation of their 2007–11 strategy with focus on artisan fishery, agriculture and livestock, mangrove planting and development of KIMWAM.

c. Currently they work in 6 communities on issues such as exchange of fishnets, support for livestock primarily through women groups and mangrove planting. Grant and credits are provided to the communities. Tangible result is seen achieved in the female groups on livestock's raring goats, pigeon, chicken raising etc and on mangrove restoration. Some new net have been distributed. But if a more sustainable fishery shall be achieved, it is crucial to have a scaling up of activities including a critical number of fishery communities in the area.

d. KIMWAM is so far happy with the relationship to SSNC, which is described as a donor/recipient relationship. The support is for one year. KIMWAM was visited by SSNC in 2006 but not during the project period. SSNC does not know much about the organisation and vice versa. It is noticed that no networking initiatives have been facilitated. Critically networking with regional organisations like WIOMSA network with headquarters in Tanzania would prove to be helpful.

e. The activities of KIMWAM are very poverty focused and they have campaigns related to HIV/ AIDS. They have women activities but does not have a gender balance activity. It is also observed that no cooperation has taken place between donors. If the cooperation shall continue it should be long term as the objective of KIMWAM is long term and results cannot be expected within a one-year timeframe. It is further critical to facilitate/focus on a broader network if sustainable fisheries shall be achieved. KIMWAM need closer contact to SSNC and capacity building and facilitation of strategic thinking should be included in future support.

3.2.7. Codesen Senegal

a. Context: Natural resource management that addresses issues of fair access to resource and participatory governance, which has implications on agricultural productivity is still a dilemma facing Senegal. The country has had a fair attempt at democratisation and this has become a leverage point for civil society to be able to mobilise and organise around issues such as political governance, water and environmental management as means of securing local livelihoods.

b. CODESEN is a Senegalese initiative that started in 1997 and expanded to Mali, Mauritania and Guinea thereby becoming a regional organisation with national membership in these countries. CODESEN works on issues related to the dam project of the Senegal River basin for irrigation and hydro power. CODESEN Senegal is a membership organization and its members are well established organizations all working in the river basin. The principal agent CODESEN engages with is the intergovernmental agency, the Senegal River Development Organisation (OMVS), created by governments of the four countries. CODESEN's objective is to work with government to mitigate the social and environmental impact of the project on communities around the project's 5 main components Environmental management and capacity building; Data and knowledge management; Trans boundary diagnosis analysis and strategic action plan; Micro finance programs – priority actions; and Programme of public participation.

c. SSNC in 2004 gave a one-year support. The project support was renewed in 2005 for another year. The current SSNC partnership funding (2006–2008) under its small project grant is in support of CODESEN's Action Plan to strengthen civil society groups; in particular the 7 departmental coordination structures in Senegal. CODESEN currently also receives funding from the intergovernmental agency OMVS.

d. It seems that CODESEN has been successful in engaging with governments and organising credible civil society voice as communities and community interests are integrated into project activities. In addition, capacity has been built of member organisations and CBOs' technical expertise in issues related to dams and development around economic, social and environmental impact. Operating along the country's political administrative structures, CODESEN has set up coordination groups made up of CBOs, youth groups, women's' groups and livelihood groups have been able to obtain funding from government for development projects. Whilst applauding CODESEN for its success in engagement with government and gaining recognition and acceptance, it is important that a patronage relationship does not develop, which will weaken CODESEN's ability to act as a watchdog.

3.2.8. Environmental Monitoring Group, EMG, in South Africa

a. EMG is small group of 8 professionals being staff members. It is not a member organization and it is nearly 100% dependent of funding from around 10 donors. SSNC current support has since 2005 been with an annual budget of 555.000 SEK.

b. EMG works for democratic, sustainable and fair decision-making processes exemplified with its work with dam affected communities and regulation of Dams. They have been an important facilitator for establishing the African Rivers Network, ARN and as part of a larger network EMG has been an active participant in the development of water resource and dam policies and regulation in SA. Water and Dams have also been the focus of their work with SSNC. Some results have materialized as the establishment of ARN, and some changes in the involvement of communities in the decision-making. They have prepared several publication/DVD's on Dam Affected people.

c. There seem to be some fatigue in the organization, as the feeling is that changes in Southern Africa in relation to Dams have been limited. At the time of the visit it looked as if EMG would give lower priority to Dams in the future.

d. EMG is in general happy about the cooperation with SSNC and does consider it a mutual partnership. Cooperation has been materialized around international events. However some staff feels they know too little about SSNC and there is a concern that the new reporting system is not able to grasp the result of their work and will create an imbalance in the partnership toward control. It is a concern if EMG gives less priority to the Dams issues, as it seems more important than ever in Southern Africa.

3.3 Summary of Visits to Thailand and Malaysia

3.3.1. Selected projects and budget in the two countries

The regional consultant living in Kuala Lumpur has conducted interviews with a total of seven organizations in Malaysia and Thailand. The organizations are a mixed of regional networks, national networks and national organizations. The organizations are as follows:

1. Thailand: Core Funding Biodiversity Action Thailand (BIOTHAI). Supported by SSNC: 1st phase 2003–2006, 2nd phase 2007–2008.

Human Rights Training for Community Representatives. Core Funding of Asian Indigenous People's Pact (AIPP). Supported by SSNC duration January 2006–December 2007.

Mekong Region Campaign for Social and Environmental Justice in River Basin Development. Living River Siam (SEARIN). Duration 2008. Supported by SSNC since 2005.

2. Malaysia: Programme To Support Cap Priorities And Organisational Needs. Consumers Association of Penang (CAP). Supported by SSNC: 1st phase 2003–2006, 2nd phase 2007–2008.

Community Mobilisation Education And Training. Sahabat Alam Malaysia (SAM). Supported by SSNC. Duration 2006–2008. Cooperation since 1997.

Enhancing Capacity Of Indigenous Peoples Organisation In The Management And Development Of Community Projects On Land And Resource Management In Sabah, Malaysia. PACOS Trust. Supported by SSNC since ?

Environment and Development Networking Programme. Third World Network (TWN). Supported by SSNC since 2004.

In the table below the budgets for the projects that the evaluation team has considered in Thailand and Malaysia.

Organisation	Country	Period	Total budget in period (SEK)	Average annually (SEK)
BIOTHAI	Thailand	2005–2008	1.120.000	280.000
AIPP	Thailand	2005–2008	800.000	200.000
SEARIN	Thailand	2005–2008	1.200.000	400.000
PACOS	Malaysia	2005–2008	1.250.000	420.000
SAM	Malaysia	2006–2008	1.880.000	470.000
CAP	Malaysia	2005–2007	900.000	300.000
TWN	Malaysia	2005–2007	4.400.000	1.100.000

Source: Bilaga IV Plan för verksamhetsområden 2008 and 2005–07.

It should be mentioned that the budgets for these projects have received an amounts in average between 200.000 to 470.000 SEK per year. An exception is TWN that is receiving 1,1 MSEK per year.

The more detailed notes from the consultants visits can be found in Annex E and F. Here follows the note about the visit to projects in Thailand.

3.3.2. Conclusion from the Thailand study

Field visit was made to Thailand, where the consultant met AIPP and BIOTHAI at their offices. Furthermore, a more remote visit to communities was done with SEARIN at the Salween River Campaign⁷.

a. The context: Thailand as a nation has experienced enormous economic changes as well as political changes in the past two decades. However these changes are not equal to all with the majority rural poor having to pay the brunt of such prosperity. The current situation were non-locally managed international investments in export-oriented resource development can be seen to contribute to the further degradation of natural resources in Thailand. While most people in rural communities remain directly dependent on a productive natural resource base for their livelihood.

Many NGOs emerge as a result of this to form a critical social movement, which is greatly observed in the work of the NGOs visited like BIOTHAI, SEARIN and TERRA. They are examples of networks built on the 'hot issues' that is strengthening the voices at provincial, national and regional levels of the community based organisations (CBOs).

b. The overall conclusion of the country study confirms that SSNC has made a good and relevant selection of partners. All the projects undertaken by the partners demonstrate community ownership and strong participatory approaches. All the projects are contributing to conservation of fragile ecosystems.

There is a good level of synergy between SSNC and the partner organizations in terms of building global awareness and campaigns to support the ground efforts. This can be seen with SSNC active in the dam issues and with SEARIN and TERRA having active partnership. However this seems to be limited to selected organizations and can be expended further.

c. SSNC support in Thailand has been greatly towards the core funding of the organizations based in Thailand. The organizations supported are largely networks either national or regional. The outcome and achievements based on the interviews are greatly linked to the approach of providing core funding. This has resulted in good ground breaking interventions and advocacy by the supported organizations. SSNC approach with the responsibilities delegated to their partners allowed for these organizations to develop based on their needs, mandate and strategic plans.

d. While Thailand also a home for many regional organisations in South East Asia. One such organisation is AIPP based in ChaingMai. AIPP seek to build indigenous peoples group's strength so they can be more effective at a regional and international platform. They target the strengthening of indigenous communities through a holistic approach bringing the communities into decision making and action. SSNC role with AIPP has been strong with information exchanges on new emerging issues and also pro-active with different studies.

Another positive example is the efforts undertaken by SEARIN and BIOTHAI with the communities, where these NGOs strong academic presence are highly regarded by the community. BIOTHAI works with peasant communities and fisher folks to raise community awareness on food security and linkages to biodiversity conservation. While SEARIN works on documenting the local knowledge to ensure community level buy-in for conservation. The SEARIN approach with their community research gives the local community the confidence to fight against construction of dams.

e. The project site visited with SEARIN at the Salween River has demonstrated concrete benefits for poor people in the community and the partner organizations engaged in pro-poor activities and poli-

⁷ This activity also had the collaboration of TERRA (Towards Ecological Recovery and Regional Alliance).

cies. The achievement seen is the strengthened ability of local communities to articulate their needs and protection of the environment. This is particularly so when the dam project as proposed will submerge villages and remove the community from their homes, livelihood and the tremendous loss of biodiversity. At present, the community members interviewed echoed the declining natural resources within their village.

3.3.3. Conclusion from the Malaysian study

a. The context: Malaysia is at a turning point regarding sustainable development. It has been developing extremely well in economic sense. However much of this is at the expense of the environment with poor management and destructive practices. The NGOs in Malaysia today serve an indispensable function of protecting and promoting democracy for civil society. Despite having working relationships with national and state government, the independence of the NGOs are kept to enable them to also act as pressure groups against any national government or state governments' "bad" policies which did not have community participation or does not protect the rights of the community either specifically or at large. These organizations seek to ensure that the real stakeholders and communities are consulted and interests are protected.

b. The overall conclusion of the country study is that SSNC support had contributed to strengthening these NGOs and the communities, which they work with in Malaysia. SSNC support is important to help local communities, who are generally voiceless in the decision making hierarchy and the organizations to advocate the new challenges facing the country such as escalating fuel cost, food prices and bio fuels. The seemingly constant threat to the fragile ecosystems and rich biodiversity of the country is an important justification for continuing support, although Malaysia is a middle income country.

c. SSNC supports SAM and PACOS focusing on strengthening local community organizations. In addition, SSNC is providing a strategic support to Third World Network (TWN) that had much supported efforts on the biosafety issue and even assisted the Malaysian government to draft an act on this matter.

In addition, organizations like SAM and PACOS working with indigenous organizations have now strengthened local communities to enforce their rights and the biodiversity. It is significant to note the SSNC had supported what would be basic elements for a legal framework, including public access to justice and decision-making achieving what is envisioned in Principle 10.⁸

d. The assessment of the selected projects confirms that SSNC has made a good and relevant selection of partners in the country. All these projects were able to ground community ownership and strengthen local partnerships with the local communities particularly the indigenous communities. It can also be seen from the projects that community ownership has ensured effective community intervention as well as alternative interventions being undertaken.

e. All projects reviewed in Malaysia have demonstrated concrete benefits for poor people in the community and the partner organizations engaged in pro-poor activities and policies. Many communities in contact with SAM and PACOS are pursuing legal cases to claim their right to land.

Many achievements can be reported by these efficient NGOs, as the CAP's project with mangrove replanting projects with local fisherfolks and farmers. One example is how the fisherfolk undertook mangrove re-planting programme to rehabilitate their area as a result of indiscriminate development and post-tsunami. This local effort now has proved to be far more effective both in terms of cost as well as sustainability of intervention than government intervention. The communities are now with CAP facilitation seen going to other communities to empower self-help.

⁸ Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration from 1992 articulated public access to information, participation in decision-making, and access to justice as key principles of environmental governance. A decade later, one hundred governments reaffirmed these goals during the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002.

f. There is a good level of synergy between SSNC and the partner organizations in terms of building global awareness and campaigns to support the ground efforts on dams, tropical forest, etc. This is the case in the collaboration with one of the strongest advocacy NGOs in the South, being Third World Network (TWN) promoting corporate social responsibility (CSR), following the global trade negotiations and influencing the Multilateral Environmental Agreements. However this can be expended further. For example, as seen in the prawn farming issue, where CAP and SSNC had separate campaigns. The main constrain as seen

was that of limitation of time, which can be overcome with better communication.

3.3.4. Final remark from Asia

The partnership between SSNC and the organizations interviewed in South East Asia is an open and transparent relationship. It is built on mutual trust and dialogue towards the furtherance of the respective issues. SSNC has seen playing a good role in issues pertaining indigenous, forest, dam and general sustainability issues. These roles can be further streamlined and development, where the local partners are strong and able to move forwards to forge a more stronger alliance.

The extensive networking is playing a good role sharing community building skills with other NGOs in South East Asia. This cross exchanges and global views are strong elements for SSNC to work further upon.

4. SSNC Working with Partners in the South

This chapter focuses on the work taking place on the ground in the South, including the selection of partners, partnership approach, advocacy, capacity-building, advisory services and cross-cutting concerns. The next Chapter 5 looks at SSNC's aid management.

4.1. Relevance of SSNC Programme

The vision of SSNC' programme is to *"contribute, in cooperation with other environmental organisations around the world, to environmentally, socially and economically sustainable development based on respect for human rights in democratic societies."*

SSNC's South Programme pursues the combined objectives of biodiversity conservation and improvement of the poor's livelihoods as the key justification for Sida support. In almost all the communities visited during the field trips, the evaluation team met poor and marginalised people affected by the degradation of natural resources. In this way, the programme is clearly consistent with Sida/SEKA's objectives.

Further justification of Sida support can be linked to the findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, which draws on contributions from more than 2,000 researchers, as published in 2005. This report concluded that *"the degradation of ecosystem services poses a significant barrier to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and to the MDG targets for 2015."*

This key international report clearly confirms the relevance of SSNC's five themes under the South Programme: 1) tropical forests, 2) sustainable agriculture, 3) climate change and watersheds, 4) marine and coastal environments, and 5) chemicals.

Moreover, the MDG 7 on environmental sustainability is, according to studies from UNDP and the World Bank, among the eight goals receiving the least attention. Its targets include *"Integrate the principles*

of sustainable development into country policies and programmes; reverse loss of environmental resources” as well as “Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss.” In this sense, SSNC’s focus on environmental sustainability is well justified.

The evaluation team observes that the SSNC’s geographical priorities coincide with some of the world’s most valuable ecosystems threatened by the highest rates of forest and land degradation. In the last two decades, the major areas of cropland expansion include Southeast Asia, the Great Lakes region of Eastern Africa, and the Amazon Basin.

SSNC supports interventions in areas of Borneo and the Amazonas with extremely rich biodiversity, with abundant endemic species of plants and animals. Since these rainforests are also lucrative sources of wood and minerals, they are often plagued by uncontrolled exploitation affecting the local communities. In the case of Borneo – where the SSNC partner PACOS is working in Sabah and SAM in Sarawak – only half of the original forest cover remains today, down from 75 percent in the mid-1980s. Deforestation has accelerated in recent years along with the advance of the agricultural frontier, mainly due to the expansion of oil palm plantation. As expressed in SSNC’s report on biofuels⁹, the craze for new energy sources is taking over millions of hectares in Indonesia, Malaysia and Brazil, which is affecting thousands of poor communities by causing deforestation and reducing the availability of land.

Mangroves being one of the earth’s most productive ecosystems, are also focussed by SSNC and their partners. According to the Ecosystem Assessment, approximately 35% of mangrove area worldwide was lost during the last decades. In the case of Ecuador, almost 70% of the mangrove has disappeared along the coast, which has impoverished more than ½ million people.

Although South Africa, Thailand, Malaysia, Ecuador, Peru and Brazil are middle-income countries, it seems well justified that SSNC work in these countries to address the same global priorities that have been featured prominently at the Johannesburg Summit for Sustainable development in 2002 and the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, in the related Agenda 21, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on Climate Change, the Convention to Combat Desertification as well as other international agreements.

4.2. Partner Selection, Partnerships and Civil Society

The evaluation’s ToR requests that the efficiency of the programme be assessed in relation to SSNC’s selection of partners and how the partnership model is working. This will be discussed in the following section.

4.2.1 Criteria for selection of Southern partners

The South Programme is intended for cooperation with non-governmental and community-based organisations (NGOs and CBOs) that share the same basic values as SSNC. As quoted in 2005–07 programme: *“The main focus is on organisations that provide opportunities for communities in the South to articulate their experiences and concerns on the environment, and to assert their influence on issues affecting their long-term livelihoods. Special efforts will be made to find appropriate forms of collaboration with indigenous peoples’ organisations and institutions. Other organisations may provide services (generation of knowledge, dissemination of information, or coordination of advocacy, lobbying and campaigns) for communities and environmental groups.”*

SSNC adheres to clear criteria for the selection of partners. These give preference to:

- a) Organisations whose internal governance and aims conform to openness, democracy and equality in decision-making as well as transparency in financial administration and management

⁹ “Fuel for development? The implications of growing demand for biofuels from the South.” SSNC report. 2007. Göran Eklöf.

- b) Organisations whose main activities are relevant to the South Programme
- c) Organisations whose proposed activities display innovation and complement rather than overlap with other efforts (in terms of methodology, approach and geographical outreach).

The evaluation team has noticed that SSNC's principles of selected partner organisations are generally in line with its own traditions as a democratic Swedish organisation and with the 2007 policy paper 'Sida's support to civil society'. This includes a mandate from primary constituencies (members, local communities etc.), internal democracy, openness and financial transparency. Priority is given to organisations aiming to empower marginalised groups, including indigenous peoples. In addition, SSNC is prioritising organisations that, due to lack of contacts, have difficulties in obtaining funds from established development assistance agencies.

4.2.2. Selection of Southern partners

SSNC's selection of partners is strongly linked to its own identity as the leading environmental NGO in Sweden. SSNC has proved highly capable of selecting relevant partners in Asia, Africa and Latin America, as well as international NGOs (Friends of the Earth and Third World Network).

The evaluation team finds that SSNC has fulfilled its first specific objective in the 2005–07 programme: *"During the program period, SSNC shall have established cooperation with organisations in the South that promote sustainable development."*

Noticeably, SSNC cooperates with partners that are well aware of the importance of combining environmental protection, social organisation and efforts to influence public decision-making. The evaluation team is impressed by the capabilities for national and international advocacy that have been observed among all the visited partners in South East Asia and Latin America, as well as within Africa Rivers Network, EMG, CODESEN and PELUM. They have clearly applied participatory methods and a rights-based approach that starts from sustainable development and the perspectives of the poor.

In the programme document, SSNC states that *"an overall assessment must always be done, taking into account also specific political, cultural and other relevant conditions."* Based on the selective field visit, the evaluation team draws the conclusion that SSNC is selecting its partners well. However, as observed in several parts of this report, the assessments that inform the selection processes are often not documented in writing. This would be a useful practice to introduce in the future.

During the evaluation, it has been discussed whether the partners have a wider constituency or not. SSNC has among its criteria for the selection of partners: *"Responsiveness and accountability to, and a clear mandate from, primary constituencies (members, local communities etc.)."* This is clearly the case with the Consumers' Association of Penang (CAP Malaysia) having about 30,000 people reading their information paper. In addition, the evaluation team visited some NGOs with deep roots in community-based organisations to which they are accountable (e.g. Pelum Kenya, C-CONDEM Ecuador, PACOS in Malaysia and SEARIN in Thailand). Some, such as Eco-Ethics, have made efforts to establish a membership-based organisation, but they have faced obstacles in charging membership fees within the poorer communities. Conversely, other Southern partners, such as EMG and Geosphere do not have any significant membership base, which is a constraint on their chances of representing an influential and broad environmental movement.

SSNC's vast popular foundation of 178,000 members is the major reasons for its marked influence on Swedish environmental policies. This experience leaves SSNC well-equipped to push the issue of constituency-building further in its future dialogue with Southern partners. It could also form part of further capacity-building (discussed later in this chapter), where SSNC has considerable expertise working as membership-based environmental NGO with full-fledged internal democratic governance and accountability.

SSNC staff indicates that, in the Southern context, they see broader constituencies as less important than in Sweden. They also notice that this importance depends upon the type of partner. For instance, a CBO differs from a watchdog NGO. The evaluation team accepts this argument to a certain degree, as it can be relevant to support think-tank NGOs, such as EMG and Third World Network. Even so, there is a need for a more systematic approach to address the constituency issue. An important discussion with partners would be about if their Board is elected by a general assembly with members or directed by a Board of Trustees with appointed members.

4.2.3. Partnership approach

SSNC works in partnership with Southern counterpart organisations. A key aim of the SSNC programme is to foster partnership and alliances between Northern and Southern NGOs on the environment. An interesting feature is the mutual understanding, where Southern partners value SSNC's acknowledgement of problems with Northern lifestyles and consumption patterns, foreign investments and resource extraction, which often promote unsustainable production and resource management in the South.

All the partners visited have expressed their appreciation of the partnership with SSNC. The visited NGOs perceive the partnership as "Southern environmentalist teaming up with Swedish environmentalists" around shared values and positions on the global environmental agenda. Many of the visited partners have also commended the open manner, in which SSNC had consulted them about the design of the reporting system. This was highlighted by PELUM Kenya, Pratec Peru, and EMG South Africa, among others.

As underlined in the South programme's objective 2, the positions of SSNC's partner organisations should be presented in Swedish and international discussions in order to increase awareness of both poverty and the underlying causes of environmental destruction.

In the evaluation team's country reports, the following has been found concerning partnership:

- CODESEN (Senegal) and EMG (South Africa) highlight the interactions with SSNC on the global platform of a World Commission on Dams, where they engage in information sharing and joint campaigning.
- The same was expressed by C-CONDEM in Ecuador. Thanks to SSNC support, this organisation has been able to work with poor communities where the mangrove is disappearing along the coast together with the Latin American regional network (Red Manglar). SSNC is also one of the key supporters of the regional pesticide network, RAPAL, with affiliates in 18 Latin American countries.
- It is recognised that SSNC is part of the international forest alliance, which campaigns to protect forests and indigenous people's rights in Malaysia, Thailand and Indonesia. There is a mutually agreed arrangement, in which the partners from the South feed information to their allies in the North, who in turn push for action in industrialised countries concerning timber and palm-oil imports from developing countries.

The partners in Malaysia and Thailand appreciate the strong element of core funding, which has enabled these organisations to build internal capacity, as well as to ensure that work on the ground is aligned with the priorities of the communities.

Satisfaction with the partnership is also expressed by the African partners CODESEN in Senegal, KIMWAM in Tanzania, as well as PELUM and Eco Ethics in Kenya. Nevertheless, they also report that the partnership is weak, in the sense that there has not been enough interaction with SSNC on substantive project issues.

It is clear to the team that SSNC has been successful in establishing well-functioning and effective partnerships with NGOs with good capacity, in particular in relation to joint campaigning and lobbying on the national, regional and international scene. Nevertheless, a major challenge for SSNC is the evolution of partnerships with the weaker NGOs and the creation of ‘added value’, i.e. of other benefits than money flowing from the relationship with SSNC. This is particularly crucial in the cooperation with many African NGOs, where the transfer of funds and a visit from Sweden every two years is just not enough. These NGOs call for greater interaction with SSNC. Details on this subject will be discussed later in this chapter.

4.2.4. Ownership

In the nine countries visited, SSNC is highly valued by the Southern partners for its open approach, which emphasizes that all partners are owners of the development work. The strong ownership is one of the most positive findings of this evaluation. It is achieved by letting the projects build on the partners’ own planning and by SSNC refraining from setting inflexible conditions (beyond reporting and sound financial management).

As said in the Thailand report, this freehand approach ensures that the organizations are given full ownership of their projects, making it easier to involve the communities.

SSNC emphasizes that all partners are owners of the development work. Many partners underlined that the projects reflect their own priorities, rather than being donor-driven. Normally, the partners are in charge of drawing up the draft project document, and SSNC headquarters usually enters into an active dialogue – although the feedback could be improved and better project documents made, as discussed further in the next chapter.

SSNC could strengthen the partner’s ownership even further by increasing core funding of the partner’s strategic plan and annual work plans, which could then be harmonised with other donors (see further in Chapter 5 about the Paris agenda). In several cases, SSNC has provided financial support to partners’ strategic planning, as highlighted by PELUM Kenya and KIMWAM in Tanzania, among others. However, this support was not linked to capacity building, which has inhibited the partners’ ability to implement their own strategies. Furthermore, the evaluation team visited several partners that had not even prepared a strategic plan. One example is Pratec in Peru, which explains that some of its other donors “prefer to focus on their own projects”, and that it has not felt the need for an organisational strategy.

4.3. Linkage Between Poverty and Environment

SSNC has positioned itself differently from those environmental NGOs that concentrate on the environment from a narrow perspective, e.g. conservation and park management. The evaluation may confirm the statement made in SSNC’s South programme document: *“during the 2005–2007 phase, [we shall] strengthen the work on organisational capacity building, focus even more on poverty and marginalized groups, and integrate gender and HIV/AIDS issues through mainstreaming in analysis and dialogue with partners.”*

In all the countries visited, the team has witnessed a clear poverty orientation, as well as examples of how Southern partners operationalise this focus on poverty and on its possible linkages to environmental and natural-resource management. Furthermore, partners are generally fostering a participatory approach, facilitating community participation as reported from the visits to the partners based in Thailand (BIOTHAI, AIPP and SEARIN), PELUM and Eco Ethics in Kenya, CODESEN Senegal, and PRATEC in Peru, among others.

Most of these NGOs work on the ground with integration of poverty and environment. As will be discussed further in the next chapter, this requires a broader partnership approach than the thematic

focus preferred by SSNC. Taking KIMWAN as an example, the starting point is to support sustainable fisheries. If SSNC is to be a proactive partner, it needs a wider understanding of the local context, of how communities are organized, of local cultural, political and historical factors, etc. Furthermore, the local fisheries might be made more sustainable by guiding the communities towards alternative productive activities within agriculture, livestock or similar fields. It is generally acknowledged that work with environment-poverty linkages from a development perspective requires integrated approaches, since solutions are seldom found within a single theme or sector.

At the very least, SSNC – together with partners – can systematise experiences of environmental mainstreaming gained in projects on the ground. The resulting findings could be used by Southern partners, as well as by Sida and other Swedish NGOs engaged in mainstreaming environmental concerns and in policy monitoring of MDG 7 (target: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes; reverse loss of environmental resources).

In order to reinforce SSNC's important support for Southern partners' pursuit of an approach that combines poverty reduction, environmental sustainability and good governance, SSNC's South Programme could benefit from following the international debate on environment/sustainable development assistance, e.g. the lessons and reflections springing from the work of IIED, IUCN and the Poverty-Environmental Partnership (PEP)¹⁰ network of international agencies, of which Sida is an active member. This debate also has its specific expression in the countries that SSNC is supporting.

4.4. Advocacy and Role of SSNC Partners within Civil Society

4.4.1. Definition

The evaluation team has adopted a broad understanding of the term 'advocacy' as *pleading a cause, or helping others to plead a cause*. Advocacy serves to influence decision-making in pursuit of a wider goal than that of the specific project. It is a fundamental tool for a rights-based approach that favours the poor and sustainable development. Advocacy can take place locally, regionally or nationally in the South, internationally, or all of the above.

4.4.2. Sustainable development in Swedish NGO community

Advocacy features prominently in the SSNC's work in Sweden. The organisation's 178,000 members make it one of the strongest voices in the public debate on environmental issues. SSNC is able to bring well-documented cases from its Southern partners to the notice of the Swedish public, as campaigns, media work and lobbying activities are intensely carried out at SSNC's headquarters in Stockholm, 274 local branches throughout Sweden and through collaboration with European/international NGO networks. One example explained in this section is the campaign for the protection of mangrove ecosystems.

The country visits confirm that SSNC has been good at providing relevant information to the stronger Southern NGOs engaged in campaigning issues, e.g. on Swedish companies' operations in their country. In addition, SSNC has made specific thematic reports with titles such as "No development guaranteed", "Fuel for development", "Food, climate and development", and "Broken Illusions" (on CDM) etc.

The absence of a Swedish coalition for sustainable development has been a constraint on the global advocacy of Swedish NGOs. The environment is among the priorities of Forum Syd, which is a strong Swedish umbrella organisation conducting advocacy on international issues, e.g. trade, Accra, World Bank/IMF, etc. The participation in international negotiations (e.g. COPs for the various conventions and MEAs) is mainly done individually by WWF-Sweden, Miljöförbundet Jordens Vänner and SSNC,

¹⁰ See website: www.povertyenvironment.net/pep

without the economy of scale gained by joining forces, as seen among coalitions in Norway (ForUM¹¹) and Denmark (92 Group¹²). This implies that the Swedish environmental NGOs are less present in the key international events than their Danish and Norwegian colleagues.

The consequence of the lacking Swedish coalition on sustainable development is a problem for the entire Swedish NGO community, as environment becomes a parallel and special activity rather than part of a broader sustainable development agenda. For example, it makes little sense to discuss climate change without also addressing the implications for economic and social development. The evaluation team suggests that SSNC raise this shortcoming to the Swedish NGO community at the meeting convened for late August 2008 in preparation of the upcoming Climate Summit. The Swedish NGOs should be even more motivated to come together by the fact that the COP 15 will be held during the Swedish presidency of the EU.

-
1. *Recommendation:* SSNC could strengthen the joint Swedish NGO platform for sustainable development by:
- doing more to integrate international issues into the domestic part of SSNC's work.
 - approaching the preparation of the COP 15 Climate Summit in 2009 by proposing and working towards a Swedish coalition for sustainable development (separately or within Forum Syd) that would unite Swedish development and environmental NGOs, enabling more effective participation in European and international negotiations and monitoring of sustainable policies.
-

4.4.3. Advocacy with SSNC partners

In general, advocacy is one of the strongest elements in SSNC's South Programme. This is a major advantage in the *thematic specialization* that fits well with the international agenda on sustainable development. SSNC also benefits from being present in Asia, Africa and Latin America, including a number of strategic countries hosting the world's most valuable ecosystems, where bilateral donors are leaving (South East Asia and South America). In the case of Ecuador, Holland and Switzerland have recently closed down their environmental programmes. In the case of Malaysia, Danida is phasing out its engagement next year as the last bilateral donor with an environmental programme.

In Malaysia, Thailand, Ecuador and South Africa, the evaluation team has observed partners with highly developed skills in *advocacy and campaigning*. In this field, some of the partners even match SSNC's performance in Sweden. This includes showcases, such as Third World Network, which is engaged globally in influencing trade and Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), Asian Indigenous People's Pact (AIPP), which is pushing the indigenous agenda in the UN, building on deep roots in local indigenous organisations. Another examples are SAM Malaysia chairing Friends of the Earth International and C-CONDEM, whose work ranges from projects within coastal communities in Ecuador to advocacy towards the World Bank and participation in the Ramsar Convention's COP-9 conference through its affiliation to Red Manglar.¹³

SSNC's International Department has – together with some Southern partners – undertaken a host of interesting activities beyond the actual projects, e.g. globally promoting the guidelines of the World Commission on Dams (WCD), an assessment of the World Bank's climate policies, an analysis of the expansion of sugarcane cultivation for ethanol production, and a report prepared jointly between SSNC, Friends of the Earth Netherlands and Sawit Watch Indonesia. Other examples, mainly with

¹¹ Forum for Environment and Development (ForUM) is a Norwegian network of more than 50 non-governmental organisations that focus on environment and development.

¹² The Danish 92 Group is a coalition of 20 Danish NGOs working on issues related to environment and development.

¹³ 9th Meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties to the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar 1971) held in November 2005 in Uganda's capital Kampala. This event was attended by the SSNC-supported Red Manglar representing CODDE-FFAGOLF in Honduras and C-CONDEM in Ecuador, among others.

partners in Asia and Latin America, are campaigns on tropical timber and biofuel. SSNC has also informed the evaluation team about the strong linkages between Sweden and ISD (Sustainable organic agriculture) in Ethiopia, where SSNC is clearly adding value beyond channelling funds.

A concrete example is the campaign against destruction of mangrove forests caused by the farming of scampi (large shrimp). This campaign was based on information from the Latin American partners Red Manglar, C-CONDEM and CODDEFFAGOLF, who informed SSNC about the ecological and social harm of scampi farming. SSNC's campaign for a boycott of scampi in Sweden has been quite successful, resulting in the hotel chain Scandic's decision to stop selling scampi in all its 122 hotel restaurants in Scandinavia and the Baltic region.

However, such types of joint action have been absent from the cooperation with numerous other African NGOs, as several of them – such as KIMWAM, Eco Ethics, Porini and CODESEN – are still some way from being strong enough at this level. These organisations first need to build their own capacity and affiliation to national/regional networks.

It could also be possible to connect some African and Latin American partners to networks involved in influencing the WTO Doha Round, as well as the EU's ongoing trade negotiations with Africa (EPA) and with the Andes Region and Central America. Indeed, SSNC is already supporting Third World Network on the trade issue. Many of the Southern partners also want to work with SSNC on GMOs.

-
2. *Recommendation:* SSNC should refine its partnership with African NGOs by seeking their active involvement in advocacy and campaigning at the national, regional and international level.

This effort could also benefit from more active use of the thematic structure of SSNC's programme, with enhanced South-South partner collaboration.

4.5. Capacity Building and Advisory Services

4.5.1. Advisory Services

SSNC has generally refrained from using technical assistance or advisors in its project portfolio, although support for local consultants has been provided in some cases, e.g. KIMWAM's preparation of a strategic plan. All contact to partners is undertaken by the programme offices in Stockholm, operating under the apparent assumption that the partners selected have the capacity necessary to implement the projects.

Given that the Stockholm-based staff have insufficient time for frequent visits and advisory services to partners, the evaluation team has discussed the idea with SSNC's International Department of establishing a resource base of external (mainly local) consultants, who can be paid from a specific budget line to be introduced in coming project documents. This could be combined with the recommendation below to step up capacity-building efforts.

Considering the ample presence of competent experts within the five thematic areas at the International Department in Stockholm, SSNC holds potential to develop into a 'knowledge-based' organisation that offers Southern partners greater strategic and technical guidance than at present. This could also include helping partners in defining the necessary advisory services based on an agreed plan for capacity building.

4.5.2. Capacity Building

In the 2005–07 programme document, SSNC has stated that “the programme will during the 2005–2007 phase strengthen the work on organisational capacity building.” Nevertheless, in the eight countries visited, the evaluation team has not seen any project in which SSNC has had systematic *capacity development* of the partner built into the cooperation. Nor has the team seen any organisational assessment carried out during the preparation of SSNC support. The evaluation team is aware that it has

been included in a project in Brazil, and also included in a recent evaluation with other donors in Indonesia. It seems to be the general assumption that selected partners have sufficient organisational capacity.

The partners visited in South East Asia and Latin America have considerable capacity, and they primarily need a good Northern partner to provide funding along with North-South collaboration and dialogue. This is also the case of an NGO such as EMG in South Africa. All these organisations show ingenuity in strengthening CBOs and fostering a participatory approach.

However, in the other African countries, the evaluation team has observed scope for enhancing the partners' performance through more substantial advisory services and capacity building, including partnership activities. This is the case of networks as well as NGOs and CBOs. In these cases, SSNC has *not* provided substantial advisory services and/or capacity building. Nor do the projects allocate sufficient – if any – resources to external advisory services.

The evaluation team finds that that organisational assessments and capacity building could be a relevant tool in relation to several Southern partners. If the support for some of the smaller NGOs in Africa is to be effective, and if they are to be involved in a broader dialogue in the long term, it is critical that SSNC embark on strengthening these organizations' capacity based on a strategic plan. This would require certain in-house capacity within SSNC in systematic organisational development (OD). Inspiration may be drawn from INTRAC in UK and CDRA in Cape Town, among others. In the case of Africa, SSCN could also learn from the Swedish Cooperative Centre's regional office in Nairobi, which has a good resource base of African facilitators for OD and change processes. Meanwhile, African partners could benefit from training courses at MS-TCDC located in Arusha in Tanzania.

The national organisations, in the conversations with the evaluation team have expressed their appreciation of the training and advisory services received from regional networks, such as AIPP (indigenous peoples) and SEARIN in Thailand/South East Asia. Similarly, valuable services have been rendered by the Latin American regional mangrove network (Red Manglar) and the network on pesticides, RAPAL, the latter with affiliates in 18 countries.

In the light of these successes, it is worth considering the option of SSCN approaching regional networks, such as PELUM and African Rivers Networks, to request their services as capacity builders of their own member organisations in Africa. This would also provide economy of scale compared with the current SSNC support for only one national chapter of PELUM Kenya.

SSNC's completion report to Sida (2005–07) mentions that some strong partners have been 'capacity builders' of other partners, as in the case of Third World Network (TWN) and Friends of the Earth International – both with interesting potentials in relation to capacity building of some future SSNC partners in Africa. Over the past years, TWN has built the capacity of many civil society actors and government policy-makers in dealing with key aspects of globalization, and in understanding the practical implications of the environment-development link.

In short, SSNC should take initiatives and release resources to pursue a more proactive partnership approach to activities on the ground, in particular in relation to the NGOs in Africa. Currently, the partnership model seems to be efficient and adding value, when it comes to national, regional and international advocacy, primarily alongside well-functioning NGOs, whereas SSNC is creating insufficient added value as regards the strengthening of weaker NGOs operating in the communities.

-
3. *Recommendation:* Several Southern partners could benefit from capacity-building efforts being built into the next phases of the projects, aimed at increasing partner organisations' effectiveness at national, district and community levels (e.g. strategic planning, leadership, management, communi-
-

cation, staff and volunteer policies, financial management, systems, etc.). When planning the budget for the next project phases, SSNC could include a specific budget line for ‘advisory services and capacity building’ to be spent in accordance with Terms of References suggested by the partners, while building a good resource base of regional/national facilitators of OD and change processes.

4.6. Cross-cutting Issues: Gender, HIV/AIDS and Indigenous People’s

The evaluation team has assessed how SSNC has integrated gender equality and HIV/AIDS issues through mainstreaming in analysis and dialogue with partners, as it was stated in the 2005–2007 South Programme Document. Furthermore, the team has looked at compliance with the programme document’s statement: *“Special efforts will be made to find appropriate forms of collaboration with indigenous peoples’ organisations and institutions.”*

4.6.1. Gender equality

It is internationally recognized that the empowerment of women and equality between men and women is a goal in its own right, as expressed in the MDG 3. In this respect, the evaluation exercise showed mixed achievements in terms of integrating gender issues into the work of the NGOs visited. Gender is dealt with as a “women’s issue”, i.e. as a need to organise activities specifically for women, rather than to address strategic gender-based interests in all aspects of the programme. For example, several women’s productive groups are being supported by the Kenyan Eco Ethics through a revolving fund, and about half of the school teachers engaged in the eco-clubs are women. Although women are present in activities in most of the projects, their roles often remain in more traditional spheres, with women as organizers at home, involved in seed exchange and food matters.

This corresponds more with a ‘Women in Development (WID)’ than a gender approach. Very few of the projects documents have incorporated gender-sensitive indicators, and it is not clear how SSNC has followed up on the 2007 gender study.¹⁴ Among several of the partners visited, gender concerns are not obviously taken into account. Most of the achievements, when they exist, are not properly recorded in order to document how gender-sensitive modalities are being employed.

The evaluation team has also observed that many of the leaders and senior project officers from the organizations in Thailand, Malaysia, Peru and Ecuador are women. As examples, both PRATEC in Peru and AIPP in Asia have worked extensively with women, who showed leadership and were fully committed to defending the rainforest and mangrove. However, in all these cases, the evaluation team saw no evidence of a strategy to pursue a gender-conscious approach, nor an account of how these women are positioned at the decision-making level. This is because there is no documentation setting out how a consultative process is undertaken to ensure that the inputs of women are considered.

It is noted that gender has been discussed at length at an international meeting last year in Lamas, Peru, where several SSNC partners were present. One issue raised was that some partners disagree with certain traditional gender indicators proposed, which were deemed to have been developed outside the cultural context of the communities. They concluded that each partner was going to pursue gender issues according to its own cultural context.

In conclusion, the present integration of the gender dimension is relatively weak in SSNC’s South Programme. This often stems from the lack of gender focus already in the project design and from insufficient dialogue between partners. Gender perspectives should receive greater attention and be better incorporated into SSNC partners’ institutional strategies. Many of the partners, such as AIPP, PACOS, RAPAL, Eco Ethics and PELUM, have great potential for being assisted by SSNC in systema-

¹⁴ Rapport om Genus och jämställdhet i Svenska Naturskyddsföreningens internationella avdelnings arbete [Report on Gender and Equality in the work of SSNC’s International Department], by Charlotta Widmark. February 2007.

tising the gender focus. Many partners express a need to know other experiences of putting a gender approach into practice. With the current lack of methods and the inability to agree on a set of indicators, progress is unlikely.

Capacity building in gender-sensitive analysis must be undertaken together with local partners in order to ensure that the gender perspective is effectively taken into consideration within the local context. It is crucial for SSNC to interact effectively with local partners in the pursuit of a gender focus.

4. *Recommendation:* Gender perspectives should be more focused and integrated as part of the SSNC partners' institutional strategies. This can be accomplished with the development of gender-specific indicators for monitoring and evaluation of focus areas, such as biodiversity, forestation etc. Furthermore, partners need to know concrete methods and other experiences of putting the gender approach into practice.

4.6.2. HIV/AIDS

SSNC has increased its presence in Africa in recent years. According to the completion report for 2005–07, in 2005, SSNC initiated a dialogue with African partners about the integration of HIV/AIDS into the projects.

All the partners met by the evaluation team in Africa were acutely aware of the *HIV/AIDS* issue. Although SSNC has devoted limited thinking to the pandemic, it is good that SSNC has entered into collaboration with two Swedish NGOs with extensive expertise in this field in Africa, namely RFSU and the Africa Groups.

During visits to communities in the fishery projects at the coast in Kenya and Tanzania, where HIV/AIDS is a major problem, the evaluation team noticed that the partners Eco Ethics and KIMWAM have clearly endeavoured to pay attention to the prevention of the disease. The organisation has worked to raise awareness of HIV/AIDS through a village campaign in March 2008. PELUM Kenya reports that HIV used to be addressed through stand-alone projects, but is now mainstreamed into programme implementation.

4.6.3. Indigenous Peoples

Poverty is particularly widespread and deeply rooted among indigenous peoples in rural areas, who have historically been discriminated. Therefore the evaluation team has been impressed by the way that SSNC has concretised the rights-based approach in its strong focus on indigenous people's concerns and rights.

As an example, the core funding provided to the Asian Indigenous Peoples' Pact (AIPP) has been observed to help build greater coordination between indigenous groups in South East Asia. Meanwhile, work is carried out directly with local organizations aimed at advancing community rights as a tool to confront the challenges of deforestation, plantations, biofuels and various other issues affecting their livelihoods.

In addition, other areas of intervention, such as dam campaigns and sustainable agriculture, in partnership with organizations that are not indigenous, such as SEARIN, TERRA and SAM Malaysia, have adopted participatory methods to ensure that indigenous perspectives are taken into consideration. Despite this success, many of these interventions are not well documented within SSNC. They only surfaced due to incisive interviews and field observations by the evaluation team.

The evaluation team observed that, despite the similarities in their nature and field of work, two SSNC partners like PACOS in Malaysia and PRATEC in Peru have no information about each other. SSNC could develop a niche in facilitating the exchange of experiences regarding indigenous knowledge and

practices. PRATEC has a long-standing record of working with agricultural diversity in “kechua lamas” communities in Amazonas, which has been well analyzed and published in PRATEC’s book.

Another potential niche would seek to further indigenous concerns from a gender perspective, as many of the activities, such as the agro-biodiversity and rights-based initiatives, have a clear gender linkage. The documentation undertaken by PRATEC as well as AIPP has identified scope for taking advantage of particular indigenous cultural values in the pursuit of a gender approach.¹⁵

Many of the Latin American countries have ratified the International Labour Organisation’s (ILO) Convention 169 with its recognition of indigenous peoples’ individual and collective rights. Malaysia was among the countries promoting the “*The Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*”, which was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in September 2007. This was a major victory for the indigenous organisations after more than 20 years of efforts to this effect. Finally, it illustrates the recognition bestowed on one of the SSNC partners that AIPP’s Secretary-General, Jannie Lasimbang, was recently appointed as an expert to the UN’s Human Rights Council.¹⁶

5. SSNC Aid Management

This chapter focuses on SSNC’s aid management, which includes the preference for a thematic rather than a geographical programme structure, capacity at country level; planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME); and sustainability.

5.1. Approaches and Relevance of Selected Environmental Themes in Relation to Local Environmental Problems

SSNC has chosen five themes as focus areas for its interventions, namely: 1) tropical forests, 2) sustainable agriculture, 3) climate change and watersheds, 4) marine and coastal environments, and 5) chemicals. Each theme is allotted one responsible programme officer in Stockholm.

A key aim of the programme is to establish partnerships and alliances between Northern and Southern NGOs and movements. The thematic approach is chosen from a Northern perspective, given that many international conventions and meetings are held within these themes, and given that much discussion in Sweden is thematically organised. In synthesis, the five focus areas are all relevant to the SSNC’s partner NGOs and the respective countries of cooperation. This overall judgment is elaborated upon here below.

5.1.1. Advantages of SSNC’s five thematic areas

Weighing up the choice between a thematic and a geographic programme set-up involves myriad considerations, many of which are constantly discussed within bilateral development agencies. The thematic approach has some obvious advantages when it comes to campaigns revolving around global environmental issues. These are often connected to the numerous Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), where NGOs in the South and in the North have a shared agenda as crucial actors in influencing the negotiations, and subsequently monitoring the implementation as well as the wider environmental and sustainability challenges.

¹⁵ The right of a life without violence at home and particularly the CEDAW convention (Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women).

¹⁶ Appointment as one of the five members of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of the Indigenous Peoples.

One planned result of the second objective of SCNN's 2005–07 South Programme is to ensure the partners' voice in Swedish and international debates. The thematic approach fits well into the work in Sweden, where SSNC has a strong identity related to the themes. This is also reflected in the recruitment of staff, as desk officers in Stockholm are selected for their thematic qualifications, rather than for knowledge of country contexts and development issues.

The thematic approach is very suitable for partnerships on national, regional and international advocacy with strong NGOs from middle-income countries of the kind that the evaluation team met in South East Asia, South Africa and Latin America. Here, the selected partners have long-standing records of participation in national and international debates, where thematic categories are often the best way to structure advocacy, public awareness-raising and campaigning. SSNC also cooperates with well-functioning regional thematic networks, e.g. in relation to the World Commission on Dams, tropical forests, etc.

Conversely, the thematic approach is often ill-suited to the experiences and support needs of NGOs in poorer countries (LDCs). This transpired in nearly all meetings held between the evaluation team and partners during the visits in Africa. Working with NGOs of less capacity requires further insights into the particular country's context and more frequent contacts to the partners.

Clearly, the types of cooperation and joint action observed in Asia and Latin America is not taking place with many African NGOs. Several of them, such as KIMWAM, Eco Ethics, PELUM and Porini, are currently not joining in as partners in international debates, although they all express an interest in climate, food security, GMOs, etc. These organisations need to build their own capacity and networking. For this, they need active support from SSNC.

In the view of the evaluation team, there is no easy answer to the question of whether a thematic or a geographical organisation is preferable in SSNC's programme and work. It should be acknowledged that strong thematically-based professional expertise holds advantages, and SSNC clearly has a strong identity related to this thematic structure. However, if SSNC wants to be a proactive partner in work with poverty–environmental linkages alongside NGOs from LDCs, in particular in Africa, it needs to combine its thematic outlook with a more geographical or integrated approach, as well as an understanding of the complexity of local contexts, in addition to stepping up capacity-building efforts. Although the latter is also needed in Latin America and Asia, in these continents, the partners visited demonstrated their ability to take an integrated approach to problems in the communities, at the municipal level and among other local stakeholders.

5.1.2. South-South contact within the themes

In general, there seems to be little synergy between the different themes within SSNC, and between the work of its various partners. Surprisingly, few contacts have been identified between organisations engaged within the same themes. Nor has there been any significant amount of papers circulated on lessons learned and good practices among the partners addressing the same thematic areas.

In some cases, the thematic approach seems to be applied so strictly that contact between partners within the same country has not even been established. Pelum and Porini met for the first time during the visit of the team, although they work with similar themes. Eco Ethics and Porini both carry out activities with coastal communities, but have never been in touch. And KIMWAN in Tanzania is not linked to the regional marine research network, WIOMSA, although both are SSNC partners since 2007 and work with fisheries. It seems that this absence of contact springs from each programme officer tending to work within “her/his theme” at the SSNC headquarters without much cross-fertilisation. The consequences are insufficient exchange of experiences among SSNC partners.

5.1.3. Chemicals and Climate

Two of the issues, chemicals and climate, are in fact cross-cutting, and if a country approach is taken, they ought to be further integrated into the projects related to the other themes.

As for the area of chemicals, the main problem is pesticides, which pertains mostly to forestry and agriculture, and should be solved within this productive and social context. Despite SSNC's thematic approach, the partners working in an integrated manner on the ground, as in the case of projects of sustainable agriculture (PELUM Kenya, ANPE in Peru) and of the RAPAL pesticide network in Latin America.

In the SSNC programme, climate change is seen as part of watershed management and closely related to clean development mechanisms, CDM. However, in LDC countries, climate change has other, equally important aspects, such as adaptation within specific geographic and productive areas. It is of some concern that SSNC, in its programme for 2005–2007, reduces this main global environmental problem to an issue of CDM. Global warming is a Northern-caused problem that needs to be addressed mainly in the North, however relevant Southern contributions might be. In the South, SSNC should focus mainly on the adaptation aspect, which is the foremost concern for low- and middle-income countries. Even so, mitigation-related issues, including CDM, are still relevant, and in many cases require integration between water, forest and agriculture.

Furthermore, there is a major opportunity to join forces with Southern partners in the process leading to COP 15 in 2009, in order to secure sufficient attention to climate change adaptation and support for decision-making structures that are acceptable to LDCs in the mould of the Kyoto Adaptation Fund and possibly novel funding mechanisms, improved funding for technology transfer and adaptation. Because of its fairly narrow approach to climate change, SSNC is losing good opportunities for broader partnership. In the view of the evaluation team, SSNC should make chemicals and climate cross-cutting, at least at the country level, and should, in a new strategy, reconsider its approach to climate change to focus on adaptation as well, which is by far the most important from an LDC perspective. This could be done without changing SSNC's thematic staff members, who would merely have to engage in more teamwork across themes at the country level.

-
5. *Recommendation:* SSNC should broaden the scope of its climate-change work by including it in all its themes, ensuring that it is not confined to CDM, but rather sets greater store on adaptation to climate change, technology transfers etc.
-

5.1.3. Programme level

The thematic approach dominates the programme documents and reporting to such a degree that it is sometimes difficult to see what the individual programme level is. SSNC could benefit from strengthening the overall South Programme (beyond the five themes), including promotion of issues that cut across all five themes, e.g. ecosystem services, climate adaptation & livelihood, gender, indigenous peoples, capacity building, monitoring of national environmental policies/budgets, etc. In addition, a certain country concentration could contribute to reducing the current fragmentation of the overall South Programme into five thematic areas. This will be discussed in the next section.

5.2. SSNC's Capacity at the Country Level

5.2.1. Number of countries and donor harmonisation

SSNC sponsors projects with almost 60 partners in about 28 countries spread over three continents (not counting the many countries affiliated to the networks). It is fairly clear that SSNC has not made the expected progress towards “*gradual concentration both thematically and geographically*”, that was announced in the 2005–07 programme document.

The current SSNC set-up has no geographical/country concentration, and the low frequency of visits does *not* allow for the necessary knowledge of the context in 28 countries. This poses a major challenge for SSNC's future engagement in Africa.

Nearly all partners interviewed pointed to a need for more interaction with SSNC. This is particularly observed among the locally-based NGOs (or CBOs), which seem to enjoy a lesser degree of interaction and dialogue with SSNC, as they do not take part in regional and international networking. This was mainly voiced by organizations visited in Africa, which emphasised that SSNC was providing insufficient “added value” in terms of dialogue, exchange of information and capacity building. It is clear from meetings with the partners and from studying SSNC’s own documentation that the Swedish organisation does not have sufficient knowledge of each and every partner and the national/local context where the projects are operating.

An example from the field visits is PELUM Kenya, where SSNC does not give substantive programme support, except on administrative project issues. The organisation lacks frequent interaction and advisory assistance. CODESEN based in Senegal also reports limited technical and substantive input to project implementation, which – together with infrequent visits – seems to be the general situation in the projects visited in Kenya, Senegal and Tanzania.

Another example is SSNC’s limited insight into the problems on the Tanzanian coast, which has a technical/thematic element, but where the actions of communities working with KIMWAM are far more driven by cultural, political, economic and social factors. It would take more intense contact for advice to be provided on specific issues regarding community livelihoods and linkages to food security, biodiversity, health, gender issues and local governance. It is striking that an old partner of KIMWAM, Swiss Aid, still finds it necessary to pay bimonthly supervision visits, even though they have an office in Dar es Salaam with easy access to communication. Nor has SSNC explored potential linkages to WWF’s programme for the Eastern Africa Marine Eco-region, which receives substantial support from WWF Denmark.

Although the partners appreciate that SSNC respects their integrity, they also express a wish for more intense dialogue with their Swedish partner on local as well as broader national and international perspectives. In particular, the African partners expressed a need for building their capacity. The evaluation team finds it possible to have a partner dialogue about strategies, planning and the corresponding implementation capacity without “taking over” the partners’ own policy formulation. It seems problematic that SSNC applies the same model to weak African NGOs as to strong Latin American, Asian and international NGOs, which are much better suited to take advantage of SSNC’s thematic approach.

Some SSNC staff have argued that SSNC should keep a low profile in the countries and leave all domestic policy completely to the partners, as they have their own rationale for the choices that they are making, while SSNC’s contribution should be confined to the Swedish and international policy level. An example given is the palm oil industry, where it is important to have Colombia, Brazil, Indonesia and other countries involved in this global issue.

Obviously, SSNC should maintain this strength in the future. However, the stated intention of doing more in Africa obliges SSNC to accept that cooperation with weaker African NGOs is of a different nature that requires greater insights into the social, cultural, political and economic context of the countries. SSNC must engage much more intensely with its local partners in Africa, stepping up capacity building efforts, focusing more on strategic planning and on linking these locally based NGOs to national and regional networks and initiatives.

5.2.2. Trends towards decentralised aid in Africa

If one compares SSNC to other development aid organisations, the lack of country concentration stands out. For instance, the Swedish Cooperative Centre (SCC) is another Swedish organisation that has a framework agreement with Sida. It works in a similar number of countries, but with an annual budget of SEK 221 million (2007), which is 10 times more than the South Programme of SSNC. SCC even has three regional offices – with African programme officers – in charge of direct contact

with the partners, which means that its Stockholm office has much less administrative work regarding the projects than SSNC, whose staff surveyed found the administrative burden to be heavy.

Many other organisations, with a far greater budget than SSNC, have been through painful country concentration processes over the last decade in order to optimise their use of scarce administrative resources and achieve greater impact. Sida has, for example, taken the concentration far, with a reduction from about 70 to 24 countries, which has been justified by giving the agency greater ability to add value and build good competencies. This means that SSNC is currently engaged in more countries than the future Sida with its new country concentration.

In conversations with the evaluation team, the heads of Sida in Nairobi as well as Dar es Salaam expressed that a general weakness among civil society is the tendency to concentrate on activities in the capital cities, while linkages from the national level to CBOs in the districts remain weak. According to these interviews with Sida embassy staff, the way these local organisations are operating only allows for contact through physical presence in the locality. To work with them, Swedish NGOs need to have proven country experience/presence.

The agenda of the Paris Declaration has accelerated the decentralisation of aid management. Along with the ongoing pursuit of Joint Assistance Strategies (JAS) and aid harmonisation in many of Sida's countries of cooperation in Africa, several donor basket funds for civil society support have been established. Many of them are following the model from the Foundation for Civil Society in Tanzania, which – governed by an independent board – provide grants and capacity building support for civil society organisations. Its staff of about 20 persons make regular visit to the grant-recipient organisations.

Geographical concentration would allow SSNC to bring together its partners within the same country with a view to influencing national environmental policies/strategies/JAS/PRSP, etc. It could also help strengthen the respective partners' ability to influence national environmental policies and push for the mainstreaming of environmental concerns into key economic sectors, such as agriculture, energy and transport, or to join forces with other NGO coalitions on tracking of the government's proposal for the national budget, with a special focus on environmental sustainability.

The currently unfocused SSNC strategy, combined with limited staffing and a relatively small SEKA/Sida framework budget, results in insufficient time being allocated to strategic and substantive dialogue with Southern partners. Accordingly, the lack of focus in SSNC's strategy is probably the most serious flaw that the team has identified during this evaluation.

6. *Recommendation:* SSNC should strike a balance between thematic focus and country insights if the organisation wants to provide added value to the weaker NGOs in Africa. Over the next three years, it is strongly recommended that the South Programme's current 28 countries of cooperation be gradually reduced to:

Option a: If maintaining the current budget about of about SEK 21 million: a maximum of 12 countries in the prioritised sub-regions in South East Asia, Latin America and Africa (not counting global projects and the countries in regional networks).

Option b: If the future budget is doubled to about SEK 40 million: a maximum of 16–18 countries in the prioritised sub-regions in South East Asia, Latin America and Africa (not counting the countries in regional networks).

These changes could be followed by greater focus on the activities in Africa, as well as on regional networks that are *anchored within national organisation*. This will enable SSNC to reach more partners more efficiently and to strengthen the fieldwork and international/regional advocacy activities. As an example, instead of finding new partners, SSNC could engage with national member organisations of

PELUM in the other African countries on which SSNC decides to concentrate in the future. This approach could also pave the way for a future regional presence of SSNC.

This country concentration should, of course, be gradually applied through responsible exit strategies. The following criteria for the country concentration could be considered, following discussions with SSNC's International Department:

- Countries in Latin America and South East Asia that have valuable ecosystems and, at the same time, strategic influence in G77 in relation to the conventions and the Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).
- Least Development Countries (LDC), first and foremost in Africa.
- Countries with Swedish investments that affect the natural resources and environment.
- Countries with gaps in international environmental assistance, i.e. with few other donors.
- Countries with several potential SSNC partners.

The point of departure should be a country concentration, to which the selection of partners related to the five (or less themes) must be subordinated (and not the reverse order starting with the number of partners per theme as indicated by SSNC staff).

5.3. SSNC Staff Resources

The evaluation team has met SSNC employees, who are dedicated, motivated and hardworking. They are technically competent on environmental issues, such as forestry, biodiversity, watershed, climate and chemicals.

However, the staff turnover has been relatively high at SSNC's International Department, which has affected continuity and been frustrating for Southern partners as expressed to the evaluation team, e.g. by Ecuadorean C-CONDEM, Kenyan Eco-Ethics and Tanzanian KIMWAM, which all have had to deal with three different desk officers within only two years.

The team is under the impression that the International Department has a mismatch between the defined tasks and the staff resources set aside to carry them out. Some of the staff members risk suffering from high stress levels.

SSNC is allowed by Sida to spend 8% of the budget on overhead costs, which means about SEK 1.6 million of the total of SEK 21 million allocated to the South programme. Today, each of the five themes has one desk officer, plus an additional half-time position for climate change, one half-time position for networking, one half-time position for accounting, plus a Head of Department (who also leads the East and Environmental Policy programmes). This is in total of 7.5 full-time positions.¹⁷

As the International Department is not running a time registration scheme, the evaluation team made a questionnaire to the staff. One question asked for each staff member's rough estimate of how the working hours are spent. This simple survey points to an overwhelming 60% of the working time spent on project administration, 20% on dealing with issues related to SSNC, and only 20% dedicated to the actual substance of the South Programme. This allocation of time is in itself a psychological factor that causes frustration, making it difficult for responsible staff members to comply with their own expectations and ambitions.

¹⁷ SSNC has as internal rule allocating SEK 250,000 to overheads per staff.

In short, there seems to be both internal and external reason. The most noticeable is the highly unfocused SSNC strategy (in the South programme), involving five themes covering about 28 countries. This implies that each programme officer must on average cover 11 countries and undertake responsibility for 13 projects. Another part of the explanation stems from the policy of SEKA/Sida, whose total spending on the framework agreements with 14 Swedish NGOs only allocates less than 3% to environmental NGOs.¹⁸ This reflects a surprisingly low priority to the environment. With all the requirements to Swedish framework organisations in terms of reporting etc., it seems to the evaluation team that the annual SEK 21 million to SSNC's South Programme is below what is needed to meet the level of ambition of a programme spanning three continents.

The current staff situation makes it almost impossible for the International Department to follow international trends within five environmental themes (some of which are complicated), and at the same time stay up-to-date on the latest *development aid modalities and methods*. As for the latter concern, SSNC benefits from membership of Forum Syd, yet lacks specialists capable of improving this aspect of SSNC's South programme.

-
7. *Recommendation:* SSNC could add a new position as “methodological specialist” to the staff. Both programme officers and partners would be assisted by this professional on issues such as capacity building, LFA, monitoring and results-based management, trends in development aid, the Paris aid-effectiveness agenda, poverty-environmental linkages, etc. This person could also be in charge of organising the realisation of external evaluations as well as papers on good practices.
-

Furthermore, the evaluation team will like to suggest some ideas to the International Department for further considerations:

- a) An internal analysis could be a way for seeking ways of reducing staff turnover, stress levels and the burden of project administration, including a more precise match between the staffing of the International Department and the defined tasks. It is suggested that the International Department introduce a time registration scheme to increase awareness of how working hours are spent.
- b) SSNC could with its thematic structure of its South Programme consider to reduce the number of themes, e.g. by merging agriculture and forestry under the heading of ‘biodiversity and agro-forestry’. In addition, the International Department could consider moving from individual thematic officers into teamwork, so that:
 - thematic expertise is combined with knowledge of selected countries, thus enabling backup and certain flexibility within the team;
 - each team is covering a geographical specialisation (countries);
 - the thematic area takes on more concrete meaning for the Southern partners; including the circulation to all partners of international know-how on the theme concerned, on lessons learned by other partners, etc.;
 - each team has command of Spanish and perhaps French.

¹⁸ According to “Bidrag till ramavtalsorganisationer 2008”, the total amount for framework agreements on work in the South is SEK 1.122 billion. SSNC is the only framework organization working directly with environmental issues. A simple equation of their budget allocation of 28 MSEK, divided by the total Swedish Government 2008 NGO budget of 1 200 MSEK gives 2,3%. Assuming that the Swedish Cooperative Centre spends 20% of SEK 147 million on the environment, while SSNC spends SEK 21 million, this implies that less than 5% is spent on environmental development aid.

5.4. Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

5.4.1. Planning of projects

In its system for planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME), SSNC has focused more on reporting than planning.

All the field visits have clearly observed that SSNC respects its partners' priorities in the planned projects, which is a key explanation for the strong feeling of ownership with all its advantages. However, the impression from reading the project documents confirms that SSNC has not provided sufficient guidance to the partners on better project planning. The quality of project documents varies considerably, as they are often more descriptive than analytic, and do not always display thorough understanding of how to plan using the Logical Framework Approach (LFA). In addition, SSNC's procedure manual prescribes no appraisal procedure (quality assurance) that provides feedback to the partner organisation.¹⁹ A desire for more written feedback was expressed by several partners to the evaluation team.

SSNC has so far placed insufficient emphasis on *indicators and baseline data*, which in the majority of the projects visited by the evaluation team constitutes an obstacle to measuring the achievements and progress towards reaching the planned objective/outputs/outcomes set out in the Logical Framework planning. Often baseline data and indicators have been lacking or not consistent enough related to the projects.

No indicators were defined at the level of the overall South Programme 2005–2007. This shortcoming has been remedied in the 2008 programme (section 3.2.1.4), which lays down the following indicators to measure the achievement of its two immediate objectives:

- Numbers and types of partner organisations within the various areas of intervention.
- Analysis of the partner organisations' missions and internal organisational development objectives described in quantitative terms etc.
- The partner organisations' own assessments of the effect achieved measured against SSNC's and the partner organisations' own objectives.
- Assessment of the partner organisations' administrative capacity and their plans to improve it.
- Assessment of the partner organisations' democratic structures and their effectiveness in involving members in decision-making processes.
- Developments in the partner organisations' membership figures and degree of self-funding.

However, SSNC has yet to use these indicators in a systematic manner, which makes it difficult to measure the effect at the overall programme level – or even within each of the five themes. This highlights the importance of developing better indicators for the coming 2009–2011 programme proposal. Furthermore, it should be possible to translate these into more specific indicators to be inserted into the various project documents.

More participatory outcome/impact-oriented methodologies could also be useful. As discussed with SSNC's International Department, the 'Most Significant Change' method could be considered as a way of structuring the target group's narrative stories as a complement to the LFA-based monitoring.

¹⁹ Procedures for cooperation with partners in SSNC's International Program 2005–2007. May 2007.

-
8. *Recommendation:* In close collaboration with its partners, SSNC could seek to enhance the results-based management of each partner (and project), setting qualitative and quantitative indicators for the planned outcomes, while also measuring the baseline. This could be based on Logical Framework, and, if possible, complementary methods like ‘Most Significant Change’, structuring of the target group’s narrative stories, participatory self-evaluations and applied research experiences.
-

5.4.2. Monitoring and reporting

In the field of monitoring and reporting, SSNC has made an effort to develop and apply a new system. This has improved several partners’ reporting to Stockholm, thus also enhancing accountability in the management of Swedish funds. Over the past two years, this reporting system has been the one issue most intensely discussed between SSNC and its partners. The majority are positive about the system, as it has also contributed to improving their own understanding of monitoring and reporting. Others are more sceptical, perceiving it more as a control tool. EMG and Pratec have expressed reservations about using LFA planning for “soft projects”. SSNC should be praised for its efforts towards overcoming any teething problems with its partners, including the 2007 workshop held in Peru, which was highly appreciated by the participants. They told the evaluation team that SSNC was their only Northern NGO partner that had openly involved them in discussing the monitoring and reporting system.

As for the quality of the partners’ reporting, the substance tends to be activity-orientated rather than focused on outcomes and strategic concerns. An example is the 71-page completion report from RAP-AL. Part of the problem is rooted in the original project design, whose six objectives tend to overlap, leading to repetition in the reporting on their fulfilment. Such examples illustrate how important it is to give more feedback to partners already in the design phase.

The evaluation team has observed that most of the key documents are only available in Swedish (e.g. annual reports and completion reports to Sida, travel reports, etc.). This is not particularly transparent to the partners, and has significantly reduced what exists in writing for mutual learning about the implementation of the South programme. It would also be useful to formulate travel reports in a standard manner, e.g. summarising the key findings and recommendations agreed with the partner from the visits.

-
9. *Recommendation:* SSNC could do more to provide advice and written feedback to its partners to progress reports and about how to improve project documents, including the use of LFA and indicators. A first step would be to change the language of the International Department’s documents and travel reports into English (Spanish in the case of Latin America and French in West Africa). Furthermore, the reporting system could benefit from more focus on mutual consolidation of results, learning and systematisation of good practices within each of the five themes.
-

5.4.2. The Paris agenda in relation to SSNC

The actual integration of SSNC’s monitoring and reporting system into the partner organisations’ own systems has been relatively scarce, as project documents and progress reports are often prepared exclusively for Sweden. The team has seen several examples, where project documents are not even shared between donors to the same partner.

SSNC has initiated a serious effort to measure results in response to such a request from Sida. The evaluation team finds that the basic obstacle to further harmonisation goes back to conflictive guidance from the different donors, even from likeminded donors within the Nordic+ Group.

On the one hand, Sweden is among the most active donors in preparing for the Accra High Level Forum in September 2008, where the key message is the need to operationalise the five Paris principles

(including alignment and harmonisation)²⁰. On the other, SEKA/Sida has yet to allow Swedish NGOs sufficient flexibility to harmonise their planning and reporting with other donors to the same Southern NGOs, preferably based on strengthening the NGOs' own PME systems.

The evaluation team has visited many Southern partners overburdened by different donor requirements. As an example, the relatively small South African NGO EMG is dealing with 10 donors, all of them imposing their separate demands. Another example is the RAPAL secretariat, whose coordinator already has his hands full communicating with affiliated focal points in 18 Latin American countries. The obligation to report in line with each donor's special format adds to his workload, taking time away from project implementation. The coordinator would clearly prefer a single joint report, adhering to a harmonised format agreed with all donors.

In other words, SSNC has made an effort towards improving the partners' reporting to Sweden (upward accountability), whereas Sida is not stimulating an improvement of downward accountability to the partners' constituency (for instance, by investing efforts in reports to the general meeting rather than just to the donors). Greater *downward accountability* is crucial for a democratic and accountable civil society in the developing countries.

The evaluation team has observed few external evaluations carried out in relation to the partners visited in eight countries. This shortcoming should be remedied, if possible through joint evaluations with other donors, as seen in the recent case of Indonesia.

To reduce the workload of the SSNC secretariat, the evaluation team has suggested that SSNC consider the model of delegated cooperation, i.e. the sharing of responsibilities among several donors. However, some SSNC staffs are not happy in losing the direct contact with partners in relation to project administration.

10. *Recommendation:* Hopefully, SEKA/Sida will be willing to translate the Accra Aid Effectiveness agenda into a revision of the reporting requirements in Sida's guidelines for NGO support, so that Swedish NGOs are allowed to make greater headway towards applying the five principles of the Paris Declaration. It is of particular importance that Swedish support be built on the partner organisations' existing governance structures, including their strategic plans, internal democracy and downward accountability to their constituencies.

11. *Recommendation:* SSNC should step up efforts for harmonisation with other international NGOs/agencies on shared planning and monitoring and reporting. This could alongside with other donors include joint core-funding based on alignment to the partners' strategic plans, relying on its partners' governance structures, annual work plans and reports to their own annual assembly or board. A greater part of the dialogue should move from the activity to the strategic level, where it may be useful if each partner convenes an annual meeting of all its donors.

Another option for reducing the workload could be delegated cooperation arrangements, where one donor takes the lead on contracts and project administration, while SSNC could still be involved in the actual contents. An example could be HIVOS taking the lead on cooperation with Ecuadorian C-CONDEM, WWF or Swiss Aid taking lead on Tanzanian KIMWAM and IWGIA taking lead on Asian Indigenous Peoples Pact AIPP.

²⁰ The Advisory Group on CSOs and Aid Effectiveness was created by the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness at the OECD Development Assistance Committee. The group is preparing for Accra in September 08.

5.4.3. Financial management

According to an analysis of the "System revision" 2004 to Sida and SSNC's follow-up, SSNC has lived up to Sida's requirements on auditing and financial controls. Nevertheless, further risk management is needed, as mentioned by Sida in the assessment (*bedömning*) of SSNC's 2008 application. Sida has specifically asked SSNC to include risk assessment in the next application for 2009–2011, insisting on the deployment of a greater array of preventive measures in the fight against corruption. This concern has been further highlighted by the intense discussions about the Swedish Auditor-General's (Riksrevisionen) report from 2007, which mentioned a number of cases of fraud (mainly on project related to Swedish NGOs without field presence).

According to conversations with heads of Sida in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, they consider it difficult to work in Tanzania and Kenya without field presence. The latest corruption scandals – with the prime minister of Tanzania involved – illustrate the magnitude of this problem, which is also seen within civil society organisations.

It would be worthwhile for SSNC to look more closely at ways to strengthen the financial control systems of the entire partner organisation. This could be seen as part of an effort to increase capacity building and organisational development of particular African partners. As discussed with the International Department, it would be obvious to consider collaboration with existing Swedish field offices, e.g. the Swedish Cooperative Centre's regional office in Nairobi, which is also interested in natural resource management and environmental concerns.

12. *Recommendation:* SSNC should consider an arrangement with another international NGO with office in Nairobi (e.g. another Swedish Framework organisation) as a cost-effective way of sharing financial control, as well as office space and staffed by perhaps two regional programme officers. The aim would be to improve SSNC's liaison with partners in Africa. This could also help reduce the workload of project administration at headquarters in Stockholm. Meanwhile, the tasks related to partners in Latin America and Asia could continue to be undertaken in Stockholm.

5.5. Organisational and Financial Sustainability

Financial/organisational sustainability has not featured prominently in SSNC's cooperation with partner. Indeed, the concern is often completely left out of project document, and even of the reporting format. Moreover, the evaluation team has failed to find any 'exit strategy' applying to the cooperation with the partners visited. This is an important issue, as the majority of Southern partners depend on international aid for more than 90% of their budget. Project designs also frequently ignore the need for replicability mechanisms.

The evaluation team acknowledges that financial sustainability is difficult to achieve in the poor LCD countries, and even in Malaysia, where domestic fundraising is not easy for environmental NGOs bringing cases to court. However, at least the need for organisational sustainability should be addressed, including measures to get more volunteers involved, as well as broader constituency-building aimed at strengthening voices in favour of sustainable development. As stated in the Thailand country report, the key to a successful and effective exit strategy is planning, pacing, communication and leadership to navigate through the complexities and potential pitfalls of a future scenario of less donor support.

The evaluation team cautions against making an overly narrow interpretation of sustainability, considering only the sustainability of the supported NGO. It should also be pondered whether the policies, regulations, concepts and activities being developed as result of the support will have a lasting impact. Furthermore, it must be considered whether supported community structures are sustainable. If so, it is less important if the NGO disappears.

-
13. *Recommendation:* SSNC should agree with partners on adequate replicability mechanisms, sustainability criteria and exit strategies. Even when new partnerships are forged, these issues should be addressed in the dialogue at an early stage. In addition, organisational and financial sustainability should be a constant concern in future project documents and reporting from partners (and SSNC reports to Sida). Obviously, the desire for sustainability must be tempered by a realistic view of what is achievable.
-

6. Conclusions of the Evaluation

This chapter draws the main conclusions regarding the request of the Terms of Reference to evaluate the effectiveness, impact, relevance, sustainability and efficiency of the SSNC's programmes financed with support from Sida.

6.1. Overall Conclusions of the evaluation

1. *SSNC's programme is relevant to the objectives of the partners, of SSNC and of Sida/SEKA.* The NGOs visited by the team in eight countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America seem to be contributing to sustainable development, linking this goal to the improvement of communities' livelihoods. Almost all NGOs visited were focusing their efforts on poor and marginalised communities affected by the degradation of natural resources. In particular as regards the cooperation with relatively strong NGOs from Asia and Latin America, the advocacy and public campaigns appear to be important and effective. The conclusion is that, within selected themes and countries, the SSNC programme is contributing to *"a vibrant and dynamic civil society as expressed in Sida's policy for support to civil society"* (2007).
2. SSNC is implementing an interesting South Programme in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is a useful contribution to the pursuit of the MDG 7 on environmental sustainability, with an emphasis on people's involvement and international advocacy. According to UNDP and the World Bank, MDG 7 is among the MDGs receiving the least attention from governments. The thematic areas of the programme are all relevant in this context, as they address important national problems.
3. The selection of Southern partners is strongly linked to SSNC's own identity as an environmental movement that is strongly engaged in the environmental cause in Sweden and internationally. In this capacity, SSNC is good at bringing examples from Southern partners to the attention of the Swedish public, and at forming partnerships in the international debates, campaigns and advocacy efforts, in particular with stronger NGOs from Asia and Latin America. Thus, by being rooted in direct collaboration with Southern NGOs on three continents, SSNC's environmental development aid programme is rather unique in a Nordic context.
4. All partners met by the evaluation team perceive SSNC as a loyal, credible and trustful partner. SSNC is considered as an organisation whose values they share, summing up the whole enterprise as: *"Southern environmentalist teaming up with Swedish environmentalists"*.
5. SSNC supports about 60 projects within five themes in as many as 28 countries on three continents. With a relatively limited budget and staff, this leaves the programme somewhat unfocused and lacking in clear priorities. It is fairly clear that SSNC has not made the expected progress towards the *"gradual concentration both thematically and geographically"* that was announced in the 2005–07 programme document. Nearly all partners interviewed pointed to a need for greater interaction with SSNC, and insufficient time and attention is given to capacity building and dialogue on matters of substance with Southern partners outside the international/regional debates.

The lack of focus has inhibited SSNC's creation of 'added value' (beyond the money) in terms of building the capacity of its partners, particularly of the weaker, locally-based NGOs and CBOs in Africa. In conversations with the evaluation team, these partners requested more dialogue, visits, networking, etc. The infrequency of visits to the partners is also a consequence of SSNC having no field officers, as the organisation runs its international operations out of Stockholm.

6. SSNC's thematic approach seems well suited for international, regional and national advocacy, and to bring issues to the forefront of the Swedish debate. However, the division of SSNC's work into five themes is not well geared to address a combination of environmental problems, poverty and development needs in local communities. In general, experience shows that this requires a far more integrated approach, including insights into the context in the country, as well as the in districts/municipalities. This problem manifests itself most clearly in cooperation with partners from poor African countries.

6.2. Relevance of the South Programme

7. In all the eight countries visited, the team has witnessed a clear poverty orientation in the SSNC programme. Many good examples have been seen of how Southern partners operationalise the linkages between poverty reduction and improved natural resource management. Partners are generally facilitating community participation.

8. The important Millennium Ecosystem Assessment from 2005 confirms SSNC's focus on the degradation of ecosystem services, which confirms the relevance of SSNC's five themes: 1) tropical forests, 2) sustainable agriculture, 3) climate change and watersheds, 4) marine and coastal environments, and 5) chemicals. These themes relate clearly to the MDG 7 on environmental sustainability.

9. The evaluation team observes that the SSNC's geographical priorities coincide with some of the world's most valuable ecosystems threatened by the highest rates of deforestation and land degradation as documented in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Reversing environmental degradation is important in Africa. However, it also seems well justified that SSNC addresses environmental problems in middle-income countries in South East Asia and Latin America. As examples, SSNC supports interventions in areas of Borneo and the Amazonas with extremely rich biodiversity, and alarming rates of deforestation as in Borneo, where only half of the original forest cover remains today, down from 75% in the mid-1980s. These valuable ecosystems justify the Swedish support seen as global public goods.

10. SSNC's efforts to establish partnerships in regional and international advocacy and debates, and to bring cases and issues into the Swedish debates, are highly relevant. The work is very important in securing civil society from developing countries a voice in negotiations and monitoring of international/regional agreements related to sustainable development. Among the commendable examples of advocacy, the evaluation team has seen the case of Borneo, where SSNC partners PACOS and SAM are working. Only half of the original forest cover remains in Borneo today, down from 75% in the mid-1980s. Another example is C-CONDEMs work in Ecuador, where almost 70% of the mangrove has disappeared along the coast, thus impoverishing more than ½ million people.

11. Although this part of SSNC's can still be further improved and enhanced, it is today highly relevant to strengthen African civil society organisations and to work with advocacy on the interrelation between poverty and environmental problems in countries where the environment is often given low priority. However, in the view of the evaluation team, the need in this area is far greater than Sida's current allocation to the environment of approx. 3% of the total spending on Swedish NGOs' framework agreements with Sida, not least in the light of the significant challenges posed by climate change affecting developing countries.

6.3. Impact and Effectiveness of the Programme

12. The majority of SSNC's partners have built capacity among hundreds of local community groups as well as community leaders. Important efforts have also been observed among the many networks supported in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

13. In general, advocacy is one of the strongest elements in SSNC's South Programme. The evaluation team has observed partners with highly developed skills in this field, applying a rights-based approach at the same time. This includes showcases, such as Third World Network engaged globally in influencing trade and Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), Asian Indigenous Peoples' Pact (AIPP), which is pushing the indigenous agenda in the UN, and C-CONDEM, whose work ranges from projects within coastal communities in Ecuador to advocacy towards international institutions. As discussed further in this report, such types of joint action have been absent from the cooperation with the majority of the African NGOs, as several of them – such as Eco Ethics, Porini, KIMWAM and PELUM – are still some way from being strong enough at this level.

14. Advocacy also features prominently in Sweden, where SSNC, with its 178,000 members, is one of the strongest voices in the public debate on environmental issues. SSNC is able to bring well-documented cases from its Southern partners to the notice of the Swedish public. An example is the campaign for the protection of tropical rainforests and mangrove ecosystems. SSNC's campaign for a boycott of scampi in Sweden has resulted in the hotel chain Scandic's decision to stop selling scampi in all its 122 hotel restaurants in Scandinavia and the Baltic region.

15. The South Programme 2005–2007 had no indicators at the overall programme level (though the 2008 programme did). In general, SSNC has placed insufficient emphasis on indicators and baseline data, which, in the majority of the projects visited by the evaluation team, constitutes an obstacle to measuring the impact, effect and outcomes compared to what was planned in the various projects. This highlights the importance of developing better indicators for the 2009–2011 programme and associated project documents.

6.4. Efficiency of the Programme

16. SSNC has been highly capable of selecting relevant partners in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Noticeably, SSNC cooperates with partners that are well aware of the importance of combining environmental protection, social organisation and efforts to influence public decision-making. SSNC has been particularly successful in establishing well-functioning and effective partnerships with NGOs that already have good capacity within the environmental field. SSNC also respects its partner's priorities in the planned projects, which is a key explanation for the strong feeling of ownership.

17. A challenge remains for SSNC to develop stronger partnerships with the weaker NGOs, particularly in Africa. Insufficient resources are allocated to engage intensely with the partners in Africa. SSNC has to accept the differing nature of working with weaker African NGOs, which requires much greater insights into the social, cultural, political and economic context of the countries. SSNC has to find a way to strike a balance between thematic focus and country insights.

18. SSNC has neither supported systematic capacity building of its partners nor provided substantial advisory services. There is an obvious opportunity to engage the external resource base in the implementation of the programme, as the Stockholm office does not have sufficient time for frequent visits and advisory services to partners. Another possible option is to give more priority to regional networks' efforts towards strengthening their national member organisations.

19. Regarding the staffing, the programme is rather efficient, as only 7.5 full-time positions at SSNC headquarters are handling a South programme of SEK 21 million a year. Given all the time-consuming

requirements to Swedish NGOs with framework agreements, this level of human resources seems insufficient to unleash processes that meet the ambitions of a programme spanning three continents – and the evaluation team is recommending that Sida increase its support to SSNC's South Programme.

The evaluation team is under the clear impression that SSNC employees are dedicated, motivated, competent within the themes, and hardworking in their jobs. However, the International Department has a mismatch between the tasks defined and the actual staff available to perform them. Staff members are currently spending a significant proportion of their working time on administrative task, which is undermining the chances of adding value to the partnerships and developing the thematic areas.

20. As for the monitoring and reporting, SSNC has made an effort to develop and apply a system. This has improved several partners' reporting to Stockholm (upward accountability). However, most of the NGOs supported by SSNC also cooperate with other donors. Very little coordination and alignment take place between these donors to the detriment of efficiency. In some cases, this results in different approaches used for similar fieldwork, and in the NGOs spending considerable time on each donor's special reporting requirements, etc.

21. Sida is not allowing sufficient flexibility in its requirements to allow for the Southern partners' reporting to be used to also improve *downward* accountability to the local constituencies. The actual integration of SSNC's monitoring/reporting system into the partner organisations' own governance systems has been relatively scarce, due to lack of harmonisation among the various donors to the same Southern NGOs. The evaluation team finds that further advance towards harmonisation is fundamentally held back by conflictive guidance from different donors, even from likeminded donors in the Nordic+ group.

22. Regarding climate change, SSNC faces the limitation of mainly seeing it as an issue of water resources and Clean Development Mechanisms (CDM). Climate change should be considered across all the themes, and adaptation to climate change is more important for developing countries than mitigation measures. A broader approach to climate change would also allow SSNC to foster more debate in relation to the COP 15 Climate Summit in 2009, providing an opportunity to establish a wider Swedish coalition for sustainable development. The current set-up in Sweden is not efficient in involving Swedish NGOs in the ongoing international negotiations on sustainable development.

6.5. Sustainability of the Programme

23. Many of the partners visited seem to be running cost-effective operations, particularly the partners in South East Asia and Latin America, which have considerable outreach and a high profile at local, national and regional levels.

24. SSNC has not worked much with its partners on financial and organisational sustainability. Reflections on this aspect are often omitted in the project documents, or even left out of the reporting format. Nor has the evaluation team seen any 'exit strategies' among the partners visited. This is a failure to pay proper attention to an important issue, as the majority of the Southern partners depend on international aid for more than 90% of their budgets. The sustainability and exit strategies are particularly crucial in middle-income countries, where SSNC could also help the partners to pursue strategies for greater mobilisation of domestic resources.

25. It is also important to view 'sustainability' from a broader perspective. The direct outputs of an NGO's concrete project activities may have less long-term impact than the same intervention's promotion of changes in policies and legislation, or its building of local capacities that work with municipalities/district administrations for pro-poor sustainable development.

6.6. Cross-cutting Issues

26. SSNC is very successful in integrating *indigenous peoples'* concerns, applying a rights-based approach. This work involves poor communities, national agendas, and partners recognised by the UN, as demonstrated by the recent appointment of the AIPP secretary general as an expert to UN's Human Rights Council.

Despite the similarities in their nature and field of work, two SSNC partners like PACOS in Malaysia and PRATEC in Peru have no information about each other. SSNC could develop a Web-facility in facilitating the exchange of experiences regarding indigenous knowledge and practices.

27. Regarding *gender equality*, the evaluation exercise showed mixed achievements in terms of integrating gender aspects into the work of the NGOs visited. Gender integration is relatively weak in the SSNC's programme, including the fact that very few project documents have incorporated gender-sensitive indicators. Gender is dealt with as a "women's issue" (Women in Development approach), i.e. as a need to organise activities specifically for women, rather than to address strategic gender-based interests. Many good activities have been observed involving women, e.g. within AIPP, PACOS, Eco Ethics, PELUM, PRATEC and C-CONDEM. Gender is obviously an area calling for more intense dialogue between SSNC and its partners.

28. Regarding the *HIV/AIDS* epidemic, in 2005, SSNC initiated a dialogue with African partners about the integration of HIV/AIDS into the projects. Some of the NGOs have incorporated HIV/AIDS prevention into their plans. It is useful that SSNC has initiated collaboration with two Swedish NGOs with extensive expertise in this field in Africa, namely RFSU and the Africa Groups of Sweden.

6.7. Summarising SSNC's 'Added Value'

The ToR from Sida asked the evaluation team to assess the 'added value' of the present model of partnerships between the SSNC and its Southern counterparts. In other words, Sida would like to know what SSNC is adding to the money value of the grants. In the programme document 2005–07, SSNC has itself signalled to what extent it can provide added value and synergies within the framework of the programme.

The evaluation team has summarized SSNC's added value – beyond the transfer of funds – in the table below, which highlights the strengths and weaknesses. In many ways, the recommendations in the next chapter are designed to respond to these challenges.

Added Value of SSNC	
Strengths	Weaknesses
SSNC's programme clearly addresses the major challenges of the MDG 7 on environmental sustainability, and is in line with the recommendations of the <i>Ecosystem Assessments</i> , which points to valuable ecosystems in Asia, Africa and Latin America.	The Southern programme is suffering from a <i>lack of focus</i> , as SSNC supports about 60 projects within five themes in as many as 28 countries on three continents. This dispersion is a major reason for SSNC's difficulties in providing more 'added value' to the projects visited by the evaluation team.
The programme is strengthening a vibrant and democratic civil society promoting pro-poor sustainable development in a number of countries.	A limiting factor is the workload of project administration carried out by SSNC programme officers in Stockholm.
Many of the supported Southern NGOs are undertaking strong advocacy and campaigning, using cases from poor communities and indigenous peoples.	This does not allow for regular visits and sufficient time to conduct dialogue on matters of strategy and substance with Southern partners, or to ensure improved coordination with other international agencies.

Added Value of SSNC	
Strengths	Weaknesses
The selection of Southern partners is strongly linked to SSNC's own <i>identity</i> as an environmental movement in Sweden. SSNC is good at <i>selecting relevant Southern partners</i> and also at defining a common agenda with its partners on environmental issues. SSNC's environmental South Programme – rooted in direct collaboration with Southern NGOs on three continents – is <i>rather unique in a Nordic context</i>. Unfortunately the potentials have not been fully explored as the Swedish NGOs have so far been unable to establish a coalition for sustainable development as in Norway and Denmark. Particular partners in Asia and Latin America have strong skills in <i>advocacy and campaigning</i>. This connection, together with the thematic specialization, fits well with the international agenda for sustainable development, and SSNC's presence is of particular importance in countries where bilateral donors are leaving (South East Asia and Latin America). <i>SSNC staff members are dedicated and motivated</i> in their work. They are competent in environmental issues, such as agro-forestry, biodiversity, watershed, climate change and chemicals. SSNC respects the partner's priorities and planning, which has fostered a strong feeling of <i>local ownership</i>. SSNC has involved its partners in defining the monitoring and reporting system.	SSNC-supported projects could, in some cases, be better at taking advantage of policy opportunities and at defining sustainability/exit strategies in the national and local context. Particularly locally based NGOs and CBOs in Africa have enjoyed less interaction and dialogue with SSNC. The limited insight into each country's cultural, political, economic and social factors affecting the targeted communities poses a <i>challenge for SSNC's future engagement in Africa</i>, including SSNC's risk management and measures to prevent corruption. Some Southern partners could improve their efficiency and performance through more substantial <i>advisory and capacity-building</i> support. Almost no projects have included systematic capacity building/organisational development efforts. This is particularly a challenge for SSNC future support in Africa. Few projects have incorporated <i>gender-sensitive indicators</i>, and the projects are characterised by relatively weak gender awareness. The <i>quality of project documents</i> varies, and more could be done as regards appraisal, feedback and QA. There has so far been insufficient emphasis on indicators and baseline data, which constitutes an obstacle to measuring the outcomes. The focus on the partners reporting to SSNC/Sida (upward accountability) has drawn away attention from efforts to improve <i>downward accountability</i> to the partners' constituencies, and internal accountability of civil society organisations.

At the end of the report's Summary (in the beginning of the report) is presented a number of specific recommendations, summing up the evaluation team's suggestions on how to respond to the aforementioned findings and conclusions.

Annex A. Terms of Reference

Terms of reference for an evaluation of sida's support to the swedish society for natural conservation's development cooperation

1. Background

A considerable part of Swedish development cooperation is channelled through Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs). At present the Division for cooperation with NGOs (SEKA EO) within the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), contributes funds to Swedish organisations and their cooperation partners in over hundred countries worldwide. During the last years, disbursements from Sida to Swedish NGOs for development cooperation have annually exceeded 1,200,000,000 SEK.

In order to streamline the administration and assessment procedures for project proposals, Sida has introduced a system of Framework Agreements with the Swedish NGOs, at the moment this entails fourteen organisations. The agreements are based on procedures; principles and criteria laid down in Sida's Conditions and Guidelines for NGO support. As part of the Framework Agreement Sida allocates funds on a multi-year basis to the organisations. These allocations normally do not exceed 90% of the total project costs.

The goal of Sida's NGO cooperation is strengthening of civil societies. Since a considerable part of Swedish development cooperation is channelled via Swedish NGOs, it is of growing interest to assert the degree to which Swedish NGO development cooperation contributed to the overall objective of SEKA EO, i.e. to the strengthening of a dynamic and democratic civil society in partner countries as well as strengthening human rights. Furthermore, Sida's overall objective is to help create conditions that will enable the poor to improve their lives.

The fourteen Framework organisations are either operative organisations with partners in the developing countries or so called umbrella organisations²¹. The umbrella organisations channel support through other Swedish NGOs to the cooperation they have with local partners.

The Swedish Society for Nature Conservation is one of the framework organisations that work in co-operation with Sida. A Framework Agreement between Sida and the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation is valid to 30 December 2008. During the financial year 2008, the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation's Framework Agreement with SEKA EO amounts to 28 000 000 SEK. Additionally, the organisation in 2008 receives 4 000 000 SEK from Sida's Environmental Policy Unit. This evaluation is part of the general follow up of programmes supported by Swedish NGOs co-financed by SEKA EO and is as such an important part of the dialogue between Sida and the Framework organisations.

2. Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

the overall purpose of the Evaluation is to assess if the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNC) development cooperation contributes to the SEKA EO objective of strengthening the civil society and enabling poor people to improve their living conditions.

²¹ SEKA EO support 6 umbrella organisations: Forum Syd, LO/TCO Council of International Trade Union Cooperation, Olof Palme International Centre, The Swedish Pentecostal Mission/PMU, Swedish Organisations' of Disabled Persons International Aid Association & Swedish Mission Council. 8 operative Framework organisations: Africa Groups of Sweden, Diakonia, Swedish Cooperative Centre, Plan Sweden, Swedish Society for Nature Conservation, Save the Children, Church of Sweden & Training for Development Assistance/UBV. Additionally, Sida also has a frame organisations for Humanitarian Assistance: the Swedish Red Cross.

The specific objective is to evaluate the effectiveness, impact, relevance, sustainability and efficiency of the SSNC's programmes financed via support from SEKA EO.²² In this evaluation emphasis should be put on examining effectiveness, relevance and sustainability, although all the five areas mentioned interrelate.

- Effectiveness concerns to what extent to if SSNC and their partners' contribution to the SEKA EO goal as well as their own goals.
- Relevance is a matter of the extent to which the objectives of the SSNC address the priorities for the stakeholders (target groups), conform relevant policies and in particular contribute to the SEKA EO goal.
- Sustainability concerns the continuation of development effects after the completion of a particular support.
- Impact, in the sense of long term development effects, is of less concern in this evaluation, although negative and positive (intended or unintended) may be of interest to document or comment on.
- Efficiency can be assessed, but not merely in strict economic terms, but also in relation to the selection of partners, the partnership model and its added value to SSNC.
- The selected programmes reviewed should constitute a representation of the programmes supported.

Moreover, the evaluation should serve as a learning tool for both SSNC and SEKA EO, as well as an instrument for Sida's overall assessment of SSNC. It should suggest improvements for the SSNC concerning planning, implementation and monitoring of their development cooperation. As well as contribute to the learning of good methods and examples for strengthening civil society that might emerge during the evaluation.

3. The Assignment

The evaluation should cover a representation of SSNC's current operations and its partners (may also include operations terminated during the last year). The evaluation should also address the following questions:

a) *What is the Effectiveness of SSNC's partners' in terms of SEKA's overall objective²³?*

Assessment of the effectiveness of SSNC's partners' work is in relation to the SEKA overall objective. A particular concern is to what extent the strategies, methods and goal chosen by SSNC contribute to SEKA's overall objective. The implementation work of the local partners should be investigated including an assessment of the relationship between SSNC and its partners and with other stakeholders. This analysis should, in turn, give an input into an assessment of the results and impact of programmes/projects funded by SSNC, in relation to the level of fulfilment of the SSNC's overall objectives. It is important to examine the whole sequence – i.e. the effectiveness of partners in relation to their partners and if there are also intermediary partners (or global ones). Also assess if the goals could be reached through alternative means or partners.

b) *What is the Relevance of SSNC's partners' programmes in the local context?*

Assessment of SSNC's partners' relevance considering sectors, stakeholders²⁴ and areas of operation in relation to the problems identified. Furthermore, addressing the relevance of the partners' work in the

²² Sida's Evaluation Manual 2nd revised edition 2007 should be used for definition of each term.

²³ Contributing to the development of a dynamic and democratic civil society and strengthening and enable poor people to improve their living conditions

²⁴ Who are the stakeholders? How do stakeholders participate? Are participatory methods used in planning and implementing of programmes?

local context is of importance. Could there for instance be target groups or areas of support that are neglected and ought to be given higher priority in the programmes? What role does SSNC partner play in their local civil society and how does it coordinate its work with other actors at different levels in society. What is the added value of this specific cooperation?

c) *What is the Sustainability of SSNC's programmes?*

After the cessation of support is there a continuation and longevity with respect to the development effects resulting from the intervention? Of special interest is to assess the value added of the present model of partnerships between SSNC and its partners.

4. Methodology, Evaluation Team and Time Schedule

the evaluation has been commissioned by Sida, the Division for cooperation with NGOs, (SEKA EO). A Steering group consisting of the Head of SEKA EO, a representative from Sida's Evaluation Department as well as a programme officer from SEKA EO will approve the inception report as well as the draft report. A reference group with representatives from SEKA EO as well as the SSNC will be of access to the Consultant through out the evaluation process. The programme officer at Sida responsible for the evaluation is Angelica Broman.

4.1 Evaluation process

The selected Consultant is asked to begin the assignment by preparing an *inception report* not exceeding 3 pages elaborating on the basic design and plan for the evaluation. The consultant should submit suggestions and criteria for selection of countries/partners to be assessed. The inception report shall be approved by SEKA EO within ten working days.

The Consultant shall evaluate relevant background documentation that will be provided by SSNC or Sida, as well as examine a sample of partner organisations and projects in at least two countries. Any studies that recently have been undertaken in regard to SSNC, as well as the principal steering document for Sida's cooperation with NGOs should be used as background material²⁵.

The partner organisations and projects shall be selected in order to ensure a reliable and representative basis for the purpose of this evaluation. The locations and/or organisations to be visited shall be determined in dialogue with Sida and SSNC.

During the evaluation process the consultant has to give relevant feedback on and discuss the initial observations/findings with the partner organisations i.e. included in the visits to the selected countries. Furthermore, before leaving a country visited the consultants should carry out a debriefing with partner organisations and when relevant with staff of the Swedish NGO or Embassy present.

A *draft report* will be submitted to Angelica Broman (SEKA EO) both by mail and in ten hard copies. SEKA EO will disseminate the draft to the Steering Committee and the reference group in order for them to be given the opportunity to comment and correct any factual errors.

4.2 Method

The evaluation should be carried out in adherence Sida's Evaluation Manual 2nd revised edition 2007 and to Dac's Evaluation Quality Standards. The analysis is expected to include a study of relevant documentation, e.g. documents in Sweden of applications and assessment memos and descriptions of organisations. Interviews will be done with 8–10 local partners of SSNC and their branches. Selection of partners to assess will be done by the consultant in dialogue with Sida and SSNC.

²⁵ "Sida's Guidelines for support to development programmes of Swedish NGOs (2007) "Perspectives on Poverty (2002)" and "Sida's policy for Civil Society" (2004) and any other document that might be of relevance.

SEKA EO considers that the evaluation team focus on lessons learnt and to the degree possible reaching the conclusions and recommendation in close dialogue with the SSNC and the selected partners to emphasise the participatory learning process.

The evaluation requires an overview of the objectives, purpose, plans and priorities of SSNC and the selected partners. It also involves an overview of the implemented programmes and projects of the selected partners. The assessment of the value added of the partnership should include an overview on the activities of SSNC that was done as part of the partnership, and the extent to which the partner perceived the partnership as relevant. Information on the programmes and projects may be found in SEKA EO database www.sida.se/ngodatabase

In order to assess the relevance in terms of civil society needs and priorities a review of secondary sources of information has to be undertaken. This might include the context analysis of the partners, study of the poverty reduction strategy paper of the country and alternative papers and persons well informed of the function and roles of civil society in the country. It could also include other types of reviews and research. It is also important to contact and if relevant interviews personnel, at Swedish Embassies.

An obvious problem with any evaluation of this type is that a major source of information comes from the partner organisations themselves. Hence, the consultants should, to the largest extent possible, try to get “second opinions” from other informants less at stake in the present partnership, or in other ways can add a different perspective. These informants might include other NGOs, community leaders, journalists, researchers, or whomever most suitable.

Furthermore, the consultants are required to have a transparent discussion, for each of their main conclusion, on the type of sources they were able to use, the extent by the informant could be considered to have a stake in the issues, the extent by which they were able to corroborate or triangulate the conclusion by other sources with a different perspective or stake, or if they have any alternative explanation of their observations.

4.3 The Consultant and Composition of Team

The Consultants assigned to carry out the evaluation are called off from the “Framework agreement for Consulting Services in relation to Civil Society” with the regard to services of evaluations/developments of methods, March 2007.

The Consultant should seek to use a participatory approach and if possible to have a gender balanced team. The Team Leader should have thorough experience of Swedish Development Cooperation including civil society issues as well as documented experience of conducting evaluations.

The team should include:

- appropriate knowledge about civil society contexts (e.g. perhaps use national or regional consultants with relevant experience of evaluating civil society)
- experience of gender issues
- environmental knowledge
- management and organisational skills.

The bid should include criteria's of selection as well as suggestions of what countries/programmes to include in the evaluation.

4.4 Time Schedule

The time needed for the assignment is estimated to a maximum of 12 person weeks, including the time required to prepare the inception report and including time for completing the report and a presentation at a seminar of the draft report.

5. Reporting and Timing

the evaluation shall be started no later than the 2008-04-01. An inception report shall be presented no later than 2008-04-03 which Sida should approve within ten days. A *draft* of the full report shall be presented to Sida's NGO Division for consideration, not later than the 2008-06-01. Sida and SSNC will comment the draft report within fifteen working days, after which the Consultant shall prepare the *final report* within ten working days.

When the draft report has been submitted the consultants will present the report at a seminar at Sida, Stockholm.

The report must include a presentation of the process in drawing up the evaluation design and choosing methodology. It shall also list all contributors to the evaluation (excepting those that have opted for anonymity).

The final report should be delivered by the Consultant to Sida's NGO Division within two weeks after received comments. The final report shall not exceed 50 pages excluding Annexes and be submitted electronically and in 10 (ten) hardcopies.

The report shall be written in English. The final report must be presented in a way that enables publication without further editing, which includes having been professionally proof read. The format and outline of the report shall therefore follow, as closely as is feasible, the guidelines in Sida Evaluation Manual – a Standardised Format. The evaluation shall be written in programme Word 6.0 or later version as attached file and copy on CD. Subject to decision by Sida, the report might be published in the series *Sida Evaluation*.

6. Other

Sida's strategy for the internal development of capacities implies that Sida and SSNC personnel should have a possibility to participate in the ongoing work of the Consultant when appropriate.

7. Specification of Requirements

Sida will, after evaluating the call-off proposals using the criteria specified below, decide upon which call-off proposal is most suited for the assignment. Sida will then make a decision and sign the call-off orders under the "Framework agreement for Consulting Services in Relation to Civil Society" with the regard to services of evaluations/developments of methods, March 2007.

The call-off proposal shall present the following information:

- How and when the assignment is to be done;
- The working methods employed in order to complete the assignment and secure the quality of the completed work; use a participatory approach and if possible a gender based team including local consultants;
- State the total cost of the assignment, specified as fee per hour for each category of personnel, any reimbursable costs, any other costs and any discounts (all types of costs in SEK and exclusive of VAT);
- A proposal for time and working schedules according to the Assignment, including suggestions and criteria for selecting countries/programmes to be examined;

The consultant should be able to sign the call-off order no later than the 2008-04-01.

Annex B. Ecuador Visit Report

Note from visits to Ecuador in May 2008. The visit was carried out by Hans Peter Dejgaard and María del Socorro Peñaloza.

Coordinadora de la Red Manglar C-CONDEM, Ecuador, Mayo 2008

1. Introducción

Las siguientes observaciones y recomendaciones están basadas en la lectura de documentos, además de 4 días de visitas en Quito y Muisne en la provincia de Esmeraldas de Ecuador. Tomando en cuenta esta limitante de tiempo además de no conocer en profundidad las características socioeconómicas del contexto local, nos parece muy importante haber contado con una discusión abierta con C-CONDEM el 8 de mayo, que pudo contribuir mucho a llegar a desarrollar un texto más preciso y completo para la evaluación del programa de SSPN Suecia. Asimismo C-CONDEM nos hizo llegar sus aportes y comentarios posteriormente (21 de mayo), que han sido incluidos en este informe.

La Agencia Sueca para el Desarrollo Internacional Asdi, está llevando a cabo una evaluación de las actividades de cooperación de la Sociedad Sueca para la Conservación de la Naturaleza (SSPN). Según los Términos de Referencia, el objetivo de dicha evaluación es determinar si la cooperación al desarrollo de SSPN contribuye al objetivo de Asdi, de fortalecer a la sociedad civil, la democracia, un desarrollo sostenible y contribuir así a que las personas que viven en condiciones de pobreza puedan mejorar sus condiciones de vida.

La Evaluación deberá servir como un instrumento de aprendizaje tanto para SSPN, Asdi así como para los socios visitados en 7 países en Asia, África y Asia. Así también debe contribuir al aprendizaje de buenos métodos y ejemplos para fortalecer a la sociedad civil, que podría surgir durante la evaluación.

El propósito principal de la evaluación es poder extraer las experiencias y lecciones aprendidas del trabajo de C-CONDEM y Red Manglar, y además, llegar a propuestas para mejorar aún más el trabajo en el futuro – que en general ya consideramos como un buen trabajo. Incluyendo discutir futuros retos y posibles orientaciones estratégicas. Los resultados de la evaluación servirán como insumo para la planificación de SSPN del periodo 2009 hasta 2011.

El apoyo de Suecia es de alrededor de 50,000 \$US en 2008, y en total alrededor de 100,000 \$US desde el inicio del apoyo en julio de 2006. Adicionalmente la C-CONDEM ha sido subcontratada, mediante convenio, por la Fundación de Defensa Ecológica FUNDECOL y el Fondo Ecuatoriano Populorum Progressio FEPP Regional Esmeraldas para llevar adelante el componente de incidencia política, en el marco del proyecto: Mejoramiento de las Condiciones de Vida de las Comunidades Usuarías Ancestrales del Ecosistema Manglar de la Provincia de Esmeraldas – Ecuador financiado por Hivos, Agroacción Alemana y Unión Europea por un monto de 15.000 euros anuales, por cuatro años a partir de febrero del 2007. Hasta el año 2007, la C-CONDEM tuvo apoyo de la ONG holandesa IICD, que trabaja en el tema de tecnologías de información y comunicación, cuyo apoyo en cuanto a capacitación e intercambio de experiencias ha sido importante para la organización.

El objetivo del proyecto HIVOS es: *“Se trata de impulsar un proceso de ejercicio pleno de derechos humanos, que permita que las familias campesinas y afroecuatorianas que habitan y se sustentan en el ecosistema de manglar, se conviertan en gestoras de su propio desarrollo, mejorando las capacidades de las autoridades locales, sus propias capacidades, el nivel de sus ingresos familiares a través del manejo adecuado del ecosistema de manglar con un enfoque que promueve la equidad de género.”*

Este proyecto tiene como grupo meta a 900 personas cabezas de familias campesinas y afroecuatorianas de 20 comunidades ancestrales de las zonas de manglar de la provincia de Esmeraldas. Dentro de ellas se encuentra Muisne, que el Equipo de evaluación visitó por dos días.

2. Conclusión General

En general, la conclusión del Equipo es que el proyecto apoyado por Suecia es muy *relevante* al vincular esfuerzos en favor del desarrollo sostenible, mediante la conservación del ecosistema manglar y la mejora de las condiciones de vida para una población costera pobre.

En este sentido, el apoyo de SSPN está contribuyendo al objetivo principal de Sida de fortalecer a una sociedad civil dinámica y democrática en Ecuador, así como también fortalecer los derechos humanos. Las familias que habitan en los manglares, en un trabajo conjunto con C-CONDEM han podido desarrollar una propuesta que ha logrado un manejo comunitario de los manglares, lo cual ha sido considerado como el paso decisivo para avanzar hacia el fortalecimiento de sus capacidades hacia el reconocimiento de sus derechos y les ha dado una fuerza de lucha por su medio de vida, el manglar.

En este sentido SSPN support in Ecuador fits well into the overall objective of Sida's cooperation with civil society, including a democratic and vibrant civil society.

Creemos que se han producido logros relacionados especialmente al mandato de C-CONDEM de construir una propuesta de gestión comunitaria para recuperar, conservar y defender el ecosistema manglar. Especialmente la incidencia política ha sido importante y se ha logrado gracias a un alto compromiso de las personas activas en C-CONDEM y las organizaciones locales afiliadas. Una labor bien vinculada con el trabajo regional e internacional a través del liderazgo de C-CONDEM en la Red Manglar Internacional que ha llegado hacia espacios como RAMSAR, Banco Mundial, FAO entre otros. Sin embargo, más allá de estos logros cabe preguntarse hacia donde apunta la Coordinadora en el futuro.

En esta nota, más allá de los logros obtenidos, ponemos énfasis en los retos hacia el futuro, consideramos que éste es el momento oportuno para discutir profundamente entre C-CONDEM, sus organizaciones locales afiliadas y las ONGs internacionales que dan el apoyo. Es la impresión del Equipo, que hace falta *más reflexión y discusión sobre los diferentes temas estratégicos* y las maneras cómo se van a desarrollar los mismos.

3. El Contexto del Ecosistema Manglar en Ecuador

Cuatro décadas de destrucción del ecosistema manglar de la faja costera ecuatoriana determinan el empobrecimiento de más de un millón de personas que milenariamente se han articulado a la pesca artesanal y a la recolección de moluscos, crustáceos y madera de mangle.

El Centro de Levantamiento Integral con Sensores Remotos (CLIRSEN), basado en su estudio de Cobertura Vegetal y del Mapa Forestal del Ecuador Continental 2000 determina que existen para esta fecha 108.299 hectáreas de manglar de las 362.802 hectáreas declaradas como bosques protectores en 1987, es decir que el país ha perdido el 70% de sus manglares.

Pese a que el Ecuador cuenta con una nutrida legislación, desde la Constitución hasta leyes, decretos, reglamentos y acuerdos que protegen y sancionan la tala, depredación y uso indebido del ecosistema manglar, todos estos han sido violentados por la actividad de producción de camarón industrial y por el mismo Estado ecuatoriano.

En la legislación ecuatoriana, el ecosistema manglar ha sido categorizado como:

- Bien nacional de uso público, son bienes que no se pueden vender ni comprar (son intransferibles), no se puede adquirir la posesión, no son susceptibles de apropiación, son imprescriptibles (ni el lapso del tiempo permite su dominio y posesión), e inembargables.
- Patrimonio Forestal del Estado
- Bosque Protector
- Ecosistema frágil
- Parte del patrimonio de áreas naturales

Pero, precisamente la cantidad de cuerpos legales e instituciones nacionales con competencia sobre el manglar son las que han dado pie a la impunidad reinante en la destrucción de los manglares ecuatorianos.

Los pueblos ancestrales del ecosistema manglar reunidos en la C-CONDEM presentaron en el año 2001 un Proyecto de Ley de Conservación del Ecosistema Manglar, el mismo aguarda aún su discusión en segundo debate por el Congreso Nacional, aunque la C-CONDEM ha dado pasos para que éste sea discutido y aprobado por la Asamblea Nacional Constituyente, actualmente con plenas funciones, para lo cual se ha presentado un proyecto reelaborado que incorpora, temas como la consulta y el consentimiento de las comunidades para actividades que puedan causar impactos socio ambientales y económicos en el ecosistema y a la población y el reconocimiento de los derechos territoriales de los Pueblos Ancestrales del Ecosistema Manglar del Ecuador.

Adicionalmente si se considera que el manglar es fuente de alimento de las poblaciones en la costa y que este ecosistema sustenta los ingresos para las necesidades básicas, en este sentido, el apoyo de Suecia está muy bien justificado.

Las poblaciones asentadas en cada sistema estuarino de la faja costera presentan una amplia diversidad étnica y cultural que va desde la cultura afro ecuatoriana, asentada en la provincia de Esmeraldas, hasta comunidades montubias de la provincia de Manabí e indígenas de Santa Elena, Guayas y El Oro. Sobre la base del último censo de población realizado en el país en el año 2001 habitan 1'028.581 personas en zonas que se benefician directa e indirectamente del ecosistema manglar.

La situación de los pueblos ancestrales del ecosistema manglar de acuerdo a los datos obtenidos del SIISE²⁶ es la siguiente:

Esmeraldas Norte: poblaciones de las parroquias: Mataje, Tambillo, San Lorenzo, Ancón, Valdez, La Tola, Pampanal de Bolívar, San Lorenzo y Eloy Alfaro. Estas parroquias tienen un promedio de pobreza por necesidades básicas insatisfechas de 92.08%. Un bajo nivel de escolaridad que da como resultado el 14.8% de analfabetismo, las mujeres registran mayores niveles de analfabetismo. Existe déficit de servicios básicos, bajos índices de salud, niveles de desnutrición crónica que ascienden al 45% en niños menores de 5 años.

Esmeraldas Sur: Muisne, San Gregorio, Bolívar, Daule, Chamanga, y Sálma: el promedio de pobreza de la provincia es uno de los más altos del país y asciende al 93%. Las parroquias de Daule y Sálma tienen un nivel de pobreza por necesidades básicas insatisfechas del 100%, seguidas por Chamanga y Bolívar, cuyo promedio es del 99%. Estas mismas parroquias tienen un 100% de déficit de servicios básicos.

²⁶ Sistema Integrado de Indicadores Sociales del Ecuador

Manabí: es una de las provincias donde se puede constatar mayor depredación del ecosistema manglar (tasa de deforestación de manglar 2,69% anual). Parroquias: Bahía de Caráquez, Canoa, San Vicente pertenecientes a los cantones de Sucre y San Vicente. El 85.4% de la población de la provincia se encuentra en situación de pobreza. Cojimíes que es una de las principales zonas productoras de camarón en la provincia, tiene un índice de pobreza del 97.7%. En esta provincia se repiten las condiciones de bajos índices de escolaridad, analfabetismo y de salud.

Guayas y Santa Elena: en las parroquias Puná y Colonche. En Puná, los índices de Pobreza por necesidades básicas insatisfechas ascienden a 94%, la situación de pobreza de poblaciones marginales tiene factores como: un alto registro de analfabetismo 9,52%, déficit de servicios básicos, déficit en atención de salud, los índices de desnutrición en Puná están sobre el 44%. En Colonche, la situación es muy parecida, el índice de pobreza por NBI es de 98%, el analfabetismo asciende al 13,6% tiene también déficit de servicios básicos, déficit en atención de salud, y la desnutrición crónica en niños menores de 5 años es del 43%.

El Oro: cantones Santa Rosa, Machala y Huaquillas. En las parroquias parte del ecosistema manglar, el 71.09% de su población se encuentra en situación de pobreza. En Bajo Alto en la Parroquia Barbones, que es un recinto de pescadores y recolectores artesanales, se evidencia un alto deterioro del ecosistema y de la economía local, igual que en Jambelí, en donde contradictoriamente se desarrollan industrias camaroneras que han contribuido al empobrecimiento del sector. En la mayoría de localidades se repiten los bajos índices de escolaridad, se registran niveles de analfabetismo del 8%, bajos índices de salud y 45% de desnutrición crónica en niños menores de 5 años.

De acuerdo a la anterior descripción y por lo observado en la visita a Muisne, podemos confirmar que se trata de áreas de intervención con muchos problemas sociales, económicos y ambientales, lo cual ha debido implicar para C-CONDEM, grandes esfuerzos de intervención, incluyendo los esfuerzos necesarios para promover y fortalecer una organización comunitaria. A esto se debe agregar que la institucionalidad y gobernabilidad de las instituciones públicas en estas zonas también tienen muchas debilidades.

La C-CONDEM

La Corporación Coordinadora Nacional para la Defensa del Ecosistema Manglar (C-CONDEM) es una organización de tercer grado que agrupa a federaciones, frentes y uniones de pueblos ancestrales del ecosistema manglar de cinco provincias del litoral ecuatoriano: El Oro, Guayas, Santa Elena, Manabí, Esmeraldas Norte y Esmeraldas Sur y organizaciones ambientalistas de la provincia de Pichincha y otras provincias que dan apoyo en la difusión y movilización.

Son miembros de la C-CONDEM aproximadamente 2.200 familias (hombres, mujeres y niños@s) con un promedio de 6 miembros por cada familia.

ESMERALDAS

FEDARPOM – SL Federación Artesanal de Recolectores de Productos Bioacuáticos – San Lorenzo. Representa a 20 organizaciones de base de 7 comunidades de la Reserva Ecológica de Manglares Cayapas-Mataje (REMACAM) del cantón San Lorenzo. El número de familias afiliadas es 437, por un total de mujeres de 589.

FEDARPROBIM – EA Federación Artesanal de Recolectores de Productos Bioacuáticos del Manglar – Eloy Alfaro. Representa a 9 comunidades de la Reserva Ecológica de Manglares Cayapas-Mataje, por un total de 387 familias. Fedarprobim tiene a su cargo corrales de cautiverio de concha y centros de acopio para la comercialización de mariscos y productos procesados.

FEPALHUM Federación Afro Palenque los Humedales del Bajo Borbón. Representa a 22 comunidades, 6 principales y 16 satélites. El manejo del cangrejo azul y el mantenimiento de cultivos de coco son algunas de las actividades que lleva adelante esta federación.

FUEMBOTH – M Federación de Usuarios Ancestrales del Ecosistema Manglar y Bosque Húmedo Tropical del cantón Muisne. Representa a 9 asociaciones y 10 grupos culturales, por un total de 200 familias. Su objetivo es fortalecer la participación y empoderamiento de los actores para la defensa, restauración y conservación de los recursos naturales, con énfasis en el ecosistema manglar, promoviendo el desarrollo integral de las comunidades locales.

FEPP – Grupo Social Fondo Ecuatoriano Populorum Progressio Regional Esmeraldas

FUNDECOL – Fundación de Defensa Ecológica de Muisne, Esmeraldas

MANABÍ

Asociación de Manglares La Boca de la comunidad de San Jacinto. La Boca representa a 42 familias; esta asociación conserva los manglares de “La Boca”, sitio de anidación de aves nativas y migratorias del ecosistema manglar.

Asomanglar Portovelo – Asociación de Pescadores Portovelo. Agrupa a 30 pescadores como socios. La asociación cuentan con un convenio firmado con el Ministerio del Ambiente para la conservación, uso sostenible y recuperación del ecosistema manglar del Refugio de Vida Silvestre de la Isla Corazón – Islas Fraguatas.

Es parte de ellos, Asomanglar, una asociación de 10 familias de guías naturalistas y promotores turísticos que prestan sus servicios en las Islas Corazón y Fraguatas.

Cooperativa de Pescadores San Francisco de Salinas. Representa a 40 familias.

OFIS – Oficina de Investigaciones Sociales y del Desarrollo

GUAYAS

Asociación de Usuarios del Manglar Cerrito de los Morreños. Agrupa a 49 familias de mangleros, cangrejeros y pescadores. La Asociación ostenta una concesión de 3400 has. de manglar en el corazón del Golfo de Guayaquil.

UCOPUN – Unión de las Comunas de la Isla Puná. Representa a 4 comunas (Campo Alegre, 100 familias; Conchiche, 50 familias; Zapote, 200 familias y Puná vieja, 230 familias) con un total de 580 familias)

Asociación de Pobladores de la Isla Satay que reúne a 60 familias con un promedio de 7 miembros por cada familia.

SANTA ELENA

Asociación para el Uso, Manejo y Conservación del Manglar de Palmar. Representa a 185 familias.

EL ORO

Unión de Organizaciones de Producción Pesquera Artesanal de El Oro – UOPPAO. Está conformada por 28 organizaciones de base, en total 1.200 asociados cabezas de familias. Se dividen en 4 grupos: cangrejeros, concheros, pescadores costaneros y pescadores de altura.

Asociación de Cangrejeros “Unidos Venceremos”. Agrupa a 16 familias; tiene a su cargo 30,20 has de manglar en custodia, entregadas en el mes de Agosto del 2000.

4. Logros del Trabajo

4.1 Logros Institucionales

Los logros institucionales más importantes identificados se describen a continuación:

- FUNDECOL consolidado con 20 años de experiencias en la zona, experiencias que a través de la creación y desarrollo de C-CONDEM han sido transmitidas a otras organizaciones presentes en las 5 provincias de Esmeraldas, Manabí, Santa Elena, Guayas y El Oro en Ecuador. Cabe resaltar que no conocemos personalmente las otras experiencias por lo que no sabemos con precisión en que grado de avance se encuentran las mismas.
- Equipo del personal y la directiva cohesionado, involucrado, comprometido tanto en C-CONDEM como en FUNDECOL.
- Se trata de un modelo interesante donde a partir del trabajo de las organizaciones locales de la costa, promovidos por FUNDECOL, han creado a C-CONDEM como una ONG “coordinadora” en Quito con el propósito de coordinación, intercambio de experiencias y trabajo de incidencia nacional e internacional. Asimismo se trata de un modelo de “abajo hacia arriba” con una gobernabilidad democrática y de rendición de cuentas hacia los mismos miembros, que en muchos casos no existe en fundaciones “cerradas” en América Latina.
- Los roles de liderazgo están bien ubicados, se nota la capacidad en el staff principal, además se percibe que existe flexibilidad de dicho staff y una buena comunicación con las bases.
- Dicho esto, es importante mencionar sin embargo, que se nota también una cierta falta de claridad de los roles entre C-CONDEM y las organizaciones locales. En el caso de Suecia, C-CONDEM es el canal hacia las organizaciones locales. En el caso de Hivos, C-CONDEM se encuentra por el contrario, con dos organizaciones locales dentro del consorcio. Algo tal vez causado por la aplicación a la CE, sin embargo, esta situación hace difícil lograr una especialización en cada organización según un mandato claro.
- C-CONDEM ha tomado el liderazgo al coordinar Red Manglar por 4 años en América Latina, lo cual también ha brindado una plataforma para llevar propuestas al escenario internacional, por ejemplo la conferencia RAMSAR en Kampala, Banco Mundial, FAO, etc. En este sentido, hemos observado un enlace muy interesante desde diferentes niveles, desde un grupo de mujeres en la comunidad Bolívar, la incidencia en Quito, hasta el contacto con instituciones internacionales.

4.2 Logros en el Tema Manglares

Cabe mencionar que el apoyo de Suecia se ha dirigido a:

- Proyecto Defensa de la Vida del Ecosistema Manglar
- Apoyo a la Red Manglar
- Alternativas de actividades productivas en el ecosistema manglar: Restauración del ecosistema, Agricultura para la soberanía alimentaria y Turismo comunitario, en estos temas la C-CONDEM ha apoyado para el intercambio de experiencias.
- Trabajo sobre el tema de Sustento alimentario con las mujeres.
- Apoyo metodológico para la elaboración de Planes de Manejo participativos y comunitarios en tres áreas protegidas del ecosistema manglar en las provincias de Esmeraldas y Manabí.
- Elaboración y Difusión de la investigación Certificando la Destrucción
- Participación en la Asamblea Nacional Ambiental, un espacio de reunión de redes ambientalistas ecuatorianas para el trabajo conjunto por el ambiente y los pueblos ancestrales

- Elaboración de una propuesta y mandato de los pueblos ancestrales del ecosistema manglar para la Asamblea Nacional Constituyente

En los siguientes *logros* listados no se ha separado lo que ha sido financiado por Suecia y qué por otros donantes.

Elaboración de Planes de manejo comunitario del ecosistema manglar.

Entrega de las áreas de manglar a las comunidades mediante acuerdos de uso sustentable y custodia (uso comunitario). Alrededor de 20.000 hectáreas de manglar de Norte a Sur, han sido entregadas a las comunidades.

Existe una buena relación con los grupos de base. Organización de la gente y concientización que fue notable durante las visitas en las comunidades por parte del Equipo.

Resultados visibles a nivel de reforestación de manglares (en comparación con los fondos bastante limitados a disposición).

En el año 1999 la C-CONDEM logró que el Estado ecuatoriano a través de un Decreto Ejecutivo (1109) reconociera la entrega de áreas de ecosistema manglar mediante Acuerdos de Uso Sustentable y Custodia a las organizaciones y comunidades de Usuarios Ancestrales del Ecosistema Manglar, esto ha permitido que actualmente 19 organizaciones estén manejando bajo esta figura 20.000 hectáreas de manglar en las provincias de El Oro, Guayas y Esmeraldas. Se está realizando una evaluación del proceso de entrega y del manejo de éstas, en el norte de la provincia de Esmeraldas. Los primeros resultados indican que de manera positiva esta figura ha aportado para detener la tala del bosque de manglar, pero que existen conflictos locales por el acceso y el control del territorio, principalmente con las empresas camaroneras.

Se ha dado un seguimiento al trabajo en las comunidades con visitas frecuentes de los técnicos, que son apreciados por las mismas comunidades.

Se nota un conocimiento técnico muy extenso en el tema de manglares, por ejemplo, las formas de hacer reforestación. Sin embargo parece que no existe la sistematización al respecto.

Expansión y transferencia de capacidades a otros pueblos del manglar en las demás tres provincias. Mediante el apoyo a la elaboración de los Planes de Manejo Participativos y Comunitarios en 3 áreas protegidas de manglar: REMACAM – Reserva de Manglares Cayapas – Mataje (Norte de Esmeraldas), Refugio de Vida Silvestre del Ecosistema Manglar del Sistema Muisne-Cojimíes (Sur de Esmeraldas), Refugio de Vida Silvestre Islas Corazón y Fragatas (Manabí).

Se han dado procesos de capacitación importantes a: mujeres, comunidades, equipo de C-CONDEM, FEPP y FUNDECOL.

Se ha desarrollado un concepto para el turismo comunitario, aunque todavía es reciente su implementación y no se pueden analizar los resultados. Pensamos que aunque es una iniciativa probable, se carece de la experiencia de aplicación en este tema por lo que será importante una reflexión sobre asesoría técnica especializada, en cuanto a los objetivos esperados, con resultados e indicadores claros.

Posicionamiento en la opinión pública sobre la problemática de las comunidades costeras afectadas por el impacto de piscinas de cría y cultivo de camarón tropical que se asienta ilegalmente en áreas de manglar.

4.3 Logros legales y de incidencia (advocacy):

- Se han logrado los convenios de co-administración y los planes de manejo participativos a través de convenios con el Ministerio del Ambiente. Cabe mencionar que los planes han subrayado la

participación comunitaria en el manejo (véase título: Co-administración a los Pueblos Ancestrales del Ecosistema Manglar).

- En este año 2008, se logró que la Subsecretaría de Pesca adopte la propuesta de los pueblos ancestrales del ecosistema manglar de veda indefinida de la concha al tamaño mínimo de captura y de rotación de zonas de concheo, levantando la veda vigente que impedía la extracción de concha del 15 de Febrero al 31 de marzo de cada año.
- C-CONDEM y sus organizaciones afiliadas han desarrollado una muy buena capacidad de incidencia, que incluye la presentación de propuestas, cabildeo, buen acceso a los medios de comunicación, información y campañas públicas, etc. Cabe mencionar que la propuesta de Ley de Conservación del Ecosistema manglar llegó a un nivel superior para ser aprobado en el parlamento (proceso interrumpido por la Asamblea Constituyente). C-CONDEM, FUNDECOL etc. cuentan con un reconocimiento por este trabajo.
- Coordinación con entidades estatales aunque sin resultados muy fuertes por falta de voluntad política del ministerio o ambiente (áreas protegidas solamente están en papel).
- Creación de un espacio de encuentro con otras redes ambientales nacionales (Foro del Agua, Frente de Defensa de la Amazonía, Federación de Turismo Comunitario, CEDENMA, Coordinadora de Agroecología, afectados por la extracción minera de Intag) en una asamblea permanente denominada Asamblea Nacional Ambiental de las Nacionalidades, Pueblos y Organizaciones Sociales del Ecuador.

5. Que Opciones Estratégicas Existen?

El Equipo tiene la impresión que SSNC no ha sido involucrado en discusiones estratégicas con C-CONDEM y sus organizaciones afiliadas. Parece que el contacto principalmente más allá de las campañas en Suecia ha sido sobre contratos, administración, informes narrativos y financieros. Sin embargo, SSNC está haciendo una contribución importante al apoyar a la Red Manglar con 10 países latinoamericanos como miembros, que según una evaluación recién hecha ha dado resultados en la incidencia regional e internacional.

La Red Manglar también tiene todo el potencial de intercambiar, discutir y desarrollar opciones estratégicas. Pero la pregunta es si se lo ha aprovechado suficientemente? Desafortunadamente, reflexiones a niveles estratégicos casi no se encuentran en los documentos de proyectos o informes enviados por C-CONDEM a Suecia. Cabe mencionar algunos aspectos para discutir con C-CONDEM:

a) Qué perspectiva hay en mantener a las mujeres y niños en el trabajo con las conchas? Es un trabajo muy duro que genera menos y menos ingresos. Y cómo se vincula esto con un enfoque de género? C-CONDEM informó que en los dos últimos años el trabajo llevado adelante con los planes de manejo participativos y comunitarios, permitieron conocer que las familias de pescadores y recolectores no ven otra posibilidad que el trabajo en el ecosistema manglar, en las zonas costeras esta es la única “industria natural que tenemos, allí no nos piden papeles ni recomendaciones, solamente vamos y encontramos nuestra comida y nuestro sustento diario” dicen los testimonios de las familias del ecosistema manglar, por lo que la C-CONDEM le apuesta a una recuperación y restauración integral del ecosistema (Entrevista C-CONDEM).

b) Es atractivo y tiene llegada a las comunidades el mensaje de C-CONDEM y las organizaciones locales? Es una mensaje para movilizar en una forma más amplia a las comunidades en las 5 provincias? Aún con un esfuerzo grande en Esmeraldas de los compañeros y compañeras por casi 20 años, parece que no se ha logrado un nivel de organización comunitaria que tenga consenso sobre los planes de desarrollo de las comunidades si es que los hay. El Equipo visitó la comunidad Bolívar, donde un

grupo de 19 mujeres esta organizado. No obstante, en la misma comunidad hace falta unidad, p.ej. se han dado disputas sobre un árbol en la plaza. Parece que esta comunidad carece de una visión común de desarrollo comunitario. Más bien se observa que más y más jóvenes están saliendo la zona, y en general, el grado de migración con casi 3 millones en el exterior es preocupante en Ecuador.

Si no hay organizaciones comunitarias más fortalecidas, parece difícil que estas comunidades podrán ejercer un control social y de vigilancia sobre la protección de las áreas protegidas. La pregunta para C-CONDEM es conocer sus perspectivas en este sentido, porque parece que las organizaciones comunitarias han sido dañadas por el clientelismo en esta parte de la costa.

c) El debate internacional de los últimos años no ha llenado las expectativas post-Rio 1992 de aprobar leyes de medio ambiente y a través de los nuevos ministerios ambientales lograr un monitoreo y regulación eficiente. Por eso, a partir de Johannesburgo 2002, el enfoque ha sido *cambiar las estrategias* hacia:

- a) la transversalización en los diversos sectores (pesca, agricultura, infraestructura, inversiones públicas, etc.)
- b) incidencia en ministerios de finanzas y economía
- c) diálogo entre actores públicos, sector privado y la sociedad civil
- d) lograr situaciones win-win, “ganador el ambiente y ganador la generación de empleo/lucha contra la pobreza”.
- e) descentralización y participación comunitaria, donde los planes de manejo han sido preparados en una forma muy participativa.

En este sentido, el Equipo todavía no ha encontrado en los documentos, referencias a estos aprendizajes y tendencias internacionales. Mientras que la Red Manglar ha desarrollado una buena capacidad para usar experiencias locales a niveles internacionales, nos sorprende un poco, que no se observa más de lo contrario, es decir aprovechar más en Muisne y las otras provincias aquellas experiencias sistematizadas de otros países de Latino América y de Asia.

d) En el proyecto con HIVOS está presente un resultado: “R4. Se han incrementado los ingresos familiares a través de prácticas productivas alternativas y la creación de empresas de transformación, comercialización y servicios.”

Una pregunta del Equipo es, si está dentro del mandato de las organizaciones locales como FUNDECOL enfocar en *proyectos productivos*? (turismo, agricultura, comercialización, ahorro y crédito, etc.). Algo que según muchas evaluaciones requiere de una especialización que muchas veces ha sido difícil para ONGs u organizaciones comunitarias. O es que su mandato deberá seguir enfocado donde han tenido más éxito hasta el momento: Participación comunitaria en el manejo y conservación de manglares, derechos, denuncias e incidencia en políticas nacionales.

e) Se debe pensar cómo enfocar de manera estratégica los temas actuales presentes a nivel tanto nacional como global, por ejemplo a nivel nacional cómo se enfocará el posible crecimiento y *reactivación de las camaronas* dado el incremento de los precios, cómo afectará esto a las comunidades involucradas en el proyecto? Y en el contexto global cómo enfocarán FUNDECOL y C-CONDEM el tema de *cambios climáticos*. Cabe mencionar que la investigación ha comprobado que los manglares tuvieron un impacto muy preventivo durante el maremoto en Indonesia y Tailandia.

En conclusión, en vez de basar la orientación estratégica tanto en los obstáculos del contexto externo, podrá también ser relevante analizar y aprovechar mejor las *oportunidades* del contexto, p.ej. fondos para adaptación de cambios climáticos, la descentralización del estado hacia los municipios, alianzas con otros actores, “ganador-ganador” entre conservación y desarrollo económico, etc.

6. Áreas Para Posibles Mejoramientos

- El Equipo considera clave el tema de la *institucionalización* dentro de C-CONDEM y FUNDECOL. Por el momento parece, que hay una riqueza de conocimiento y experiencia acumulada en las cabezas de un pequeño grupo de C-CONDEM y FUNDECOL, que ha trabajado con un alto compromiso y esfuerzos por muchos años. Sin embargo, una replicación y ampliación requiere un mayor grado de sistematización, formación de recursos humanos y divulgación de estas experiencias – hacia otros actores también. En este sentido hacen falta más esfuerzos en la sistematización de experiencias acumuladas.
- Ampliar el trabajo en la búsqueda de *aliados* para el caso de manglares (afuera del mundo ambiental). Algo que debe incluir otras ONGs, gobiernos locales, iglesia, sector privado, consumidores, etc. Además, parece importante las perspectivas en trabajar con las juntas parroquias, siendo el nivel local de los municipios en Ecuador.
- Las *alternativas* productivas tales como la agricultura sostenible, manejo de la finca, turismo comunitario, etc. son importantes. Sin embargo éstas no están suficientemente desarrolladas y se podría contar con asistencia técnica de otros actores especializados en este tema. Por el momento, el proyecto apoyado por HIVOS ha arrancado las alternativas en Esmeraldas. Otra conexión está presente con la Red Agroecológica.
- El turismo comunitario parece ir en marcha lentamente pero no se cuenta con información escrita al respecto. La página web específica también hace falta. Sin embargo, con la expertise del encargado del equipo debería ser posible lograr avances en el turismo.
- El Equipo tiene la impresión, que FUNDECOL ha logrado un buen nivel de organización. Pero no está claro hasta que punto se ha logrado un fortalecimiento de las organizaciones en las *otras tres provincias*? Que fortalezas se han dado al respecto? Se cuenta con un método sistemático para fortalecimiento organizacional?
- Una pregunta que surge es: Cómo se planteará la agenda a la Asamblea Constituyente a partir de las propuestas (más políticas que técnicas) de la red de ONGs llamada ‘Asamblea Nacional Ambiental’? El Equipo ha observado una tendencia dentro de las ONG ambientales al “no” frente a las alternativas productivas del gobierno, pero sin presentar *alternativas viables y documentadas*. Por ejemplo: la minería. No debe C-CONDEM ser un poco más cuidadosa en pronunciarse con respecto a temas donde no tiene expertise, ejemplo la minería? En este sentido lo que C-CONDEM ha planteado es la revisión del modelo de desarrollo, después de décadas de implementar proyectos extractivos, el saldo es una población más pobre y ecosistemas destruidos. Este planteamiento es el resultado de tres años de reflexión en la Asamblea Nacional Ambiental, y el apoyo de C-CONDEM a la propuesta de los pueblos afectados por la minería quienes se han pronunciado por el no a la minería de gran y mediana escala y de cielo abierto. No es que la C-CONDEM hace una propuesta de no a la minería, sino que se adhiere a la planteada por los pueblos afectados. Ellos piensan que la clave está en buscar este sentido de una nueva forma de vivir de los pueblos que permita la reconciliación con la naturaleza que es la garantía del largo plazo para el género humano.

Trabajo en otras provincias:

En el norte de la provincia de Esmeraldas, por tener la presencia del FEPP Regional Esmeraldas en la zona, se ha podido dinamizar el trabajo alrededor de la recuperación de la concha y el cangrejo y trabajar con juntas parroquiales (gobiernos locales) para regular el manejo incluyendo la comercialización. Aquí existen redes de federaciones de uruáis ancestrales del ecosistema manglar y de humedales que son beneficiarios del Proyecto Hivos. Agroacción Alemana y Unión Europea, hay una excelente participación, sin embargo el nivel organizativo es bastante débil por el cuestion-

amiento de las bases a los dirigentes de las Federaciones, pero el reconocimiento de la C-CONDEM es muy alto ya que se logró posicionar a la organización a través del proyecto Manglar TICS, apoyado por el IICD.

Sobre el trabajo en otras provincias hay que resaltar que las organizaciones de la provincia de El Oro tiene actualmente un alto nivel de liderazgo en temas del ecosistema manglar, llevan adelante recuperación de áreas de manglar ilegalmente encerradas para piscinas de cría y cultivo de camarón, conjuntamente con la Capitanía del Puerto, de la Dirección General de la Marina Mercante, la Unión provincial cuenta con 23 organizaciones principalmente de recolectores de concha y han liderado el manejo de las áreas de manglar entregadas mediante acuerdos de uso sustentable y custodia, el manejo de la veda permanente al tamaño mínimo de captura de la especie concha y la recuperación de concha para repoblación y reproducción en encierros elaborados y monitoreados dentro del ecosistema manglar, esto ha sido un aporte valioso intercambiado a través de la C-CONDEM. En la provincia de Esmeraldas es sustantivo el aporte en el proceso de reforestación de bosque.

En la provincia de Manabí, siendo el estuario del Río Chone uno de los más afectados por la destrucción del ecosistema y la implementación de piscinas, se ha logrado articular 4 grupos de base, quienes prácticamente han perdido todos los recursos del ecosistema y con quienes se está trabajando junto con algunos gobiernos locales en un plan de recuperación y restauración del estuario del Río Chone, a partir del modelo del Plan de Manejo Participativo y Comunitario del Refugio de Vida Silvestre de la Isla Corazón.

En la provincia de Guayas como se explicó el trabajo tiene retos fundamentales: uno que aquí se encuentra asentada la industria de producción de camarón en cautiverio con mayor poder político y económico que incluso tiene amenazada constantemente a la comunidad y por otro lado que los costos de movilización son extremadamente grandes, por lo que apenas hemos podido contactar con cuatro organizaciones las cuales han participado de encuentros y talleres, hemos realizado una asamblea provincial, pero hay tiempos largos sin trabajo.

7. Comentarios Para Planificación e Informes

Según los TdR dado por ASDI, la evaluación debería sugerir mejoras en cuanto a la planificación, implementación y monitoreo de la cooperación al desarrollo.

Como ya se ha planteado anteriormente: La realidad que hemos visto está mejor que el proyecto/ informes que hemos leído sobre el proyecto. Sin embargo, el Equipo considera que este es un tema donde C-CONDEM debe poner esfuerzos en mejorar. Este aspecto tiene mucho que ver con el comentario anterior sobre la necesidad de una mayor reflexión y discusiones de opciones estratégicas en base de sistematización de experiencias por escrito.

Tenemos varios comentarios al proyecto 2007–08, que nos lleva a la pregunta: Qué comentarios y asesorías han recibido de Suecia para este documento de planificación?

Dentro de nuestras *observaciones* a la planificación y monitoreo resaltamos las siguientes:

- En el *Marco Lógico* no es recomendable contar con 5 objetivos, lo cual hace difícil hacer una formulación realista de resultados a alcanzar. Un ejemplo:
Resultado: Se amplía y mejora el proceso de otorgamiento de áreas de manglar en co-administración a los pueblos ancestrales del ecosistema manglar.
- El proyecto financiado por Suecia *carece de los indicadores* necesarios que debe tener un proyecto para verificar los avances de los resultados y objetivos planificados. Cómo se va a medir el objetivo en términos de tiempo/cantidad/calidad etc.? Cuentan con una *línea base* para comparar antes y después del proyecto?

- En el proyecto también hace falta un análisis sobre la situación socio-económico-ambiental, por ejemplo los efectos de la migración, pobreza etc. En este sentido será posible justificar mucho mejor el proyecto hacia los financiadores.
- El documento carece de información sobre *otros proyectos y donantes*. Además, nos parece problemático que el tema de sostenibilidad organizativa y financiera no ha sido discutido en el documento. Tampoco está mencionado el *enfoque de género*.

8. Aprovechar la Agenda de Paris

Los proyectos/informes no dan información sobre los demás donantes/proyectos, lo cual ha implicado la falta de una visión total del trabajo. La razón para esto tiene que ver más que todo con los donantes, donde cada uno está ocupado sólo con “su proyecto”. El Equipo considera que se debe discutir y aprovechar los cambios actuales en las modalidades de la cooperación.

La primera evaluación de la Declaración de Paris (hecho en 2005) indica que son las instituciones del Sur las que hasta el momento han obtenido las mayores ventajas que las agencias internacionales de estos 5 principios: Apropiación, alineamiento, manejo por resultados, responsabilidad mutua y armonización.

En el caso presente, este tema probablemente no es algo fácil de cambiar durante los 4 años del proyecto HIVOS ya aprobado en la Comisión Europea. Sin embargo, de forma modesta, el Equipo recomienda dos pasos:

- a) que C-CONDEM elabore sus futuros proyectos alrededor de su propio *Plan Estratégico*, sus planes anuales y su *sistema de gobernabilidad interna* (asamblea, directiva, gerencia). Esto en vez de seguir elaborando proyectos para ONGs internacionales por separado.
- b) considerar una *armonización de formato de reporte*, liberando tiempo para que C-CONDEM ponga más esfuerzos en la reflexión y calidad de los informes (en vez de usar tiempo para transferir información tanto al formato Comisión Europea y Suecia). Probablemente, lo más realista será usar el formato de la CE.
- c) En concreto considerar un *futuro monitoreo y seguimiento conjunto entre Hivos y SSNC*, que además, resuelva la limitaciones de un monitoreo de larga distancia desde Estocolmo.
- d) C-CONDEM, FUNDECOL etc. podrían pensar en llamar a una *mesa de coordinación* con sus donantes, inclusive para presentar y discutir estrategias hacia el futuro. Por ejemplo, planificar una reunión anual invitando sus amigos de ONG internacionales.

9. Sostenibilidad y Replicación

Lamentablemente la sociedad civil en Ecuador se encuentra hoy en una situación donde la salida de agencias internacionales se está incrementando, dentro de ellos Holanda y Suiza que por años han otorgado un financiamiento considerable para el tema ambiental. El enfoque en África y el PIB/cápita es un factor importante dentro de muchas agencias bilaterales, por lo cual solamente las agencias multilaterales se quedarán.

A continuación algunas observaciones para discutir con C-CONDEM:

- Alrededor de 1 millón de personas en Ecuador están vinculados a los manglares, dependen cotidianamente de los recursos costero marinos, convirtiéndose así el tema manglar en una problemática socio económica y cultural, además de ambiental. Por lo tanto *el alcance*, que por ahora es aún limitado, debe ampliarse a un mayor número de comunidades y actores involucrados para tener un impacto relevante – algo donde va a ser muy importante conocer los resultados del proyecto apoyado por HIVOS. La cuestión a discutir con C-CONDEM es si sería posible optar por una *estrategia de*

replicación más eficiente? Aquí se deben contemplar dos aspectos: 1) los fondos que recibe C-CONDEM son aun muy limitados para fortalecer el trabajo con las bases, la prioridad ha sido el trabajo nacional, sin embargo si esto no va de la mano con el fortalecimiento organizativo, los procesos se debilitan. Por otra parte hay que contemplar que un Ley del Manglar o la demanda de entregar áreas en custodia, no beneficia solamente a las comunidades y organizaciones representadas en C-CONDEM, a los beneficios se acogen todos los pueblos del ecosistema manglar estén o no organizados en la C-CONDEM, por lo que el numero de beneficiarios es mucho mayor a los representados en C-CONDEM.

- Dentro de toda la información leída por el Equipo hasta el momento, parece que *no* se ha pensado en el tema de *sostenibilidad organizativa y financiera*. Por el momento C-CONDEM tiene cierta dependencia de solamente tres ONGs internacionales. La pregunta es: Cómo seguirán después que no haya el apoyo de SSNC, IICD y Hivos, ? Qué va a pasar el 2010 al finalizar el apoyo de Hivos/CE?
- Nos parece que es tiempo de pensar en una estrategia al respecto (*una estrategia de salida/exit strategy*), que además de nuevas solicitudes hacia el exterior deberá incluir recursos domésticos de diferentes fuentes, como un posible respaldo/apoyo financiero de los municipios y otras fuentes en la sociedad ecuatoriana. Ecuador tiene la capacidad, dado su Producto Interno Bruto, de asignar recursos para la gestión ambiental, la cuestión será como movilizar y crear sensibilización publica para ser parte del Presupuesto Público?
- También cabe señalar, que el Equipo ha preguntado sobre *el número de miembros* de C-CONDEM y sus afiliados. Este dato no se conocía, lo cual parece reflejar que un aumento de membresía no ha tenido prioridad. Algo que podría ser parte de una estrategia de mayor sostenibilidad organizacional y financiera en base a recursos domésticos. Lo mismo sobre un mayor esfuerzo para movilizar el involucramiento de voluntarios. Se conoce el número de organizaciones representadas en la C-CONDEM pero no el número que a su vez cada organización representa, pues la mayoría de ellas con organizaciones de segundo grado. Frentes, Uniones, etc
- Dentro de C-CONDEM existen el presidente y la coordinadora como pilares de esta institución. En el caso que uno de ellos salga de la estructura y los cargos queden acéfalos, se debería pensar cómo seguir. Existen personas que vayan capacitándose en esta línea, el llamado *cambio generacional*? Aquí se contestó que existen también dos niveles de equipos capacitados para asumir el liderazgo: un equipo político que esta en el Consejo de Dirección y en las juntas directivas de las organizaciones de base y un equipo de promotores de campo que están listos para asumir cargos y direcciones.

10. Valor Agregado por Parte de SSNC

Qué valor agregado se ha dado de parte de SSNC más allá de los fondos financieros? Es una pregunta clave para el Equipo visitando también Perú, Senegal, Kenya, Tanzania, Malasia y Tailandia.

La mayor parte del contacto con Suecia parece administrativo, algo tanto indicado por SSNC como por C-CONDEM. Solamente ha habido una visita en marzo 2007, que era una visita de introducción – y donde no existe un informe en español para compartir con C-CONDEM. Además, el contacto ha sido obstaculizado por 3 cambios de oficial de programa en Estocolmo.

En comparación, C-CONDEM tiene un acompañamiento mucho más cercano y contacto frecuente con *Hivos* con su oficina de representación en Quito. Hivos consideró que no era suficiente contar con la oficina regional ubicada en La Paz.

Sin embargo, se aprecia el esfuerzo en Suecia sobre la *campaña pública sobre el consumo de camarón tropical* producido en las piscinas de áreas de manglares. Se nota el involucramiento de voluntarios de la SSNC (Grudrun Hubendick entre otros). Además se ha valorado el intercambio con PRATEC del Perú y otros

socios latinoamericanos que fue organizado por Rodolfo Magne en SSNC.

En conclusión, el Equipo considera que el apoyo de Suecia podrá ser *optimizado con un mayor acompañamiento de SSNC*. Alternativamente, se llegará a un arreglo con Hivos como encargado del seguimiento y monitoreo (más frecuente).

11. Resumen de ‘Valor Agregado’ por Parte de SSNC que ha Sido Identificadas durante la Evaluación en Ecuador y Perú

De acuerdo al trabajo de campo realizado, y a las visitas a las diferentes organizaciones, específicamente PRATEC en Perú, y C-CONDEM en Ecuador, con quienes trabajamos en forma conjunta, se han identificado las siguientes fortalezas y debilidades en analizar el ‘Valor agregado’ por parte de SSNC (mas allá de canalizar los fondos).

‘Valor agregado’ por parte de SSNC	
Fortalezas	Debilidades
Buena selección de socios en los dos países visitados.	La estructura temática de la SSNC no ha funcionado. La división en las cinco categorías temáticas ha llevado más bien a un enfoque de especialización en los diferentes temas, con el efecto que ya no existe un intercambio de información entre temáticas relacionadas ni entre países. Por lo que se ha visto en el trabajo de campo, tanto en la costa como en agricultura se nota que no funciona esta estructura, que ni siquiera ha logrado un contacto sur-sur. Por eso, se sugiere una visión más amplia donde se relacione a los temas costa con manejo de agua, y agricultura sostenible con bosques y forestería.
Buena selección de los temas, se trata de temas relevantes dentro de la temática ambiental de los países considerados. Perú: ante el modelo actual de desarrollo orientado al crecimiento económico, con énfasis en inversiones extranjeras y desarrollo económico, el sector ambiental se encuentra dejado de lado por el gobierno. Ecuador: pasa algo similar. El tema de los manglares es particularmente sensible en términos ambientales, amenazado por las camaroneras y enfrentados a leyes y normas que no se implementan en el país. Ante este escenario, el apoyo de SSNC es de relevancia.	No existe una circulación de la información internacional dentro de los temas, ni impulsado por SSNC, ni por socios de los temas.
SSNC va más allá de abordar la temática de la conservación ambiental como tal. En todos los casos se percibe una relación directa entre medio ambiente y pobreza.	SSNC no ha hecho suficiente intento de facilitar el hecho de compartir entre socios las experiencias y lecciones aprendidas de los años de trabajo. Por ello, la información de cada coparte, muy valiosa y rica en muchos casos, permanece en la organización y no logra discutirse, enriquecerse, con aportes de otros socios que están dentro de la misma temática.
Se percibe un sentido de confianza de los socios hacia la SSNC. Esto porque existe el sentido de respeto desde la SSNC a sus socios.	No hay un acompañamiento a foros internacionales, no hay un espacio común de discusión sobre los distintos temas de la SSNC que tocan las organizaciones.
El apoyo de la SSNC está fundado en la planificación de las organizaciones visitadas. Existe plena confianza en las mismas.	No hay una transmisión del “best know how” y las tendencias. Parece que en las redes esto si funciona pero no así en la agricultura o en el tema manglares.

‘Valor agregado’ por parte de SSNC

Fortalezas

Un gran aporte de la SSNC es el de tomar casos concretos de sus socios en el sur para organizar y desarrollar campañas en el norte. Este es el caso específico de C-CONDEM, donde SSNC ha desarrollado una campaña importante donde una cadena de hoteles dejó de consumir camarón proveniente de las camaroneras. Una muestra de que SSNC tiene gran poder para organizar este tipo de campañas y eventos de incidencia directa en consumidores del norte. Esto por su número tan grande de miembros y su poder de convocatoria pública.

Cabe enfatizar que es importante la continuidad en este tipo de campañas, y para ello es determinante la continuidad dentro de SSNC, en cuanto a personal involucrado y un flujo de información entre partes constante y fluido.

SSNC permite que se creen vínculos no solo a nivel local, sino también regional, nacional y global. Esto se percibe especialmente en las redes.

SSNC ha podido llegar a los temas que no siempre despiertan interés o que no son tan conocidos. Así ha logrado cubrir los huecos en países donde sí hay altos niveles de biodiversidad, pero donde por ejemplo entidades estatales no llegan a producir cambios positivos en estos temas. Los temas tales como la problemática del manejo de los manglares o la conservación de la biodiversidad en Lamas, no son abordados por el estado de modo que SSNC juega un rol determinante para estas copartes.

SSNC también apoya propuestas puntuales (ANPE), cubriendo un apoyo en temas donde se necesita algún apoyo puntual y pequeño, lo cual demuestra la flexibilidad de esta organización para enfocar ciertas temáticas.

Debilidades

La SSNC se ha convertido un poco en administradores y existe paralelamente muy poco diálogo sobre los contenidos con los socios.

Cuando existe un tema a discutir, es más sobre las actividades y no así sobre las estrategias.

Parece que hubiera un understaff. En el caso de la costa se manifiesta en la falta de seriedad en la comunicación, caso C-CONDEM, donde la organización en dos años ha tenido 3–4 oficiales. Esta es una expresión de la misma gente de la organización.

El idioma es una barrera importante. No nos referimos solamente al inglés sino al sueco, que es el idioma predominante en los informes internos de la SSNC. El inglés aunque no es el idioma que maneja la gente, puede ser traducido en última instancia, pero el sueco no debe ser el idioma oficial. En el caso de Latinoamérica se debe considerar traducir todos los documentos pertinentes al español.

Esta barrera impide un mejor flujo de comunicación entre la SSNC y las copartes. Sin embargo, parece que nunca se manifestó la barrera del idioma como un problema real, lo cual hace presumir que estos documentos nunca fueron compartidos o discutidos con las copartes.

Se conoce de una evaluación en C-CONDEM realizada hace 3 meses por un consultor sueco que no hablaba español, lo cual dificultó el trabajo considerablemente.

Comunicación. No existe un intercambio de información, no hay un buen flujo de información especialmente de parte de la SSNC. La mayor parte de la comunicación se basa en temas administrativos y de cumplimiento de informes más que discusiones sobre los contenidos mismos y aportes temáticos que podría dar la SSNC. Hay muy poca discusión temática y sobre el seguimiento de los proyectos. (Comprobar viendo los emails)

Transparencia. Los documentos internos y algunas evaluaciones están en sueco. Los socios saben solo lo temático pero no lo que pasa en el proyecto.

‘Valor agregado’ por parte de SSNC	
Fortalezas	Debilidades
	A nivel de proyectos el idioma esta bien, pero no en los temas del programa en si.
	Las visitas que realiza la SSNC son mas de verificación que de aprendizaje mutuo.
	Existe falta de continuidad en los puestos de trabajo de la SSNC. Según se pudo comprobar en C-CONDEM, ha habido 4 cambios de las personas de contacto en Suecia, lo que ha dificultado y retrasado el proyecto. Muchas veces ni siquiera se ha avisado a la organización de los cambios de personal producidos y simplemente dejaron de recibir emails de determinadas personas, sin recibir ninguna explicación al respecto.

12. Recomendaciones

El Equipo recomienda a SSNC continuar con el apoyo a los socios vinculados con la problemática de manglares en Ecuador.

Más que todo, el Equipo considera que el financiamiento sueco debe ser pensado en llenar “nichos estratégicos”, que no están contemplados suficientemente en el proyecto HIVOS/Comisión Europea. Dentro de éstos se recomienda:

- Se recomienda mayor reflexión, discusión y análisis para lograr mayor claridad sobre las *opciones estratégicas* a futuro, aprovechando una sistematización de sus propias experiencias combinado con experiencias internacionales. Con esta base de análisis, hará la justificación para selección la opción estrategia mas viable.
- Que las organizaciones locales con el apoyo de C-CONDEM se concentre construir una propuesta/ *plan de desarrollo local*, que a través de una amplia participación de las comunidades llegará a un consensos en las comunidades. Este plan debe dentro del marco de desarrollo sostenible integrar aspectos productivos/economicos con la gestión comunitaria para recuperar, conservar y defender el ecosistema manglar.
- Ante la *recuperación de los ingresos de las piscinas de camarón* que ya se está viendo, causará probablemente un aumento fuerte de la actividad camaronera, y cómo están organizados ante tal situación. Como van a afrontar el hecho de la vuelta de los camaroneros? Será necesario fortalecer las organizaciones comunitarias y el control social paraenfrentar la reactivación de la industria camaronera. Por un lado se debe aprovechar la ilegalidad de las empresas camaroneras y fortalecer la demanda al estado de recuperar y restaurar este ecosistema y por el otro lado, fortalecer las organizaciones de base para la vigilancia, la denuncia el control y el monitoreo permanente para recuperar las áreas y no permitir más talas.
- Si bien se percibe el valor de las acciones de la C-CONDEM y FUNDECON en cuanto a activismo, hay necesidad de reforzar la capacidad frente a temas concretos como las denuncias de los afectados, que se hace al respecto más allá de presentar los *casos al sistema judicial*.
- Se recomienda llevar a cabo un *análisis de género*, que incluya la temática de los roles entre mujeres y hombres en las comunidades.
- Elaboración y discusión de una *estrategia de sostenibilidad organizacional y financiera* (incluyendo discutir la estrategia de diversificar a más donantes principales; a un tiempo prudente planificar en una forma

responsable la salida con las ONGs internacionales (estrategia de salida), dando un plazo de tiempo para C-CONDEM y sus afiliados para implementar su estrategia de sostenibilidad).

- Considerar dar mas peso al *fortalecimiento de organizaciones* locales en las demás provincias donde no se tiene conocimiento acerca de sus capacidades.
- Poner más énfasis en buscar *alianzas* con otros actores locales/nacionales, incluyendo instancias públicas (ministerios, municipios, universidades, etc.) y otros actores de la sociedad. Dentro de esto se debería considerar formas para una escala mayor de sensibilización pública a favor del valor de los manglares.
- Poner mas énfasis en una *sistematización de experiencias* para divulgación de experiencia a otros actores que puedan aprovecharlos. Incluyendo, aprovechar mas el vinculo con Red Manglares para conocer y aprovechar a nivel local las experiencias de otros países.
- Proponer a los donantes un fortalecimiento del sistema de *Planificación, Monitoreo e Evaluación (PME)* dentro del sistema de gestión propia de C-CONDEM y sus afiliados con asamblea anual, directiva electa, gerencia – en vez de la situación actual con sistemas de PME paralelos para los donantes. Se recomienda contar con una línea de base en las zonas de intervención.
- Proponer a *Hivos, SSNC y IIDC* considerar una división de trabajo que aproveche las ventajas comparativas de cada uno (ejemplo HIVOS encargada del monitoreo y asesoría, IIDC parte de asesoría en comunicación y SSNC encargada de enlace a campañas internacionales y conjuntamente con Red Manglar hacer incidencia internacional)

Cabe decir que algunas de las recomendaciones se podrá llevar a cabo con el financiamiento total actual para C-CONDEM y las organizaciones locales. Otras de las recomendaciones va a requerir financiamiento adicional dentro de los próximos años, tanto de fuentes nacionales como internacionales. Y mas que todo, será recomendable reforzar la sistematización de experiencia y el manejo de conocimiento para mejorar las estrategias aplicados los siguientes años.

Annex C. Peru Visit Report

Note from visits to Peru in May 2008. The visit was carried out by Hans Peter Dejgaard and María del Socorro Peñaloza.

Proyecto Andino de Tecnologías Campesinas PRATEC, Mayo 2008



Informe de la Evaluación de la Sociedad Sueca para la Protección de la Naturaleza SSPN:
Análisis de PRATEC

1. Introducción

Entre el 30 de abril al 2 de mayo de 2008, el equipo de evaluación trabajó en forma conjunta con PRATEC para el proceso de evaluación de las actividades de la Sociedad Sueca para la Protección de la Naturaleza SSPN. Después de analizar la documentación existente que fue provista en las oficinas en Lima, conocer las instalaciones de PRATEC, y tener una reunión inicial con el Director de PRATEC, Jorge Ishizawa, y el responsable nacional del proyecto apoyado por SSPN, Grimaldo Rengifo, nos trasladamos a Lamas, San Martín, Perú, donde tuvimos la oportunidad de conocer a la ONG Waman Wasi, entidad ejecutora le Proyecto y al grupo de trabajo de esta organización a la cabeza del coordinador Luis Romero. Ya en la visita de campo, pudimos conocer las actividades de un grupo de mujeres indígenas kechua lamas de la asociación “warmikuna tarpudora”, y conocer sus perspectivas en torno al proyecto con Waman Wasi. También pudimos asistir a una reunión de las comunidades sobre otros temas, donde destacó el tema del funcionamiento del fondo revolving Muyuna así como aspectos referidos al tema de acceso a nuevas tierras productivas, como un deseo de las comunidades.

En este corto periodo de tiempo, estamos concientes de haber logrado un vistazo general y superficial de la situación, dado que la realidad y el contexto en el que habitan las comunidades kechua lamas, es mucho más complejo que lo que se ve a primera vista. De todos modos, hemos preparado algunas observaciones y recomendaciones, que se basan en la lectura de documentos, la visita a las chacras de las mujeres, la asistencia al mercado de la agrobiodiversidad donde pudimos experimentar el intercambio de productos entre comunidades además de degustar los platos especialmente preparados para

nuestra llegada, y la asistencia a la reunión de las comunidades. También pudimos tener largas conversaciones y discusiones con el responsable nacional del proyecto y con el coordinador de Waman Wasi, la denominada NACA o núcleo de afirmación cultural andina, que se encarga de la ejecución en terreno del proyecto. Podemos afirmar que aprovechamos nuestra corta estancia al máximo posible.

Adicionalmente tuvimos reuniones con otras instituciones externas que conocen el proyecto PRATEC, quienes nos dieron sus opiniones, los aspectos positivos y negativos así como sus puntos de vista, contribuyendo a ampliar nuestra visión sobre la organización. Para un detalle de las instituciones externas visitadas, véase lista adjunta.

Al igual que en el caso de la otra ONG visitada, CCONDEM, consideramos relevante el compartir los hallazgos con PRATEC, por lo que hemos discutido inicialmente con ellos los primeros puntos relevantes, problemas, retos a futuro, de forma muy abierta, con la idea de poder llegar a un informe que refleje los temas más importantes de discusión, para que esta evaluación tenga también sentido para las copartes del SSPN.

La Agencia Sueca para el Desarrollo Internacional Asdi, lleva a cabo una evaluación de las actividades de cooperación de la Sociedad Sueca para la Conservación de la Naturaleza (SSPN). Según los Términos de Referencia, el objetivo de dicha evaluación es determinar si la cooperación al desarrollo de SSPN contribuye al objetivo de Asdi, de fortalecer a la sociedad civil, la democracia, un desarrollo sostenible y contribuir así a que las personas que viven en condiciones de pobreza puedan mejorar sus condiciones de vida.

La Evaluación deberá servir como un instrumento de aprendizaje tanto para SSPN, Asdi así como para los socios visitados en 7 países en Asia, África y Asia. Así también debe contribuir al aprendizaje de buenos métodos y ejemplos para fortalecer a la sociedad civil, temas que podrían surgir durante la evaluación.

El propósito principal de la evaluación es poder extraer las experiencias y lecciones aprendidas del trabajo de PRATEC, y además, llegar a propuestas para mejorar aún más el trabajo en el futuro. Incluyendo discutir futuros retos y posibles orientaciones estratégicas. Los resultados de la evaluación servirán como insumo para la planificación de SSPN de una posible tercera etapa del proyecto en base a la propuesta elaborada: “Sembrar para comer. Hacia la soberanía alimentaria en los kechua lamas de la cuenca del Río Mayo, Lamas, San Martín, Perú, periodo julio 2008 hasta diciembre 2011”.

2. La Cooperación Entre SSPN y PRATEC

La SSPN y PRATEC llevan trabajando juntos muchos años. La primera etapa se llevó a cabo entre junio de 2002 y junio de 2005, con el programa: Recuperación y conservación de bosques en los Kechua Lamas de la cuenca del Río Mayo, Lamas, donde la prioridad se puso en la conservación del bosque en las reservas y chacras nativas. La segunda etapa surgió como una necesidad de poner énfasis en las superficies chacareras de las mismas comunidades para acompañarlas fortaleciendo la agrobiodiversidad. También se propuso fortalecer la organización de las comunidades, con la intervención de las autoridades locales de las comunidades, con el fin de constituir una mesa de diálogo para la elaboración y ejecución de políticas ambientales y sociales. Sin embargo, ya finalizando esta segunda etapa, es posible ver que esto no ocurrió. Otro tema en la segunda fase fue el tema educativo. Se planteó la incorporación de los saberes locales en el currículo educativo de las escuelas, y además que lo enseñado según dicho currículo debe alinearse con los saberes del lugar. Para ello se han venido desarrollando en las escuelas los talleres de afirmación cultural donde los niños aprenden cerámica, tejidos, plantas medicinales, música y danzas, que los mismos indígenas enseñan. Un último punto en este proceso planteaba la implementación de un fondo de dinero revolvente, con interés cero. El fin: la compra de semilla, gastos domésticos y emergencias, donde las mujeres serán quienes definan los requerimientos de crédito.

La segunda etapa de esta cooperación se inició con la firma de un convenio en mayo de 2005, regulando la cooperación formal entre las partes a partir del 1° de junio de 2005 hasta el 31 de mayo de 2008. Bajo este convenio la SSPN se comprometió a apoyar financieramente a la implementación de la 2ª etapa del programa de PRATEC: Agrobiodiversidad sustentable y conservación de bosques en los kechua lamas de la Cuenca del Río Mayo, Lamas, San Martín. Ambas partes se comprometieron a hacer esfuerzos para un intercambio de información en relación a la diversidad agrícola y cultural, comprometiéndose a mantener informado uno al otro sobre el desarrollo del proyecto, así como sobre otros aspectos. A punto de terminar esta fase se ha elaborado ya una propuesta para la próxima fase.

La tercera fase: Sembrar para comer. Hacia la soberanía alimentaria en los Kechua lamas de la cuenca del Río Mayo, Lamas, tiene como objetivo apoyar al fortalecimiento de la base productiva indígena de 120 familias pertenecientes a 15 comunidades, enfatizando en la producción para el consumo de lo que se produce. Se pretende reforzar la base organizativa, la cogestión del fondo de microcrédito Muyuna, la participación de las mujeres en la diversificación agrícola y en la vigorización de la cultura culinaria, así como la constitución y gestión del fondo indígena para la seguridad alimentaria FONSEAL a ser cogestionado por organizaciones indígenas.

El apoyo de Suecia durante los últimos tres años ha sido de \$us 54.900 anualmente, con el último desembolso para el periodo entre julio 2007 a junio 2008, llegando a un *total de \$us 164.720*.

Posteriormente ya existe una propuesta para la tercera etapa, que comprende tres años y medio (julio 2008 a Diciembre 2011), se ha presupuestado un total de \$us 198,567, con un monto anual de \$us 56.734. Entre los financiadores de PRATEC en los últimos años desde el 2005 se destaca a GEF, TdH Alemania, TdH Holanda, Tradiciones para el mañana (Ginebra, Suiza), Broederlijk Delen (Bélgica), SWEDBIO (Suecia), donde los más importantes tomando en cuenta el monto han sido TdH Alemania y el proyecto del GEF y Gobierno italiano. Actualmente muchos de estos proyectos ya han concluido, sin embargo hay una continuación en los siguientes proyectos y su financiamiento es el siguiente:

Instituciones financieras PRATEC	País	Periodo del proyecto	Monto (\$us)
Tradiciones para el Mañana	Suiza	Octubre 2007 a septiembre 2008	131.000
Tradiciones para el Mañana	Suiza	Octubre 2008 a septiembre 2009	125.000
Tierra de Hombres	Holanda	Julio 2007 a junio 2010	120.000
Tierra de Hombres	Alemania Oficina Regional Andina	Enero a diciembre 2008	76.262
Tierra de Hombres	Alemania	Julio a diciembre 2008	20.000 Euros

El proyecto apoyado por Suiza data de 2005, con el objetivo general de recuperar y valorizar los saberes y las tradiciones de crianza de la diversidad biológica y cultural de las comunidades campesinas andino-amazónicas del Perú. El proyecto trabaja mediante contratos de servicios con diez NACAS. Cabe destacar que éste es el mayor financiamiento que recibe actualmente PRATEC. La modalidad de trabajo es la suscripción de convenios con los NACAS, quienes en talleres de reflexión en las comunidades elaboran iniciativas que se llevan a cabo con el apoyo financiero. Las iniciativas giran en torno a temas de agricultura y ganadería nativas, artesanías, salud, fortalecimiento de las funciones de las autoridades tradicionales, prácticas rituales, entre otras.

3. El Contexto de los Kechua Lamas

3.1. OIT 169 y Pueblos Indígenas

Se considera que Pratec y Waman Wasi conocen y aplican de manera muy coherente los principios del Convenio OIT 169 sobre Pueblos Indígenas y tribales en países independientes de 1989. Como lo manifiesta el convenio, Reconociendo las aspiraciones de esos pueblos a asumir el control de sus propias instituciones y formas de vida y de su desarrollo económico y a mantener y fortalecer sus identidades, lenguas y religiones, dentro del marco de los Estados en que viven; Observando que esos pueblos no siempre pueden gozar de los derechos humanos fundamentales y que sus leyes, valores, costumbres y perspectivas han sufrido una erosión; Recordando la particular contribución de los pueblos indígenas y tribales a la diversidad cultural, a la armonía social y ecológica de la humanidad, especialmente los Artículos 14, 15 y 19 son importantes en este sentido.²⁷

3.2. El grupo étnico de los Kechua Lamas

El grupo étnico de los Kechua Lamas²⁸ es el tercer grupo más importante que habita en la Amazonía Alta del Perú. Tiene una población de unos 22.500 habitantes que se dedican a la agricultura a secano en laderas y pendientes siendo ésta la parte principal del sustento. Para las comunidades que viven cerca de los ríos o terrenos de caza, la pesca y la caza son otros rubros importantes. Según el censo nacional de 1993, existen en la región 51 comunidades, 14 de las cuales están reconocidas por el Estado mientras 37 aún no son reconocidas. Actualmente las no reconocidas se encuentran en un proceso difícil, puesto que si llegan a ser reconocidas, perderán los títulos individuales que poseen.

A finales del siglo 20, ocurrieron varios hechos que influyeron en la vida actual de las comunidades. Por un lado la guerrilla del grupo Tupac Amaru durante la década de los '80 y parte del '90 desintegró a las comunidades al desplazarse los pobladores o porque los jóvenes fueron reclutados ya sea por el ejército o la guerrilla. Por otro lado, se ha vivido un proceso de migración andina y colonización en las tierras de los kechua lamas desde los años 60 y con más fuerza en los 70 y 80, colonizadores que aplicaron técnicas agropecuarias hacia cultivos comerciales, extracción indiscriminada de bosques y promoción de monocultivos a gran escala para la exportación. La consecuencia de esto ha sido una deforestación y degradación del ecosistema hasta su desaparición, quedando actualmente en la provincia sólo bosque secundario. Además se ha producido erosión, desertificación, cambios en los cauces de los ríos, baja productividad de los suelos, lo cual ha llevado también a cambios en los patrones culturales de las comunidades. La coca y el narcotráfico aún existen y aunque se dice que la superficie cultivada de coca ha disminuido, aún se encuentran parcelas de coca al igual que la migración continúa en ascenso.

²⁷ Artículo 14.1. Deberá reconocerse a los pueblos interesados el derecho de propiedad y de posesión sobre las tierras que tradicionalmente ocupan. Además, en los casos apropiados, deberán tomarse medidas para salvaguardar el derecho de los pueblos interesados a utilizar tierras que no estén exclusivamente ocupadas por ellos, pero a las que hayan tenido tradicionalmente acceso para sus actividades tradicionales y de subsistencia. A este respecto, deberá prestarse particular atención a la situación de los pueblos nómadas y de los agricultores itinerantes. 2. Los gobiernos deberán tomar las medidas que sean necesarias para determinar las tierras que los pueblos interesados ocupan tradicionalmente y garantizar la protección efectiva de sus derechos de propiedad y posesión. 3. Deberán instituirse procedimientos adecuados en el marco del sistema jurídico nacional para solucionar las reivindicaciones de tierras formuladas por los pueblos interesados.

Artículo 15.1. Los derechos de los pueblos interesados a los recursos naturales existentes en sus tierras deberán protegerse especialmente. Estos derechos comprenden el derecho de esos pueblos a participar en la utilización, administración y conservación de dichos recursos.

Artículo 19. Los programas agrarios nacionales deberán garantizar a los pueblos interesados condiciones equivalentes a las que disfruten otros sectores de la población, a los efectos de: a) la asignación de tierras adicionales a dichos pueblos cuando las tierras de que dispongan sean insuficientes para garantizarles los elementos de una existencia normal o para hacer frente a su posible crecimiento numérico; b) el otorgamiento de los medios necesarios para el desarrollo de las tierras que dichos pueblos ya poseen.

²⁸ La siguiente información ha sido extraída de la Propuesta elaborada por PRATEC para la 3ª etapa del Proyecto: Sembrar para comer, hacia la soberanía alimentaria en los Kechua Lamas de la Cuenca del Río Mayo, Lamas, San Martín, Perú.

Sin embargo, después de la época difícil y violenta, los pobladores originales de estas áreas han vuelto a sus núcleos de asentamiento y continúan viviendo en laderas y pendientes. Además han emprendido la recuperación del paisaje que conocían.

Actualmente se afirma que la superficie promedio familiar es de entre 5 a 8 has., esto por la venta y cesión de terrenos, especialmente a los migrantes. Además existen más de 30 comunidades que no acceden a zonas boscosas de libre acceso.

Los mayores problemas identificados se pueden resumir como sigue:

- Por el sistema de rotación entre chacra y bosque en terrenos tan pequeños, la productividad ha disminuido, la diversidad no es la misma y la cantidad de alimentos para la familia es pobre y lo que vende es poco.
- La orientación de empresas y Estado al monocultivo han alterado la base de la agricultura diversa. Hay una crisis donde la gente come mal y menos.
- La situación alimentaria es mala. Existen situaciones de desnutrición crónica en las comunidades, especialmente en mujeres gestantes y en niños en edad preescolar.

Las soluciones de las comunidades se traducen como:

- Ante esta situación la migración se hace más fuerte.
- Alianzas con grupos familiares indígenas en otras comunidades para compartir tierra
- Intensificación de la modalidad chacra huerto en las tierras actuales. Las comunidades se dedican a la agricultura diversificada en sus pequeñas áreas, que tratan como huertos, combinando plantas alimenticias con arbustos y árboles maderables y frutales.
- Ocupación de áreas que ahora son parques nacionales o áreas protegidas.

En este contexto, Waman wasi en la segunda etapa del proyecto ha apoyado:

- El incremento de la productividad de las chacras, establecimiento en nuevas áreas de grupos de parentesco y ocupación gradual de territorios ancestrales de caza y recolección.
- Se buscan las posibilidades de formar dentro de un Área de conservación regional, un área de conservación comunal, pero para ello se necesita que las comunidades no reconocidas sean reconocidas oficialmente.

En conclusión, el mayor problema es la productividad de las tierras. Esta es baja a pesar de los esfuerzos que se han hecho mediante el incremento de la biodiversidad. La pregunta es si en esta etapa se logrará el deseado aumento de la productividad sin aumentar la cantidad de tierras. Parece que el tema de una búsqueda más intensa hacia un mayor acceso a tierras, va cobrando mayor importancia, y es en esta dirección donde se debería trabajar. Esto quiere decir, buscar los canales para acceder a tierras por la vía legal. Existen suficientes argumentos documentados que demuestran que es un tema de supervivencia de estas comunidades.

A pesar de las buenas intenciones de aumentar la productividad, parece que este proceso no está dando los resultados esperados, por lo que la opción es buscar opciones de manejo comunitario de tierras.

El papel del estado es determinante en esto. En vista que se trata de una población marginalizada y no reconocida, se debería poner más esfuerzos en esta dirección. PRATEC cuenta con un bagaje de información e investigación muy importante, que podría utilizar en esta etapa para lograr mayor incidencia política.

Falta en este punto conocer más en profundidad cómo es la política nacional hacia los pueblos indígenas. Que ventajas concretas tiene ser reconocido por el estado? Tener acceso a tierras?

Lo que logramos ver a través de la entrevista con la autoridad municipal, fue una apertura hacia un trabajo común con PRATEC para elaborar conjuntamente una estrategia. Esta iniciativa no debe ser pasada por alto, dado que es una oportunidad de tener incidencia política, que es creemos, importante en esta etapa. Un trabajo conjunto hacia el tema de tierras puede ser un tema, pero también otras alternativas productivas.

Lamentablemente en cuanto a las instituciones que representan a los grupos indígenas, se observan muchas debilidades. La institucionalidad y gobernabilidad de estas instituciones dejan mucho que desear y lo que se ha observado es una división en vez de unidad entre grupos indígenas, tal es el caso de FEPIKRESAM y CEPKA, quienes en las entrevistas demostraron claramente que no están dispuestas a unirse por una causa común, tal como lo es la búsqueda del reconocimiento, por lo que no son entidades que pueden apoyar en el proceso, no tienen claridad sobre sus mandatos ni objetivos estratégicos.

4. Logros del Trabajo

4.1. Logros Institucionales

Los logros institucionales más importantes identificados de PRATEC se describen a continuación:

- PRATEC ha llegado a ser una institución consolidada, con dos décadas de experiencia en la llamada afirmación cultural andina, donde se enfatiza en la vigorización de la chacra y difusión de la sabiduría de las culturas andinas amazónicas. La forma de trabajo es mediante convenios con distintas ONGs llamadas NACAS y grupos de campesinos para lograr la diversidad en la agricultura acompañada de la afirmación cultural.
- Los años de trabajo y las experiencias acumuladas se han sistematizado en textos, documentos y libros contándose con una buena y consistente base de datos acerca de diferentes temas: enfatizándose en el tema de la agrobiodiversidad y los temas relacionados a ella.
- La forma de organización de PRATEC como organización central con sede en Lima, y las distintas organizaciones ejecutoras, ONGs (NACAs) parecen funcionar bien bajo ese esquema. Por lo que pudimos ver con Waman Wasi, este esquema funciona. Lo interesante es un modelo con una cantidad pequeña de personal en la capital y el peso en respaldar a ONGs locales.
- Waman Wasi (WW) es una ONG, fundada en 2002, en Lamas, cuyos fines son: La vigorización de las comunidades originarias y el fortalecimiento de la biodiversidad de la naturaleza y de las chacras, estimulando la relación de respeto y cariño; el Acompañamiento a las comunidades andino amazónicas en la afirmación cultural, basada en la relación íntima entre diversidad cultural y biológica. Creemos que se han logrado estos objetivos.
- Existen 18 NACAs en total. La relación de PRATEC con ellas es en forma de una “red institucional informal”, en tanto no ha sido instituida. PRATEC asume tareas de formación, acompañamiento y asesoramiento técnico a los NACAs, coordinación de proyectos, convocatoria, preparación y realización de talleres de reflexión y publicación de libros.
- El equipo de Waman Wasi, especialmente el coordinador Luis Romero, con quien más se pudo discutir por el tema de tiempo, está 100% involucrado y comprometido con la WW. Además tiene una visión dinámica, proactiva del proyecto. Está buscando contactos en otras esferas además de las comunidades indígenas, ha tenido contactos con entidades públicas y se nota que la relación de su equipo con las comunidades y esferas institucionales es buena. Existe una buena comunicación con las organizaciones de base. El equipo en su totalidad es muy reconocido por la gente, y cuenta con mucha aceptación.

4.2. Logros temáticos principales:

- Se considera que uno de los mayores logros ha sido el de recuperar la diversidad de productos agrícolas que se había perdido, lográndose además un incremento de la diversidad. Esto con el fin de mejorar la situación de los kechua lamas, además como una medida importante del manejo de riesgo. Consecuentemente, en un número de comunidades, que por ahora es todavía limitado, se ha logrado un mejor uso y conservación del suelo, fortaleciendo además la agrobiodiversidad.
- Otro logro importante es que han logrado que los valores culturales no desaparezcan. La sabiduría de las comunidades por el contexto descrito tendía a desaparecer. PRATEC y WW han logrado detener ese proceso y rescatar esos conocimientos y saberes.
- La difusión de estos conocimientos a los niños como generaciones futuras a través de un sistema de educación que combina la educación tradicional con los saberes y conocimientos de los sabios de las comunidades, es otro logro importante.
- Se ha logrado también el fortalecimiento de las mujeres a través de procesos de concientización y capacitación. Las mujeres están presentes en todos los ámbitos, destacándose en todo el circuito productivo, velando por la diversidad y cuidando los recursos con gran capacidad, además encargándose del hogar y los niños. Sin embargo se nota aun el rol relegado de las mujeres en espacios de discusión. Estos espacios de poder y toma de decisiones están en manos de los hombres de las comunidades.
- Se nota un conocimiento muy extenso en el tema de la diversidad chacarera, y en todas las especies diversas que se han logrado recuperar. Sin embargo falta la vinculación de esto con los temas prácticos de nutrición. En los 15 años de trabajo se puede hacer una evaluación y correlación entre aumento de diversidad y calidad de vida de las comunidades participantes en el proyecto.
- Se percibe que existe un vínculo entre la biodiversidad, género y pueblos indígenas. Esto está sistematizado en el estudio elaborado por PRATEC (cual es?). Uno de los objetivos es la regeneración de la diversidad biológica en la chacra y el bosque. Son las Mujeres Chacareras quienes cumplen un rol importante en mantener la diversidad de cultivos, la alimentación y la salud de las familias. Como ejemplo de ello en nuestra visita a la Organización indígena “Warmikuna Tarpudora” pudimos comprobar como las mujeres conservan la diversidad de cultivos nativos, y son además las que se encargan de intercambiar las semillas de forma muy cuidadosa y selectiva. La selección de las semillas es hecha por las mujeres también.
- Aquellas áreas agrícolas que se encuentran degradadas o muestran un estado de regresión (aprox.25% del área total), están siendo recuperadas poco a poco por las comunidades, quienes realizan con su saber y conocimiento, labores de recuperación. Son los grupos de ayuda mutua quienes están trabajando para revertir las tendencias de desertificación. también se encargan de cuidar las fuentes de agua, conservando las mismas, sembrando plantas adecuadas y con un proceso de información la resto de la comunidad para no contaminar los puquíos.
- Existen varios grupos con tareas bien definidas. Los grupos de ayuda mutua compuestos mayormente por mujeres que trabajan en la chacra y en el monte y los comités de gestión comunal compuestos por hombres que se dedican al fondo muyuna, pero también a la protección y cuidado de las fuentes de agua, mediante la limpieza de las microcuencas. Se ha observado un empoderamiento de las mujeres involucradas en las actividades.
- Se ha podido percibir un fortalecimiento organizativo comunal en la reunión de varias comunidades del proyecto, donde se discutió los avances del fondo muyuna. Si bien no todos los participantes reflejaron sus opiniones, existían algunos hombres que tenían claridad sobre lo que su comunidad quería alcanzar. A pesar de los avances en este tema, falta aún por avanzar.

- Se han logrado algunos avances en la incorporación de saberes a la currícula escolar. Se trata de 3 instituciones educativas con 8 docentes y 105 niños involucrados en el proceso de incorporación del saber local. Existen además talleres con niños donde los mismos miembros de la comunidad enseñan.
- La difusión de información por la radio es un tema importante, porque se convoca a la gente de las comunidades a expresarse. Aquí acuden también muchas mujeres, rompiendo la barrera de no poder expresarse en otros espacios. La difusión se hace también a través de videos y publicación de cartillas, afiches y libros.
- Reconstruir confianza y recomposición social. Según lo descrito en el contexto en el capítulo 3 con el conflicto entre el ejército y la guerrilla, que además de la migración y colonización ha generado una situación difícil en esta zona, el proyecto ha tenido logros en este sentido.
- El Fondo muyuna es percibido como un logro importante en la comunidad, conformado por representantes de 8 comunidades kechuas que agrupan a 170 familias. Este fondo ha alcanzado un nivel muy importante, la reunión de comunidades giró en torno al fondo y sus avances. Se trata de un fondo diversificado hacia familias, asociaciones de mujeres, jóvenes y ancianos, pero aún no se quiere ampliar porque no hay “confianza” en todos. Los fondos van principalmente a la agricultura, Salud, Construcciones, Educación, Fiestas, Velorios y Emergencias. Sin embargo este tema debe estar sujeto a un análisis más profundo del tema, como se presenta más adelante en el punto de temas a mejorar.
- Los procesos de capacitación han sido llevados a cabo en forma amplia en cuanto a su alcance, no sólo hacia las comunidades, sino a profesores, y otros actores involucrados en temas de la recuperación de saberes y valoración de la cultura, tal es así que se invitó a representantes de las organizaciones que trabajan con grupos indígenas, CEPKA, entre otros, demostrando así una apertura en los procesos de capacitación y difusión de conocimientos. Sin embargo, la capacitación deberá dar un salto hacia fortalecimiento de capacidades de liderazgo, empoderamiento más allá de la capacitación tradicional.
- En líneas generales los logros se ven alentadores, sin embargo tomando en cuenta que la próxima etapa enfatiza el tema de soberanía alimentaria, se deberían evaluar los resultados y logros concretos en términos de indicadores claves: grado de desnutrición de las comunidades kechua lamas en la actualidad, han bajado los índices de desnutrición como consecuencia de la recuperación de la diversidad? El proyecto va por buen camino, sin embargo, vale la pena replantear ciertos temas, que se analizaran en el punto de estrategias.

4.3. Logros legales y de incidencia (advocacy):

Por las numerosas publicaciones, PRATEC se conoce a nivel académico y es reconocido en este ámbito. Pero falta mayor acceso a otros niveles. Falta la incidencia política, se percibe una lenta sensibilización y movimiento hacia las políticas públicas que es hacia donde podrían dirigirse las propuestas. El conocimiento adquirido por PRATEC a lo largo de estos años no se usa como herramienta de gestión sino más bien permanece como una teoría interesante.

Dentro de las perspectivas para aumentar la incidencia se encuentran:

- Parece que el proceso de incidencia se lleva a cabo de manera muy cautelosa todavía. Hay como un cierto temor a llegar a niveles políticos. Esto está por parte justificado cuando se comprueba la situación de conflicto entre organizaciones indígenas tales como CEPKA y FEPIKRESAM.
- Reconocimiento legal como tema clave. Waman Wasi ha trabajado en este tema y se ha logrado acercamientos con ciertas instancias involucradas en este proceso. Sin embargo el tema es muy complejo, por el momento han recibido un oficio para ir a la oficina Agraria para ser reconocidos,

pero el problema son los títulos de propiedad que se anularán si son reconocidos como comunidad. La estrategia para WW es, ante la división actual en las sociedades quechuas, donde hay 14 comunidades reconocidas y 37 no reconocidas, lograr la unión, buscar alianzas para este tema entre las comunidades y otras instituciones.

- En el caso de la Alcaldía se podría pensar en mayores acercamientos con esta instancia que ha mostrado apertura en la entrevista. Considera a WW como un importante actor de enlace entre una entidad pública y las comunidades Kechua Lamas. Sin embargo, según WW no se percibe claridad administrativa a nivel de la municipalidad. No existe un lazo de confianza fuerte.
- Conforme se da el movimiento de las generaciones jóvenes en roles de liderazgo se van dando cambios en las perspectivas de ellos. Jóvenes que han migrado y se han educado en la ciudad han recibido otros inputs que, cuando vuelven a sus comunidades quieren aplicar. Sus enfoques cambiarán y será necesario un proceso de modernización en el enfoque de la organización también. PRATEC deberá prepararse ante el cambio que viene de afuera y de las nuevas generaciones.
- Coordinación con entidades estatales está en marcha en Waman Wasi, con la disposición del Alcalde. Afirma que logran trabajar en forma coordinada, y quiere continuar en este sentido. también dice que cuentan con fondos así que se puede pensar en una coparticipación financiera con aportes de Suecia.
- Se debería buscar aliados estratégicos para difundir la información generada.

5. Áreas para Posibles Mejoramientos

5.1. Nutrición, producción y mercado:

- El tema de la diversidad biológica, recuperación y conservación es el eje en torno al cual gira el proyecto, con un enfoque muy cauteloso hacia el mercado, porque existe el temor que el mercado pueda romper esa diversificación que costó tanto lograr. Sin embargo, el equipo cuestiona esta afirmación, puesto que el círculo de pobreza que existe en las comunidades Kechua Lamas no ha mejorado en estos años, a pesar de la mejora que se ha producido en la diversidad. La principal limitación que se observa es el hecho de que la productividad de las tierras no puede aumentar, dado que se trata de tierras ya degradadas y de una superficie pequeña. Al no ser expertos en este campo, no podemos afirmar que no habrá un aumento de productividad a futuro, y por lo tanto una mejora en los niveles de nutrición. Sin embargo un estudio que pueda mostrar la correlación entre diversidad y nutrición podría dar pistas sobre cómo enfocar la próxima etapa.
- Al plantear el tema del mercado, no se debe pensar en una introducción masiva al mercado exportador, basado en un proceso de monocultivo como en el pasado, donde se deforesten áreas inmensas para producir productos sujetos al precio internacional. Sin embargo existen posibilidades de producir para el mercado local a una mayor escala que la actual, que deberían investigarse.
- El enfoque de introducción al mercado no es absoluto, dado que existen distintos tipos de mercado, por ejemplo, mercados de comercio justo pueden ser explorados. Porque estos pueden cumplir el requerimiento del proyecto de comprar toda la diversidad de productos. Pero son temas que se deben investigar con mayor profundidad.
- Otro problema de la diversidad, que se debe analizar, es que por tenerse de todo un poco en una parcela, la producción no llega a ser suficiente, es decir no hay un excedente que provea de ingresos, al estar toda la parcela en equilibrio, este equilibrio no permite generar excedentes que se puedan aprovechar.
- Creemos que la desnutrición en las comunidades no depende del mercado, sino de la baja productividad de las chacras, y para ello se deben buscar otro tipo de soluciones como lo plantea el mismo

proyecto con la necesidad de un reconocimiento legal de la tierra. Pero para dar este paso, es necesaria una incidencia más fuerte, conjuntamente con otros aliados, que PRATEC-WW debe analizar si está dispuesto a afrontar.

- El tema de la tecnología aunque no ha sido analizado, es un aspecto que sin duda llegará en algún momento a las comunidades kechua lamas, y que puede ser un instrumento valioso de intercambio de información y empoderamiento a la vez de autoafirmación.
- Según lo expresado por los miembros de las comunidades, ellos quieren cambiar, ir a otros lugares, a otras tierras más productivas y además para que no sólo los migrantes de afuera aprovechen de mejores tierras. Además los terrenos de ellos ya están cansados, quieren ir a otros lugares para que sus hijos tengan una vida mejor. Quieren conocer los planes de desarrollo y participar más. Esto es un reto para WW. Exige un cambio de estrategia.

5.2. Organizacional

- A pesar que el vínculo entre el nivel nacional y el local está bien pensado, al tener una estructura simple a nivel nacional y delegar a nivel local a la ONG, el problema es que el ámbito nacional de PRATEC es pequeño, el peso local esta bien pero falta a nivel nacional. Esto lleva a que PRATEC sea un actor local más que nacional.
- El fortalecimiento organizacional se limita a 2 resultados en la segunda etapa: 12 grupos de ayuda mutua fortalecidos en 8 comunidades y 3 organizaciones intercomunales protegen 3 microcuencas. Este proceso debería ampliarse en la nueva fase del proyecto.
- Por la corta visita, el tema de la participación no se ha percibido como empoderamiento, falta la formación de líderes, tanto mujeres como hombres, que puedan entrar en algún momento a incidir en las políticas públicas.
- En cuanto al fondo Muyuna, es necesario un análisis cuidadoso en cuanto al concepto de este fondo. Por lo que se ha visto, no se trata de un fondo de crédito, dado que para que esta figura sea sostenible (en una institución financiera) es necesario que se genere algún retorno más su marco jurídico. Si el crédito va hacia fines productivos, que puedan generar fondos que puedan luego pagar el crédito (créditos productivos), entonces se habla de crédito, por ejemplo en la cooperativa de ahorro y crédito existente. Como ese no es el objetivo presente, dado que el fondo es para temas de necesidades, tales como salud, educación, adquisición de bienes, se trata de una donación. El problema de esto es que se corre el peligro de crear una dependencia, que es lo que PRATEC WW justamente quiere evitar. Sin embargo, es necesario un análisis más profundo de este tema.
- En una posible próxima etapa, el objetivo es alcanzar la soberanía alimentaria. Sin embargo carece todavía de una planificación estratégica al respecto que puede dar líneas claras de cómo avanzar al respecto.
- Expansión y transferencia de conocimientos a otras comunidades no se hace en la forma esperada, lo cual ha hecho al proyecto relativamente costoso comparado con la participación de menos de 100 familias en las ocho comunidades. Ahora si se propone hacerlo en la tercera fase. La replicación y ampliación requiere tanto un concepto como la formación de recursos humanos y divulgación de estas experiencias hacia otros actores también.
- Ampliar el trabajo en la búsqueda de aliados que puedan aportar en los temas claves. Incluir otras ONGs, gobiernos locales, iglesia, sector privado, etc.
- El tema de la migración de las comunidades kechua lamas a las ciudades o al exterior, debe ser analizado en términos de que impactos socioeconómicos genera esta en las comunidades. El hecho de que existan remesas, y de que los migrantes especialmente los jóvenes, en algún momento

vuelvan a sus comunidades con nuevas ideas de cambio, puede llevar a una nueva etapa de desarrollo. Este es un proceso inevitable que PRATEC WW debe prepararse a enfrentar.

5.3. Que opciones estratégicas existen?

Los temas estratégicos en parte han sido mencionados, pero vale la pena puntualizarlos:

a) Cuales son las perspectivas de continuar con la diversificación de la producción si la productividad no aumenta en las chacras? En la propuesta para la 3ª etapa se plantea el objetivo de desarrollo de ampliar la diversidad y productividad de las chacras y mejorar la disponibilidad y consumo de alimentos, mediante la implementación de un fondo indígena de seguridad alimentaria local, pero no está claro cómo se llevará a cabo y cómo será el fondo. Es algo similar al fondo muyuna? Requiere un análisis y descripción más profunda. No se debe olvidar que existen muchas experiencias no exitosas al respecto (documentadas en el estudio Coica-Oxfam).

b) Si se continúa con el fondo muyuna, se debe definir que tipo de fondo es, si se trata de un fondo de asistencia o es un fondo de microcrédito. No está claro si se cobra un interés o no. Reflexionar sobre el peligro de crear una dependencia en las comunidades.

c) La migración de las zonas andinas a la amazonia debe analizarse en términos prácticos. Que implicancias tiene este proceso? Que conflictos se producirán y cómo se puede frenar estos procesos? Necesariamente será necesario acelerar el tema del reconocimiento o avanzar en el tema de derechos sobre las tierras.

d) El tema de la constitución de una reserva comunal exige un planteamiento estratégico que PRATEC WW podría considerar impulsar. Así como CONDEM desarrolló el Plan de manejo comunitario de los manglares, este será un instrumento que marcará las líneas estratégicas a seguir. Dado que existen numerosas experiencias de planes de manejo en Perú, se puede solicitar el apoyo de expertos en este tema.

e) Las experiencias sistematizadas de otros países con similares problemáticas en Latinoamérica, Asia o África no son mencionadas en los documentos de PRATEC. No se ha encontrado referencias a aprendizajes y tendencias internacionales. Tampoco no parece que funciona la afiliación al tema agrícola de SSPN en términos de intercambio de experiencias con otros socios dentro del mismo tema.

f) Se tiene la impresión que es tiempo para una apertura en el enfoque de la diversidad. Los resultados que se han logrado en estos años de trabajo han sido enriquecedores hacia el logro de los objetivos iniciales, sin embargo se percibe que ahora es necesario un cambio para lograr una mejora en los niveles de vida de la población de las comunidades. En ese sentido es importante tener claridad sobre los problemas de salud de las comunidades, mediante la realización de un estudio sobre los niveles de desnutrición en toda la población de las comunidades, asimismo la incidencia de enfermedades tales como TBC, el acceso a sistemas tradicionales de salud, vacunación a niños, nivel de mortalidad infantil, etc.

g) Se debe pensar cómo enfocar de manera estratégica los temas actuales presentes a nivel tanto nacional como global, por ejemplo a nivel nacional cómo se enfocará la creciente migración de las comunidades? Y en el contexto global cómo se enfocará el tema de cambios climáticos.

A modo de conclusión, se debe pensar también en aprovechar las oportunidades del contexto, p.ej. fondos para adaptación de cambios climáticos, la descentralización del estado hacia los municipios, alianzas con otros actores, “ganador-ganador” entre conservación y desarrollo económico, etc.

6. Comentarios para planificación e informes

6.1. Marco Lógico

Según los TdR de Asdi, la evaluación debería sugerir mejoras en cuanto a la planificación, implementación y monitoreo de la cooperación al desarrollo.

Podemos afirmar que una vez que vimos el proyecto en la realidad, los informes no reflejan toda la riqueza del proyecto. Esto depende también sin embargo de la forma en que se escriben los informes.

En cuanto a la propuesta de proyecto, nos preguntamos: Qué comentarios y asesorías han recibido de SSPN de Suecia para este documento de planificación? Dentro de nuestras observaciones a la planificación y monitoreo resaltamos las siguientes:

En el Marco Lógico se presentan 6 objetivos específicos, una cantidad que ya hace difícil manejar esta metodología de planificación. Normalmente, se recomienda limitarse a un solo objetivo inmediato para lograr al finalizar el periodo del proyecto. Con sus resultados e indicadores.

El primer objetivo no está claro. Se trata del Fondo indígena de seguridad alimentaria local. No se entiende en que consiste este fondo, por lo tanto no se entienden los indicadores ni resultados. Se plantea como un fondo no reembolsable, sin embargo no está claro cómo contribuirá a la mejora de productividad que se busca alcanzar. El fondo muyuna constituye el segundo objetivo, que como se mencionó antes, debe ser analizado porque no es un crédito real. Los demás objetivos continúan con la línea de la segunda etapa. En el último objetivo se plantea entre otros, apoyar las pasantías entre organizaciones indígenas e iniciar las gestiones para constituir una reserva comunal. Se trata de dos temas distintos en un solo objetivo, siendo el tema de la constitución de la reserva comunal tal vez el más importante de todo el marco lógico. No está clara la priorización.

El proyecto financiado por Suecia carece de los indicadores necesarios que debe tener un proyecto para verificar los avances de los resultados y objetivos planificados. Cómo se va a medir el objetivo en términos de tiempo/cantidad/calidad etc.? Cuentan con una línea base para comparar antes y después del proyecto?

El documento carece de información sobre otros proyectos y donantes. Además, nos parece problemático que el tema de sostenibilidad organizativa y financiera no ha sido discutido en el documento.

6.2. Aprovechar la Agenda de París

Los proyectos/informes revisados durante la evaluación no dan información sobre los demás donantes/proyectos, lo cual ha implicado la falta de una visión clara de la magnitud del proyecto PRATEC.

Otro problema lo constituye el formato de informes que cada donante define por separado, de modo que la ONG debe contar con un tiempo determinado para la elaboración de los informes. Ya en 2007 se realizó a iniciativa de PRATEC, un encuentro para tocar el tema de la gestión de proyectos de la SSPN, análisis y perspectivas. En este contexto, se debería analizar los resultados obtenidos en relación con la agenda de París y buscar puntos de coincidencia. La razón de estos problemas tiene que ver más que todo con los donantes, donde cada uno está ocupado sólo con “su proyecto”. El Equipo considera que se debe discutir y aprovechar los cambios actuales en las modalidades de la cooperación.

La primera evaluación de la Declaración de París en 2005, indica que son las instituciones del Sur las que hasta el momento han obtenido las mayores ventajas que las agencias internacionales de estos 5 principios: Apropiación, alineamiento, manejo por resultados, responsabilidad mutua y armonización.

El equipo de evaluación ha tomado contacto con TdH Alemania y Broederlijk Delen, sin embargo, parece que el tema de armonización no se ha tocado en el diálogo con PRATEC. Por eso, PRATEC puede pensar en adecuar estos principios de alguna manera:

- a) PRATEC debe a la brevedad posible elaborar su Plan Estratégico, posiblemente junto con la participación de Waman Wasi y otras organizaciones de amistad, también sus planes anuales y su sistema de gobernabilidad interna (asamblea, directiva, gerencia). Esto en vez de seguir elaborando proyectos para ONGs internacionales por separado.
- b) Considerar una armonización de planificación, monitoreo y reporte, liberando tiempo para que PRATEC ponga más esfuerzos en la reflexión y calidad de los informes.
- c) PRATEC y Waman Wasi podrían pensar en llamar a una mesa de coordinación con sus donantes, inclusive para presentar y discutir estrategias hacia el futuro.

7. Sostenibilidad y Replicación

El ritmo de crecimiento económico de Perú se refleja a nivel internacional como muy positivo y el PIB/cápita ha mostrado en los últimos cinco años un crecimiento continuo. Aspecto que puede llevar en algún momento a la salida de agencias internacionales. Por ello es necesario que instituciones como PRATEC estén preparándose para esta salida de las agencias internacionales de cooperación bilaterales.

- La problemática abordada por PRATEC y las 19 NACAs ubicadas en el país es un tema importante. Se trata de la sobrevivencia de comunidades indígenas no reconocidas. El tema del alcance, dentro del proyecto apoyado por SSPN, es aun muy pequeño. Para lograr un impacto relevante debe ampliarse a más comunidades. Como enfocará esto PRATEC? Cual es la estrategia de replicación?
- Dentro de toda la información leída por el Equipo hasta el momento, parece que *no* se ha pensado en el tema de sostenibilidad organizativa y financiera. Por el momento PRATEC depende de tres ONGs internacionales. La pregunta es: Cómo seguirán después? Qué va a pasar el 2011?
- También se debe pensar en una estrategia al respecto (una estrategia de salida/exit strategy), que además de nuevas solicitudes hacia el exterior deberá incluir recursos domésticos de diferentes fuentes, como un posible respaldo/apoyo financiero de los municipios y otras fuentes en la sociedad peruana.
- Dentro de PRATEC existen dos pilares, el director y el responsable nacional de proyectos. En el caso que uno de ellos o ambos salgan de la estructura y los cargos queden acéfalos, se debería pensar cómo seguir. Existen personas que vayan capacitándose en esta línea, el llamado cambio generacional?

8. Valor Agregado por Parte de SSPN

Qué valor agregado se ha dado de parte de SSPN más allá de los fondos financieros? Es una pregunta clave para el Equipo visitando también Ecuador, Senegal, Kenya, Tanzania, Malasia y Tailandia.

Más que todo, se ha valorado el taller del año pasado que posibilitó un intercambio con otros socios en América Latina. Además, se aprecia el esfuerzo en Suecia sobre información, incidencia y campaña pública en el Norte.

Una crítica que surgió en la discusión con PRATEC, es que no hay continuidad en SSPN, ellos han experimentado mucho cambio de personal lo que ha dificultado el intercambio de información y una buena y dinámica comunicación. Sin embargo, esta situación ha mejorado notablemente los últimos 2–3 años con la presencia de Rodolfo Magne en SSPN.

El Equipo considera que el apoyo de Suecia podrá ser optimizado con un mayor acompañamiento de SSPN, en términos de un diálogo sobre las estrategias de implementación, sostenibilidad dentro de otros aspectos mencionados en el presente informe.

La mayor parte del contacto con Suecia parece administrativo según la impresión de PRATEC. Mientras que ellos no tienen conocimiento sobre los demás proyectos/socios que los suecos están apoyando en África y Asia. Por ejemplo, el equipo de evaluación ha observado bastantes similitudes entre el trabajo de PRATEC y el trabajo de PACOS en Malasia – aun a pesar que uno se sitúa en agricultura y el otro en forestaría, según la estructura de SSPN.

El ‘Valor agregado’ por parte de SSPN se detalla en la siguiente tabla de fortalezas, retos y debilidades:

‘Valor agregado’ más allá de los fondos por parte de SSPN	
Fortalezas	Debilidades y retos
Apoyo a Pueblos Indígenas y Gestión Territorial Indígena en la Amazonía de Perú	Hace falta de un diálogo (documentado por escrito) sobre la estrategia de implementación, además sobre sostenibilidad organizacional y financiera. Hace falta trabajar con una ampliación de la membresía de PRATEC y Waman Wasi, el último con el potencial de contribuir al desarrollo de organizaciones indígenas que ojala un día podrá ser institucionalizado en AIDESEP.
Un buen respeto a las prioridades de PRATEC y sus organizaciones locales afiliadas.	Es poco lo que PRATEC ha sentido como socio del tema agricultura en la estructura de SSPN. No se han dado conceptos de otros socios para replicas de las experiencias para otras comunidades. Tampoco tiene ideas sobre socios similares en Asia y África vinculados con agro-forestaría sostenible, biodiversidad o Pueblos Indígenas.
La capacidad de promoción (advocacy)/incidencia, siendo SSPN sus “embajadoras” en el Norte.	Los formatos de reportes han sido cuestionados por PRATEC. Sin dar una conclusión a este debate, es en la vista de la evaluación un problema que los informes no reflejan la riqueza en la implementación del proyecto mismo.
Un buen contacto y entendimiento entre PRATEC y el oficial de programa de SSPN	A PRATEC le hace falta asesoría para mejorar su capacidad de planificación y monitoreo. Es insuficiente lo que ha recibido de retroalimentación sobre sus propuestas de proyectos. Esta débil el enlace entre lo local, nacional e internacional en términos de incidencia y alianzas con otros actores. En este sentido solamente se ha observado pocas sugerencias por parte de SSPN. Otro ejemplo hubiera sido fomentar conexiones a otros centros de conocimiento en los temas de Waman Wasi, por ejemplo el centro de investigación y capacitación CATIE ubicado en Costa Rica.

9. Conclusión General

La conclusión general del Equipo es que el proyecto de PRATEC apoyado por Suecia es *relevante* porque integra varios temas. Por un lado el tema de la diversidad de especies que se ha logrado recuperar en tierras degradadas como un logro ambiental, y por otro lado la problemática de poblaciones indígenas que no son reconocidas en un país como Perú con una población indígena importante, además de la pobreza en estas comunidades y las maneras como estas pueden salir de ese círculo. Así a través de los años se han venido haciendo esfuerzos en favor del desarrollo sostenible, mediante la recuperación de la agrobiodiversidad y la mejora de las condiciones de vida para las poblaciones de los kechua y las amas.

Creemos que se han producido logros importantes en cuanto a la recuperación de la diversidad de semillas y especies agrícolas, protección de fuentes de agua y un manejo sostenible de las fincas, esto con la participación activa de las comunidades, y aprendiendo los saberes de los sabios de estas comunidades. Así se ha logrado también frenar una mayor degradación del medio ambiente y evitar mayores procesos de migración. También se ha logrado difundir estos conocimientos a los niños en un proceso continuo de educación intercultural.

Sin embargo, más allá de los logros obtenidos, se trata en este informe de analizar los retos hacia el futuro. Dado que está a punto de finalizar esta etapa del proyecto, consideramos que es un buen momento para analizar profundamente entre PRATEC-Waman Wasi, las organizaciones locales afiliadas y las ONGs internacionales que dan el apoyo. Es la impresión del Equipo, que hace falta más reflexión y discusión sobre los diferentes temas estratégicos y las maneras cómo se van a desarrollar los mismos. Incluyendo el tema de una falta de diálogo sobre aspectos estratégicos entre PRATEC y la Sociedad Sueca para la Protección de la Naturaleza SSPN.

10. Recomendaciones

Se considera que PRATEC está en buena dirección, conoce y tiene experiencia en el trabajo con comunidades indígenas y sabe como trabajar con las comunidades. Waman Wasi también ha demostrado un buen acercamiento a las comunidades. Por lo tanto se cumple el enfoque hacia desarrollo sostenible y los derechos de las comunidades indígenas.

Después del análisis realizado, el Equipo *recomienda a SSPN continuar con el apoyo a PRATEC y Waman Wasi como entidad ejecutora*. Esto por la importancia del tema que se trata, no sólo a nivel ambiental sino también al ser un tema de desarrollo de los pueblos indígenas en Perú.

1. Se recomienda un *Plan Estratégico Institucional de PRATEC*, llamar a una mesa de donantes y discutir poner el reto a los donantes. Se piensa que está justificado que se ha tomado 6 años para desarrollar esta fase, pero ahora hace falta un mecanismo, una estrategia para ampliar los alcances de la primera fase a más comunidades en la zona.
2. Se recomienda una presión más fuerte en el tema de reconocimiento legal de las comunidades y en el tema de acceso a tierras.
3. Fortalecer el trabajo de incidencia de PRATEC, como aprovechar los potenciales en la incidencia local como a nivel nacional en colaboración con otros actores (sociedad civil e instancias públicas). Además, se recomienda a PRATEC poner más énfasis en la advocacia nacional en colaboración con otros actores, quienes incluyendo éstas, podrán aprovechar más las buenas publicaciones hechas por PRATEC.
4. Se recomienda mayor reflexión, discusión y análisis para lograr mayor claridad sobre las *opciones estratégicas* a futuro, aprovechando una sistematización de sus propias experiencias combinadas con experiencias internacionales. En este sentido, también debe ser posible aprovechar una conexión con otros socios de SSPN, como por ejemplo en Malasia y Tailandia.
5. Aunque no es la función de PRATEC WW el asumir la función del estado, se considera que se ha llegado a un punto donde es importante construir una propuesta/*plan de desarrollo local*, que a través de una amplia participación de las comunidades llegará a un consenso en las comunidades. Este plan debe dentro del marco de desarrollo sostenible integrar la diversidad biológica como base, con el acceso a nuevas tierras donde se propondrá un manejo comunitario, para poder mejorar las condiciones básicas de vida de las comunidades kechua lamas.
6. Ante la inminente entrada de aspectos externos a las comunidades kechua lamas- cuando retornen los migrantes jóvenes de Lima o España- como enfocará PRATEC los cambios de afuera? Se debe tomar en cuenta que las comunidades quieren cambiar, no rechazan el mundo moderno, han expresado deseos de crecer, relacionarse con otras comunidades, etc., Esta inquietud debe ser tomada en serio y coadyuvar al desarrollo de estos deseos de cambio.
7. Los informes de PRATEC para Suecia son demasiado abstractos en vez de ser concretos, hace falta narrativas sobre los cambios más importantes. Falta más sobre reflexiones, retos y debilidades en los informes.

8. PRATEC debe repensar su imagen. Hay un problema de imagen por su forma de presentarse. Esto se ve tanto en la página web como en los informes, la imagen debe ser más dinámica y tal vez menos “ideológica”. Un cambio de imagen mejorará la percepción en Perú. Ir de lo abstracto a concreto: PRATEC tiene muchos buenos ejemplos como el frejol.
9. Se recomienda llevar a cabo un *análisis de género*, que incluya la temática de los roles entre mujeres y hombres en las comunidades.
10. La capacitación debería ampliarse hacia temas legales, políticos, conocimiento en temas de reconocimiento legal. Pero también hacia la formación de líderes y formas más sistemáticas para el *fortalecimiento de organizaciones* comunitarias.
11. Elaboración y discusión de una *estrategia de sostenibilidad organizacional y financiera* (incluyendo discutir la estrategia de diversificar a más donantes principales; a un tiempo prudente planificar en una forma responsable la salida con las ONGs internacionales (exit strategy), dando un plazo de tiempo para PRATEC WW para implementar su estrategia de sostenibilidad).
12. Aunque la organización ejecutora WW demuestra capacidad en sus funciones, se debe pensar en un proceso de *fortalecimiento* de la misma organización local. Incluyendo reforzar la membresía de la organización con la invitación de líderes comunitarios para una asamblea anual. También debería ser posible ampliar la organización con miembros/voluntarios capacitados/técnicos/maestros etc. de la zona. Con un buen desarrollo, la perspectiva podrá contribuir a un fortalecimiento de organizaciones indígenas en la provincia San Martín, que hoy en día está dividido por la debilidad de AIDSESP en la zona.
13. Hacer un estudio sobre cómo lograr la *replicación* de estos resultados, para identificar factores, motivación, mecanismos, etc., que explican como se puede replicar, dónde hay otras demandas en otras comunidades, todo esto se puede hacer en PRATEC. Se debe publicar, sistematizar experiencias y mostrar de manera práctica.
14. Proponer a los donantes un fortalecimiento del sistema de *Planificación, Monitoreo y Evaluación (PME)* dentro del sistema de gestión propia de PRATEC, en vez de la situación actual con sistemas de PME paralelos para varios donantes. Se recomienda contar con una línea de base en las zonas de intervención.
15. Finalmente es importante mencionar que tras amplias discusiones con PRATEC y WW, sobre los temas arriba mencionados, se llegó a puntos de coincidencia importantes.

Annex D. Informe RAP-AL Network

Note from visits to Peru and Ecuador in May 2008. The visit was carried out by Hans Peter Dejgaard and María del Socorro Peñaloza.

Red de Acción en Plaguicidas y sus alternativas para América latina RAP-AL

1. Introducción

Con el objetivo principal de desarrollo de: “Contribuir a mejorar la calidad de vida, mediante la reducción y eliminación del uso de plaguicidas y transgénicos, la promoción de la producción y el consumo de alimentos sanos, de la conservación del ambiente y el desarrollo de la agricultura sostenible” la red RAP-AL está posicionada en 18 países de la región de Latinoamérica.

El proyecto en ejecución “Participación ciudadana para la reducción de plaguicidas en América Latina – “Alimentos sin venenos para todos”, formulado para el período 2005–2008, es apoyado por Hivos por 4 años (300 mil Euros-46%), Fondo Biodiversidad por 4 años (100 mil Euros-15%), SSPN por 3 años (144 mil Euros-22%), Rausing por un año (45 mil libras-9%) y Novib por tres años (38.5 mil libras-8%). Rausing y Novib han prorrogado su participación, mientras los otros organismos no se han pronunciado aún.

El periodo 2006–2007 fue crucial para la mayor inserción de RAP-AL en las actividades internacionales de la Pesticide Action Network PAN, donde todas las regiones del mundo están involucradas, constituyéndose la única red que trabaja en el tema de plaguicidas.

Este proyecto se basa en que una vez identificado un problema de plaguicidas, se realizan actividades de investigación, y se procede luego con la difusión de información. También se busca dar a conocer los riesgos y peligros crecientes de la agricultura de monocultivo basada en plaguicidas y semillas transgénicas, y los avances de la agricultura sostenible en el mundo y particularmente en América Latina. Se organizan encuentros para analizar problemas y sus causas, así como soluciones científicas y técnicas, normativas y organizacionales, y se propicia el diálogo entre los sectores involucrados.

RAP-AL también cumple labor de incidencia política, busca influir en políticas nacionales e internacionales para la reducción y paulatina eliminación de plaguicidas y cultivos transgénicos; difunde información sobre impactos y experiencias alternativas; desarrolla acciones de formación y capacitación y establece alianzas estratégicas con otras organizaciones.

Ante la situación actual de las nuevas tendencias de siembra de agrocombustibles que afectan la producción de alimentos y sus precios y amenazan la seguridad alimentaria RAP-AL tiene un nuevo reto.

2. Conclusión General

Como conclusión general se puede afirmar que RAP-AL juega un rol muy importante en la temática de los plaguicidas en Latinoamérica, al ser la única red que trabaja en este tema, por lo tanto el equipo de evaluación cree pertinente continuar con el apoyo a esta organización. El trabajo de RAP-AL está en concordancia con el objetivo principal de Sida, de fortalecer a la sociedad civil democrática, permitiendo que la gente en pobreza pueda mejorar sus condiciones de vida, esto a través del conocimiento, la concientización, el involucramiento de personas u otras organizaciones en la temática de los plaguicidas y los peligros que estos conllevan, especialmente sobre la población vulnerable, tales como niños y mujeres, cumpliendo así también con los derechos humanos de la población directamente involucrada con los plaguicidas.

3. Logros de RAP-AL

Los logros mas importantes manifestados se refieren a: i) posicionar el tema de los agroquímicos a nivel nacional e internacional, ii) motivar a los miembros de la red a participar en los comités nacionales sobre plaguicidas y sustancias toxicas. Iii) Sensibilizar y concienciar, pero también, iv) proponer alternativas al uso de los plaguicidas, v) articular acciones con el resto de la sociedad.

RAP-AL ha podido cubrir el ámbito de la ejecución y la cobertura. Han llevado a cabo: i) campañas de denuncias dirigidas a la opinión publica, ii) acciones para incidir en la normativa pública (tomadores de decisiones y funcionarios de estado) y iii) acciones de miembros a nivel local a través de la implementación de proyectos.

Otro tema destacado se refiere al inter-aprendizaje que se dio entre copartes y RAP-AL. Que parece haber dado muchos frutos.

4. Relacionamiento entre RAP-AL y SSPN

Las organizaciones entrevistadas se han mostrado satisfechas en cuanto al contacto con la SSPN y el tipo de relación. Por ejemplo la anterior coordinadora resaltó el acompañamiento de SSPN como compañeros o copartes interesados en aportar al fortalecimiento de la organización, y no como fiscalizadores. Siempre han sentido franqueza y transparencia de parte de SSPN, aspecto que valoran mucho, Esto queda demostrado con el taller que se organizó en Lamas Perú en octubre de 2007, donde se demuestra la apertura de SSPN de discutir sus mecanismos de planificación para poder llegar a consensos respecto a este tema. SSPN siempre tuvo la posición abierta respecto a estos temas.

5. Áreas para Posibles Mejoramientos

Uno de los temas que preocupan y se repiten en las entrevistas es el referido a la administración dividida en países. Por la explicación que se recibió, la coordinación política es la que rota cada dos años (máximo cuatro) con el fin de compartir responsabilidades y fortalecer a las organizaciones miembros, mientras que quieren mantener la continuidad de la parte administrativa relacionada con el manejo de recursos financieros y la parte de comunicación. Sin embargo en el periodo anterior este esquema fue demasiado para la excoordinadora. Eran demasiadas tareas en manos de una persona. El equipo apropiado debería constar de 12 personas pero cuenta con 2. Según opiniones del coordinador actual, la separación es positiva, en tanto da la oportunidad de ganar experiencia en este campo. Los costos no se han elevado según lo demuestra el coordinador en el registro contable para 2008.

Otro de los temas identificados como dificultosos, se refiere a la elaboración de informes, porque con las nuevas plantillas de SSPN se producen entre 41 y 70 páginas por informe, son informes muy largos, y se necesitan que estos informes sean más concretos. Por otro lado, se esta tratando de tocar el tema de la armonización con SSPN donde la idea es que las organizaciones presenten un solo informe a sus financiadores. Este proceso debería ir acompañado de una discusión de estos temas con los demás financiadores, algunos de los cuales podrían definir la forma simplificada pero consistente de presentar los informes.

6. Recomendaciones

Se recomienda que la red RAP-AL considere los puntos siguientes:

1. El marco lógico incluye tres objetivos, lo que impide una formulación de resultados realista, lo mismo con las actividades planificadas y los indicadores. Este tema deberá ser analizado en mayor profundidad, y en base a una línea base (¿)

2. No se menciona el tema de la sostenibilidad en el sentido de que no se menciona (tal vez existe) una estrategia de cómo seguir en cuanto a aspectos financieros. Existe una membresía que aporta? Cuanto son los montos de aportes? Este aspecto es muy importante para la continuidad del proyecto.
3. El tema de la agenda de Paris y sus principios (apropiación, alineamiento, manejo por resultados, responsabilidad mutua y armonización) debería tratar de aplicarse, y debe partir de los organismos financiadores. Especialmente el tema discutido de la armonización de formato de reporte debe ser aplicado, para contar con informes que sirvan a todos los donantes, que sean concretos, que no quiten tiempo a la Red, y que este tiempo sea usado en la reflexión y calidad de los informes.
4. Se puede pensar en una mesa de coordinación de donantes, donde se discutan temas estratégicos.
5. Se tiene la impresión que el trabajo muy importante de RAP-AL esta muy relacionado con sus organizaciones miembros, pero no así con las organizaciones de base. Tal vez se pueden hacer ciertas alianzas con las organizaciones de base.
6. El enfoque de género si bien está presente, no está del todo visible. No se percibe con claridad cual es el abordaje de RAP-AL hacia género. Dado que las mujeres rurales están expuestas a plaguicidas y su salud puede verse afectada en mayor proporción que los hombres, es necesario contar con indicadores que tomen en cuenta estos criterios. (o tal vez existen?)
7. Aunque se afirma por parte de los coordinadores de RAP-AL que la separación de sedes es un aspecto positivo, no se encuentran los argumentos claros que justifiquen esta medida. El problema es que finalmente los costos sí serán mayores con dos sedes de coordinación diferentes. Si se demuestra que los beneficios de esta medida son mayores a los costos, se justifica la permanencia, pero no se han recibido estos argumentos.

Persons Met in Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia

Name	Position	Institution
La Paz, Bolivia		
Tania Santivañez	Directora	CEIISA, eje de RAPAL en Bolivia
Guido Dávalos Camargo	Técnico	CEIISA, eje de RAPAL en Bolivia
Bodo van Borries	Director regional	Terre des Hommes internacional (Bolivia)
Lima, Perú		
Marco Bazan	Coordinador	Terre des Hommes. Oficina Lima Peru
Luis Gomero Osorio	Coordinador	Red de Acción en Agricultura Alternativa (RAAA-RAPAL Perú)
Moisés Quispe	Director	ANPE
Luis Gomero	Director	RAAA Perú
Robert Guimaraez Vazquez	Vice Presidente del Consejo Nacional	AIDSESP (la Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana)
Soledad Fasabi Shupingawa	Tesorero	AIDSESP
Pedro García Hierro	Abogado	Especialista en territorios indígenas
Blanca Arena	Abogada	Especialista en territorios indígenas
Jorge Ishinawa	Director Ejecutivo	PRATEC
Grimaldo Rengifo	Coordinador Regional	PRATEC
Nilda Arnillas	Administración	PRATEC
Luis	Coordinador	Waman Wasi
Equipo WW (5–6 personas)		
Grupo de mujeres Warmikuna Tarpidora	Coparte Waman Wasi	
Miguel Sangama	Presidente regional	CEPKA (San Martin Perú)
Victor Sifuentes Rojas	Alcalde Lamas	Alcaldía Lamas
Juan Salas	Coordinador	FEPIKRESAM (San Martin)
Ecuador		
Lista FUNDECOL	Varios cargos	FUNDECOL
Marianelli	Coordinadora	CCONDEM
Líder Góngora	Coordinador	CCONDEM
Verónica Yepez	Comunicación	CCONDEM
Reunión con mujeres en la junta parroquial de Ancón de Sardinas		
Doris Ortiz	Coordinadora Ecuador	HIVOS Holanda
Johanna Renchenks	Representante en Ecuador	VECO Bélgica
José Carvajal	Oficial de Programa	VECO Bélgica
Sara Caría	Coordinador	ACRA Italia
Rosa Rodríguez	Coordinador	HEIFER
Davis Reyes	Técnico	Acción Ecológica Ecuador
Mónica Trujillo	Coordinadora RAPAL para la región Andina	RAE Ecuador, miembro de RAPAL
Elsa Nivia (por email)	Directora Ejecutiva Ex. coordinadora regional de RAPAL	Rapalmira. RAP-AL Colombia

Team Schedule

	Activity
Friday 25 April 2008	Meeting with Tania Santivañez, Director of CEIISA, in La Paz; member of RAPAL
Week 1	
Monday 28 Apr.	Meeting with Marco Bazan, Coordinator TdH in Lima Meeting with Red Ambiental Peruana RAP
Tuesday 29 Apr.	Meeting with Rogelio Quispe, President of ANPE Meeting with Luis Gomero, RAAA Peru, member of RAPAL
Wednesday 30 Apr.	Meeting with PRATEC Team in Lima: Jorge Ishinawa, Director Ejecutivo, Grimaldo Rengifo, Coordinador Nacional and Nilda Arnillas, Administrator and Contabilidad Trip to Lamas, Peru Meeting with Waman Wasi Team, Presentation of the team and the project
Thursday 1 May	Visit to project: meeting with Grupo de mujeres Warmikuna Tarpidora, asamblea de comunidades kechua lamas Debriefing with team
Friday 2 May	Meeting with other institutions: CEPSA Alcaldia de Lamas FEPIKRESAM Trip to Lima
Sunday 4 May	Quito: Meeting with Monica Trujillo, ex coordinator of Red Ambiental Ecuador, now regional coordinator RAPAL Trip to Esmeraldas, Ecuador
Week 2	
Monday 5 May	Meeting with FUNDECOL and CCONDEM team: presentation of team and project Visit to the group of Mujeres concheras de Bolivar Visit to the group of carboneros
Tuesday 6 May	Trip to Quito
Wednesday 7 May	Meeting with Doris, Coordinator in Ecuador of Hivos
Thursday 8 May	Debriefing with CCONDEM Meeting with VECO and representative of Italian Cooperation
Friday 9 May	Trip to Lima. Hans Peter return to Copenhagen and Maria to La Paz.

Annex E. Malaysia Study Report

Note from study in Malaysia in May 2008 carried out by Sunitha Bisan that is living in Kuala Lumpur.

1. Introduction and Background

1.1. Mission Background

This review mission was undertaken from 12.05.2008 until 20.05.2008 in Malaysia. The mission reviewed partner organizational background, approaches and processes adopted by SSNC and partners as well as the approaches and processes adopted by partner organizations with community. The mission relied heavily on the documents provided by SSNC for this evaluation. The review was by way of email contact and phone/online interviews. There was no site visits conducted in this part of the mission, however, the consultant is living in Malaysia and with many years of experience with NGOs within environment and gender issues.

According to the Terms of Reference from Sida, the overall purpose of the Evaluation is to assess if the SSNC development cooperation contributes to the Sida's objective of strengthening the civil society and enabling poor people to improve their living conditions. The specific objective was to evaluate the *effectiveness, impact, relevance, sustainability and efficiency* of the SSNC's support in Malaysia (the emphasis has been put on examining effectiveness, relevance and sustainability).

This study is part of an evaluation, where field visits also have been conducted to Thailand, Kenya, Tanzania, Senegal, Peru and Ecuador.

1.2. NGOs Background

The NGOs in Malaysia today serve an indispensable function of protecting and promoting democracy by acting as the "watchdogs" for civil society, particularly against the excesses and abuses of the powers that be. At the same time, there are also opportunities to influence decision-making of policies and laws that NGOs can use in some circumstances. The NGOs which SSNC supported and which were reviewed were Consumers Association of Penang (CAP), Sahabat Alam Malaysia (SAM), PACOS and Third World Network (TWN) that works internationally has clearly seen to have used this opportunities effectively to promote local agenda. The Third World Network (TWN) has their international secretariat based in Malaysia is also particularly active in South-east Asia.

Despite having working relationships with national and state governments, the independence of these NGOs are kept to enable them to also act as pressure groups against any national government or state governments "bad" policies. These bad policies are policies which did not have community participation or does not protect the rights of the community either specifically or at large. These organizations seek to ensure that the real stakeholders and communities are consulted and interests are protected.

The Malaysian NGOs particularly those which have received SSNC grants have also played an important and significant role in international arena. This is evident from Third World Network having strong presence in international negotiations on trade, climate and environment. Further Ms Meena Raman from SAM (Friends of the Earth Malaysia) is also chairing Friends of the Earth International.

Even if the government would feel that the NGOs were a problem, overall it can be seen that the partnership was mutually beneficial because there is a flow of information to the government to strengthen their bargaining position at international arena. Again TWN can be seen to have supported the Malaysian government in many critical matters such as the biosafety issue and even assisted the Malaysian government to draft an act on this matter.

All these NGOs supported are also part of a larger voluntary network called the Malaysian Environmental NGOs (MENGOs). MENGOs is supported by DANIDA and this mechanism was designed to allow greater NGO participation in environmental planning. Thus far the synergy and cooperation within MENGOs is well taken both by the government and also with the concerned active environmental organizations in the country.

2. Outcomes, Achievements, Constraints and Challenges

2.1. Overall Feedback

There are varied responses in terms of SSNC partnership with the organizations in Malaysia. This is because the evaluation is at the end stage of the support. Organizations like Consumers Association Penang (CAP) funding concluded last year and PACOS will be concluding this year. Overall the position in Malaysia is similar with Thailand where the support had a strong element of core funding. This approach is greatly appreciated to enable the groups to build internal capacity as well as ensure the alignment of work on the ground with the communities.

2.2. Brief description of projects & achievements

Consumers Association of Penang

CAP was established since 1970. CAP seeks to ensure that the right of every consumer to basic needs such as food, housing, health care, sanitation facilities, public transport, education and a clean environment is upheld. CAP undertakes a variety of intervention towards this end such as research, campaigns and pilot projects.

Brief Details of project:

Name	Programme to Support CAP Priorities and Organisational Needs
Duration	1st Jan 2007–31st December 2007
Objectives	The overall goal of this project is to bring changes in Malaysian society that will contribute to genuine sustainable development consistent with sound ecological principles and to ensure a more sustainable distribution of wealth and resources within society
Development Objectives	To bring about genuine sustainable development with is both ecologically sound and socially just
Project Objective	The project purpose is to improve and strengthen the effectiveness and capacity of CAP so as to enable it to contribute better to meeting its overall goal and objective.
	Indicators
	1. Number of peoples' organisations strengthened
	2. Number and types of activities undertaken to promote alternatives
	3. Effect of representations made on government policies and practices
	4. Increase in local income generated
	5. Nature of products generated
	6. Number of staff who have been developed
	7. Number and Nature of skills learnt
	8. Popularity of website
	9. Number of joint activities with SSNC

Under the SSNC support, CAP had use the opportunity to conduct demonstration and pilot projects with the community to support and prove that innovative people-centered environmental strategies do work. This is particularly evident with the mangrove planting at tsunami hit areas with local fisherfolks who have better knowledge on the trees which ensured a better survival rate of the initiative. This local effort now has proved to be far more effective both in terms of cost as well as sustainability of interven-

tion than government intervention. The communities is now with CAP facilitation seen going to other communities to empower self-help

Besides that this aids in the conservation of mangrove areas and the local biodiversity needed for livelihood of fisherfolks. More importantly is that CAP with the local communities and people's organizations are advocating for a more sustainable fisheries by pushing for ban on trawling activities and destructive fishing gears, effective enforcement of the Fisheries Act in acting against encroachment of trawlers. As such, the ability to initiate a multi-level actions which helps build on the sustainability of local livelihood is a real niche and strong commitment by CAP.

These demonstrations provide proof that signifies the alternative approaches which can be adopted by the communities. Further five local groups were reported to be strengthened. These new approaches provided a learning centre for all partners and other communities in Malaysia and also other countries in the region.

SSNC role with CAP is noted to be very minimal. The potential for joint activities with SSNC was not fully realized. For example although both organisations had worked on the issue of shrimp farming, it is noted that no real collaborative action was taken collectively. Nevertheless, SSNC appreciation and own campaigns on the issue had helped in furthering awareness of this problem area in their constituency. Here the potential to develop a stronger alliance and collaboration within the South programme would have been important to further sustain the agenda. However the outcome by review of documents does not do justice to the matter.

Sahabat Alam Malaysia (SAM)

Sahabat Alam Malaysia (SAM) is a grassroots, community non-governmental organisation involved in environment and development issues, based in Malaysia. Since its inception in late 1977, SAM has worked closely with numerous affected communities throughout Malaysia.

The SSNC support for SAM began in 1997 and has been continuing ever since. The support both financially and in campaign activities has been very critical in enabling SAM to be more effective in its community mobilisation and advocacy efforts in especially assisting the indigenous communities. From the documentation provided the support was mainly to address the forest issues in Sarawak. This support has been crucial to enable communities be encouraged to stand for their rights. There were many battles won but the war rage on.

The indigenous peoples' voices are very weak as they do not have the democratic space to resist bad decision making processes. The political structure is such that the State has jurisdiction over forest and land, and is therefore strong and the Federal Government is beholden to the State for political support and is consequently reluctant to 'interfere' in State matters. Hence, there is a need to mould, mobilise and empower indigenous communities to be resistant against an all powerful state and its allies and advocate for their right to life and land are recognised and respected. The project support by SSNC work directly at this grassroots level.

It has also been informed that the partnership with SSNC is good apart from monetary support. This is also because SSNC is part of the international forest alliance which campaigns to protect forests and indigenous people's rights in Malaysia. There is a mutually "We feed them" with information and "they push for action" in the North through putting pressure on timber/palm oil imports from Malaysia. They also send letters to the government of Malaysia when we need targetted action.

With the powerful timber, plantation and other companies on the one hand and the very strong Sarawak Government which is non-participatory and very arrogant in its approach on the other, the voice of the indigenous peoples is indeed weak. The Federal Government is beholden to the State for political support and is consequently reluctant to 'interfere' in State matters. Political opposition is therefore very weak.

Brief Details of project:	
Name	Community Mobilisation Education and Training
Duration	1st January 2006–31st December 2008
Objectives	To strengthen and assist local communities, especially the indigenous peoples, in their fight to protect the rainforests so as to enable them to defend their livelihoods through sustainably managing their natural resources and in maintaining their traditional cultures.
Development Objectives	To strengthen the rights of indigenous communities in their fight to protect their lands including the rainforests, lives and livelihoods through sustainable means of managing the resources.
Project Objective	<i>To assist communities affected by Bakun Hydroelectric Project to have their native rights recognized</i> Indicators: 1. Outcome and progress of the legal case 2. Number of maps produced for the legal case showing evidence of native rights 3. Number of media releases in relation to the project and the responses from the Government <i>To halt illegal logging through community mobilization and legal assistance in recognition of indigenous peoples rights to the forests</i> Indicators: 1. Number of legal cases filed and outcome 2. Number of areas where communities have been able to resist destructive and mass logging activities 3. <i>To counter the promotion of Malaysian timber as being sustainably produced</i> Indicators: 1. Nature of campaigns against unsustainable production of Malaysian timber and outcome 2. Success rate of exposing flawed certification processes 3. The outcome of the FLEGT process in Malaysia <i>To halt the expansion of plantations in remaining forested areas and which violate rights of indigenous peoples</i> Indicators: 1. Number and nature of representations made 2. Number of communities mobilize 3. Number of legal cases filed in support of indigenous communities 4. To enable local communities to become economically self-sufficient and independent through the promotion of sustainable livelihoods Indicators: 1. The number of communities which have become self sufficient. 2. The types of sustainable livelihoods produced and promoted

Given the above, democratic space to carry out activities are severely constrained with

- The press being controlled by the Government or companies;
- Access in and out of the State for SAM staff is curtailed and
- Communities are subject to intimidation and harassment by police and government authorities.

With an all powerful State, the indigenous communities over the years have resorted to the use of the Courts to challenge State decisions; international campaigns to embarrass the government and direct action such as blockades and refusal to move to sustain their fights. Organisations like SAM have been instrumental in assisting these communities in their various strategies for action. Much of these efforts can be seen as the outcomes of the project fund by SSNC, particularly with the communities they work in. What is also important to note is ownership by the targeted communities which helps in sustaining the actions and ensures limited compromise.

One example is how SAM is directly involved in 8 cases with 3 different lawyers. About 17 villages are involved in all these cases. SAM is indirectly involved with 4 other legal cases involving 6 villages. Overall in Sarawak, there are 173 cases filed and at various stages in court. Number of villages under pressure which SAM work with is about 175 village in the areas of Baram, Tatau, Suai/Niah, Belaga, Bintulu and Limbang. Therefore it is observed the critical situation at ground level and the strong need to have very committed personal as well as ensuring their capacity is at the very best.

It is observed that organisations like SAM would have a difficulty in sustainability if foreign funds are withdrawn. This is due to the openly critical and challenging nature of the organisation as well as the importance of maintaining organisation independence and integrity. Therefore there is a high reliance to foreign donor who allows for such independence.

Pacos Trust (PACOS)

PACOS TRUST (PACOS) is a community based voluntary organisation registered under the Trustees Ordinance Chapter 148, Sabah, Malaysia to help raise the quality of life of indigenous communities. PACOS also plays a key role in building networks of indigenous organisations that are struggling against the erosion of their resources and indigenous systems. This is done through the establishment of formal and informal networks between community organisations at different levels. PACOS is also the coordinator for indigenous focus under the Civil Society Sub-Component of the Biodiversity Component which is a bilateral cooperation between the governments of Malaysia and Denmark.

Brief Details of project:

Name	Enhancing Capacity of Indigenous Peoples Organisations in Management and Development of Community Projects on Land and Resource Management in Sabah, Malaysia
Duration	1st March 2005–28 February 2008
Objectives	To empower the indigenous communities to determine their own development
Project Objectives	<i>To strengthen mechanisms on management of community resources (land, water and forest)</i> Indicators: 1. Good participation and acceptance of activities by communities through attendance of at least 30 per cent in all activities 2. POs are able to plan, analyse and take action on their problems and needs of their organisation during implementation of projects 3. Community projects are maintained and indigenous knowledge appreciated by the younger generations <i>To analyse training needs and develop suitable training modules for the Peoples Organisations (PO)</i> Indicators: 1. 3 leadership training sessions and 4 joint tactic/study sessions a year for all POs 2. Training modules and monitoring mechanisms that can be replicated and used by Pos

The indigenous peoples of Sabah, like the communities in Sarawak face a threat of land loss as a result of large scale development within the state. The indigenous peoples of Sabah regard native customary land as the essence of their lives as land is an important part of their cultural identity and their source of livelihood.

Despite the fact that the Sabah Land Ordinance (SLO) protects native customary rights (NCR), it is being disposed for purposes like logging, plantation, forest reserves and industrial zones. Under the SLO land can be registered under various categories; NT for Native Titles, FR for Field Register, CL for Country Lease and PL for Provisional Lease. Such categorization is deemed to protect the interest of Sabah natives as NT and FR can be owned by them whereas CL or PL can be owned by other than Sabah natives such as Malaysians, foreigners, government agencies and others. However, indigenous

peoples' rights to NT and FR are not absolute and as a result, ownership of customary land has been given to outsiders to a great extent.

Interviews with PACOS indicate a good and strong relationship with SSNC. SSNC programme officer Maria Rydland is noted to have shared much materials and information with the group on relevant matters particularly new developments at international levels on indigenous peoples issues.. This is much appreciated and had enhanced the project that was being implemented.

The entry point for the intervention is through the early childhood education. There are 22 education centers which were established based on community demand. These centers not only function to educate the children but also for community based education. Parents particularly mothers are motivated to participate into issues concerning their community. This intervention sees the injection of para-legal training which is essential to strengthening the voice of the local community. Here the empowerment of women is achieved.

PACOS feels that SSNC support has enabled them to empower local communities who are now able to demand their rights. For example, a number of cases have been filed and a couple has been successful particularly against the destruction of the forest in the said community. SSNC support had further strengthened a community based effort undertaken by PACOS to create alternative leaders, who are more democratic and better exposed and informed on matters concerning their villages and also on state and national issues. These leaders are given orientation and training courses to enhance their capacity to conduct and to participate effectively in developing their area by the Support Unit of PACOS.

The Third World Network (TWN)

The Third World Network is an independent non-profit international network of organizations and individuals involved in issues relating to development, the Third World and North-South issues. The TWN has its international secretariat in Malaysia and has a strong presence in international forums.

Brief Details of project:

Name	Environment and Development Networking Programme
Duration	2004–2007
Objectives	a) To support and strengthen the capacity of, and networking among, NGOs and community organizations in environment-related activities; b) To improve lobby and advocacy work in international environmental negotiations; c) To strengthen the capacity of developing countries' negotiators; d) To increase our influence on policy-makers at national, regional and international levels, including through building up the advocacy capacity of national NGOs and regional networks of NGOs; e) To deepen understanding on the trade and environment relationship; f) To promote positive alternatives in terms of policies, legislation, and technical methods so as to better counter environmentally destructive policies and technologies.

Based on the internal evaluation conducted by TWN, it is stated that the basic achievement over the past 4 years has been the building of capacity in a number of developing countries among civil society actors and government policy makers, policy implementers and diplomats to better deal with key aspects of globalization, and to enhance their appreciation of the environment-development nexus.

This has been done through an intensification of TWN's own research and analytical skills, expansion and training of staff, and a significant increase in publications and information dissemination tools.

In summary TWN achieved the following:

- a) Provided a civil society analysis of developments, from developing countries' perspective, related to the WTO, UNCTAD, World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO), World Tourism Organisation, bilateral free trade agreements, Bretton Woods institutions, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Kyoto Protocol and their implications for national policy making and impact on Southern societies;
- b) Provided consistency and coherence in the analysis and understanding of the issues and linkages addressed in the various fora and processes listed in (a) above;
- c) Collaborated with national groups in a number of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America as well as Europe and North America to respond to developments in numerous fora and processes listed in (a) and to be pro-active in offering alternatives by lobbying national governments;
- d) Provided substantive inputs in various local, national, regional and international discussions among civil society and with governments and different actors on engagements and meetings on various sustainable development issues covered by TWN;
- e) Assisted like-minded diplomats and negotiators from several developing countries at the WTO, UNCTAD, World Health Organisation (WHO), CBD and UNFCCC by providing research and analytical inputs, and convening informal consultations to strengthen preparedness of these delegations in international negotiations;
- f) Localization of discussions of international and national developments in sustainable agriculture, biodiversity, IPRs, trade, climate change;
- g) Facilitated the active participation of local organizations, and in cooperation with Tebtebba Foundation the participation of indigenous peoples organizations, in various national, regional and international NGO and inter-governmental meetings and engagements;
- h) Provided leadership in coordinating the NGO activities at the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) and contributed substantively in civil society analysis of the official discussions and efforts in influencing the CSD processes on Water, Sanitation and Human Settlements (2004–2005) as well as Energy, Climate Change, Air Pollution and Industrial Development (2006–2007);
- i) Documented and disseminated widely information on the Programme areas via TWN's websites (parent website, Biosafety Information Centre website, FTA Malaysia website), electronic listserves on WTO and Trade Issues, Biosafety, Intellectual Property, FTA, Finance, Sustainable Agriculture, Climate Change, Health;
- j) Published periodicals (Third World Resurgence, Third World Economics), bulletins (New Frontiers, SUNS, Chinese language Bulletin on Biodiversity and Traditional Knowledge), TWN Features, booklets, briefing papers that focus on developing countries' perspectives, at the level of community experiences, national policies and experiences, and the options for global decision-making on the Programme areas.

TWN is observed to be extremely competent in international issues and the articulation of these issues. It is unclear how SSNC had used this strength to build their own capacity particularly in understanding the issues within the context of Asia. TWN would have been an important partner particularly in issues of climate change, governance and trade issues.

2.3 Constraints and Challenges

The presence of fundamental global norms for equitable decision making as also articulated in Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration is far from being realized fully in Malaysia. The economic boom at the expense of environmental degradation has resulted in many marginalized communities both rural and urban to suffer the effects of the environmental degradation. Although bestowed with seemingly much wealth, the public awareness is shrouded with apathy as consumerism pre-occupies especially the middle class.

Indigenous communities have been lulled into a dependence towards state support and so has many other communities like farmers and fisherfolks. Therefore meaningful and informed public participation is very much low. The recent political changes have highlighted the importance of civil society to be vigilant. It is a crucial time for communities to demand that there is good governance with transparency, accountability and inclusiveness. However the communities need to be oriented to assume a more active public participation in decision making for this to happen. This would be true in the Peninsular region. However the states of Sabah and Sarawak have their peculiar issues and importantly until now the issues of land rights and indigenous peoples' rights have not been resolved.

SSNC for the case of Malaysia seems to have embarked on supporting individual organizations on much targeted output. This is a departure from what is seen in Thailand where a more regional focus was taken. It is significant to note the SSNC had supported what would be basic elements for a legal framework which is to support public access to justice and decision-making achieving what is envisioned in Principle 10.

Nevertheless implementation seems to be uneven as a result of the varying capacities of the organizations and the varying interaction between SSNC and the said organizations.

3. SSNC Working with Partners

3.1. Partner Organisation Strategy and Constituency

All the partner organisations have clear strategies with strong and dynamic leadership. In fact the leadership of these organizations are very strong and are also recognized internationally as experts in their issues. However since there was no field visits undertaken it is impossible to gauge the effectiveness of implementation by the said organisation and the roles SSNC played (if any).

3.2. Partnership with SSNC

In Malaysia, apart from TWN which is more a think-tank and policy advocacy organization (though they also support partners in issues networks in other developing countries), the support is towards key NGOs in their specific arena. This is a departure from Thailand where the support is towards strengthening networks. However the support working on the three access principles of (i) access to information, (ii) access to participation and (iii) access to justice is critical in ensuring there is public participation in decision making and management of natural resources.

Apart from PACOS who seems to have very strong relationship with SSNC, SSNC focus on the other organizations is very limited. Again it would be unjust to conclude that SSNC partnership was weak because like in Thailand the freehand approach ensured that the organizations were given full ownership of their project. Again this approach has ensured transparency and accountability as well as the flexibility to meet community needs more than donor needs.

The exit strategy is also difficult being that the nature of work these organizations are undertaking. SAM and PACOS efforts to bring community grievances to the legal courts would be extremely difficult without international funding of such nature. SAM's ability to be a watchdog organisation will also be greatly hampered as maintaining its integrity is critical to their work. Thus independent funding of this nature is important, and SSNC could over the coming years help the Malaysian partners in strengthen domestic funding and other international funding.

SSNC should ensure a better exit strategy and needs to address the issues of escalating costs and the changing priorities from governments and donors as a result of the economic advantage of Malaysia.

3.3. 'Added values' of SSNC (strengths and weaknesses):

SSNC and the partner organizations are very much aligned to Sida objectives on sustainable development and strengthening civil society. There are clear participatory elements present and strengthening of community for effective participation. The general observation in terms of SSNC's "added values" can be seen as follows:

Added Value of SSNC beyond providing funds?	
Strengths	Weaknesses
SSNC activism in forest issues and indigenous people's concerns are important as it helps bridge the understanding of issues in the South East Asian context.	The synergy is weak between all partner organizations.
SSNC openness and ease in management. Direct funding to the project focus ensures that the communities receive maximum advantage. Further the core funding approach enables that the organizational staff capacity building is undertaken particularly by allowing them to focus on specific issues..	SSNC can play more role by providing guidance in terms of result based management of the projects. This will ensure that sustainability and ownership of the project is transferred to the community which is critical within the political scenario of the country.
SSNC has selected both relevant and strong partners that are influential at both local, national and international level.	There should be more interaction and concrete framework towards phasing out. There is a weak gender presence in the projects and implementation.

3.4. Malaysia example of current international debate

The current international debate on increasing food prices and bio fuels is getting very concrete expressions in Sarawak (Malaysian Borneo) as this example illustrate. This could together with the very high level of biodiversity be an important justification for continuing SSNC's support in the coming years in Malaysia, although the country is a middle-income country.

The mission managed to conduct an independent interview with Ms Sarojeni Rengam, Executive Director of the Pesticides Action Network Asia Pacific (PANAP). PANAP is a regional organisation working on pesticides issues and food security. This interview was conducted as a result of their independent fact finding mission in Sarawak. (refer Annex 3 for the press release and brief information). This independent review was also undertaken after reading documents forwarded in respect of Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand.

Asia is a region blessed with biological diversity and also threatened by its degradation. Most of the root cause is by way development is structured. The current food crisis is as a result of the lack of focus on self-sufficient production of staples. Another factor based on PANAP reviews is a result of the structural adjustments made by countries to liberalize food as commodity which greatly affects the poor in the region.

The Sarawak Fact Finding Mission points to a crucial fact that:

"since the lands are native customary lands through continuous customary practices of cultivation for generations, the land cannot be taken away from the indigenous peoples by the state government nor be leased out to private companies for plantations. This strategy and action constitutes gross violation of indigenous peoples' rights to NCR land....."

The Team also found that the development of oil palm plantations at a rate of 7% covering more than 40% of land in Sarawak has tremendously reduced food production; destroyed the rivers where communities depended on the fish; the pollution of the rivers, particularly with highly hazardous pesticides and the environment has affected the health of communities with increase in diseases.

The insatiable expansion of this monocrop has destroyed the forests with the resultant loss of biodiversity that has even further affected the dependence of the indigenous communities for their livelihood. The use of palm oil for agrofuel is a threat to food production and is one of the contributing factors of the current global food crisis. The increase demand for agrofuel has led to intensive expansion which has brought about deforestation, consequently impacting on climate change.”

Therefore there is grave need to address this onslaught of new priorities in all the nations in Southeast Asia which is currently being siege by this new developments.

4. Recommendations and Way Forward

Malaysia is at a turning point. It has been developing extremely well in economic sense. However much of this is at the expense of the environment with poor management and destructive practices. The only manner to address this concern and ensure the development is sustainable is by accelerating effective public participation. At national level this remains an unfinished project, where Malaysian NGOs can play an important role.

The findings and conclusions from the review are summarized as follows.

1. It is recommended that a gradual Exit strategy is undertaken than the present abrupt approach. This should include increased ability of the partners to mobilize domestic resources in Malaysia (which remains difficult), including for the watchdog function. This is imperative for the sustainability of the work undertaken so far. Although Malaysia is a middle-income country, it is recommended to continue the support to civil society organisations work particularly with communities which focus on biodiversity and local/indigenous peoples in one of the richest areas of the world in term of biodiversity. This is particularly important as the current challenges face in relation to bio fuel, food security, depletion of mangroves, climate change and governance issues have a strong basis for support.
2. Therefore within this renewed partnership it is also recommended that a more systematic approach is taken to monitor public participation systems and monitor government efforts to improve this access and also country performances. It is noted that independent assessment by civil society can identify gaps in law and practice. Regular monitoring can track the progress and ensure that community rights are not traded.
3. There should be more synergy between SSNC and the partner organizations in terms of building global awareness and campaigns to support the ground efforts.
4. While much has been achieved across different levels of stakeholders, much remains to be done. This requires further collaboration between all partners. This synergy seems to be missing and needs to be worked upon. It is also noted that the MENGOs platform built by DANIDA support had addressed the need for collaborative action. SSNC should also therefore seek to have a more global view of the national NGO world to facilitate this potential.
5. Further the experience of Malaysia would also be useful to be shared with other partners in the region. Here the regional organizations like Asian Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP) also funded by SSNC would be also a strong ally in terms of indigenous struggles. Other organizations like TWN and PANAP would also be good allies for the food security issues. These organizations can play a good role *sharing community building skills* with other NGOs in other regions. This cross exchanges and global views are strong elements for SSNC to work further upon. It is therefore recommended that SSNC develops a much better website for these partners to link as a first point of contact. This is something that is greatly lacking within the management of information.

Malaysia Persons Met

Name	Position	Institution
Ms Meenakshi Raman	Legal Advisor, Head of Community and Rural Section	Consumers Association Penang
Ms Meenakshi Raman	Legal Advisor and Honorary Secretary	Sahabat Alam Malaysia
Chee Yoke Ling		Third World Network
Anne Lasimbang	Executive Director	PACOS Trust
Sarojeni Rengam	Executive Director	Pesticides Action Network Asia Pacific (PANAP)

Team Schedule

	Activity
4 May 2008	Emails documents to CAP & PACOS to set meeting objectives and focus
Monday 12 May	Email to CAP Research on documents for CAP
Tuesday 13 May	Email exchanges Contact with TWN Document analysis on TWN materials that were forwarded.
Wednesday 14 May	Setting meeting on skype with Meena Interview Meena on Skype
Thursday 15 May	Sending documents to SAM and also setting evaluation objectives via emails Skype interview with Chee Yoke Ling TWN Telephone interview with PACOS
Friday 16 May	Continued interview with Chee Yoke Ling TWN
Saturday 17 May	Follow up on more information and statistics on legal cases in Sarawak from SAM Research emerging issues on Sarawak.
Week 2	
Monday 19 May.	Further details from PACOS
Tuesday 20 May	Phone Interview Sarojeni Rengam PANAP
Wednesday 21 May	Finishing Malaysian Report & emails to interviewed organisations
Thursday 22 May.	Writing report/editing/
Friday 23 May	Revisit Report
Saturday 24 May	Send Draft to Team Leader
Week 3	
Monday 26 May	
Tuesday 27 May	
Wednesday 28 May	Reply from TWN
Thursday 29 May	
Friday 30 May	Email to organizations that did not give feedback yet
Week 4	
Thursday 12 June	Reminder email to organizations to feedback
Friday 13 June	
Saturday 14 June	Reply from Meena (went to COP)/PACOS

Annex F. Thailand Field Visit Notes

Note from visit to Thailand in May 2008 carried out by Sunitha Bisan.

1. Introduction and Background

1.1. Mission Background

This mission was undertaken from 04.05.2008 until 11.05.2008 in Thailand. The mission visited four organisations. Two organisations namely Biodiversity Action Thailand (BIOTHAI), Bangkok and Asian Indigenous Peoples' Pact (AIPP), Chiangmai were visited at their administrative office. While TERRA and SEARIN were met at field site by the Salween River.

According to the Terms of Reference from Sida, the overall purpose of the Evaluation is to assess if the SSNC development cooperation contributes to the Sida's objective of strengthening the civil society and enabling poor people to improve their living conditions. The specific objective was to evaluate the *effectiveness, impact, relevance, sustainability and efficiency* of the SSNC's support in Thailand (the emphasis has been put on examining effectiveness, relevance and sustainability).

The mission reviewed partner organisational background, approaches and processes adopted by SSNC and partners as well as the approaches and processes adopted by partner organisations with community. The mission relied heavily on documents and reports with several personal interviews in Thailand.

This study is part of an evaluation, where field visits also have been conducted to Kenya, Tanzania, Senegal, Peru and Ecuador.

1.2 The Context

The Thailand NGOs are large and diverse. It is impossible to count the vast number of organizations that exist in Thailand. Many of these engage in community development efforts. Therefore the NGOs are an important factor in the building civil society in the nation for democracy and human rights.

This is imperative as Thailand as a nation has experienced enormous economic changes as well as political changes in the past two decades. These changes also unfortunately are not equal to all with the majority rural poor having to pay the brunt of such prosperity. The current situation where non-locally managed international investments which mainly promotes export-oriented resource development can be seen to further contribute towards the degradation of natural resources in Thailand. While most people in rural communities remain directly dependent on a productive natural resource base for their livelihood.

Many NGOs emerge as a result of this to form a critical social movement, which is greatly observed in the work of the NGOs visited like BIOTHAI, SEARIN and TERRA. They are examples of networks built on the 'hot issues' that are strengthening the voices at provincial, national and regional levels of the community based organisations (CBOs).

It is also observed that there is a strong academic activism present in these NGOs. There is great benefit seen from this activism as these academics are highly regarded by the community. This gives legitimacy to the NGO work and the people's struggle. For example, BIOTHAI's researches and campaigns addressing consumption patterns and environmental/ biodiversity issues has a strong influence with the mix of academicians and community. The SEARIN approach with their community research also clearly demonstrates how conscious facilitation gives the local community the confidence to fight against construction of dams which will destroy their homes and livelihoods. As such it is observed a clear advocacy of the democratization of rural areas which enables the community to address their rights by these organisations supported by SSNC.

Besides that the diversity of NGOs also include regional NGOs and networks like TERRA on water as well as dam issues and AIPP on indigenous concerns. The visit made to AIPP based in ChiangMai, Thailand enabled the consultant to appreciate the complex work of AIPP in seeking to build indigenous groups strength. This is to enable them to be more effective at a regional and international platform. Therefore the targeted communities are indigenous communities in the region and their capacity building.

2. Outcomes, Achievements, Constraints and Challenges

2.1. Overall conclusion

There is overall positive outcome from the partnership and impact within local communities. The interventions demonstrate strong participatory approaches which is evident in the community research, trainings and project implementation. It is also enriching to observe a more holistic approach is emerging in bringing the communities to the centre of decision making and action.

For example, AIPP who actively work with its members to build organisational capacity in effort of pushing the indigenous peoples agenda forward. SSNC role with AIPP can be seen as strong with information exchanges on new emerging issues and also pro-active where in SSNC had supported studies to be undertaken on the issues.

Another clear example is the community knowledge efforts undertaken by SEARIN and BIOTHA I. Both on different issues where SEARIN works on documenting the local knowledge to ensure community level buy-in for conservation. While BIOTHA I working with peasant communities and fisherfolks to raise community awareness on food security and the link to biodiversity conservation. However this process needs to be further institutionalized and the empowerment processes needs to be further strengthened to generate or foster self-sustaining local mechanisms to address local community needs and concerns. Thus much can be done for aligning these innovate approaches towards a more sustainable development.

2.2 Brief description of projects

Based on the interviews conducted and documents provided, the organisations mainly received core grants towards the organisational administration and running of the secretariat with some specific project. All the four organisations had taken the opportunity of core funding to build secretariat capacity focusing on staffing competency.

In summary the brief details of the organisation supported are as follows.

Biodiversity Action Thailand (BIOTHA I)

The organisation is a network with a diversity of membership ranging from civil societies to academicians and people in authority. The core attention is on the value of biodiversity. The mission learnt that method of working is inclusive with various efforts to link local communities like farmers and fisherfolk with challenges posed by the market for example the drive towards genetically modified organisms (GMOs). The effort and success in monitoring GMOs, community rights and traditional knowledge is linked to the lobbying and advocacy done by the group collectively. The opportunity for policy changes is pressured by the strong solidarity built over the years.

SSNC was the first donor starting in 2002 where a permanent secretariat was supported. The ability to have a permanent secretariat has enabled the group to coordinate themselves better. One clear effort is the Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) which are taking place in the nation. It is learnt that SSNC funds were used to undertake an analysis of the text of the FTA between Thailand and Japan where public debate was raised on the issue of patenting of micro organisms.

A permanent secretariat also helps strengthen the movement where it is noted that BIOTHAI has representation in various government committees which enables policy intervention. For example, BIOTHAI is a member of the National Economic and Social Advisory Council and also a subcommittee member to the National Human Right Commission.

SSNC also had played a key role to ensure financial sustainability of the organisation with the intervention of other donors to support the work. For example, SSNC sourced out OXFAM for BIOTHAI. Nevertheless, the exit strategy by sourcing other donors does not ensure financial sustainability of the organisation or that the organisation is now wean off foreign dependency.

Asian Indigenous People's Pact:

AIPP is a network of indigenous organisations in Asia region. SSNC support to AIPP before 2004 has been towards the core funding of the organisation and its secretariat. After 2004, the support has a mixed of core funding and activity/project based programmes. For example the recent completed project is on Human Rights Training for Community Representatives (January 2006–December 2007).

The support of a secretariat by SSNC clearly has help indigenous groups concerned develop a clear niche which is conditional to their present state where in there is:-

- a strengthening of internal capacity needed for international advocacy;
- better coordinating and collaboration amongst member, where there are expertise matching on respective needs of members.
- better dissemination and collation of information.

The cross-fertilization is seen amongst the group and also with SSNC. This creates a synergy and capacity of the indigenous groups to influence decision and participate more effectively. Here is seen that SSNC is a keen partner in understanding local issues pertaining indigenous communities and the responses needed to address these needs.

SSNC in their interaction with the organisation has helped in expanding the funding base of the organisation. However, AIPP comments are that those supports are more project oriented while SSNC partnership has allowed for funds to be used for secretariat support. The secretariat permanence is critical at this time to better translate the people's perspectives into the wider development agenda.

Living River Siam – SEARIN

An NGO established in 1999 by academics and activist working particularly on environment and social impacts caused by state development policies and projects. SEARIN is a campaign based organisation working to support local community rights to their natural resources and opposing threats to rivers and riverine ecosystems in mainland Southeast Asia.²⁹ Further it is observed that SEARIN is actually having more focus in Thailand with the various river campaigns carried out by them with the affected communities.

It is observed from the field visit to Tambon (Village in Thai language) Tha Ta Fang that SEARIN modus operandi is rooted with strong grassroots/local affected community support. A further observation is that SEARIN played an important facilitative role in bringing other NGOs, communities, media and academics together to act against the threat to the environment. In this present case, it was with regards to the river dams and indigenous knowledge.

The Thai Baan research has been perceived as an important tool by local community leaders and academicians. From the interviews it is seen that this approach builds confidence of the local commu-

²⁹ Details taken from Evaluation Report: Southeast Asia Rivers Network (SEARIN) May 2006

nity to pursue their struggles and empowering local communities to actively participate in decision-making. This confidence derived from the appreciation that local communities have distinct knowledge also creates a social space and leverage for them to participate in decision making of the local government. This is particularly so when the dam project as propose will submerge villages and remove the community from their homes, livelihood and the tremendous loss of biodiversity. At present, the community members interviewed echoed the declining natural resources within their village.

The programmes and activities of SEARIN address these issues. As an example of their focus on the Salween River Campaign which was visited by the mission.

The information gathered with SEARIN on the possible exit and the escalating change in priorities was adequately informed to them. The value of this partnership is seen in the assistance and commitment in the campaigns which were carried out particularly with regards to river dams.

Towards Ecological Recovery and Regional Alliance (TERRA)

TERRA formed in 1991 worked on issues pertaining current development and the impact on natural resources and local communities in the Mekong region. TERRA is present in 6 countries which are China, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam and Burma where greater focus in place on Cambodia and Laos. TERRA strategically emphasises on monitoring, information sharing, networking and campaigning in the Mekong region. Great emphasis is seen in promoting good and reliable information towards better campaigns by the communities. This is inline with the organisational objectives wherein TERRA “believe that public debate on, and participation in, decisions concerning environment and development is a crucial first step in forging paths towards a more equitable and sustainable future for all people in the Mekong region” (source: <http://www.terraper.org/about.php>)

One such many projects and information has been generated to support this aims. Another example of this focus is on building young activist through an internship programme which not only strengthens networking but also ensures greater dissemination of information. TERRA also obtains its mandate from its local partners by bringing them into a conference focusing on the Mekong. This helps to clarify agendas and strengthen networking which essential for the campaigns particularly those which is cross borders. For example, the energy issue where there is support to develop a regional grid which is detrimental to the smaller countries, the environment and the local communities. Besides that TERRA also publishes a magazine to promote the public debate important to forging a more equitable and sustainable future for people in the Mekong region.

It is informed that SSNC is a long term partner. This partnership is not limited to financial support but also as an advocacy partner. As an example on forest issues, SSNC has facilitated platforms for debate in Sweden. SSNC is seen as a fellow campaigner the issues of forest, dams, energy and local community rights.

SSNC has injected the need for sustainability to balance the financial dependence. However the issues these days are more complex and it is difficult to address alone. A regional alliance is crucial. Nevertheless it was insufficient to fully observe the extent of SSNC contribution on this matter as the interview and meeting took place at a field site.

3. Outcomes & Achievements

3.1. Achievements

Based on the information given, there is more information on project level with specific project output being obtained. However, not all project sites were visited and evaluated which makes it difficulty to identify the impacts apart from what is reported.

All four organizations are not limited to project funding but also obtain core funding. Therefore the evaluation again encounters some difficulties of linking the status of outcomes to interventions and the relevance of current approaches to strategic and operational planning of the partner organizations. This is mainly due to limitation of time and information in the appropriate language.

The outcome and achievements based on the interviews are greatly linked to the approach of providing core funding. This has resulted in good ground breaking interventions and advocacy. Nevertheless it is unclear from the limited exposure and documentation the extend of the SSNC partnership resulting in enriching the effectiveness of these organisations.

It was importantly pointed out in the interviews that the trust SSNC had on partner organisations in fund management is greatly appreciated. SSNC approach with minimal presence in the implementation of the programmes allowed for these organisational to develop based on their needs, mandate and niche. How far did this help mobilize other funds in support of outcomes is not clear apart from SSNC assisting the said organisations to identify other donors towards more stable financial state.

Nevertheless the partnership that eventually was built was mutually supportive where it is seen in some of the organisations like AIPP, SEARIN and TERRA has been able to develop a stronger rapport with SSNC.

Core Grants:

Organisation	BIOTHAI	AIPP	SEARIN
Use as administrative funds	✓	✓	✓
Use for communication	Development of website and online presence with occasional support to other member organisations (a sharing of resources with network members)	Particularly for: (i) disseminating information and sharing of experiences of international conventions, (ii) exchanges of information, issues, expertise.	Particularly for: (i) community level (ii) media partners

Overall it can be seen that:

- a) The strengthening of the organisations which are mainly networks both national and regional has also ensured the capacity building of local and smaller community groups as well as potential individuals. The built-up of local capacity with injections of regional exposures has progressively built the civil society movement. The cross-fertilization and localized concerns have also built the said organisations knowledge in advocating for the respective changes.
- b) The strengthened home office or secretariats of BIOTHAI, AIPP, TERRA and SEARIN also enable the groups to articulate their purpose with greater clarity. This makes their facilitation of community participation and highlighting the community issues becomes better coordinated. Most organisations visited show ingenuity in fostering a participatory approach in their respective agendas. Further there are also pro-active actions undertaken to look at institutional strategies and addressing shortcomings in the administration. For example, SEARIN Thai Baan concept which is facilitated with the local community which brings their concerns and experiences to the centre stage.
- c) It is also noticed that SSNC has played pro-active roles in ensuring that the organisations had widen their donor sources and also aided the recipient organisations to contact potential donors. It is informed that SSNS had identified the possible future partner and also aided in contact with these donors. This synergy is important as it proved the ease in the cooperation and also the deeper understanding of civil society realities.

A further observation is that as SSNC is a civil society organisation, the flexibility, consultative nature of work as well as the trust towards how the funds will be optimized had ensured that the funds provided were actually optimized beyond just core funding. This opportunity was seized by the organisations and their potential can be seen raised as this result of this flexibility.

For example, the solidarity between TERRA and SEARIN in campaigning against dams particularly in Thailand allows a more united front. Nevertheless it is unclear how SSNC support had fostered this unity or if it was driven by a common donor source.

3.2. Organisational Achievements

Based on the interviews, the achievements are recorded as follows.

No	Organisation	Focus Area	Successes
1	Biodiversity Action Thailand (BIOTHA)	• Biodiversity conservation • Food security • People's Participation in decision making	1 lobby against GM cotton and monitoring on this issue 2 US Free Trade Agreement watch and other Trade Agreements. This task is also seen collaborative with other regional groups like TWN. 3 linking local food culture to biodiversity conservation. Ability to fundraise for activities to be conducted in large scale. Eg food fair with the Health Foundation which attracted some 30000 people. 4 The strong network is recognised with Network coordinator sitting in many national committees organised by the government on various issues. 5 The secretariat also provides technical support to partner network organisations such as IT support. 6 Overall, the collective decision making and alliance has helped in raising concerns on issues of food security and biodiversity.
2	Asian Indigenous People's Pact (AIPP)	• Member groups capacity building and institutional strengthening. • Providing a forum for exchange of ideas and information • Facilitating, monitoring and taking part in various United Nations (UN) meetings.	1 member groups capacity built and witness in the more active participation in international meetings. 2 exchanges of information and also in some instances expertise is seen. AIPP is building on this opportunity by bringing indigenous groups together at a fair in July 2008. 3 Information dissemination is ongoing and is currently being re-organised with a new strategy being table. 4 a strong niche is seen in the alliance of such diverse community of indigenous communities and also organisation. 5 gender focus is given adequate attention. Many initiatives are undertaken to address the capacity of women to participate in while creating an enabling environment for participation.
3	Living River Siam-SEARIN	• Community capacity building • Promotion of water management and sound development practises • Collaboration with other NGOs and civil society actors • Promoting a community based research	1 one significant success is the community based research or locally called the Thai Baan approach. This approach has help build confidence of local community. This strategy is important to help communities to participate in their own causes. 2 collaboration with other civil society actors has help to build up the importance of the issues and also build synergy amongst the groups.

No	Organisation	Focus Area	Successes
4	Towards Ecological Recovery and Regional Alliance (TERRA)	• Monitoring and understanding key trends through research/ local study • Information dissemination. Publish managazine: Watershed • Capacity building • Alliance building	1 Generation of information and the capacity building initiatives with local communities and also young activists. As example, their internship programme also builds capacity of local young activists. 2 Its campaigns on issues of dams and forest are important in understanding these issues as well as local rights.

3.3 Constraints and Challenges

1. Generally, the downside of SSNC almost hands free approach is that there is a possibility that there is lack of appreciation of concerns and context of the region from SSNC. Therefore cross fertilization of issues is difficult to be assessed between the local partner and SSNC. For example, the issue of food security and links to biodiversity conservation which is extremely important in the region both in terms of climate change as well as population density has received less attention.

2. Despite the building of a wider donor based by SSNC for these recipient organisations and reduction of SSNC support in the overall organisational funding, it is observed that all the organisations are still in some ways dependent on the SSNC support. Therefore any withdrawal and reduction in funds will hamper the progress made thus far. One of the problems identified is the escalating competition for attention, commitment and donations. Traditional donors have new expectations, and new generations of donors demand new approaches. Further the economic boom in the region flags a reduce necessity to concentrate on the region.

However the working modes of these organisation is still very much traditional. There is still requirement to assist them in managing these new changes and also for them to identify key roles to implement change; map and plan key steps, establish risk analysis, and communicate change internally and with stakeholders.

The key to success is effective exit strategy is the planning, pacing, communication and leadership to navigate the complexities and potential pitfalls in this new scenario of lesser donor support.

This is imperative with the current conditions within the region and also nationally. Despite the apparent economic boom which is fuelling a rapid industrialization and urbanization of Asia, most people remain directly dependent on a productive natural resource base for their livelihood.

It is very clear that the pressures on existing nature resource base are increasing. Many communities have no choice but to adapt to the climatic changes. These are the skills and areas which is currently being looked at as a whole by all the groups visited.

Urban-biased policies and industrial development resulting in the manipulation of natural resources are unsustainable. Further non-locally managed international investments in export-oriented resource development are leading to degradation of those resources. Thus a stronger civil society movement is required. This needs serious and careful consideration to how some support can be given both in terms of financial aid as well as partnership in understanding the key issues and lobbying these issues at international foras to effect a more environmentally responsive decision.

3. Gender concerns although present is rather weak. The potential gender-differentiated risks of the degradation and shift in policy need to be carefully identified. Policy strategies are not clear and are needed to better understand and address gender issues.

The potential environmental and socio-economic risks that may arise from the establishment and operation of urban-biased industries, large-scale plantations for the production among others of biofuels and many other threats needs to be considered with gender lens and advocate upon. In addition, the potential risks for food security resulting from an increase in food prices due to the growing use of agricultural crops for biofuels production, inappropriate land-use and the increasing loss of biodiversity needs also be addressed.

4. The strong work on the ground done by the groups wherein reaching out to smaller groups and communities are important as it seeks to build community confidence in seeking justice and their right. This is an important element towards to democratization of rural areas and allowing communities to demand engagement in policy making. This effort needs to be continued. The present economic boom underscores the importance of such community efforts to ensure civil society are not lulled into a situation of dependence and their resilience is strengthened. The task of building people power is the ultimate capacity and insurance for sustainable development.

5. SSNC had brought partners together to share experiences or they themselves have share experiences and information. The organisations like SEARIN has indicated that the partners meetings enabled cross-fertilization and also the ability to inform SSNC members on the work undertaken in the region. AIPP indicated that networking with SSNC at international foras enabled an exchange of information which benefited both parties. Nevertheless, regular sharing to strengthen a multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral approach in promoting sustainability, strengthening communities and ensuring a people-centred approach is undertaken needs to be undertaken in a more coherent and systematic manner.

3.4. Project Specific Constrains and Challenges:

The project specific analysis is based on one field visit and document review.

Organisation	Project	Objective	Constrains
SEARIN	Salween River Basin Campaign	To strengthen local community organizations' and civil society's capacity to voice their needs and demands, and to participate in policy and decision-making processes in water development projects To promote water and energy management policy that allows for the incorporation of social, cultural, environmental local knowledge in the decision-making processes, as well as due consideration of alternatives for meeting water, energy, and flood control needs. To collaborate with NGOs, Civil Society Organizations, and People Organizations in the East and SE Asia Region, as well as international NGOs, to campaign on dams and river issues in mainland SE Asia. To develop and promote community based research on livelihood impacts from large-scale development projects To raise public awareness on fair and sustainable water resource management.	1 The field visit during a community event was limited due to the inability in local language and the organisation being busy in meeting arrangements. However from the limited exposure it is seen that there is a good number of communities that are involved. There is potential for replication and expension. This is restricted as observed from the limited number of staff. 2 There is good work on media attention however it is unclear how this impacts policy. 3 There is strong networking observed at the organised event. TERRA and SEARIN with other NGOs and academicians work well. It was informed that SSNC had assisted the campaign by facilitating a Swedish media to carry the campaign story. 4 Although there are activities, the bridging of the communities and authority needs further strengthening. This was an observation made by the evaluators who undertook an internal evaluation of SEARIN in May 2006.

4. SSNC Working with Partners

4.1. Partner Organisation Strategy and Constituency

It is observed that each partner has clear organisational strategies and mandates. The capacity of the organisation is good with excellent programmes and community mobilisation. The organisations have also undertaken exercises to clarify their strategies, initiatives and also to enable more innovative approaches towards achieving their mission.

4.2. Partnership with SSNC

The partnership with SSNC can be seen in two fold: as a donor who provides financial aid and as a partner civil society organisation advocating sustainable development. The organisations have all benefited from the partnership. However the consistency of the understanding and support varies from organisation to organisation. This gap is observed, though with extremely limited understanding of SSNC home operations, due to lack of technical know how or constraints in personnel. A process or mechanism to fully appreciate the partner organisations focus and its relevance to the overall sustainability agenda is not consistent.

4.3. 'Added values' of SSNC (strengths and weaknesses):

The general observation in terms of “added values” can be seen as follows:

Added Value of SSNC beyond providing funds?	
Strengths	Weaknesses
The most acknowledged strength is the easy working relation with SSNC. The approach of SSNC to allow the organisations to make their own decisions and are flexible with any needed changes enabled the organisations to do the needful without much red tape. This also created a relationship based on mutual trust and respect which in the NGO value based setting was important.	The lack of oversee and guidance does not ensure the appreciation of issues, local constraints and challenges. It is observed that the contact is with a limited no persons at SSNC which limits interaction and reduce the potential of networking.
Integration of participatory methods and measures for enhancing participation of target communities in implementation of projects/programmes/community knowledge management etc is strong in all these NGOs.	The mission was unable to assess the exchange in learning the ground realities of the region by SSNC. The gender perspectives is also not clear and should receive more focused and be more integrated.
Network building and local/regional partnerships in focused areas have strengthened the focus to protection and conservation of natural resources.	The network can be further strengthened and mechanisms for cross-fertilization and a multi-disciplinary approach may be beneficial in addressing future challenges within the region.
There is alliance building with SSNC as a partner to promote these issues in other international forums assist to further campaign the action undertaken locally.	This interaction is not consistent and it is difficult to determine the impact. Cross-fertilization of partners and building towards a more global understanding of the various issue based initiatives is also lacking and should be made possible by this interaction. SSNC could play a greater role in linking on the ground mitigation, adaptation and campaigns to a global concern and policy.

5. Recommendations and Way Forward

The task towards achieving the focus areas and priority requires a dynamic process. The management of these partnerships is diverse in nature both in terms of focus and issues. Many of the issues raised in this report are known to the local partners' management bodies and are receiving attention. There is genuine interest and support at the country as well as regional level for a better focus on results. This point to the critical awareness that the results based management and approach is a journey not a destination. The recommendations here are designed to help SSNC navigate that journey.

1. SSNC could benefit more appreciating the concerns and context of the region particularly with all its partners work. from SSNC. For example, the issue of food security and links to biodiversity conservation which is extremely important in the region both in terms of climate change as well as population density has received less attention.
2. SSNC should have a better exit strategy plan designed with their partners. The current donor diversifying does not reduce dependency on external funding.
3. There is a great potential to demonstrate a strong gender presence in all the partners organisations and programmes. This potential is not harnessed well. Most of the organisations have strong women presence and also the project seemingly have a strong balance in participation. However the gender impact is observed not well captured.

The Learning's

First there is a need for greater partnership. A stronger and consistent alliance between SSNC and the partner organisations needs to be generated. This will enhance understanding amongst all partners about the approaches, the technical knowledge and community needs in addressing issues of their concerns. This is important as these NGOs in the region can play a key role in mainstreaming the adaptation in development within the current challenges in the region. Further the present challenges also a much stronger civil society movement.

In seeking to improve these regional programmes greater attention to detail is needed. A quality assurance process is recommended as a way of scrutinizing the programmes supported. This needs to be supported by clearer documentation and reviews. The present approach places more responsibility on local partner to develop programmes that respond to country needs and contribute towards global goals is a step in the right direction. The challenge now is to assess how for the implementation had supported accountability and ability to adopt to changes in priorities. SSNC should have a clearer framework to building the capacity of these organizations to become more self-reliant and a much clearer exit strategy.

It is on these premise that critically places a need for continuity in support towards building a stronger civil society movement to cope with the challenges in the region. The past strategies may no longer be suitable particularly with the effects of climate change and the other issues pertaining to energy and forest. This is further worsened with the changing social and trade patterns. The new knowledge developed in addressing these situation can be transmitted in as a case of new knowledge, technology to enable other communities adapt better to these challenges. Although these strategies may be supported already, the current challenge provide opportunities and can be a stimulus to assist the transition to improved practices in land management, biodiversity conservation, climate change, coastal management and sustainable agriculture.

Persons Met

Name	Position	Institution
Witoon Liamchamroon	Director	BIOETHAI
Ms. Jannie Lasimbang	Secretary General	AIPP
Ms. Apinya Phutipraisakul	Finance Manager	AIPP
Mr. Benjamin Tongpoeng	Administrative Manager	AIPP
Ms. Saowaluck Thaluang	Assistant Finance and Administrative Manager	AIPP
Ms. Christine Z Chan	Project Manager	AIPP
Mr. Binota Moy Dhamai	Campaign and Policy Advocacy Coordinator	AIPP
Ms. Mrinalini Rai	Collaborative Management Learning Network	AIPP

Ms. Atina Gangmei	Coordinator, Regional Capacity Building Coordinator	AIPP
Mr. G. Chin Khan Muan	Information and Dissemination Manager	AIPP
Piapor Deetes		Living River Siam – SEARIN
Dr Chayan Wadhanaphuti	Chairman	Living River Siam – SEARIN
Somsak Srimalee	Village Headman	Tha Ta Fang Tambon
Nu Chamnam	Former Headman	MaeKhong Tambon
Sririp Sadmajeeapon		villager involved in Thai Baan community research, Tha Ta Fang Tambon.
Premrudee Daoroung		TERRA

Team Schedule:

	Activity
Sunday 4 May	Travel to Bangkok
Monday 5 May	Meeting with BIOTHA – Mr Witoon
Tuesday 6 May	Travel to ChiangMai Meeting with AIPP
Wednesday 7 May	Travel to rural site with SEARIN Interviews with SEARIN, TERRA and village headman
Thursday 8 May	Observe community programme at the forest reserve Village tour to observe importance of the community struggle Interview with participant of community research to explore gender perspectives. Return to ChiangMai & Bangkok in the evening/night
Friday 9 May	Report and follow-up for further details
Sunday 11 May	Return to Malaysia

List of Documents Used

Documents reviewed mainly obtained from SSNC and also provided by organisations. Additional documentation provided are as follows:

BIOTHA	Organisational Profile (in Thai) Free Trade Agreements and their impact on Developing Countries: The Thai Experience (publications supported by Consumers International)
AIPP	Communications Strategy Draft Document Indigenous Women and Decision Making: A community Training Manual A project undertaken with UNDP Regional Indigenous Peoples' Programme and UNDP Asia Pacific Gender Mainstreaming Programme.
SEARIN	Living River Siam – SEARIN Final Report Year 2006 Evaluation Report on the Southeast Asia Rivers Network (SEARIN) 2003–2006 by Omtip Mekrugsawanich (Mae Jo University) And Ken Kampe (Chiangmai University).
TERRA	A study on Salween which was also in mainly in Thai and returned back to them. Basically the documentation in on the study of representatives of 3 communities in Tha Ta Fang Village, Mae Sam Lap and TERRA.
OTHERS	Activist Intellectuals: Scholar-NGO interfaces in Thailand's civil society Author: LeeRay M. Costa, Assistant Professor of Anthropology and Women's Studies, Hollins University NGOs, advocacy and popular protest: A case study of Thailand. Author: Preecha Dechalert.

Annex G. Senegal Field Visit Notes

Note from visits to CODESEN in Senegal in May 2008. The visit was carried out by Emelia Arthur.

1. Introduction and Background

This report covers field visit findings to CODESEN Senegal. It must be read within the context that the visit was very short (1.5 days) due to scheduling challenges.

CODESEN is a sub-regional organisation with national membership in Senegal, Mali, Mauritania and Guinea working on issues related to the Senegal River basin. Each country has a number of member organisations with specific focus but all working on issues in the river basin. CODESEN is a Senegalese initiative that started in 1997. Through interaction with the World Commission on Dams, facilitated by IUCN, they got information on the sub regional governmental dam project along the Senegal River basin.

The governments of the 4 countries with funding from the World Bank, African Development Fund and UNDP are working on constructing two dams along the Senegal River basin for agricultural irrigation and hydro power. An inter-governmental organisation, the Senegal River Development Organisation (OMVS) was created with the mandate “to set up the conditions required for sustainable development in the whole Senegal River basin”

The project has 5 main components:

- Environmental management and capacity building
- Data and knowledge management
- Trans boundary diagnosis analysis and strategic action plan
- Micro finance programs – priority actions
- Programme of public participation

OMVS recognises the project naturally has negative and positive environmental and social impact, and CODESEN’s objective is to work with government to mitigate the social and environmental impact of the project.

In 2002 with funding from IUCN SENEGAL CODESEN held meetings to build its structures in Senegal. It operates along the country’s administrative structures. There are seven provinces (political administrative structures) along the river basin where they have coordination groups made up of community based organisations, youth groups, women’s’ groups and livelihood groups. These are groups affiliated with the member organisations of CODESEN.

In CODESEN’s view, to engage meaningfully with OMVS at national and sub regional levels it was important to facilitate the creation of CODESEN in the three other countries (Mali, Mauritania and Guinea), as well as build a sub regional organisation. It was for this that they first encountered SSNC in 2004 with a one year support to strengthen civil society capacity and for missions to Mali, Mauritania and Guinea. The project support was renewed in 2005 for another year.

The current SSNC partnership funding (2006–2008) under its small project grant is in support of CODESEN’s Action Plan to strengthen civil society groups; in particular the 7 departmental coordination structures in Senegal and not necessarily the sub regional organisation.

The study team met with members of the executive secretariat of sub regional CODESEN, Senegal CODESEN, Mauritania CODESEN, OMV national and sub regional secretariat.

Table: Budget and expenditure overview

	2004–2005	2005–2006	2006–2007	2007–2008	
	SEK	SEK	SEK	SEK	SEK
Annual Budget by SSCN	248 000	248 000	248 000	248 000	
Spent this year				248 000	
Total general					592 000

2. Outcomes, Achievements, Constraints and Challenges

2.1. Outcomes & Achievements

Civil Society Organisation and Voice:

- From a local initiative facilitated and created similar organisations in 3 other countries and built a sub regional organisation duly acknowledged by governments in all four countries. This supported civil society organisation in countries, especially Mauritania, where that was a challenge.
- Organised credible civil society voice as Communities and community interests are integrated into project activities
- Built capacity of member organisations and CBOs technical expertise in issues related to dams and development around economic, social and environmental impact.
- Facilitated information sharing, communication and dissemination of information to the ground.
- CODESEN has been able to engage with and generated public awareness on the dam project and its consequences such as water-related diseases and brought to the fore human implications in energy and water resources management
- Helped communities formulate development projects and secured funding from OMVS
- CODESEN led a campaign against location of high tension pylons and succeeded and worked with displaced community members for relocation of villages and provision of social amenities (water, electricity and telephone).

Engagement with Government:

- In 1998 CODESEN initiated engagement with OMV and through persistence were given a seat at the table for project implementation. CODESEN is accepting and highly recognised and respected by OMVS as an equal partner with expert knowledge in their field of work. CODESEN's activities are considered relevant to OMVS objectives. OMVS also recognizes CODESEN as having capacity of working with communities. Their work is viewed as complimentary to governments' efforts as they help government in identifying needs and solutions of people affected by the infrastructural development.
- OMVS sees the relationship with CODESEN as a long useful partnership which is beneficial to both partners but more importantly to the population in the river basin.
- Through analysis and advocacy CODESEN has been successful in bringing to the attention of government social impacts of the programme and the need to design programmes to address them. As a result achieved social justice and equity awareness translated into concrete activities for fighting

poverty such as access to food, water, disease prevention, environmental protection and agricultural land and productivity.

- CODESEN Mauritania has had 34 organisations work with OMVS to identify and formulate 15 community development projects for cooperatives in ecosystems and food security, sustainable agriculture, natural resource management and soil erosion.
- In all major government reports on progress to project financiers mentions partnership with CODESEN and the impact.
- OMVS financed the institutional strengthening of CODESEN to consolidate its gains as a sub regional organisation
- As a result of the relationship between CODESEN and OMVS, CODESEN has gained Observer Status of an Africa-based network of government bodies.

Constraints and Challenges

- One major constraint is that the 3 other national organisation are not as strongly organised as the Senegal organisation.
- The strength of CODESEN lies in how organised and strong the sub regional organisation is as the project has a very well financed and strongly organised governmental structures at national and sub regional level. Currently, CODESEN does not have resources to achieve building a cohesive sub regional organisation.

Assessment of Log frame

Extent of achievement of results against objectives

As the document was in French it was difficult to assess the performance, however, information from interacting with members of CODESEN indicates progress in achieving project objectives.

It is important to point out that CODESEN finds the log frame process of reporting quite difficult and cumbersome. They recommend a participative process to construct a frame that works for them as well as SSNC.

3. SSNC Working with Partners

3.1. Partner Organisation Strategy and Constituency

As mentioned earlier in this report CODESEN is both a sub regional organisation, with membership in 4 countries, and a national organisation. The description of the structure below holds for both national and sub regional levels.

- *General Assembly*: this is the highest decision making body (congress) of the organisation. It is constituted of representatives of executive secretariat, steering committee and representatives of the department coordination. It has responsibility for defining institutional structures, implementation framework and strategic plan of the organisation. It meets every three years to examine and review annual reports; make changes in membership of steering and executive committees.
- *Steering Committee*: this acts as a board of directors and gives orientation and control of the organisations. It operationalises the strategic framework agreed by the General meeting. It meets every 3 months for situation analysis, receive narrative and financial reports from the executive secretariat and assess performance of the secretariat. In the case of Senegal the steering committee is composed of 12 member organisations from the founding organisations, the Executive Secretary and representative from the department coordination.

- *Executive Secretariat*: is made of 5 members – Executive Secretary, Administrative and Financial Secretary; Education, Training and Research (responsible for strengthening capacity); secretary for sustainable development and secretary for organisation, social and economic affairs. The Executive Secretariat supervises and coordinates the implementation of organisation's activities at local and national levels. It is responsible for fundraising.
- *Department Coordination*: is the most basic structure organised along local government political administrative structures. Each department coordination is made of community based groups and organisations that work with CODESEN member organisations, and has focal points. Each department coordination also has focal points that the executive secretariat. At that level they are involved in community needs analysis and intervention planning. Based on the analysis they send proposals to the Executive Secretariat for rationalisation and validation for approval of the steering committee.

3.2. Partnership with SSNC

- CODESEN and SSNC relationship was developed through interactions on a global platform of World Commission on Dams
- SSNC infrequent visits and engagement with the project
- Whilst the financial reporting format is appreciated the log frame reporting format is considered as difficult to fill and does not respond to CODESEN's needs. CODESEN will like to have a role in determining reporting formats appropriate for both partners.
- SSNC's understanding of the context CODESEN works in is improving however CODESEN does not think they fully understand
- Though the scope of the partnership agreement mentions that both partners will make efforts to cooperate on information sharing; joint campaigning for the global follow-up to World Council on Dams; linking and networking in ICDRP and dialogue on financial management and organisational development, the sense is that these don't really happen. There is information exchange mainly between the executive secretary and a particular SSNC staff but there is no sense of joint campaigning. Also there is a great concern about documents sent to CODESEN in English or other language that is not comprehensible to CODESEN. As a result they spend a lot of money to translate into French before they share with the member organisations and the department coordination.

3.3. ' Added values' of SSNC (strengths and weaknesses):

Added Value of SSNC beyond providing funds?	
Strengths	Weaknesses
Provided good financial reporting which has transcended to member organisations enabling a strengthening of organisational financial systems at both country desk and member organisations' level	Log frame reporting format causes additional administrative burden for partner organisation. It takes quite substantive partner organisation time to comply with reporting format
	Find some parts as repetitive
Helped in the process of consolidating the achievements towards federation of civil society in one network with national and sub regional coordination to gain acceptance and leverage with government and the inter-governmental structures.	Limited technical or substantive input for programme support. This is different from financial reporting expertise. It is about programmatic support around the themes CODESEN advocates on. They do mention however that there is contact between the executive secretary and one SSNC staff (Goran)
Information sharing on developments on areas of work	
SSNC sometimes provides strategic direction in actions to take with external donors (e.g. the World Bank) to enable CODESEN get the attention and collaboration of government	

4. Recommendations and Way Forward

1. There is need to support strengthening national organisations as well as sub regional institutional building to integrate the various national action plans.
2. Support to deepen information, communication and education of local population and further capacity building to formulate projects on environmental sustainability
3. Training in understanding the science of Sida reporting format (Log frame) so that it can be a beneficial tool for the organisations own growth for monitoring and evaluation as well as a reporting tool. Sida supported partners to agree on and input into reporting systems and structures. Review log frame with specific yearly targets and indicators
4. Frequent project visits and engagement with project implementation team
5. Understand better the development context of partner countries and the challenges on the ground
6. Documents must be in language comprehensible to partner organisations.

List of People Met

CODESEN Executive Secretariat

1. Abdallahi Diarra – Executive Member, CODESEN Mauritania responsible for Training, Education and Research
2. Aboubacry Mbodj – Executive Secretary, CODESEN Senegal and CODESEN Sub regional
3. Moctar Fall – Executive Member CEDESEN Senegal, Finance and Administration
4. Aby Sarr – Executive Member CODESEN Senegal responsible for Education, Training and Research.

OMVS

5. B.A Mamadou – Sub regional Administrator, OMVS
6. Mrs. Kane Raby Diallo – Sociologist and Specialist on Communication and Information, Senegal National OMVS
7. Mme Wane Aissatou DTA – Specialiste in Micro finance, Senegal National OMVS
8. Ababacar Ndao – Coordinator, Senegal National OMVS
9. Mme Sall – Coordination Assistant, Senegal National OMVS

Summarizing added Values of SSNC

Added Values of SSNC beyond providing funds?	
Strengths	Weaknesses
La reconnaissance par les autorités du Haut Commissariat de l'OMVS, des Cellules nationales et institutions affiliées (Comités nationaux et locaux de Coordination) du rôle crucial des Organisations membres de la CODESEN (Coordinations départementales) et des Coordinations nationales d'Organisations de la Société civile des trois (3) autres Etats membres (Guinée, Mali, Mauritanie) dans la mise en œuvre des différents projets ou programmes actuels et futurs (GEF/BFS, PGIRE, etc.).	L'insuffisance de moyens matériels et financiers pour répondre aux sollicitations des Coordinations nationales de la CODESEN de Guinée, du Mali, de la Mauritanie et du Sénégal et des populations du Bassin du fleuve Sénégal.
La volonté affirmée des institutions affiliées à l'OMVS (Cellules nationales, Comités nationaux et locaux de Coordination, Observatoire de l'Environnement) à coopérer avec la CODESEN et ses différentes Coordinations départementales (Louga, Saint-Louis, Dagana, Podor, Matam, Kanel et Bakel), ainsi qu'avec les Coordinations nationales d'Organisations de la Société civile de la Guinée, du Mali et de la Mauritanie.	Les trois (3) Projets financés dans le cadre du partenariat entre la CODESEN et la SSCN (mars 2004–février 2005, novembre 2005–novembre 2006, décembre 2006–décembre 2008) n'avaient pas prévu de subventions pour les Plans d'action des trois (3) autres Coordinations nationales de la CODESEN de Guinée, du Mali et de la Mauritanie.
L'enthousiasme et l'engagement ferme des Coordinations départementales de la CODESEN (Louga, Saint-Louis, Dagana, Podor, Matam, Kanel et Bakel) et des Coordinations nationales d'Organisations de la Société civile de la Guinée, du Mali et de la Mauritanie à participer activement à la gestion holistique, durable et équitable des ressources en eau et de l'environnement ainsi qu'à l'amélioration significative des conditions de vie des populations locales.	Insuffisance d'échange d'expérience et de prises de positions communes sur les thématiques environnementales majeures (inondations, changements climatiques...).
La prise de conscience par les populations du Bassin du fleuve Sénégal de leurs droits (accès à l'eau potable, à l'assainissement, à l'hygiène et à la santé pour tous) dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre des projets ou programmes actuels et futurs de l'OMVS .	
La participation active et durable des femmes et des jeunes à travers des campagnes de sensibilisation et de plaidoyer pour le respect de l'égalité et de l'égalité de genre. Cette démarche a permis l'adhésion massive à la CODESEN de Groupements d'Intérêt économique (GIE), de Fédérations départementales et régionales des Femmes ainsi que des Organisations de Jeunes dans les sept (7) Coordinations départementales (Louga, Saint-Louis, Dagana, Podor, Matam, Kanel et Bakel). Celles-ci occupent environ 50% des Organisations membres de la CODESEN.	
Le renforcement des capacités des organisations de la société civile en matière de dialogue et de plaidoyer sur les questions relatives à la problématique des barrages et du développement durable dans le du bassin du fleuve Sénégal. Celles-ci ont fait l'objet de larges échanges au niveau des communautés du Bassin du fleuve Sénégal, en vue d'une gestion durable des écosystèmes naturels (sol, faune, flore, biodiversité), d'une conservation des ressources en eau et de l'environnement et d'une amélioration du cadre de vie des populations locales (accès à l'eau potable, à l'assainissement, à l'hygiène et à la santé pour tous).	
La participation des Coordinations nationales et départementales de la CODESEN à la Campagne de vulgarisation des conclusions et recommandations du Rapport de la Commission Mondiale des Barrages (CMB) publié en novembre 2000 à Londres (Grande Bretagne).	

L'établissement des liens et du réseautage entre la CODESEN et le Réseau International des Fleuves (International Rivers Network – IRN) basé en Californie aux USA, Global Greengrant Fund basé en Californie aux USA, le Réseau d'Action d'Eau douce (Freshwater Action Network (FAN) basé Londres (Grande Bretagne), le Réseau Africain de la Société civile sur l'Eau et l'Assainissement (African Civil Society Network on Water and Sanitation – ANEW) basé à Nairobi au Kenya, le Réseau Africain des Cours d'Eau (African Rivers Network – ARN) basé à Kampala en Ouganda, le Réseau de la Société civile pour la Campagne Régionale sur l'Eau, l'Assainissement et l'Hygiène en Afrique de l'Ouest en partenariat WaterAid basé à Londres et au Ghana.

The Partners recommendations for Strategic Orientation for the next three (3) years SSNC Programme

La CODESEN recommande :

- une meilleure prise en compte de l'éducation relative à l'environnement et de la formation sur les droits humains, la citoyenneté, la démocratie et la gouvernance locale ;
- la consolidation des acquis du Programme sur la gestion durable des ressources en eau et de l'environnement (lutte contre l'érosion et la déforestation, contre les maladies endémiques liées à l'eau (diarrhées, bilharzioses, paludismes, etc.) avec la mise en place des grands barrages, la lutte contre la pollution et les nuisances (rejet des engrais et pesticides dans les cours d'eau), le développement de nouvelles approches face aux défis liés aux changements climatiques ;
- l'inspiration de l'approche des Nations Unies, développée par l'UNESCO qui vise à ancrer les droits humains dans la gouvernance publique locale, à travers les Documents Stratégiques de Réduction de la Pauvreté (DSRP) et d'accélération de la croissance. L'une des innovations majeures de cette approche est qu'elle privilégie l'entrée par le droit et non par le besoin de la personne. En effet, le droit implique le devoir, donc la responsabilité, tandis que le besoin reste une requête passive.

Recommendations and Ways Forward

Recommendation for improving the on-going project

Durant l'exécution du projet en cours, la CODESEN s'est rendue compte que « la pauvreté en soi est un défi des Droits humains ». « Sans l'exercice des droits humains, la pauvreté ne peut être bannie ». Le Rapport mondial sur le développement humain, publié en 2000, souligne que : « des conditions de vie décentes, une nutrition adaptée, la santé et l'instruction, un travail correct et la protection contre les catastrophes ne constituent pas seulement des objectifs de développement, ce sont aussi ceux des droits humains³⁰ ».

La pertinence d'une telle approche réside dans le fait qu'elle replace l'être humain au centre des préoccupations de l'heure c'est-à-dire du « développement humain », qui signifie « la satisfaction des besoins spirituels et matériels du plus grand nombre ».

How can the Programme level be further approached?

L'approche préconisée s'inscrit donc dans la mission dévolue à la CODESEN qui vise à s'attaquer aux problèmes de pauvreté par les racines : éradication de l'analphabétisme, la lutte contre les maladies endémiques, contre la discrimination, l'exclusion et la violence sous toutes ses formes, qui sont souvent à l'origine des conflits les plus perceptibles aux niveaux tant local, national que régional.

³⁰ PNUD, 2000: Rapport mondial sur le développement humain, p. 8.

C'est dans cette perspective que la CODESEN a impulsé une dynamique de large concertation et de participation des ONG et organisations communautaires de base (OCB) dans le Bassin du fleuve Sénégal. Cette démarche a permis de fédérer les initiatives des Coordinations nationales de la CODESEN de Guinée, du Mali, de la Mauritanie et du Sénégal pour la mise en œuvre des activités de proximité au profit des populations locales.

What is your suggestion for the next phase of SSCN's 2009–2011 Southern Programme?

Agir localement pour rendre effectifs les droits humains, la citoyenneté, la démocratie, la gestion durable des ressources naturelles et la lutte contre la pauvreté. L'atteinte de ces objectifs nécessite à la fois le renforcement des capacités institutionnelles des CODESEN aux niveaux tant local, national que sous-régional. Ce qui implique la mobilisation des moyens à la fois matériels et financiers suivants :

- la location d'un Siège social fonctionnel (locaux équipés d'un matériel bureautique et informatique adéquats) pour les quatre (4) Coordinations nationales de la CODESEN de Guinée, du Mali, de la Mauritanie et du Sénégal);
- la dotation d'un fonds d'appui aux activités transversales menées par le Secrétariat Exécutif sous-régional au profit des différentes Coordinations nationales de la CODESEN (Guinée, Mali, Mauritanie, Sénégal) ;
- l'appui aux missions de représentation au niveau des rencontres sous-régionales, régionales et internationales (conférences, foras, sommets, etc.).
- l'achat d'un véhicule (4 x 4) pour les missions de supervision de l'ensemble des activités du Secrétariat Exécutif sous-régional de la CODESEN dans les Coordinations nationales de Guinée, du Mali, de la Mauritanie et du Sénégal ;
- la mobilisation de fonds d'appui (lutte contre la pauvreté, formation) pour les quatre (4) Coordinations nationales de la CODESEN de Guinée, du Mali, de la Mauritanie et du Sénégal au cours des trois (3) prochaines années : 2009–2011.

Annex H: Note from Visit to Kimwam in Tanzania

Note from visits to KIMWAM, Mtwara peoples Umbrella Organisation, Mtwara

May 21th to May 23rd. 2008. The visit was carried out by Hans Hessel-Andersen.

1. Introduction

KIMWAM was with the support Suisse Aid established in 1993/4 as an umbrella organisation for the Mtwara people in particular the fisheries communities. Another umbrella organisation KIMASS was established at the same time but with a main focus on the rural communities. The two organisations “divided the territory between them”. Until years 2000 KIMWAM functioned in reality as a project implementer of support from Suisse aid. From year 2000 the support was changed towards a more general support including support for salaries. This meant that KIMWAM became more independent. Suisse aid was still the dominant donor, but is currently in a phase where they will phase out their support. KIMWAM must therefore seek new funding sources.

Kimwam has several focus areas. According to its strategy for 2007–11 it has 4 main areas of work: Artisanal fisheries sector, agriculture and livestock keeping sector, environment-mangrove planting and management, and KIMWAM office development. KIMWAM works with 19 different member groups, of which 17 was consulted in the preparation of the strategy. The areas of the strategy are coherent with SSNC’s priorities. The strategy is mostly an identification of focus area, activities and budget, but do not include many strategic considerations on how the work will develop. Currently KIMWAN is planning to add a new area of work, which is not covered by their strategy. They are close to make an agreement with the American organisation PACT, to work with vulnerable children in Mtwara town. It is not clear why they take up this new line of work as it is outside the strategy. It is probably only a reflection of the funding reality within fisheries. KIMWAM hope they can use their skills in livelihood development/productive activities, and expect the nature of the work to be similar to the activities they carry out in the fishery communities.

There is a clear focus on poverty alleviation, although they do not have tools to map poverty. Only outdated regional data exists/are available to them. Have work with sensitization with regard to HIV/AIDS through a village campaign in March 2008. This element is strengthened in the new proposals. HIV/AIDS is a major problem in the area. Several women productive groups are being supported through grants for productive activities. Gender issues are dealt with as a women issue, meaning as project for woman activities and not as a gender issue.

The support has a duration of 1 year and run for 20th June 2007 to 20th June 2008 with a budget of 240 000 SEK. An additional agreement of 19,000 SEK for training was made in April 2008, and in December 2006 a budget of 45,000 SEK was agreed for the preparation of a strategic plan. They try to integrate men and woman in new activities.

Suisse Aid has been the key donor to KIMWAM since 1993. In 2007 they allocated 45,149,3000 Tsh to KIMWAM, while Foundation for Civil Society allocated 6,616,500 Tsh. Together the same amount as SSNC provide in 2007. It is expected that PACT in 2008 will allocate around 35,000 USD for one year and WWF a form village banking system. Received training 3 people.

Suisse aid carry out supervision visits every second months.

There is very little contact between the donors. It is of concern that KIMWAM implement three different arrangement for funding of same type of community projects, – different credit models,

different models for co-funding and in some case grants depending more on the principles of the funding donors than on the principles of KIMWAM.

It also unclear whether budget mentioned as KIMWAM contribution in the SSNC budget is actually coming from KIMWAM. It is confirmed that the budget comes from Suisse AID.

It is difficult for KIMWAM to document results, both because they do not have a good baseline and indicators, but also as the time horizon of the SSNC support for 1 year, is far to short to observe real results, in KIMWAMs area of work. If SSNC wants to support result in this area of work it requires a longer time horizon.

They do currently have activities with SSNC funding in 6 different communities/9 groups. The support covers from new fishnets as grants, to outboard motors as revolving funds, to cow and goats as grants. It is not clear when grant are used and when revolving funds are used. According to KIMWAM are credits paid back.

2. Organization

KIMWAM is a member organization. It has 41 group members representing 395 individual members. The highest level is the General Assembly. Meet every three years.

Major decisions as selection of chairman and executive committees are made by the General Assembly for three years. Leaders council approve strategic plan, budgets and hiring of staff. (leaders come from member groups). Meet every three months. Sometime they delegate responsibility for new programmes and staff hiring to executives committee. Executive committee include KIMWAMs chairperson, umbrella secretary, treasurer, the adviser/director, and the accountant, the last two do not have voting rights.. Day to day decisions are made by the Director and together with the members organizations, which are the main clients of KIMWAM.

KIMWAM is guided by its members. KIMWAM works through its member organisations.

It has 8 staff members. 1 Director, 1 adviser, 1 Secretary, 1 accountant, 1 ass. Accountant, 1 credit officer and 2 field animators.

The staff does receive a modest salary through the various support KIMWAN receives. The organisation is as such completely dependent on donor funding. No plan exist for how to make the organisation sustainable, but it is a real issue for them. Members pay a small member fee in total 12,000 TSH/group/year. One idea of KIMWAM is to take a percentage of revolving fund for administration and they have very concrete idea to build an office building and rent it out.

No face to face discussions did take place during the approval process of the support; discussions took place over the internet. SSNC visited the organisation in January 2007 before the new strategy was prepared, before the project was formulated and implementation started. SSNC has not visited KIMWAM since.

3. Partnership with SSNC

Contact between SSNC and EEIU was established through WWF. SSNC was made aware of KIMWAM through WWF and took contact in Sept/October 2006. Following this contact funding for preparation of a strategy and a 1 year organisational support project developed over the internet.

Apart from some input during the project preparation, there has been some input on substance from SSNC to KIMWAM. These have mainly been related to discussions of the new activity areas. Given relatively frequent changes on SSNC programme officer (3 times) and the relative short project dura-

tion (so far only 5 months), this is not surprising. The contact around administrative issues to SSNC functions well and timely. No joint initiatives have taken place. No systematic capacity development of KIMWAM is included in the support. The support does include support for salaries and operations (not clear why KIMWAM receives salaries while EEIU in Kenya does not!) So far the relationship has mostly had the character of a donor/recipient relationship. Still KIMWAM are happy with the cooperation.

The future cooperation is currently unclear. KIMWAM has prepared a new project proposals continuing the current activities. The budget is SEK 603,000 SEK for one year. This should be clarified relatively soon, as KIMWAMs current support terminates June 20th. 08.

Kimwam staff are not very knowledgeable about SSNCs organisation and staff. Would like to know more/have more contact.

SSNC has *not* facilitated a contact to WIOMSA regional network, which is a key fishery institution or to other SSNC partners.

The activities of KIMWAM are within the priorities of SSNC, but priorities have been set by KIMWAM.

The target group of KIMWAM is the poorer fisher communities. They have a format for feasibility studies (20 point checklist) to be used before approving the projects. They do not hold data on the poverty level of the communities they work with. Furthermore they initially use much time on consultation with the communities to establish trust. During the short visit of the consultant it was the impression that KIMWAM had established a trustful relationship to the communities in relation to the productive activities. The work with a combination of 2 days courses and follow up in the field. Progress seem to have been made on the productive activities, but little progress has been made on the main objective sustainable fisheries.

It is considered highly difficult to achieve results within sustainable fisheries, when only working view few communities out of a number which impact the fish stock. It would be important for KIMWAM to at least have a perspective of a broader cooperation at village level/local government, with other NGO as WWF, WIOMSA etc, ministry of fisheries etc., if they want to achieve their objectives. This would be important in order to strengthen the advocacy work, which is highly needed as some of the key issues e.g. about sustainable fisheries cannot be solved unless all the fishermen in the area jointly change the fishing technologies. Reaching a larger group of communities will also reduce the transaction costs.

KIMWAM is part of a local NGO network, which discuss they implementation of the poverty strategy Mkukuti. It is the conclusion that the Mkukuti do not achieve enough concrete results on the ground.

4. SSNC Aid Management

As mentioned above SSNC has *not* yet provided substantial technical input to the KIMWAM activities. It is furthermore doubtful that SSNC will be able to provide that in the future within their current set-up, with fairly infrequent visits. They have limited insight in the problems on the Tanzanian coast, which has a technical/thematic element, but is far more influenced by cultural, political, economic and social factors. It would take a more intense contact if advice should be provided on specific issues. It is an issues whether SSNC should channel it funds through on of the other partners of KIMWAM e.g. WWF or Suisse Aid or at least cooperate on implementation arrangements and joint supervision. It is striking that an old partner as Suisse Aid still finds it necessary with bimonthly supervision visits, although they have An office In Dar with easy access to DAILY communication..

SSNC has not facilitated contact between the NGO's they support in Tanzania. WIOMSA and KIMWAM, who both have activities with the coastal communities, do not know each other. No regional or global networking has been facilitated.

Discussions related to Paris declaration have not been relevant yet for KIMWAM as it is an initial small support. But coordination between the donors are highly needed.

Furthermore SSNC's new reporting and monitoring system has not yet been fully implemented in relation to Kimwam, but they are fairly positive.

5. Recommendations for Consideration

The following recommendations shall only be considered as one input to a further process. In a further process they should be further elaborated and adapted to the need of KIMWAM and the problems at the coast.

- 1 Good contact fisher community groups and some results on productive activities. However they need a strategy/plan for how to broaden the results and/or involve broader groups at village level or network level. Need to support to develop this area.
- 2 The intervention do not solve the fishery problem, as it take a change in fishing gear mamona a broader group of fishermen to achieve results as mentioned above. More focus on coordination.
- 3 Other environmental problems unsolved e.g. corals for houses
- 4 Too many systems for credits and grants, seems to depend more on the donors, than on KIMWAM policies. One system must be established, KIMWAM and SSNC should ensure that donors meet during SSNC next visit.
- 5 SSNC should work with KIMWAM on how to develop simple baseline and indicators.
- 6 Coordinating of donors should be strengthened. SSNC could consider using delegated cooperation using WWF or Suisse Aid for monitoring and joint supervision.
- 7 Contact should be established with WIOMSA. SSNC to facilitate linkages to other SSNC supported partners.
- 8 Strategy should have more strategy elements as e.g. how to use credits and grants, how to develop networks, how to link alternative productive activities and fisheries and how to expand to village level.
- 9 The future support to KIMWAM should be clarified. If the cooperation is continued within a 3-year framework, it is crucial that capacity development in terms of financial, human and organisational capacity is included
- 10 KIMWAM has an urgent transport problem as only one motor bike is fully functional. For reason not clear to the consultant SSNC will not pay for transport. It is strongly recommended that SSNC reconsider this position as it otherwise risk supporting an organisation which cannot reach their target group. Support to modest means of transport as motorbikes are crucial and it is difficult to see the argument for why this should be more unsustainable than support for salaries. What is clear is that motor bikes can be used without salary support, but support to salary does not make sense without transportation. Furthermore SSNC should include support for operation of the motor-bikes.

Persons Met

KIMWAM:

Rashid Champunga, Director

Godfrey Nyalila, adviser

Fidea Ruanda, secretary

Eusebius Liundi, Accountant

Norton Mbata, Hadija Malibiche, ass. Accountant

Zuhura Nangomuh, filed animator

Hassan Kasimba, field animator.

The Mnawene Village-Mkubiru subvillage and the Mgao Village fisher and woman groups.

Mr. Elias Z.Mungaya project executant WWF Tanzania, and representatives from PACT and Suisse Aid.

Annex I. Note from Visit to EMG in South Africa

Visits to Environmental Monitoring Group, EMG located in Cape Town, South Africa. April 8th and 9th 2008. Hans Hessel-Andersen

1. Introduction

Meetings were held with Stephen Law, Director, Thabang Ngcozela, programme manager for the SSNC support, Jessica Wilson, Programme Manager for a parallel programme. Phone interview was carried out with Liane Greeff, former Programme manager for SSNC support who had been in that role since 1999.

The organization

EMG is a small organization of employed professionals. In April 2008 EMG included 8 staff members: 1 Director, 4 programme officers and 3 administrative staff. As of April 2008 the organization was in process of recruiting another 3 programme officers bringing the number of staff 11.

EMG has only fully paid staff and do not use voluntary staff and it is not a member organization. However, it participates in a number of membership based networks, and thereby ensures its connection and “mandate”. See the relative page on the EMG website: <http://www.emg.org.za/networks/networks.htm>

Daily decisions on programmes are taken by programme officers, while larger decisions are taken by the Director in consultation with senior staff. More principal decision as approval of new programmes is taken by the Board of Trustees.

The mission and approach of EMG are: “*Our mission* is to awaken the potential in ourselves and others to engage powerfully, mindfully and creatively in our relationship with the natural environment and the resources that sustain life.

We believe that society’s relationship with the natural environment is inextricably bound to our relationships with each other, and that sustainable use of the planet’s resources is not possible without political, economic and social justice. Our *focus* is thus on building democratic, fair and sustainable decision-making processes that relate to the use and management of natural resources.

- disseminate information, analysis and alternative viewpoints into the public domain, and to specific target audiences; and
- facilitate mutual learning, dialogue and effective action; and
- demonstrate and share best-practice through building partnerships, facilitating action-research and promoting dialogue”

Received support

EMG is financed 99% by donors. It received from 2003 to 2006 the following support:

2003: 3,023,673 Rand

2004: 2,638,743 Rand

2005: 2,903,591 Rand

2006, 5,676,320 Rand (including the Irish Aid support which EMG is just managing)

SSNC’s support to EMG has been app. 500,000 Rand/year in this time period. Other major donors have been the Heinrich Boell Foundation, Ford Foundation and IBIS. In 2006 Irish Aid gave a major

funding for Water Dialogues, where EMG functioned as an administrator and not so much as sole executer. More than 10 different donors have provided support. SSNC support is 20% of the total funding and has been focused on Water resources and Dams through the Water Justice programme. According to EMG is the funding from SSNC more flexible than most other funding.

Nonetheless is all the funding project or programme oriented. EMG does not receive support for the budget as seen in “official” development aid.

EMG does not receive official development aid but has often in the past raised funds through official channels which it administers. An example of this is the funds raised by GTZ to pay for African Rivers Network delegates to attend the 2006 African Ministerial Conference on Hydropower. Similarly for the SA Multistakeholder Initiative on the WCD, EMG raised funds from the Dept Water Affairs and Forestry and Development Bank of South Africa to cover dam affected communities expenses of travel and accommodation to meetings.

2. Cooperation with SSNC

The current cooperation between SSNC and EMG has covered 2005–7 with an extension for 2008. Currently a new programme for 2009–11 is under discussion.

The main focus of the Water Justice Africa Programme has been on:

1. Follow up on the SA Initiative on implementation of WCD recommendations
2. Disseminate findings and approaches from WCD and the SA Initiative at a Africa level
3. Collaborate research towards a book on Dams in Africa
4. Build and support civil network with more focus on Africa level as ARN.
5. Promote water harvesting

2.1. Results

Ad. 1. In 2004 EMG was responsible for the publishing of the Report “Applying the world commission on Dams Report in SA”.

EMG has been able to influence policy development, and has been an active partner in the SA multi-stakeholder initiative, which elaborated the above-mentioned report. Furthermore EMG has supported Dam Affected Communities in gaining recognition of their problems, to organize themselves and get a voice. Currently they have been asked to facilitate development of a programme for DAC in SA. The activities around the WCD have made civil society stronger than it was before e.g. did UNEPs Dam Development Programme in the end have more African than European participants.

There are mixed signals on the lasting effect of the WCD in South Africa. Some claim it has had some impact on the praxis of the Governments policy and processes in relation to Dams, they claim that Governments praxis on environment and resettlement are far better in relation to Dams than in relation to Mines. Others are more negative. However all agree that it has not fundamentally change the policies and praxis, and there is still a long way to go. As EMG work as one member of larger networks and as progress on policy level has many sources it would be fair to say that EMG has been part of a process which have led to a South African water policy – particularly on instream flow requirements and the environmental reserve (which stipulates that the river has first “right” to water and debates how much water should remain in the river) is amongst the best in the world, and the Dept of Water Affairs and Forestry have improved their public participation processes.

DWAF is much better at public participation compared to other governmental departments such as Mineral and Energy Affairs, and the Dept Environmental Affairs and Tourism. Still the main focus remains on mitigation of impact rather than involvement in considering alternative option in the

planning phase. And for many of the SA NGO involved in the Dams policies it is seen as a setback that 20 new Dams are proposed in the National Water Resources Strategy. So although South Africa is maybe more advanced than other African countries, it still has some way to go to achieve a sustainable and participatory policy.

Ad. 2. The Findings and approaches from the WCD have been presented in various publications and in the publication above. Furthermore they have been presented at conferences of Dams.

Ad.3. It has been decided not to initiate the collaborative research towards a book on Dams. Instead it has been decided to produce documentaries as DVD and slides based on existing material. The first DVDs on Inanda Dam “Flooded and Forgotten” about the Dam Affected Communities, and the Bujagali DVD “Seven Stories of Resettlement” have been finalized. The Documentary on Kainji Dam, Nigeria and one on the AngloPlat Mining in Limpopo Province are in the Final Draft stages, and three more are currently being produced on Maguga Dam Resettlement Case Study, Swaziland, on, the Mphanda Uncua Dam in Mozambique and the Merowe Dam in Sudan.

Ad.4. In most of its work EMG works in either SA networks or as part of regional networks. The South African Multistakeholder Initiative is one such network EMG has been part of establishing; African Rivers Network has been another. There is also the South African Water Caucus (SAWC) and the Network for Advocacy of Water Issues in South Africa (NAWISA)

The ARN has membership throughout Africa and is run by a Coordinating Committee with about 8 members. It is now working fairly well and are hosted by NAPE in Uganda, EMG was very instrumental in establishing the African Rivers Network and mentored the transformation in leadership. It is still an active member of the Coordinating Committee.

Ad.5. The work on water harvesting has had relatively low priority and has not made much progress. Research was undertaken at the Cape Town level where it was agreed on the need for rainwater harvesting, and EMG has been involved with discussions at the township level on possible pilot case studies where rainwater tanks can be developed and monitored. This is one of the priority areas planned for 2008.

2.2. Reporting and planning

EMG is in a process of introducing SSNC’s new reporting and planning format. However they are not very happy with the system for several reasons. 1. They do not think a log frame based system can reflect in a sufficient manner what are actually happening in the type of work EMG and other NGO’s are carrying out. 2. The systems drive the cooperation/partnership in a more unequal direction. Could risk that partnership developed in direction of control. EMG plan and report in log frame manner to SSNC, while the opposite is not the case. It has to be said that EMG still consider the reporting requirement of SSNC more flexible than many other donors.

Still some find the new approach more streamlined than the previous approach but rather dry and does not do justice to all what EMG has done. It is stressed that slide show and similar tools together with personal contact should also form part of monitoring. In particular face to face contact and joint activities are building a stronger feeling of partnership.

The director of EMG has produced a paper on reporting and indicators at the encouragement of the SSNC. A similar paper has been produced by one of the Latin American NGO’s. (Protec, Peru).

3. Meetings with SSNC

The persons interviewed were in general happy with the cooperation with SSNC. Some staff express that there has been a feeling of mutuality in the relationship, which at times were close at other times more distant interaction and synergy. Still they felt they knew too little about the organization. Further they felt that there was room for stronger daily/regular cooperation. Currently the main cooperation on substantive issues took place in relation to Conferences and on the yearly meetings.

Plans for 2009–12.

The identification of future activities is currently being identified. Some issues considered are Climate change and water, and rural development and fair trade. Some activities will most probably continue in relation to Dams, but it is expected that this issues will have far less priority in the future programme. Given the still high priority of the South African governments on this issue this is of concern.

Annex J. Note from Visit to ECO Ethics in Kenya

Note from visits to Eco Ethics International (EEIU) in Mombasa May 6th to May 8th 2008. The visit was carried out by Hans Hessel-Andersen.

1. Introduction

The Mombasa Chapter of Eco-Ethics International Union (EEIU) focus mainly on marine-coastal issues and poverty alleviation. Sensitization with regard to HIV/AIDS is integrated in the work and as advocacy, environmental education and awareness raising. Several women productive groups are being supported through a revolving fund and app 50% of the school teachers engaged in the eco-clubs are women. Gender issues are dealt with as a women issue, meaning as project for woman activities and not as a gender issue. The support has a duration of 1 year and a budget of 21 000 \$.

Apart from the support from SSNC, the EEIU did in 2007 and 2008 received support from the Foundation of Sustainable Development and EEIU Head office of the amount of over USD 50 000. Eco-Ethics International Union has its headquarter in Germany.

Five projects are running in Kenya, including:

1. The alternative livelihood project which include a revolving fund, and aim to create alternative income possibilities for fisher families,
2. Makuti Business support project (support to woman group). Has overlap with 1 as it uses the revolving fund.
3. Community capacity building. Focus on organising communities and sensitise around HIV/AIDS.
4. Eco-club project. Env. Education in schools.
5. Networking and partnership.

SSNC direct support goes mainly to 1–4, but point 5 is by EEIU seen as an integrated part of the programme. The activities of EEIU seem dispersed, with very distinct project lines for each activity, and a preliminary assessment too dispersed in light of the limited capacity of the organisation.

2. Organisation

EEIU is by regulation a member organisation. But in reality it is function like a mixture between a voluntary organisation and a semi-professional organisation. It has 6 staff members. 1 Director, 1 Programme manager, 1 financial officer, 1 programme officer, 1, person responsible for communication and liaison, and 1 person responsible for Eco-Club coordination. In addition they have 1–2 volunteers.

The staff do not have a regular salary, but receive a smaller allowance and do from time to time carry out consultancy work. In this sense it is a financially vulnerable organisation, with risk for staff turnover. The management spent some time on securing a sounder financial basis. At the same time it makes it less dependent on external funding and must be taken as an indication of commitment.

Major decisions as approval of Strategies, budget and appointment of Director are made by the Board. Day to day decisions are made by the Director and the Management committee consisting of the Director, the financial officer and the Programme manager.

It has been tried to establish a member organisation, but although some people sign up it has been nearly impossible to collect membership fee and activate the members. According to EEIU there are no tradition for this type of member engagement, which requires active input and a membership fee.

EEIU has a strategy running from 2007–12, and provide the basis for the organisations work. Major elements in the strategy are threefold: improving on institutional structures, systems and organisational capacity, empowerment of local communities and effective collaboration and partnership. The strategy was not discussed in depths with SSNC during preparation of the project. No face to face discussions did take place during the approval process of the support; discussions took place over the internet. SSNC has not visited the organisation.

3. Partnership with SSNC

Contact between SSNC and EEIU was established during a meeting Hosted by WIOMSA in Mombasa. Following that a 1 year organisational support project developed over the Internet.

Apart from some input during the project preparation there has been *no* input on substance from SSNC to EEIU. Given relatively frequent changes on SSNC programme officer (3 times) and the relative short project duration (so far only 5 months), this is not surprising. The contact around administrative issues to SSNC functions well and timely. Still the future cooperation is currently unclear. This should be clarified relatively soon, as EEIU has to look for other sources of finance.

EEIU staff has read several papers about SSNC, but has no direct contact to the organisation apart from with the Programme officer.

The relationship has so far mainly had an administrative character, and there has been frequent e-mail contact. No support on substantive issues has been provided and no joint initiatives have taken place. No systematic capacity development of EEIU is included in the support and only minor support for administration is included. The support does not include support for salaries, as in the case of PELUM and PORINI. So far the relationship has mostly had the character of a donor/recipient relationship. Still EEIU are happy with the cooperation.

SSNC has *not* facilitated a contact to PORINI, which also have activities at the coast or to other SSNC supported organisations within or outside Kenya.

The activities of EEIU are within the priorities of SSNC, but they have been set by EEIU.

The target group of EEIU is the poorer fisher communities and school children from primary to high school. They have a format for feasibility studies to be used before approving the projects. Furthermore they initially much time on consultation with the communities to establish trust. During the short visit of the consultant it was the impression that EEIU had established a trustful relationship to the communities and schools, and that some results had already materialised in relation to eco-club and woman productive groups.

The current strategy for EEIU 2007–12 is new and has not been used as the basis for the current activities, although the agreement of course has been influenced by the at that time on-going development of a strategic plan and the support s consistent with the plan. It is within the aim of the poverty strategy of the government.

EEIU is active in various fora. It is e.g. chairing the NGO group linked to Nema's consultation on EIA process in the Mombasa region. It is furthermore promoting the case of fisherman toward the fishery institutions. However the work of the EEIU could benefit from a further focus on networking of fishery communities/user association or similar and of networking with other NGO's in the region. This would be important in order to strengthen the advocacy work, which is highly needed as some of the key issues e.g. about landownership cannot be solved unless the local communities get a stronger voice.

Further if EEIU intent to scale up its activities it is needed to establish or work through existing/ broader organisational structures, which allow them to reach a larger group of communities and reduce the transaction costs. Working intensively with few communities is not realistic. It also has to be stressed that if a solution to some of the major issues related to e.g. storage and marketing of fish products shall be found it will requires a larger organisational backing.

4. SSNC Aid Management

As mentioned above SSNC has not yet provided technical input to the EEIU activities. It is furthermore doubtful that SSNC will be able to provide that in the future within their current set-up, with fairly infrequent visits, as they have limited insight in the problems on the Kenyan coast, which has a technical element, but is far more influenced by cultural, political, economic and social factors. It would take a more intense contact if advice should be provided on specific issues. This independent of the fact that the current SSNC programme officer is knowledgeable about the problems at the Kenyan Coast.

SSNC has not facilitated contact between the NGO's they support in Kenya. Porini and Eco-Ethic, who both have activities with the coastal communities, do not know each other's existence! Not regional or global networking has been facilitated.

Discussions related to Paris declaration have not been relevant yet for Eco-ethics as it is an initial small support.

Furthermore SSNC's new reporting and monitoring system has not yet been fully implemented in relation to EEIU.

5. Recommendations for Consideration

The following recommendations shall only be considered as one input to a further process. In a further process they should be further elaborated and adapted to the need of EEIU and the problems at the coast.

1. The future support to EEIU should be clarified. If the cooperation is continued within a 3-year framework, capacity development in terms of financial, human and organisational capacity should be included. The capacity development could take its point of departure in EEIU own organisational development assessment from 2007.
2. Link to other SSNC supported organisations should be facilitated by SSNC
3. Links to other similar project in Africa should be facilitated
4. EEIU should focus its activities on fewer issues and work more in depths, and gradual scale up of activities. For example if they focus on fisheries they should consider the whole cycle from catch to marketing and establishing of relevant structures for marketing.
5. Advocacy activities for possible broader organisations of the communities should be supported, as many problems as land issues can only be solved politically.
6. A possible future programme should support strengthening of NGO/CBO network at the coast to increase the efficiency of both the service delivery work and the advocacy work. The problems of KMF are highly unfortunate, as this type of organisation is highly needed. Existing structure should be used to the extent possible. The role EEIU in this work should be discussed.
7. If future support is considered SSNC and EEIU should be coordinated with UNDP small grant programme, in particular in relation to the possible initiative from the fund to support networks at the coast.

8. SSNC should support the introduction of planning and monitoring systems with training of staff of EEIU and as relevant align to a EEIU developed system
9. EEIU's future activities should relate to the new national ICZM policy and strategy, in which EEIU has been involved in the preparation of.

Persons Met

Nastaja Vogt, technical advisers from UNDP's Small Grants programme

Nancy Angira. Volunteer.

Eco Ethics:

Okeyo Benards, Director

Richard D. Kiaka, Programme Manager

Ruth Mugira in charge of Eco Clubs

Omondi Mohamed Agengo, in charge of finances

Margaret Kilunda (Communications and Liaisons)

The consultant carried out visit to different Fishing Communities, crafts groups and women groups namely, Likoni beach management unit site where EEIU-K has put a fish landing facility locally known as a banda, Diani Handcraft Industry in Ukunda, Mpaji ni Mungu women group in Gazi, Bidii women group in Munje and Munje Fisherfolk Self-help group in Munje.

Finally the consultant participated in the opening of the workshop for environmental education hosted joint by be ECO Ethics and KOEE, Kenya Organization for Environmental Education at Hotel Cool Breeze in Mombasa Island.

Annex K. Note from Visit to Pelum Kenya

Note from visits to PELUM Kenya in May 2008. The visit was carried out by Emelia Arthur.

1. Introduction and Background

This report covers field visit findings to Participatory Ecological Land Use Management PELUM-Kenya.

PELUM Association is a member-based Africa regional organisation founded in 1995. It has members in East, Southern and central Africa. It is organised on regional and country basis.

PELUM-Kenya is organised around a country secretariat referred to as the Country Desk with upward and downward accountability and responsibility to a Board, Country Working Group, an Annual General Meeting (AGM) and the member organisations and their respective constituents (farmer groups and individual farmers). Its vision is “to see communities are self-organised to make informed choices towards improved quality of life that is socially and economically sustainable”.

SSNC has supported PELUM Kenya’s activities since 2003. The support in the past has been for one off activities such as governance training for the Country Working Group and institutional funding. Currently SSNC is co-funding PELUM Kenya’s Sustainable Agriculture and Livelihood Improvement (SUSALI II) Programme running from January 2007 to June 2010. The other funders are HIVOS (Netherlands), EED (Germany) and Bread for the World (Germany)

The SUSALI II programme is an upscale of a successfully piloted project in sustainable agriculture. It is structured around PELUM Kenya’s 3 main programme areas namely:

- *Campaign, Advocacy and Lobby (CAL)*: CAL aims to see small holder farmers, consumers, policy makers, legislators and the general public educated and aware of issues that affect small scale farmers and their livelihoods. It achieves this through capacity building of PELUM Kenya members on campaign themes, link partners to directly lobby and advocate for policy reform; and participate in local, national and international forums and campaigns that favour small scale farmers and pastoralists.
- *Capacity Enhancement and Building Programme (CEP)*: CEP aims to build capacity of member organisations in community development. It achieves this through technical capacity building in ecological land use practices and institutional development; identifying areas of need of PELUM-Kenya Country Desk staff and members and to link up PELUM with like minded organisations.
- *Research and Information Management (RIM)*: RIM aims to ensure effective information sharing and knowledge management through an efficient hub at the PELUM Kenya country desk. It achieves this through enhancing the capacity of members on information sharing and knowledge management; farmer-led documentation; improved members capacity in ICT; and developing effective communication and office infrastructure of the Country Desk.

The evaluation team engaged with 3 member organizations of PELUM-Kenya and their activities on the ground. These are Sustainable Agriculture Community Development Programme (SACDEP-Kenya), Youth Action for Rural Development (YARD) and Resource Oriented Development Initiatives (RODI-Kenya). The evaluators also met and engaged in discussions with the PELUM-Kenya Country Desk staff (the Country Coordinator and the programme staff).

2. Outcomes, Achievements, Constraints and Challenges

2.1. Outcomes & Achievements

General

PELUM-Kenya's vision and objectives of empowering communities to be self sustaining is clearly demonstrated in the way farmer groups engage with issues and the integrated livelihood initiatives on the ground. Their approach of not working directly with the beneficiaries on the ground but rather through member organisations is an empowering approach to development. This is achieved through capacity building in technical expertise and organisation governance for member organisations who in turn build the capacity of the farmer groups in identified communities who then become resource persons for other community members and surrounding communities. The specific comments below are general observations on PELUM Kenya's performance.

i. Strengthened Capacity: Member technical and institutional capacity has been strengthened. The secretariat's staff strength increased from 3 in 2004 to 7 in 2008. There have been increases in projects, membership and networking activities. Members are very happy with capacity building in organisational development & Governance; and technical skills (seed conservation). Mention is made in particular of training for boards of member organisations. Member organisations in turn pass on the training to their constituent farmer groups. Capacity building in sustainable agriculture has improved quality of information and services to farmer groups. Resource persons in member organisations are used for such capacity building exercises.

ii. Integrated Farming & Improved Livelihood: Community farmer groups' have an integrated system where they store seeds, plant indigenous crops, raise livestock for household and market purposes and use the excretion of the livestock as manure. In some cases they are involved in tree and food crop integrated farming. Significant portions of farming lands committed to organic farming. Farmers engage in composting and attest of increased yields, improved domestic consumption leading to improved health. Their activities have been recognised and certified by a national certification body in organic farming.

Market linkages have been established for their products and therefore increased income levels. For example farmers sell goats for Ksh10, 000 per goat. They supply produce to a hotel in the capital of Kenya at higher prices than middle men used to pay. They sell a bag of lemons at Ksh1500 instead of Ksh 60. They also sell a broiler for Ksh 270 instead of Ksh 120. The farmer groups serve also as intermediaries between the hotel and other farmers. They offer 3 times the price brokers offer to other farmers for their produce and sell to the hotel at higher prices. Their activities in seed conservation have been recognised also by Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) which led to KARI conducting a research in farmer group practices and offering further training and funding support in constructing seed banks.

iii. Farmer-led Actions: there is enough evidence that farmers are able to mobilise, plan and take actions independently of member organisations direct assistance. A level self dependence has been reached. Farmers have also been engaged in farmer-led documentation and farmer-to-farmer extensions as already mentioned elsewhere in this report.

iv. Mainstreaming gender, HIV and environment: HIV work place policy initiated by PELUM-Kenya and domesticated by some of the member organisations and their projects. HIV/AIDS used to be implemented as a stand alone projects but PELUM-Kenya encouraged its members to mainstream HIV/AIDS into their respective community programmes. PELUM members' activities pay extreme attention to the environment in a way that agricultural livelihood activities are integrated into larger environmental concerns that bring benefits to farmers.. It is important to note though that gender as a development ideology or philosophy is not necessarily fully understood by staff and therefore a conscious approach has not adopted. However a lot of project beneficiaries are women as a result of which a narrow aspect of gender is addressed. It is noteworthy also that there is strong women representation of women on the PELUM staff as well as member organisations.

v. Information sharing: very organised and systematic flow of information from the secretariat to member organisations and to farmers as well as organised farmer-to-farmer extension. Member organisations rate networking as one of the highest benefits they derive from PELUM-Kenya and the entire PELUM network.

2.2. SUSALI II Project Specific:

This programme is only 1 year through its implementation.

- AGM democratically selected the 5 member organisations working in partnership with the country desk in project implementation through specific AGM-determined criteria.
- The implementing partner organisations have clarity on the project objectives and understand the development challenge the programme is seeking to address.
- The anti GMO coalition was strengthened evidenced by change of name from Kenya GM Concern (KeGCO) to Kenya Biodiversity Coalition (KBioC) and increased membership by over 100% from 22 to 45 Members
- Farmer groups are very conversant with the discourse on GMOs. They were highly involved in the process of generating evidence against the campaign on GMOs
- Successfully promoted and farmer groups eagerly subscribe the tenets of organic farming using participatory methodologies to reintroduce indigenous, local and traditional agricultural products and planting methods without the use of any fertilisers and pesticides.
- Appreciating the value of small portions of land and utilization of such with high produce yields
- Rediscovery, production and consumption of organic indigenous food
- Training in seed security at and group and individual farmer level
- Implementing partners have improved internal governance and financial systems from capacity building and learning from colleague partners through networking
- Contributing to building society and community cohesion, environmental and healthy living
- Improved governance and leadership of member organisations and farmer groups
- Improved levels of savings due to savings on energy use, consumption of vegetables instead of buying. Now use Ksh. 50 on energy for a month from a day
- Supported networking activities within PELUM-Kenya as a network which include Country Working Group meetings, the National Board, the Annual General Meeting, member organizations visits to other members and sharing of best practices.

2.3. Constraints and Challenges

- Technical expertise and skills in core thematic areas for specific campaigns such as the GMO campaign
- SSNC does not give substantive technical programme support except administrative for reporting purposes.
- There has been few SSNC visits and interactions with PELUM-Kenya, its members and project implementation on the ground.
- Inadequate understanding of the Sida reporting format by PELUM-Kenya staff as a beneficial mechanism for PELUM-Kenya itself.

- Identifying a workable M&E systems and process that match Country Desk and member organisations aspirations for measuring impact of programme activities
- Broadening understanding of development and all its elements (such as gender as an ideology rather than just sex roles) and linkages with country poverty analysis and priorities.
- Channelling gains on the ground into agriculture policy and law reform advocacy. For example Kenya agriculture law does not recognise indigenous crop seeds as seeds but rather as food or reforming extension services to meet farmers real needs.
- Reliance on donors for project implementation and its attendant consequence of spending considerable staff time complying with different reporting formats.

2.4. Assessment of SUSALI II Log frame

This assessment is done understanding that the programme is only one year into implementation.

Extent of achievement of results against objectives

Objectives	Results/Outputs	Extent of achievement
Small holder farmers, consumers, policy makers, legislators and the general public educated and aware of issues around GE/GMOs and their implications to the Kenyan Agriculture.	Stronger, better informed, increased involvement and participation of small scale farmers, consumers, policy makers, legislators and the general public articulating and lobbying issues around GE/GMOs	Partially achieved
	The emergence of seed diverse and GE free zones declared by small-holder farmers in different zones/ areas in Kenya.	Partially achieved
Increased income of the small holder farmers through promotion of viable and sustainable alternatives through production, consumption and marketing of indigenous, traditional and local foods.	Increased production, consumption and marketing of indigenous, traditional and local foods.	Achieved
	Increased appreciation and awareness on the value of indigenous, traditional and local foods by the local target groups at the community level, neighbouring communities and at the national level.	Partially achieved • Local target groups are aware of the value and are fully on board • Through the groups' activity some community members are aware and engaging in the practice. Group members sell seeds to them and provide training • However the awareness has not extended to the entire community, neighbouring community and national level but there are lots of opportunities to scale up and generate a massive campaign.
Enhanced capacity of PELUM Kenya as a network to efficiently and effectively meet the increased needs of its member organizations.	Strengthened Country Desk as a more effective and active networking hub addressing the needs of the member organizations.	Partly achieved
	Enhanced networking in PELUM-Kenya with Member Organizations getting the optimal benefits of networking	Partly achieved
	Effective monitoring and evaluation tools in place and in use.	Least achieved • Held M&E workshop • Developing tools

3. SSNC Working with Partners

3.1. Partner Organisation Strategy and Constituency

PELUM Kenya has been operating with a 2003 to 2007 strategic Plan which is due for review.

PELUM Kenya has well defined structures and systems of governance with clear mandates. The mandate is for PELUM Kenya to build the capacity of member organisations who work directly with farmer groups.

In terms of decision-making in determining programme priorities, PELUM Kenya works with a structure where the highest decision making body is the Annual General Meeting which ratifies policy recommendations from the Country Working Groups, the second highest decision-making body, and composed of two members from the member organisations (the CEO and a the organisation's lead representative who has voting powers at CWG).. Below the CWG is the Country National Board whose membership is elected from within the Country Working Group. The Country Desk, made up of the Country Coordinator and technical programme and administrative staff, is directly responsible to the National Board and works directly with the member organisations who in turn work directly with their constituent farmer groups and individuals. Member organisations pay annual subscription fee.

PELUM Kenya relates with regional PELUM which also has clear governance structures. It has a Triennial General Meeting composed of all country desk coordinators, chairpersons of all national boards and 2 others determined by each country. The TGM is accountable to a regional Board which works more directly with a regional desk composed of a secretary general and regional programme and administrative staff. The regional desk relates more directly with all the country desks.

It is important to note however that there is a great deal of autonomy on the part of Kenya PELUM, a deviation from the past where decision-making is heavily centralised at the regional level. All is required at present is that each country's activities are in line with the core principles and values of PELUM and country desks remit the regional organisation and annual fee of 15% of its subscriptions.

There are very strong well established individual member organisations with clear governance structures and autonomous programme activities and target groups aligned with the core principles and values of PELUM Kenya.

There seems to be proper and sound financial accountability systems, checks and balances by the Country Desk and member organisations.

3.2. Partnership with SSNC

The PELUM-Kenya/SSNC partnership was established in 2003 when PELUM submitted a proposal for institutional support.ii. PELUM acknowledges a growing and more defining relationship with SSNC over time. Mention is made in particular reference to:

- involving PELUM-Kenya in the reporting systems
- inviting PELUM-Kenya in the development of its three strategic Plan
- the visit by the two staff from SSNC (2004, 2006) and another one from Sida (2007).
- holding discussions with the programme staff during our visit to SSNC.

The funding of another three year programme. There has not been enough interaction between PELUM-Kenya programme staff and SSNC. Certainly the Country Coordinator has had much more interaction. Though PELUM-Kenya was not contacted on SSNC's 2005–2007 programme planning, it was contacted and contributed to the current ongoing programme design at a meeting in Stockholm with other SSNC partners from the global south. PELUM-Kenya's mandate is not at variance with SSNCs. They are both natural resource management related. Programme priorities are not donor-

determined. PELUM-Kenya's members determine specific programme priorities. The current programme SSNC is supporting emanated from the ground and agreed through PELUM's structures. SSNC was then approached, in addition with others, for funding partnership. The partnership is fairly strong in terms of reporting, administration and direct communication between SSNC and PELUM-Kenya. However, the partnership is also weak in some ways:

- There is little input on substantive technical programme issues from SSNC.
- There is little interaction from SSNC with programme implementation staff.

The two SSNC project visits to PELUM-Kenya in the 2004 and 2006 have played a very important role in partnership building. These, however, should be increased. The project visit report should be written in English (not in Swedish) and should also be sent to the partner for the ease of understanding.

3.3. 'Added values' of SSNC (strengths and weaknesses):

Added Value of SSNC beyond providing funds?	
Strengths	Weaknesses
Provided good financial reporting which has transcended to member organisations enabling a strengthening of organisational financial systems at both country desk and member organisations' level	Causes additional administrative burden for partner organisation. It takes quite substantive partner organisation time to comply with reporting format
	No technical or substantive input from SSNC for programme support

4. Recommendations and Way Forward

PELUM is appreciative of relationship with and support from SSNC. There is high recognition of SSNC's institutional support for PELUM-Kenya at its nascent stages. The following recommendations are made with this background.

1. Using experiences of working with grass-root based networks and NGOs in the south, SSNC in collaboration with Southern partners, and in alliance with other northern organizations, advocate for change of international policies, instruments and global thinking governing natural resources by engaging more structurally at higher levels with EU, WTO, Sida, and other Swedish NGOs
2. Support for in-house capacity building in technical expertise in specific activities such as Biofuels, GMO, WTO, Climate Change and liberalisation of agriculture, EU policy and to play a role in international lobbying on those issues. Encouragement of partner-demand driven needs basis technical support beyond financial and narrative reporting.
3. Support relevant networking forums among SSNC partners in a particular country and across a region as a tool for sharing experiences and strengthening capacities. Such activities also help bring together individual partner, country and regional gains together to see composite gains and assess greater impact. It also helps identify models that can be recommended and adopted for programme implementation. For example adopting and replicating PELUM's approach to work will be a good way to contributing to programmes beyond administrative support.
4. Training in understanding the science of Sida reporting format and programme design (Log frames) so that it can be a beneficial tool for the organisations own growth for monitoring and evaluation as well as a reporting tool. In 2006, Sida/SSNC supported partners to agree on and input into reporting systems and structures. While this is so, there is a need for constant participatory review of the log frame with specific yearly targets and indicators

5. SSNC to consider mutually agreeing with other funding partners on a common reporting format so as to reduce the programme staff time used in writing many different reports to several funding partners supporting one programme
6. Broaden PELUM-Kenya Country Desk staff and member organisations' perspective on development and grassroots mobilisation and organisation including gender as an ideology and not just sex differences.
7. Support PELUM-Kenya's vision of building a farmer movement to lead on people-led development
8. Frequent project visits by SSNC staff and technical engagement with project implementation team
9. SSNC to invest in capital support and especially those that are in tandem with organizational goal and vision e.g. land, buildings, resource and learning centres, which enables partners to strengthen their sustainability strategies.
10. Understand better the development context of partner countries and the challenges on the ground
11. Frequent interaction between SSNC and partners through possible mechanisms. E.g. establishment of a local representative office or partner support office or arm.
12. Travel report as partner feedback should be in a language that is discernible by partner organisations and should actually be circulated to partners.
13. SSNC (indeed and other partners) to consider supporting emerging and important needs outside the agreed activities. Such needs may include those that will help and strengthen the implementation on the on-going programme. These may include organisational development, staff capacity and recruiting additional staff.
14. In addition to funding PELUM-Kenya network, SSNC to consider directly funding specific activities of regional and sub-regional PELUM Association as well as individual member organisations of PELUM-Kenya that bring value addition to PELUM Kenya's work.

Annex L. Key Questions for Visiting Selected SSNC's Partners

Version 27 April 2008

The Evaluation Team intends to synchronise the key questions that will be discussed during the visits in each country.

It is important to ask all the key questions (a, b, c, d). We know that it is not possible to go through all the “bullet questions”, however, they can hopefully served as inspiration for how some of the questions can be asked.

The key-questions are structured after the preliminary report outline. *Here follows the list of key questions:*

3. Outcomes and Achievements in Visited Countries

3.1. The Latin America field study

3.2. The Africa field study

3.3. The South East Asia field study

- Tell success stories from the implementation of the project!
- What have been the key constraints and weaknesses?
- Go through the Logical Framework, hearing the partners assessment of the progress on the planned objectives and outputs (with related indicators).
- What is the assessment of the assumptions and risks?

4. SSNC Working with Partners in the South

a) Partner organisations strategy and constituency.

- What is the mandate of your organisation?
- Do you have a Strategic Plan?
- How is the balance between advocacy organisation, service delivery/productive oriented?
- Constituency? Member organisation (association) or Foundation? Number of members? Number of staff? Number of volunteers?
- Decision-making structure? Annual Assembly? Elected Board? Internal democracy and accountability mechanism?

b) Partnership with SSNC.

- How was the partnership established?
- What do you know about SSNC?
- Does the mandate of your organisation coincide with SSNC's mandate? Was your organisation consulted by SSNC when the 2005–2007 programme was formulated?
- How is the partnership functioning? Is it partnership or donor/recipient relationship?

- How is priorities decided on themes and intervention area? By SSNC's priorities or by own priorities? What happens if there are contradiction?
- Is your organisation supported as "organisational support" or small project grants?
- Contact with SSNC. How often have they been in contact with SSNC in 2008?
- How is your contact mainly with SSNC? By mail/Skype/Face to face/phone?
- What about use of language for sharing documents, including SSNC overall planning and reporting to their Boards and Sida (is enough translated?).

c) Target groups for the project, including poverty orientation. Have you undertake a (simple) poverty analysis? Have you developed mechanisms to reach the poor? Have you considered linkages between poverty reduction – environment – good (local) governance?

d) Context sensitivity and quality of partner's and SSNC's country analysis? How is the SSNC's programmer officer's understanding of your country?

e) The projects Objective and Implementation Strategy. Has it been possible to operationalise? Could you have worked with another implementation strategy?

f) Advocacy at local level, at national level country, in the region and at global level?

- Provide examples of your advocacy work the last 3 years (evidence based, position papers, public campaigns, media/press, lobbying, coalitions/networking, etc.).
- How do your organisation relate to poverty strategies in your country? Do you relate to national environmental policies? Are you approaching monitoring of the MDG 7 (environmental sustainability)?

g) Capacity building and organisational development

- How has capacity building/organisational development been done the last 3 years of the partner organisation? (together with SSNC or others). Please provide us with written materials from this process.
- Mainly training approach? Or what type of capacity building has SSNC supporting?
- How is capacity build within the environmental issues?
- Capacity building of community based organisations? Any specific methods used in Africa?
- Several of the projects is connected to regional networks. How is that working? How much are the member organisations contributing to this network?

5. SSNC's Aid Management

h) What is SSNC's technical expertise and advisory to the partners on the theme related to the Project?

- At least 3 examples where SSNC has contributed with technical expertise? Preferable provide the evaluation team with copies of this.
- How has SSNC contributed to strengthening your organisation?
- Is your contact with SSNC programme officers mainly on administrative issues, or mainly on content?
- SSNC's capability to ensure cross-fertilization between the various partners & countries/continents? What do they do and how do they do it? Examples of papers sharing experiences?

- Has experiences and lesson learned been systematised (in written)?

i) The Paris aid effectiveness agenda and challenges to SSNC and partners.

- How many donors are supporting your organisation?
- Please provide us with the 2007 general account, including with the contributions from the various donors outlined.
- How SSNC and partner organisation have responded to the five Paris principles: Ownership, alignment, result based management, harmonisation and mutual accountability?
- How is coordination between the partner organisation and the various donors?
- Often several different planning, monitoring/reporting and accounting systems imply a burden on the partner organisation. Is this something your organisation and SSNC are aware of and try to avoid? (e.g. through all donors using host organizations systems). Any harmonisation?

j) Planning, monitoring and evaluation system (including quality assurance, results-based management, feedback and learning).

- How was the planning of the on-going project document done? Participatory? What comments and feedback from SSNC?
- Is the new Result/reporting system helpful? Is it mainly a one-way control system or has it been useful for the dialogue between the partners?
- What has been your organisations view on the discussion about the new Result system? (with comments from EMG and Pratec)?
- How is SSNC and partner organisation measuring effect/impacts? How Very little (systematic) use of indicators in the reporting from 2005–07.
- Is the reporting system mainly upward and/or downward accountability? Where is spent most staff resources (reporting to the NGOs own governance system or to Stockholm?)
- Request copies of all Reviews/external evaluations related to the countries, we will visit.

k) Sustainability, replicability and exit strategies.

- External funding, own funding or combination?
- How do the partner and SSNC consider sustainability? What will happen if the external funding disappears one day? What has been done for increasing domestic resources?
- Have an Exit strategy been discussed and planned? (also in the case where several years future support is most likely).

l) Crosscutting issues (gender, environment, HIV/AIDS and democracy/CSO governance). What is the specific approach taken to indigenous peoples rights?

m) Financial management and – monitoring. What kind of audit is carried out? Has SSNC provided help for pro-active financial controller? (for strengthening partners financial system).

6. Conclusions

The Team summaries in a Debriefing Note summaries tries to discuss and establish the preliminary findings and conclusions.

- n) Conclusion on the level of compliance in terms of relevance and objectives of SSNC and Sida/SEKA.
- o) Summarizing ‘added values’ of SSNC (strengths and weaknesses): Added Value of SSNC beyond providing funds?
- p) The partners recommendation for Strategic Orientations for the next 3 years SSNC Programme.

7. Recommendations and Ways Forward

- Recommendations for improving the on-going project
- How can the Programme level be further approached?
- What is your suggestion for the next phase of SSNC’s 2009–2011 Southern Programme.

Request documents

For all organisations and project support in the countries we visit, please request the following:

1. Agreement/project description.
2. Plans and reports
3. Earlier reviews or evaluation
4. Key products

Annex M. Overview of Themes and Number of Countries in SSNC Project Portfolio

	Countries	No projects	Forestry	Agriculture	Climate and Water	Coast	Chemical
Afrika	Etiopien	2	MELCA Mahiber	ISD			
	Ghana	1				CSRM	
	Kamerun	1			ARN		
	Kenya	3	PORINI	PELUM		EEIUK	
	Senegal	2			CODESEN	AMN	
	Senegal/ Mauretanien	2				MSC	
	Sydafrika	3+1 regional	GeaSphere		EMG, Earthlife Africa Durban/ Johannesburg, Ilitha Lomso		
	Tanzania	1+1 regional				KIMWAM, WIOMSA	
	Togo	1			JVE		
	Uganda	2	NAPE		NAPE		
Asien	Bangladesh	1				ASIA	
	Filippinerna	3		MASIPAG, SEARICE, GRAIN			
	Indien	2	SOPHIA		SANDRP		
	Indonesien	5	Sawit Watch, Elang, JIKALAHARI, WAHLI, AMA KALBAR				
	Kambodja	2			CEPA, Mlup Baitong		
	Kina	1		PEAC			
	Malaysia	3	PACOS, SAM			CAP	CAP
	Nepal	1			WAFED		
	Thailand	3–4 Regional	AIPP	BioThai	Terra, SEARIN		
Europa	Ryssland						
	Storbritannien				Bretton Woods Project		
	Ukraina						
	Vitryssland						
Latinamerika	Argentina	1 Regional		RAP-AL			
	Bolivia	1		CETHA	MAB		
	Brasilien	3	FASE-ES	Centro Ecológico	MAB		
	Chile	1			IEP		

	Countries	No projects	Forestry	Agriculture	Climate and Water	Coast	Chemical
	Colombia	3		Grupo Semillas, ASPROINCA	ASPROCIG		
	Costa Rica	1		SITRAP			
	Ecuador	1				C-CONDEM	
	Guatemala						
	Honduras	1				CODDEFFAGOLF	
	Mexiko	1		CECCAM			
	Peru	2		PRATEC, ANPE			
	Uruguay	2–3 Regional	WRM, Guayabira Group	REDES			
Globalt/ regionalt			FoEI	TWN		CFFA, Red Manglar	
5 June 2008							

Recent Sida Evaluations

2008:27 The Asian Regional Research Programme on Environmental Technologies (ARRPET)

Peter Sundin, Bo Göhl, Cecilia Petersen, Cecilia Öman, Björn Wahlstedt
Department for Research Cooperation

2008:28 National Democratic Institute's Programme on Strengthening Women's Participation in Political and Decentralisation Processes in Burkina Faso

Sarah Forti, Adiza Lamien Ouando
Department for Democracy and Social Development

2008:29 Experiences and Lessons Learnt from Sida's Work with Human Rights and Democratic Governance, Final Report

Tom Dahl-Østergaard, Karin Schulz, Barbro Svedberg
Department for Democracy and Social Development

2008:30 The Swedish Civil Society Organisation/Non-Governmental Organisation Cooperation Programme, Ethiopia, 2004/05–2006/07

Britha H. Mikkelsen, Knud Olander, Michael Tamiru Gubay, Workwoha Mekonnen
Department for Africa

2008:31 Finalização do Apoio Sueco à Saúde em Angola, Um Estudo da Evolução dos Serviços de Saúde Reprodutiva e Infantil 2006–2007

Kajsa Pehrsson, Kenneth Challis, Tazi Maghema
Department for Democracy and Social Development

2008:32 The Swedish Support to Institutional Capacity Building of the National Institute of Statistics in Cambodia 2006–2008

Tobias Stern, Claes Norrlöf, Pernilla Lundin
Department for Democracy and Social Development

2008:33 Southern Africa AIDS Trust Project Evaluation, 2008

Ron Titus, Unity Chari
Sida

2008:34 Contribucioned de Asdi al Desarrollo del Sector Privado en Bolivia, 2003–2007, Resultados e Impactos

Erik Larrazábal Antezana, Miguel Zalles Denegri
Sida

2008:35 Sida's Support to the Swedish Committee for Afghanistan (SCA)

Göran Carlsson, Staffan Engblom, Tove Myhrman
Sida

2008:36 Performance Analyses of the Cooperation between Swedish Radio and Radio Republic Indonesia 2000–2005

Madeleine Elmqvist, Lars Rylandaer, Lukas Luwarso
Sida

2008:37 Programa Regionalizado de la Gestión Defensorial en Colombia

Francesca Jessup, Elisabeth Hayek
Sida

Sida Evaluations may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 779 96 50
Fax: +46 (0)8 779 96 10
sida@sida.se

A complete backlist of earlier evaluation reports may be ordered from:

Sida, UTV, SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0) 8 698 51 63
Fax: +46 (0) 8 698 56 43
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden
Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: sida@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>