

Annex 4: Evaluation Grid (2) Implementation Process of the Project (page1/6)

Abbreviation: C/P-counterpart person J/E-Japanese expert

Item	Source/ Methods	Results (as of Nov.13, 2007)
1)Implementation of Activities		
(1) Activities under Output 1	Review of progress reports, Questionnaire, interview with C/P, J/E, target groups	<p>Overall, most of the activities under Output 1 are delayed for nearly one year, compared with the schedule delineated in the latest PO, mainly due to a delay of completion Activity 1.1 that precede to Activity 1.2 and 1.4. The latter activities have not been started yet. It is expected that all the necessary activities to achieve Output 1 would be completed by the end of the Project.</p> <p>Major issues are highlighted below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Activity 1.1 ("Prepare Basic Guidelines for sustainable use of flooded forest resources, taking the opinions of the riverbank dwellers into consideration")</u>: Basic guideline for sustainable use of flooded forest resources within the Project Area, which was scheduled to be completed by January 2007 as per the latest PO, has not been prepared yet due to delay of formation of a committee responsible for the preparation. At present, formation of the committee is underway. Brazilian side envisages that the activity should be completed by July 2008.</li> <li>2. <u>Activity 1.2 ("Government of the State of Amapá will widely disseminate the prepared basic guidelines through a guidebook")</u>: This activity item, schedule to start in April 2007, has not begun yet because of the delay of preparation of the basic guidelines (i.e. Activity 1.1). It is expected that a guidebook will be prepared and disseminated in 6-7 months after the completion of the guidelines: that is 2-3 months before termination of the Project.</li> <li>3. <u>Activity 1.3 ("Establish an agency responsible for overseeing sustainable use of flooded forest resources within the State Government of Amapá")</u>: As an agency responsible for executing the policy of sustainable use of flooded forest resources within the State Government of Amapá, IEF was established in April 2007. The organization chart has been developed and 24 staff members, including eight forest engineers, has been assigned. One-hundred more is planned to be recruited in the next fiscal year (i.e. January-December 2008) through civil service public exam. At this moment, the organizational statute is being reviewed by the office of the General Prosecutor of the State. If there are no legal issues, the State Governor will approve it. Once the statute is approved by the Governor (hopefully by December 2007), IEF could assume its function officially.</li> <li>4. <u>Activity 1.4 ("Hold periodic meetings with institutions involved and riverbank dwellers on sustainable use of the flooded forest")</u>: An annual meeting of the Committee of Flooded Forest in the Municipality of Mazagao is planned to be held after basic guidelines become available.</li> </ol>
(2)Activities under Output 2	Review of progress reports, Questionnaire, interview with C/P, J/E, target groups, GRPU	<p>The activities under Output 2 consist of (i) those related to establishment and strengthening of forest management/ agroforestry associations (i.e. Activity 2.1~2.2) and (ii) those related to preparation and implementation of forest management plans (i.e. Activity 2.3~2.4). While the former has been implemented almost on schedule, the latter was seriously behind the schedule as compared with the schedule delineated in the initial PO (ver. 1-1) agreed by JCC in June 2006, mainly due to land use/occupancy right issues in the Target Sites as well as delay in disbursement of local cost by Brazilian side. Compared with the latest PO (ver 1-2) approved by JCC in August 2007, progress of the activities are almost on schedule. On condition that ongoing and planned sub-activities are implemented as planned, the activities under Output 2 are expected to be completed by the end of the Project.</p>

Item	Source/ Methods	Results (as of Nov.13, 2007)
		<p>Major issues are highlighted below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Activity 2.1 ("Establish a forest management/ agroforestry association at each Target Site, whose activities include agroforestry systems of riverbank dwellers")</u>: This activity item is mostly on schedule. Two forest management/ agroforestry associations have been established in Maraca and Mazagao Velho. Establishment of forest management sections, sawmills sections, and agroforestry sections within the associations, however, has been held back for the following reasons among others: 1) initial enhancement of administrative capacity of the association members, which started in June 2006, has not been completed yet<sup>1</sup>; and 2) the headquarters buildings of the association have not been constructed.</li> <li>2. <u>Activity 2.2 ("Conduct monitoring and give training courses to the relevant members to enhance administrative capacity of the associations")</u>: This activity item is on schedule and is expected to be completed as planned.</li> <li>3. <u>Activity 2.3 ("Assist each association in preparing its forest management plan and requesting licensing of its forest management plan from IBAMA or SEMA")</u>: Preparation of the forest management plan is behind the schedule because of the delay of the preceding necessary activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <u>Maraca</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The first forest inventory (i.e. sample survey) of Maraca area, which was scheduled in Feb 2006, was delayed until May due to delay of budget release. It was difficult to carry out the inventory in the flooded forest area in the rainy season, too.</li> <li>- The second forestry inventory (i.e. 100% inventory) of the individual plots could not start until renewal of a contract of concession of land use right between INCRA, which is a responsible agency for the land issue of the said area, and ASTEX-MA (Association of Workers of Maraca Agro-Exploitation Settlement) was completed in October 2007.</li> <li>- The second inventory is planned to be completed in December 2007. On condition that the subsequent activities are implemented as envisaged, the indicator is expected to be achieved by Mar-Apr 2008.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2) <u>Mazagao Velho</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The first forest inventory of Mazagao Velho area, which was scheduled in Feb 2006, was delayed until May due to delay of budget release. It was difficult to carry out the inventory in the flooded forest area in the rainy season, too.</li> <li>- The second forest inventory (i.e. 100% inventory) has not been able to be conducted because most of the association members do not have official occupancy/use right for the land. At a community meeting on November 3, 2007, organized by GRPU and participated by INCRA, SEDE, and IEPA, it was agreed to grant <del>provisional</del> "terms of authorization of use" (<del>i.e. land use right</del>) to the associations members and other community people concerned. According to a GRPU official who attended the above mentioned meeting, the relevant procedures should be completed in 3-4 months.</li> <li>- At present, the second inventory is planned to be conducted in May-June 2008. On condition that the subsequent activities be implemented as envisaged, the indicator is expected to be achieved by September 2008.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>4. <u>Activity 2.4 ("Assist members of forest management section of each association in execution of its forest management plan")</u>: This activity item has not started yet because of the delay of Activity 2.3. Forest management section of each association has not been organized, either. Execution of the forest management plans are expected to start in April</li> </ol>

<sup>1</sup> It has been partially completed.

Annex 4: Evaluation Grid (2) Implementation Process of the Project (page3/6)

Item	Source/ Methods	Results (as of Nov.13, 2007)																												
		2008 in Maraca and in October 2008 in Mazagao Velho.																												
		Table 1: Outline of land issues in the Target Sites, which affected the process of preparation of forest management plans																												
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Maraca</th> <th>Mazagao Velho</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Legal owner of the land</td> <td>Federal government (Settlement of INCRA)</td> <td>Federal government</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Land authority</td> <td>INCRA</td> <td>GRPU</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Legal use right holder at the time of the Project commencement</td> <td>Astex-ma (via "contract of concession of use of real right" with INCRA) *Astex-ma in turn concedes the concession to community people</td> <td>n/a ("terms of authorization of use" by GRPU required according to the Ministerial Ordinance No.284 of October 14, 2005.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Major issues encountered</td> <td>-Renewal of the above mentioned contract between INCRA and Astex-ma was delayed.</td> <td>-in the beginning of the Project, the personnel concerned with the Project tried to coordinate with INCRA as de facto land authority because it had given land occupancy right to three persons in the Target Site. -It took some time before all the concerned realized that they should coordinate with GRPU rather than INCRA in solving the issue.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Present status</td> <td>-The contract was renewed on Oct. 7, 2007</td> <td>-It was decided to give "terms of authorization of use" to individuals in accordance with the Ministerial Ordinance No.284 of October 14, 2005. (It is the first case in Mazagao Velho)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Remaining steps towards solution to land issues.</td> <td>-Completion of conceding of the concessions to the <del>existing</del> associations of Maraca (Dec. 2007 )</td> <td>-Completion of necessary procedures in accordance with the above ordinance (Mar-Apr. 2007)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Maraca	Mazagao Velho	1. Legal owner of the land	Federal government (Settlement of INCRA)	Federal government	2. Land authority	INCRA	GRPU	3. Legal use right holder at the time of the Project commencement	Astex-ma (via "contract of concession of use of real right" with INCRA) *Astex-ma in turn concedes the concession to community people	n/a ("terms of authorization of use" by GRPU required according to the Ministerial Ordinance No.284 of October 14, 2005.)	4. Major issues encountered	-Renewal of the above mentioned contract between INCRA and Astex-ma was delayed.	-in the beginning of the Project, the personnel concerned with the Project tried to coordinate with INCRA as de facto land authority because it had given land occupancy right to three persons in the Target Site. -It took some time before all the concerned realized that they should coordinate with GRPU rather than INCRA in solving the issue.	4. Present status	-The contract was renewed on Oct. 7, 2007	-It was decided to give "terms of authorization of use" to individuals in accordance with the Ministerial Ordinance No.284 of October 14, 2005. (It is the first case in Mazagao Velho)	5. Remaining steps towards solution to land issues.	-Completion of conceding of the concessions to the <del>existing</del> associations of Maraca (Dec. 2007 )	-Completion of necessary procedures in accordance with the above ordinance (Mar-Apr. 2007)						
	Maraca	Mazagao Velho																												
1. Legal owner of the land	Federal government (Settlement of INCRA)	Federal government																												
2. Land authority	INCRA	GRPU																												
3. Legal use right holder at the time of the Project commencement	Astex-ma (via "contract of concession of use of real right" with INCRA) *Astex-ma in turn concedes the concession to community people	n/a ("terms of authorization of use" by GRPU required according to the Ministerial Ordinance No.284 of October 14, 2005.)																												
4. Major issues encountered	-Renewal of the above mentioned contract between INCRA and Astex-ma was delayed.	-in the beginning of the Project, the personnel concerned with the Project tried to coordinate with INCRA as de facto land authority because it had given land occupancy right to three persons in the Target Site. -It took some time before all the concerned realized that they should coordinate with GRPU rather than INCRA in solving the issue.																												
4. Present status	-The contract was renewed on Oct. 7, 2007	-It was decided to give "terms of authorization of use" to individuals in accordance with the Ministerial Ordinance No.284 of October 14, 2005. (It is the first case in Mazagao Velho)																												
5. Remaining steps towards solution to land issues.	-Completion of conceding of the concessions to the <del>existing</del> associations of Maraca (Dec. 2007 )	-Completion of necessary procedures in accordance with the above ordinance (Mar-Apr. 2007)																												
		Table 2: Tentative timetable for preparation and acquisition of license for forest management plans																												
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Maraca</th> <th>Mazagao Velho</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Establishment of associations and identification of participants</td> <td>(July 2006)</td> <td>(Sep 2006)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Zoning and delineation</td> <td>(Jun 2006 &amp; Jul 2007)</td> <td>(Jul 2007)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. First inventory (sampling survey of the whole area)</td> <td>(May 2006)</td> <td>(Feb 2006)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Complete settlement of land use right issues</td> <td>Dec 2007</td> <td>Mar 2008</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Second inventory (100% inventory of individual plots)</td> <td>Oct-Dec. 2007</td> <td>May-Jun 2008</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. Preparation of forest management plan</td> <td>Jan. 2008</td> <td>Jul 2008</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7. APAT (Preliminary Authorization for Technical Analysis of Forest Management Plan)</td> <td>Jan 2008</td> <td>Jul 2008</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8. Screening of the plan by SEMA</td> <td>Feb-Mar 2008</td> <td>Aug-Sep 2008</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Maraca	Mazagao Velho	1. Establishment of associations and identification of participants	(July 2006)	(Sep 2006)	2. Zoning and delineation	(Jun 2006 & Jul 2007)	(Jul 2007)	3. First inventory (sampling survey of the whole area)	(May 2006)	(Feb 2006)	4. Complete settlement of land use right issues	Dec 2007	Mar 2008	5. Second inventory (100% inventory of individual plots)	Oct-Dec. 2007	May-Jun 2008	6. Preparation of forest management plan	Jan. 2008	Jul 2008	7. APAT (Preliminary Authorization for Technical Analysis of Forest Management Plan)	Jan 2008	Jul 2008	8. Screening of the plan by SEMA	Feb-Mar 2008	Aug-Sep 2008
	Maraca	Mazagao Velho																												
1. Establishment of associations and identification of participants	(July 2006)	(Sep 2006)																												
2. Zoning and delineation	(Jun 2006 & Jul 2007)	(Jul 2007)																												
3. First inventory (sampling survey of the whole area)	(May 2006)	(Feb 2006)																												
4. Complete settlement of land use right issues	Dec 2007	Mar 2008																												
5. Second inventory (100% inventory of individual plots)	Oct-Dec. 2007	May-Jun 2008																												
6. Preparation of forest management plan	Jan. 2008	Jul 2008																												
7. APAT (Preliminary Authorization for Technical Analysis of Forest Management Plan)	Jan 2008	Jul 2008																												
8. Screening of the plan by SEMA	Feb-Mar 2008	Aug-Sep 2008																												
(3)Activities under Output 3	-ditto-	<p>Overall, the activities under Output 3 have been implemented almost as planned. It is expected that the planned activities would be completed by the end of the Project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activity 3.1 ("Assist agroforestry section of each association in organizing <u>meetings to prepare an implementation plan for the agroforestry systems adapted to the local conditions</u>"): Meetings with riverbank producers (i.e. association members) have been held at each Target Site and an implementation plan for the sustainable agroforstry system (SAF) have been identified for each Site. These meetings were held by the Project since the agroforestry sections of the associations had not been organized as mentioned in (2) above.</li> <li>Activity 3.2 ("Assist riverbank dwellers (i.e. members of association) in <u>implementing the agroforestry systems according to the prepared plans</u>");</li> </ol>																												

Annex 4: Evaluation Grid (2) Implementation Process of the Project (page 4/6)

Item	Source/ Methods	Results (as of Nov.13, 2007)												
		<p>The activity item is on schedule and would be completed as planned.</p> <p>3. <u>Activity 3.3 ("Assist members of agroforestry section of each association in organizing collection and shipping of the agroforestry products and in promoting favorable sales conditions.")</u>: Although some agroforestry products have been harvested already, this activity item has not started yet. The Project plans to transform the associations into the cooperatives so that they could organize collection and shipping of the products and could promote favorable sales conditions (ex. organic brand). Brazilian side envisages that the associations would be able to be transformed into the cooperatives by the latter half of the year 2008.</p> <p>Table 3: Key steps and their tentative timetable for transformation of the associations into cooperatives</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="539 584 1394 757"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Maraca</th> <th>Mazagao Velho</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Enhancement of administrative capacity of the officials of the associations</td> <td>Jun. 2006-Jan. 2008</td> <td>Jun. 2006 -Jan. 2008</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Construction of the building of the cooperative headquarters</td> <td>Dec. 2007*1</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Registration with relevant authorities</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*1 The information was provided by the association. The C/Ps from RURAP are suspicious if construction will be completed by then because they are not sure of the timing of the release of the budget of the State Government on this matter.</p>		Maraca	Mazagao Velho	1. Enhancement of administrative capacity of the officials of the associations	Jun. 2006-Jan. 2008	Jun. 2006 -Jan. 2008	2. Construction of the building of the cooperative headquarters	Dec. 2007*1	n/a	3. Registration with relevant authorities	n/a	n/a
	Maraca	Mazagao Velho												
1. Enhancement of administrative capacity of the officials of the associations	Jun. 2006-Jan. 2008	Jun. 2006 -Jan. 2008												
2. Construction of the building of the cooperative headquarters	Dec. 2007*1	n/a												
3. Registration with relevant authorities	n/a	n/a												
(4)Activities under Output 4	-ditto-	<p>Overall, the activities under Output 4 are behind the schedule except for Activity 4.3 due to delay of necessary preceding activities; namely Activities 2.3, 2.4 and 3.3.</p> <p>1. <u>Activity 4.1 ("Hold periodic meetings between the associations and Furniture Sector to exchange ideas/opinions to establish and strengthen partnership")</u>: This activity item will be held back until the second forest inventory (i.e. 100 % survey of individual plots) is conducted in the Target Sites; because the Project fears that it might raise wrong expectations among the riverbank producers and that it might induce a trade of illegal timbers.</p> <p>2. <u>Activity 4.2 ("Assist members of each forest management/ agroforestry association in signing and executing a timber supply agreement with the furniture cooperation in Amapa")</u>: Before taking up this activity item, two conditions have to be satisfied: (i) the sustainable forest management plans should be prepared and authorized; and (ii) the associations should be transformed into cooperatives. Since neither of these has been met so far, the activity has not been able to start yet.</p> <p>3. <u>Activity 4.3 ("Enhance entrepreneurial capacity of furniture sector for sustainable development to strengthen partnership with the associations")</u>: This activity item is on schedule and is expected to be completed as planned.</p>												
<b>2 Project Management</b>														
(1)Implementation System	Questionnaire, interview with C/P, J/E.	The Secretary of SEDE is the Project Director and the President Director of IEPA and the Secretary of SEICOM are the Project Managers. Various State and Federal agencies such as IEPA, SEICOM, SETEC, IEF, RURAP, SENAI, SEBRAE, and IBAMA participate in the Project as implementing organizations. Under overall guidance of the Project Director and the Project Managers, a C/P from SEDE is responsible for overall achievement of Output 1 while a C/P from RURAP is responsible for Output 2 & 3. A C/P from SEICOM is responsible for Output 4. The system has been functioned well so far.												
(2)Decision making & Monitoring	Review of project reports, materials related to	1. <u>Joint Coordination Committee</u> : The first meeting of the Joint Coordination Committee, the decision making body of the Project, was held in June 2006 <sup>2</sup> . Subsequently, two meetings were held in December 2006 and												

<sup>2</sup> Functions of the JCC delineated in the Record of Discussions (R/D) of the Project are: (i) to discuss and decide overall strategies

Annex 4: Evaluation Grid (2) Implementation Process of the Project (page5/6)

Item	Source/ Methods	Results (as of Nov.13, 2007)
process	PO, PDM, questionnaire & interview with C/P, J/E	<p>August 2007. At present, the JCC is composed of Chairman (the Secretary of SEDE) and Members (representative of ABC, Project Managers, Representative of SETEC, SEMA, EMBARAPA, RURAP, SENAI, SEBRAE, IBAMA, IPAM, Japanese Experts, and representative of JICA Brazil, as delineated by the R/D. As Observers, representatives from other State and Federal agencies, including INCRA, MME, Electronorte (Electricity Company), etc. have participated in some of the meetings. It would be useful if the minutes of the meetings were prepared in more simplified manner: the agenda, agreements and disagreements, actions to be taken and their schedule and responsible parties should be clearly delineated under separate headings.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <u>Project Management Committee:</u> In addition to the Joint Coordination Committee, the Project Management Committee, consisting of 7 members i.e. the Project Director (P/D) from SEDE, the Project Managers (P/M) from IEPA and SEICOM, the Local Coordinator from SEDE, two Japanese Experts (the Chief Advisor and the Project Coordinator), and a representative from JICA Brazil Office, was established in June 2007. According to the minutes of the said meeting, "[t]he decision power on the administration of the Project will be of the competency of this Management Committee". It should be noted that it is a function of the JCC to make decisions relevant to the overall management of the Project. The role of the Project Management Committee need to be further clarified. In addition, overall management of the Project is a responsibility of the P/D and managerial and technical matters of the Project is a responsibility of the P/Ms as per the R/D. Five meetings in total have been held so far; however, P/D and/or P/Ms were not able to attend the last few meetings due to other engagements.</li> <li>3. <u>Regular meetings:</u> The first meeting of the Project Management Committee, held in June 2007, decided that a weekly meeting, participated by the technical C/Ps from SEDE, RURAP, IEF, and SEICOM as well as the Japanese Experts be organized in order to plan the activities in future, etc. It decided to organize a bimonthly meeting, participated by representatives of Implementing Organizations, to promote information sharing.</li> <li>4. <u>Monitoring by JICA:</u> The Project has been closely monitored by JICA. The Project has submitted a semiannual progress report to JICA Headquarters and JICA Brazil Office (in Japanese). So far, three reports were submitted in May and December 2006 and August 2007. The second report was prepared by the Brazilian side in Portuguese and was translated into Japanese. In addition, the Chief Advisor/ J/E in Forest Management has submitted a monthly report to JICA Headquarters and JICA Brazil Office in time (in Japanese). JICA dispatched a Project Consultation Mission in May 2006, at the end of the preparatory stage of the Project, to assist preparation of a draft PDM and PO. In addition, the Project Monitoring Mission was sent in February 2007 to monitor overall progress of the Project. JICA Brazil Office has always participated in the meetings of JCC and Project Management Committee.</li> <li>5. <u>The PDM and the PO:</u> After six-month preparatory stage of the Project, a draft PDM and a draft PO was formulated through discussions among the C/Ps and the Japanese Experts within overall framework of the Master Plan delineated in the R/D. They were approved in the first meeting of the JCC in June 2006 (i.e. PDM ver1 and PO ver 1-1). Since then, the PO was modified, taking into account the changes occurred during the course of implementation (PO ver 1-2). It was approved by the third meeting of JCC held in August 2007. The Project has been implemented and monitored based on the PO. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the PDM and the PO of the Project, three language versions (English, Portuguese, and Japanese) exist. There are discrepancies among their text. Some are editorial but others are more significant.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

in the management and coordination of the Project; (ii) to review and endorse the annual plan of the Project; (iii) monitor and evaluate the progress of the Project; and (iv) make decisions relevant to the overall management of the Project.

Annex 4: Evaluation Grid (2) Implementation Process of the Project (page6/6)

Item	Source/Methods	Results (as of Nov.13, 2007)
		<p>While the Brazilian side uses the Portuguese version, the Japanese side uses Japanese version.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition, most of the Objectively Verifiable Indicators for the Outputs and the Project Purpose of the PDM (ver.1) are not well defined. Some of them lack objectively verifiable targets. Description of some of the Activities is found to be vague.</li> <li>• Moreover, as for the PO (ver. 1-2), necessary information such as "expected outcome(s)", "implementers", "(required) inputs", etc. is not specified for each sub-Activity. While detailed start and end dates for each of the sub-activities for the whole Project Period are specified (which seems to have given undue pressures to some of the C/Ps), the schedule is not shown in the form of bar charts that would have facilitated the concerned personnel to understand the planned schedule and the progress of the activities at a glance.</li> <li>• In the monitoring process, these issues have not been addressed. This has made it difficult for all those concerned to have common understanding of the overall implementation process and progress of the Project based on the PO as well as expected achievement level of the Outputs and the Project Purpose of the PDM. (For the purpose of the mid-term evaluation, the PDM for evaluation (Annex 1) was prepared through a series of consultations with the C/Ps and the Japanese Experts as a basis for the evaluation)</li> </ul>
(3) Communication	Review of project reports, questionnaires & interview with C/P, J/E	<p>Within each technical field (i.e. forest management, agroforestry, and wood processing), communication between the Japanese Expert team and their Brazilian technical C/Ps as well as among the Brazilian technical C/Ps is generally sufficient for day-to-day implementation of the Project. Communication across the technical fields needs improvement. It is hopeful that a bi-monthly C/P meeting would facilitate the matter.</p>
3.Coordination with relevant organizations	-ditto-	<p>-The Project has coordinated with INCRA in renewal of a "contract of concession of use of real right" with Astex-ma in Maraca. It also coordinates with GRPU in giving "authorization of use" to association members (and other concerned community people) in Mazagao Velho.</p> <p>-The Furniture Association (SINDIMOVEIS) collaborates with the Project in identifying training needs and recruiting trainees. It also pays cost of accident insurance for the trainees</p>
4. Other factors that have affected the implementation process	-ditto-	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Other facilitating factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Acceptance of the Project activities by the local communities in Maraca and Mazagao Velho.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Other hampering factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recess of the activities of during the election period (September-October 2006).</li> <li>- Technical C/Ps overloaded because of the assignment of the Project activities on top of their routine and other engagement.</li> <li>- Delay of release of local budget in the beginning of Brazilian fiscal year (January -March).</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

Abbreviation: C/P-counterpart personnel J/E-Japanese expert

## 1. RELEVANCE:

Item	Source/methods	Evaluation (as of November 13, 2007 unless otherwise mentioned)
<b>1.1 Necessity</b>		
(1) Relevance with the needs of Brazil	Review of the relevant document	<p>The Overall Goal ("The livelihood of riverbank dweller living in the Project Area will be improved through sustainable use of forest resources on the estuary tidal floodplains in Amapa") is relevant with the needs of Brazil.</p> <p>➤ The tidal flood plain that spreads through the Amazon River hydrographic basin is a region blessed with abundant forest resources and an inestimable ecosystem. Lately, however, it has been undergoing a severe degradation of its forest resources due to the pressures produced by woodcutting. Although Amazon River's downstream has not yet suffered from a large-scale deforestation process, tidal flood plain dwellers (riverbank dwellers) depend on the harvesting of timber and other forest products for the most part of their livelihood.</p>
(2) Relevance with the needs of the target groups	Review of the relevant document questionnaire and/or interview with C/P, and target groups	<p>The Project purpose ("The way of utilizing forest resources for improving the livelihood of riverbank dwellers will be improved in the Project Area on the estuary tidal floodplains") is relevant with the needs of the target groups.</p> <p>➤ Macapa city, the capital city of the State of Amapa, is the main destination of the timber harvested by the river bank dwellers and possesses a significant potentiality to become the local furniture manufacturing center for the indigenous product. Nevertheless, it is not only the case that timber is not efficiently utilized there, but also that the technology employed in its processing as well as the furniture manufacturing technology used is low, making the local production is uncompetitive when compared to that of other states. As a result, a vicious circle is established where the river bank dwellers are forced to sell their production at extremely low prices and consequently are taken to reproduce their unplanned timber in order to simply maintain their livelihood.</p> <p>➤ If such an inadequate use of timber and forestry management derived from the unplanned harvesting conducted by the dwellers goes on, it is expected that Amapa's inestimable tidal floodplain forest resources will suffer an acute decline in the near future and bring extreme consequences for the dwellers themselves. Yet, neither a well-rounded law nor a political agenda are provided by Amapa's government which is intended to cope with the problem and establish and adequate forest management of the tidal floodplain and its resources.</p>
<b>1.2 Priority</b>		
(1) Relevance with development policies of Brazil	Review of national development plan	<p>The Overall Goal is considered to be relevant with the national development plan of Brazil.</p> <p>➤ According to the "Major Objective II – Regional and Environmental Economic Dimension" in Long-Year Developing Strategy 2004-2007 by the Government of Brazil, "[t]he preservation and the sustainable use of natural resources, particularly of our forests", go through the strengthening of environmental organizations of the public sector and through the immediate application of laws and control mechanisms and regulation of economic activities" and "[i]t is fundamental to stimulate the implementation of intensive projects in the use of Brazilian biodiversity directed to the economical and social development of several Brazilian regions, constituting an important source of employment and income for a significant part of the population" are described.</p>
(2) Relevance with ODA policies of Japan	Review of ODA policy documents	<p>The Overall Goal and the Project Purpose are still consistent with ODA policies of Japan.</p> <p>➤ According to the "Official Development Assistance Charter", published by the Government of Japan, "consideration to global warming and environmental problems," is one of the four priority issues.</p> <p>➤ According to the Japan's Medium-Term Policy of Official Development Assistance (ODA), 2005, the Government of Japan has been setting the environmental sector as one of the most important sector of international</p>

Item	Source/ methods	Evaluation (as of November 13, 2007 unless otherwise mentioned)
		<p>cooperation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ According to the latest "JICA Country Programme of Brazil" (September 2006), environment conservation, including promotion of sustainable utilization of natural resources by local people, is identified as one of the important development issues.</li> <li>➤ JICA also has been positioning the "sustainable use of natural resources" as one of three important perspectives in the Sector Guideline of Forestry and Nature Conservation. The Project contains the component of livelihood improvement of the riverbank dwellers utilizing the natural resources such as timber and agroforestry products, which meet its Sector Guideline.</li> </ul>
1.3 Adequacy as means		
(1) Technological Advantage of Japan	Questionnaire and/or interview with C/P	Judging from the C/P's assessment on Japanese Expert dispatched and increase of their technical capacity through the Project, there are technological advantages of Japan in the field of sustainable use of forest resources.

**2. EFFECTIVENESS :**

Items	Source/ methods	Evaluation (as of November 13, 2007 unless otherwise mentioned)
2.1 Achievement level of the Project Purpose & contribution of the Outputs	Review of Accomplishment Grid, (Annex 3) & project reports, questionnaire and/or interview with C/P, J/E	<p>Judging from the achievement level of the Outputs, achievement level of the Project Purpose is behind the schedule.</p> <p>Outputs 1, 2, and 3 directly contribute to the achievement of the Project Purpose. The contribution of Output 4 is also confirmed as creation and strengthening of the partnership between the riverbank dwellers and furniture makers is expected to contribute to securing a stable market for the legal timber produced from the Target Sites through Output 2.</p> <p>All of the Outputs, although their level of achievement is mostly behind the schedule, have contributed and/or are expected to contribute to the achievement of the Project Purpose. If the Outputs had been achieved as currently scheduled, the Project Purpose would be achieved by the end of the Project.</p> <p>Note: It was found difficult to assess the current level of achievement of the Project Purpose with the Indicators of PDM (ver 1.) because they were not clearly defined. For example, the Indicator 1.1 started with "[l]legal logging will increase . . ." without clearly defining "what" of legal logging is a target. It could mean "absolute volume of the legal timber", "ratio of the volume of legal timber to the total volume of the timber", "persons who engage in the legal logging", etc. The numerical target (X m3, etc.) was not specified, either. Prior to the start of the evaluation, PDME had been prepared through consultation with the J/Es and the Brazilian C/Ps prior to the start of the evaluation in order to have common understanding on what the description of the Indicators meant; however, specification of the numerical targets had been held back because due discussion among the Japanese Experts and the C/Ps had been found to be necessary for this.</p>
2.2 Important Assumptions	-ditto-	<p>The Important Assumption for the Project Purpose ("Non-occurrence of sudden alterations in regional economy that affect income of riverbank population") has been satisfied so far. It is not certain if it will continue to be satisfied until the Project end.</p> <p>Note: There is a need to re-examine if the present assumption is relevant.</p>

**3. EFFICIENCY:**

Items	Source/ Methods	Evaluation (as of November 13, 2007 unless otherwise mentioned)
3.1 Achievement level of the Outputs	Review of Accomplishment grid (Annex 3), project reports, questionnaire & interview	<p>Overall: The achievement of most of the Outputs is behind the schedule. (See Annex3 for details).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <u>Output 1</u>: The Output has been partly achieved but the achievement level is</li> </ul>



Items	Source/Methods	Evaluation (as of November 13, 2007 unless otherwise mentioned)
	with C/P & J/E	<p>behind the schedule. Basic guidelines, which should have been prepared by January 2007 according to the latest schedule, have not been prepared yet. IEF was formed in April 2007 as an agency responsible for executing the policy of sustainable use of flooded forest resources within the State of Amapa but its official statute has not been approved by the State Governor yet. As currently envisaged, the guidelines would be prepared by July 2008 and IEF would be officially established and would start to assume full-fledged function within the year 2008. It is expected that the Output would be achieved by the end of the Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <u>Output 2:</u> The Output has been partly achieved but the achievement level is behind the schedule. Two forest management/agroforestry associations have been established in the Target Sites. At each Target Site, more than 35% of riverbank producers involved in forestry activities have become members of the association though forest management section per se has not been formed yet. Preparation of forest management plans for approval by SEMA has been delayed because of the delay of settlement of land use right issues in the Target Sites.</li> <li>➤ <u>Output 3:</u> The Output has been moderately achieved. At each Target Site, more than 35% of the families that belong to the association participate in the agroforestry activities through the Project (i.e. 100% in Maraca and 48% in Mazagao Velho). So far, agroforestry systems are implemented in approximately 60ha in the Target Sites. It is expected that Output 3 would be achieved by the end of the Project.</li> <li>➤ <u>Output 4:</u> The Output has been partly achieved but the achievement level is behind the schedule. Timber supply agreements with the furniture cooperative have not been prepared and signed due to delay of the activities under Output 3 (preparation of forest management plans) and Output 2 (transformation the associations into registered cooperatives). Subsequently, none of the furniture makers have used the legal timbers produced from the Target Sites based on the timber supply agreements. On condition that the foresaid activities of Output 2 and Output 3 be conducted without further delay, Output 4 is expected to be achieved by the end of the Project.</li> </ul>
3.2 Important Assumptions	Interview with C/P & J/E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The present important Assumption ("Non-occurrence of sudden alterations in regional economy that affect income of riverbank population"): It has been satisfied so far. It is still considered to be a relevant assumption.</li> <li>➤ The Assumption, which was not identified in the PDM. It was found settlement of legal usufruct right issues in the Target Sites to be the condition that is essential to achievement of Outputs (Output 2 &amp; 4) but is not able to be controlled by the Project.</li> </ul>
3.3 Appropriateness of the Inputs		
(1) Brazilian side		
(a) Land and facility	Review of Accomplishment grid (Annex 3), project reports, questionnaire & interview with C/P & J/E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <u>Timing:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A room on the ground floor of the building of SEDE in Macapa has been provided as an office space for the Project since the beginning of the Project.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ <u>Quantity:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project Office is used by both Japanese Expert team and Brazilian Coordinator team. The room of 25m<sup>2</sup> is packed with eight office desks, eight chairs, and other office equipment. In addition, a meeting room specifically for the Project is not provided. The meeting room of SEDE can be used for a meeting; however the previous booking is required so that it is not always available when needed. It cannot be booked more than four days in a row, either. As a result, some of the regular meetings and all of the informal and/or ad hoc meetings are held in the Project Office. At the peak time, without mentioning the number of desks and chairs, space itself is not enough. It would be more efficient if the larger office space was made available for the Project. For</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Items	Source/Methods	Evaluation (as of November 13, 2007 unless otherwise mentioned)
		<p>information, relocation of the Project Office to the premise of IEF is currently under discussion.</p> <p>➤ <u>Quality:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The broad-band internet connection has been made available. Though power failure occurs sometimes, it has hardly affected the implementation of the Project.</li> </ul>
(b) Assignment of counterpart personnel	-ditto-	<p>➤ <u>Timing &amp; duration:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the beginning, allocation of the technical C/Ps was delayed. In the case of the Expert in Agroforestry, who has been assigned since June 2006, his technical C/P was not assigned until September 2006; the Expert had to conduct a survey by himself. In addition, the State Governor does not have official authority to appoint officials of Federal Government as C/P of the Project. For example, two officials from SENAI, who have worked with J/E in Wood Processing, have not been officially assigned as C/P.</li> </ul> <p>➤ <u>Quantity:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All of the C/P engage in the Project on part-time basis. They are sometimes too busy with other work to focus on the Project activities. In particular, the Local Coordinator, who is Advisor to the Secretary of SEDE and the coordinator of the projects of the State Government of Amapa.</li> </ul> <p>➤ <u>Quality:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical C/P with the relevant background, experiences, and technical level has been assigned.</li> </ul>
(c) Running expenses for the implementation of the Project	-ditto-	<p>➤ <u>Timing:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the beginning of the Brazilian fiscal year, release of local budget is virtually recessed for nearly three months. During the period from January to March 2007, for example, per diem allowance related to a field trip to the Target Sites was not available to the C/Ps. (It was paid later). Lunch tabs were picked up by the Japanese Expert on condition that they would be reimbursed later. All of the fuel costs requested by the C/Ps were not paid; the Japanese side had to bare part of the cost from time to time. The second forest inventory in Maraca, scheduled to be conducted in February-March 2007, was canceled because of this problem. (The inventory was further delayed due to land issues as stated in Annex 4).</li> <li>For the next year, the Brazilian side confirmed that the budget for the activities in January 2008 was secured; however, it is not certain if the budget for the activities in February and March would be released.</li> </ul> <p>➤ <u>Quantity:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>So far, a total of R\$ 301,000 has been released for implementation of the Project by the State Government of Amapa. According to the questionnaires and interviews with the C/Ps, the amount available to them, in particular the expenses related to field trips, has not been sufficient. The Japanese Experts confirmed that it had been a case. As stated above, during the period of January-May 2006, the local budget was not released. In the other months of the year, the problem still remained. For instance, some of the planned field trips had to be canceled because the requested budget was not released.</li> <li>In principle, running expenses for the Project activities are borne by the Brazilian side as per the R/D; however, in day-to-day planning of the activities, it was necessary to discuss and clarify who should bear what and how much (or contribution percentage) frequently. In order to address the issue, the Project agreed to plan and examine the budget necessary for the activities quarterly since the fourth meeting of the Project Management Committee held in September 2007.</li> </ul>
<b>(2) Japanese side</b>		
(a) Japanese expert	Review of Accomplishment grid (Annex 3), project reports, questionnaire & interview with C/P &	<p>➤ <u>Timing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All of the Experts were sent in accordance with the original plan without delay.</li> </ul> <p>➤ <u>Quantity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Duration of the assignment of the Experts in Wood Processing/Project</li> </ul>

Items	Source/Methods	Evaluation (as of November 13, 2007 unless otherwise mentioned)
	J/E	<p>Coordinator and Agroforestry is considered appropriate. In the case of the Chief Advisor/Expert in Forest Management, however the duration is not sufficient. Due to administrative reasons, he had to be absent in September-November 2006 and March-April 2007 (i.e. 6 months in total). This resulted in increase in the workload of the Project Coordinator during his absence and delay of the activities related to his technical fields.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of the Experts is found to be rather inappropriate. The Chief Advisor, who also serves as the Expert in Forest Management, goes out of the office for field activities to the Target Sites often (almost every day when forest inventory is implemented). Once he goes to a field by boat, he cannot come back until the next day at the earliest since the Project prohibits the concerned personnel from a boat trip in the afternoon for the safety reason. This has affected his performance as the Chief Advisor. It has increased the workload of the Project Coordinator, too. It would be more efficient if one person were assigned for the post of the Chief Advisor and another person for the post of the Expert in Forest Management.</li> </ul> <p>➤ <u>Quality:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Experts with adequate technical background, experiences, and skills have been dispatched.</li> </ul>
(b) Provision of equipment	-ditto-	<p>➤ <u>Timing:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In general, the equipment has been procured and delivered as planned. A photocopier, however, was not delivered until February 2006 due to delay of the administrative procedures of JICA.</li> </ul> <p>➤ <u>Quantity:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantity of the equipment is considered sufficient for implementation of the Project.</li> </ul> <p>➤ <u>Quality:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The items, specifications and the quality of the provided equipment are moderately appropriate.</li> <li>• All of the seat back rests of the small-size boats (two in total), procured in Macapa, have started to fell off within 6 months after delivery. As for the small-size boats, negotiation with the maker for in-warranty repair is underway. In addition, water used to come into one of the large-size boats, procured in Sao Paulo due to a problem in its structure. It was repaired on November 10, 2007.</li> <li>• One of the provided vehicles is a second-handed, which was made in 2000. Due to aged deterioration, a part of its interior coverings fell off in April 2007. In addition, its anti-locked brake system has a problem. The Project has requested three companies to send quotations for the repair.</li> <li>• A laser printer-photocopier goes wrong often: its print becomes light soon. Though regular maintenance is conducted by a local company, the problem repeats.</li> </ul> <p>➤ <u>Operation &amp; Maintenance (O&amp;M):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since most of the equipment was procured locally, spare parts and consumables are readily available in Brazil. O&amp;M manuals in Portuguese were provided by the makers.</li> <li>• As the equipment is planned to be handed over to the Brazilian side at the end of the Project, its maintenance is a responsibility of the Japanese side in principle at the moment.</li> </ul> <p>➤ <u>Utilization:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All of the equipment is essential for the Project activities and is utilized fully.</li> <li>• From time to time, the equipment provided for the Project has been utilized for other purposes. The first meeting of the Project Management Committee agreed that "the equipment and materials acquired by the Project will be used exclusively for the activities of the</li> </ul>

Items	Source/Methods	Evaluation (as of November 13, 2007 unless otherwise mentioned)
		<p>Project. In case of extreme necessity, however, it is to present a CAUTELA<sup>1</sup> to the Chief Advisor, who will decide on the request. It will be analyzed the contents of the form of CAUCAO<sup>2</sup> whether this document is suitable and sufficient. As for the utilization of equipment, JICA's rule of utilization will be observed"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four items of the equipment necessary for the training in wood processing (i.e. Plate Joiner, Grinder, Sliding Mitter Saw, and Table Saw) have been installed at the premise of a NGO named Casa de Hospitalidade II in Macapa City because the Brazilian side had not been able to provide adequate training space in the beginning of the Project. In November 2006, the Furniture Association of Amapa, the State Government of Amapa (including SEDE and SEICOM), SENAI, SEBRAE, and Municipal Government of Santana established CADIMA in Santana City. Equipment for training has been procured and installed by the State Government of Amapa. As the Brazilian side and the Furniture Association plan to conduct the subsequent Project training at CADIMA, continuous utilization of the equipment currently located at Casa de Hospitalidade II in future is uncertain.</li> </ul>
(c) Training in Japan	-ditto-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ Timing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training was implemented according to the plan without delay.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➢ Quantity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Duration of the training period is sufficient for the trainees to absorb</li> </ul> </li> <li>➢ Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field, subjects and contents were relevant with the needs of the trainees.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➢ Utilization: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The trainees have utilized what they have learned in the Activities of the Project.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
(d) Japanese local activity budget	-ditto-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ Timing &amp; quantity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Necessary amount has been disbursed without delay.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>3.4 Preconditions</b>	-ditto-	
<b>3.5 Coordination with other relevant Japanese and international projects/schemes</b>	Review of progress reports, questionnaire and/or interview with J/E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ There has been no specific coordination with other Japanese and international schemes/projects.</li> <li>➢ The Third Country Training Program of JICA: The Project had a plan to dispatch two C/Ps in the field of Agroforestry to the "Second International Course of Capacity Building in Agroforestry Technology" held under the Third Country Training Program of JICA in Beien, Brazil. It was not realized, however, due to budgetary reason as well as miscommunication between Brazilian and Japanese sides.</li> </ul>
<b>3.6 Other promoting /hampering factors</b>	Questionnaire and/or interview with C/P, J/E	As already stated, the delay of settlement of land use right issues, which cannot be controlled by the Project, have adversely affected the progress of the some of the Activities and achievement level of some of the Outputs. Through collaboration with the relevant land authorities (i.e. INCRA and GRPU), the issues have been mostly solved and the concerned activities have already started in Maraca and are likely to be implemented as planned in Mazagao Velho.

#### 4. IMPACT:

Items	Source/Methods	Evaluation (as of November 13, 2007 unless otherwise mentioned)
<b>4.1 Impact at the Overall Goal level</b>		

<sup>1</sup> CAUTELA is usually a document, in which the person who borrows something promises that the borrowed object will be returned, but CAUTELA here is used in the meaning of a request form for borrowing something.

<sup>2</sup> CAUCAO is usually an amount of money paid in guarantee when borrowing something (which will be returned upon the devolution of the borrowed object), but here CAUCAO is used in the meaning of a written commitment stating that the borrowed object will be returned as well as the penalties in case of its loss or damage).

(1) Likelihood of achievement	Questionnaire and/or interview with C/P, J/E	It was found too early to assess the likelihood of the achievement of the Overall Goal at this stage.
(2) Important Assumption	-ditto-	The Assumptions ("Lack of occurrence of major institutional reforms in the State Government" and "No sudden increase in number of new migrants to the Project Area") have been met so far. It is uncertain if they would be satisfied in future.
4.2 Other impacts	Questionnaire & interview with C/P, J/E, target beneficiaries	<p>➤ Some positive impacts have been already observed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The presence of the Project has promoted the process of settlement of land use right issues in the Target Sites because the concerned land authorities (i.e. INCRA and GRPU) have placed priorities in solving the problems in response to the requests made by those concerned with the Project. In Maraca, renewal of a "contract of concession of use of real right" between Astex-ma and INCRA had been accelerated: the contract was renewed in October 2007. For Mazagao Velho, GRPU has lately decided to give "terms of authorization of use" to the association members and other concerned community people based on the Ministerial Ordinance No. 284 of October 14, 2005. It is the first case to apply the said ordinance in the State of Amapa.</li> <li>2. The Project has increased the level of awareness of riverbank dwellers on the use of natural resources</li> <li>3. One woman, who is an association member of Maraca, participates in the process of preparation and implementation of forest management plan under the Project. She is the first woman who has ever participated in the process in the State of Amapa.</li> <li>4. The C/Ps in the field of Wood Processing, who are instructors of SENAI, have utilized the techniques acquired through the Project in planning and implementing the training courses organized by SENAI and other institutions.</li> </ol> <p>➤ Negative impacts have not been observed, so far.</p>

**5. SUSTAINABILITY:**

Items	Source/Methods	Evaluation (as of November 13, 2007 unless otherwise mentioned)
<b>5.1 Institutional &amp; Organizational Aspects</b>		
(1) Policy and legal supports	Review of the relevant document, questionnaire to C/P	As mentioned in the Relevance, sustainable use of forest resources of flooded forest has policy and legal supports that are likely to continue in future.
(2) Management capacity of the relevant activities	Questionnaire and/or interview with C/P & J/E	On the whole, the implementing organizations have managed the relevant activities without serious problems so far.
(3) Deployment of C/P	-ditto-	The current technical C/Ps in the fields of Forest Management, Agroforestry (including those involved in rural organization), and Wood Processing seem to commit to their work. Most of them are permanent employees of the State Government or the Federal Government so that their employment is ensured. Unless they get transferred to a completely different department, it is likely that they would continue to engage in the Project until the end of the Project. The same holds true of their deployment in the post-project period.
(4) Coordination with other relevant organizations	-ditto-	The Project has coordinated its activities with national and local organizations. It is expected that the collaborative relationship with the relevant organizations would be sustained in future.
<b>5.2 Financial Aspects</b>	-ditto-	So far, a total of R\$ 301,000 has been released by the State Government of Amapa. According to the questionnaires and interviews with the technical C/Ps, the amount available to them, in particular the expenses related to field trips, has not been sufficient. This was confirmed by the Japanese Experts. In order to secure financial sustainability, efficient utilization of the released budget would be required.
<b>5.3 Technological Aspects</b>		
(1) Technical	Questionnaire and/or	Technical capacity of the C/Ps has been enhanced steadily. It is expected

Items	Source/Methods	Evaluation (as of November 13, 2007 unless otherwise mentioned)
capacity of C/P	interview with C/P, J/E, target beneficiaries	that, by the end of the Project, the C/Ps will be able to acquire skills, knowledge, and techniques to plan and implement the relevant activities by themselves.
(2) Utilization and dissemination of the transferred techniques and the project deliverables	Questionnaire and/or interview with C/P, J/E, target beneficiaries	it is considered possible that IEF, RURAP, and SENAI will utilize and disseminate the transferred technologies appropriately after the end of the Project as part of their normal work. It is considered that the technologies being transferred are locally adaptable and relevant with the local needs. It would be helpful, however, to develop technical manuals for the practitioners as well as materials for extension and training as appropriate.
(3) Utilization of the provided machinery and equipment	Questionnaire and/or interview with C/P & J/E	Machinery and equipment provided by the Project has been utilized fully. As most of the machineries provided are general items such as vehicles and computers, a grinder mill, a table saw, etc., the technical capacity to utilize the machinery and equipment after the completion of the Project is likely to be ensured for the most part. As for maintenance, since most of the equipment is locally procured, spare parts and consumables are available in Brazil.

**Annex 6 A Draft of Modified PDM (PDM ver 2) (page 1/2)**

Name of Project: Sustainable Use of Forest Resources of Flooded Forest in Estuary in the State of Amapá  
 Period of Cooperation: 3.5 years (November 2, 2005 to May 1, 2009)

Implementing Agency of Beneficiary Country: SEDE, IEPA, SEICOM, IEF, RURAP, SETEC, EMBRAPA, SEBRAE, SENAI, IBAMA Collaborating Agencies: IBAMA, EMBRAPA, INCRA, GRPU

Project Area: Flooded forest region of Mazagão Velho and adjacent areas in Municipality of Magazão in State of Amapá Target Group: Riverbank population of flooded forest region

**Narrative Summary**

Overall Goal	Narrative Summary	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p>The livelihood of river dwellers living in the Project Area will be improved through sustainable use of forest resources on the estuary tidal floodplains in Amapá</p>	<p>1.- The rate of forest area reduction in floodplains in the Project Area of the State of Amapá will be decreased by XX %                      2. In the Project Area, production volume of the agroforestry products (*1) either introduced or the relevant techniques of which enhanced by the Project support, will increase by XX tons compared to the time of the termination of the Project.</p>	<p>1. Survey conducted by IEF                      2. Survey conducted by RURAP                      3. Survey conducted by SEICOM</p>	<p>-Lack of occurrence of major institutional reforms in the State Government                      -No sudden increase in number of new migrants to Project Area</p>
<p><b>Project Purpose</b>                      The way of utilizing forest resources for improving the livelihood of river dwellers will be improved in the Project Area on the estuary tidal floodplains.</p>	<p>At the conclusion of the Project, in comparison with the beginning of the same:                      1. Volume of timber legally extracted from the Target Sites (i.e. Maraca and Mazagão Velho) according to the licensed forest management plans will come to X m<sup>3</sup>, which correspond to X % of the total volume of timber extracted from the Target Sites.                      2. Volume of the agroforestry products from the Target Sites, either introduced or the relevant techniques of which improved by the Project support, will increase to X tons                      3. Volume of the legal timber produced from the Target Sites, which are standardized and sold to manufacture furniture, will increase to X m<sup>3</sup>; which correspond to X% of the total volume of legal timber extracted from the Target Sites.</p>	<p>1.1 Review of basic guidelines prepared                      1.2 Review of project reports</p>	<p>Non-occurrence of sudden alterations in regional economy that affect income of riverbank population</p>
<p><b>Outputs</b>                      1. A technical framework for sustainable use of flooded forest resources within the project area will be established within the State Government of Amapá.                      2. Sustainable management of the forest will be conducted by the riverbank dwellers</p>	<p>1.1 Basic guidelines for sustainable use of forest resources in flooded forests (include implementation framework, regular discussion with riverbank dwellers, records related to guideline monitoring methodology, etc) will be established by XX (when)                      1.2. An agency responsible for dealing sustainable use of flooded forest resources will be established within the State Government of Amapá</p>	<p>2.1-2.3. Survey conducted by IEF</p>	
<p>3. Agroforestry systems will be established by the riverbank dwellers</p>	<p>2.1 A forestry and agroforestry association will be established at each Target Site                      2.2 At each Target Site, over 35% of riverbank producers involved in forestry activities will become members of forest management section of the association by the end of the Project                      2.3 A forest management plan, prepared by the respective association, will be approved by SEMA by XX (two forest management plans in total)                      2.4 By the end of the Project, the approved forest management plans will be executed in a total of 300 ha in the Target Sites by the members of the forest management sections of the associations                      3.1 At each Target Site, over 35% of the association members will become members of its agroforestry section by the end of the Project.                      3.2 By the end of the Project, agroforestry systems will be implemented in a total of 60 ha in the Target Sites by the members of the agroforestry section of the associations                      3.3 The associations will be transformed into registered cooperative by XX (when)</p>	<p>3.1 &amp; 3.2 Information from RURAP</p>	
<p>4. Partnership between the riverbank dwellers and furniture makers will be created and strengthened</p>	<p>4.1 A timber supply agreement between each of the associations and the furniture cooperation in Amapá (i.e. UNIMOVES) will be signed by XX (when) (two agreements in total)                      4.2 By the end of the Project, at least 60 furniture makers in municipalities of Amapá (i.e. Macapá and Santana) will be using timbers taken from the Target Sites legally by the associations in accordance with the timber supply agreements</p>	<p>4.1 Survey conducted by SEICOM</p>	

~~Struck through~~ = the words deleted from the sentences of PDME. Underlined = the words added to the sentences of PDME

Activities	Inputs	* Non-occurrence of serious natural disasters and climatic alterations in the Project Area  *Final settlement of land use right issues will not be further delayed in the Target Sites.  <b>Pre-Conditions</b>
<p>[6-month project preparatory period]                      0-1. Study current situation (natural conditions, social conditions, etc) of target areas tentatively selected.                      0-2. Obtain and organize current policy measures of the State Government of Amapá regarding flooded forests.                      0-3. Research current market and distribution situation for agricultural products produced in flooded forests/floodplains.                      0-4. Conduct market research for furniture in internal market.                      0-5. Based on research results, perform a review of the (proposed) PDM and (proposed) Plan of Operations and establish a concrete indicator.</p> <p>[Period of project execution]                      1-1. Prepare Basic Guidelines for sustainable use of flooded forest resources, taking the opinions of the riverbank dwellers into consideration.                      1-2. Government of the State of Amapá will widely disseminate the prepared basic guidelines through a guidebook.                      1-3. Establish an agency responsible for overseeing sustainable use of flooded forest resources within the State Government of Amapá.                      1-4. Hold periodic meetings with institutions involved and riverbank dwellers on sustainable use of the flooded forest.</p> <p>2-1. Establish a forest management/ agroforestry association at each Target Site, whose activities include agroforestry systems of riverbank dwellers.                      2-2. Conduct monitoring and give training courses to the relevant members to enhance administrative capacity of the associations                      2-3. Assist each association in preparing its forest management plan and requesting licensing of its forest management plan from IBAMA or SEMA.                      2-4. Assist members of forest management section of each association in execution of its forest management plan</p> <p>3-1. Assist agroforestry section of each association in organizing meetings to prepare an implementation plan for the agroforestry systems adapted to the local conditions                      3-2. Assist riverbank dwellers (i.e. members of association) in implementing the agroforestry systems according to the prepared plans.                      3-3. Assist transformation of the associations into <u>registered cooperatives</u>.                      3-<del>3-4</del>. Assist <del>members of</del> agroforestry section of each <del>association</del> <u>cooperative</u> in organizing collection and shipping of the agroforestry products and in promoting favorable sales conditions.</p> <p>4-1. Hold periodic meetings between the forest management/ agroforestry associations/<u>cooperatives</u> and Furniture Sector to exchange ideas/opinions to establish and strengthen partnership                      4-2. Assist <del>members of</del> each forest management/agroforestry <del>association</del> <u>cooperative</u> in signing and executing a legal timber supply agreement with the furniture cooperative in Amapá.                      4-3. Enhance entrepreneurial capacity of furniture sector for sustainable development to strengthen partnership with the <del>associations</del> <u>forest management/ agroforestry cooperatives</u> and to secure the <u>stable market for the legal timber</u></p>	<p>&lt;Japanese side&gt;                      (1) Long-term expert (2) Chief Advisor and forestry policy/ management techniques, and wood processing / project coordinator.                      (2) Short-term expert (including local human resources) Agroforestry, marketing, environmental education, rural society study, etc.                      (3) Equipment and machinery Vehicle, boat for transportation, wood processing equipment, office equipment, etc                      (4) Training in Japan Forest policy / management techniques, wood processing, etc., from 2 to 3 people /year, according to need.                      (5) Expenses for local activities</p> <p>&lt;Brazilian side &gt;                      (1) Counterpart personnel Project Director, Project Manager, employees of involved state institutions, etc                      (2) Land and facilities Office for the Project, experimental station, etc.                      (3) Others Payment of local costs, etc</p>	<p>* Non-occurrence of serious natural disasters and climatic alterations in the Project Area                       *Final settlement of land use right issues will not be further delayed in the Target Sites.   <b>Pre-Conditions</b></p>
<p>By agroforestry products the understanding herein is <u>timber</u>, non-timber and agriculture products</p>		

\*1 By agroforestry products the understanding herein is timber, non-timber and agriculture products

~~Entwicklungs~~ = the words deleted from the sentences of PDM. Underlined = the words added to the sentences of PDM.



Annex 7 A sample format of simplified PO

#	Activities (as per PO ver1-2 except for underlined Activities, which is modified in accordance with PDM/e) *Note: There are discrepancy of the text of some of the Sub-activities of PO among different language versions. Due to time constraint, the discrepancies could not be corrected during the period of Mid-term Evaluation. The discrepancies must be corrected through consultations of the concerned parties as soon as possible)	Expected Results	Schedule (based on planned date shown in the left column)												Implementors	Other major inputs		Remarks
			CY2006		CY2007		CY2008		CY2009		Responsible Persons as per PO ver1-2	Japanese side	Brazilian side	Progress				
			JFY05	JFY2006	JFY2007	JFY2008	JFY2009	09										
			Nov-Jan	Feb-Apr	May-Jul	Aug-Oct	Nov-Jan	Feb-Apr	May-Jul	Aug-Oct	Nov-Jan	Feb-Apr	May-Jul	Aug-Oct				
0	<u>Output</u> Preparatory Phase																	
0-1	Study the present situation of the tentative target area (natural conditions, social conditions, etc).		↕	↕														
	a) Clarify and agree upon the criteria for selecting target area.		↕	↕														
	b) Identify at least 2 potential target areas including Mazagaon Velho.		↕	↕														
	c) Conduct socio-economic survey and vegetation survey to obtain basic information on the potential target areas.		↕	↕														
	f) Select the project target area.		↕	↕														
0-2	<u>Complete information on the State of Amapa Government's policy towards the estuary tidal floodplain.</u>		↕	↕														
	a) Compile the laws, decrees and policy of the State regarding the environment.		↕	↕														
	b) Identify administrative organs related to the estuary tidal floodplain.		↕	↕														
	c) Identify the problems related to the estuary tidal floodplain.		↕	↕														
0-3	<u>Survey market and distribution conditions related to the products originating from the estuary tidal floodplain.</u>		↕	↕														
	a) Survey the intrastate market of agricultural products in Amapa (demand, variety, price, potentiality).		↕	↕														
	b) Survey the distribution amount as well as route followed by the State's agricultural products exportation.		↕	↕														
	c) Survey the volume and variety of the agricultural production in the project's target area.		↕	↕														
	d) Identify agricultural products that might be sustainably produced in the estuary tidal floodplain and that might be high marketability.		↕	↕														
0-4	<u>Make a survey on the furniture market in Brazil.</u>		↕	↕														
	a) Survey the current situation of the furniture market in the State (production volume, favorite trees, design, price range, etc.)		↕	↕														

Progress: A=completed as planned, A2=completed but delayed, B=ongoing as planned, B2=ongoing but delayed, C1=not started yet (as planned), C2=not started yet (delayed)

Annex 7 A sample format of simplified PO

#	Activities (as per PO ver1-2 except for underlined Activities, which is modified in accordance with PDMe) *Note: There are discrepancy of the text of some of the Sub-activities of PO among different language versions. Due to time constraint, the discrepancies could not be corrected during the period of Mid-term Evaluation. The discrepancies must be corrected through consultations of the concerned parties as soon as possible	Schedule (based on planned date shown in the left column)												Implementors	Responsible Persons as per PO ver1-2	Other major inputs	Remarks	
		CY2006			CY2007			CY2008			CY2009							
		JFY05	JFY2006	JFY2007	JFY2008	JFY2009	09											
		Nov-Dec Jan-Mar Apr-Jun Jul-Sep Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar Apr-Jun Jul-Sep Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar Apr-Jun Jul-Sep Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar Apr-Jun Jul-Sep Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar Apr-Jun Jul-Sep Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar Apr-Jun Jul-Sep Oct-Dec											
b)	Survey the current situation of the furniture market in other Brazilian States (production volume, favorite woods, design, price range, etc.)														SEICOM			
c)	Survey the marketability of furniture made of timber which are produced in the estuary tidal floodplain.														SEICOM			
d)	Survey the most appropriated local timbers to be used in furniture manufacturing and of its quantitative manufacturing potentiality.														SEICOM IEPA EMBRAPA IPAM			
e)	Determine potential market(s) and product design that will be promoted through the Project activities.														SEICOM			
f)	Survey on the furniture makers (technical level, maker's population, income, management structure, etc.)														SEICOM			
0-5	Establish a concrete PDM and PO based on the result of the surveys.														SEDE Ali C/P institutions			
Output 1 A technical framework for sustainable use of flooded forest resources within the project area will be established within the State Government of Amapá.															Arandy (SEDE)			
1-1	Prepare Basic Guidelines for sustainable use of flooded forest resources, taking the opinions of the riverbank dwellers into consideration.														Ronaldo (RURAP)			
e)	Set up a commission formed by representatives of the State and Federal governments, NGOs, Municipal Government of Mazagão and a representative of the riverbank community to prepare the Basic Guidelines.														Arandy (SEDE)			
b)	Commission will hold seminars in riverbank communities														Alan (SEDE)			
c)	Commission will prepare basic guidelines based on discussions at seminars, quarterly meetings, committee of the Floodplain Management Committee.														Ronaldo (RURAP)			
1-2	Government of the State of Amapá will widely disseminate the prepared basic guidelines through a guidebook.														Arandy (SEDE)			
1-3	Establish an agency responsible for overseeing sustainable use of flooded forest resources within the State Government of Amapá.														Cunha (IEP)			
a)	Establish an agency responsible for overseeing sustainable use of flooded forest resources within the State Government of Amapá.														Arandy (SEDE)			
b)	Form a local project execution staff made up of 4 individuals (1 coordinator and 3 technicians) to provide technical support to project area.														Arandy (SEDE)			
1-4	Hold periodic meetings with institutions involved and riverbank dwellers on sustainable use of the flooded forest.														Arandy (SEDE)			

Progress: A=not completed at all; B=not completed but delayed; C=not started yet (as planned); D=not started yet (delayed).

Annex 7 A sample format of simplified PO

#	Activities (as per PO ver.1-2 except for underlined activities, which is modified in accordance with PDMe) *Note: There are discrepancy of the text of some of the Sub-activities of PO among different language versions. Due to time constraint, the discrepancies could not be corrected during the period of Mid-term Evaluation. The discrepancies must be corrected through consultations of the concerned parties as soon as possible)	Expected Results	Schedule (based on planned date shown in the left column)												Implementors	Other major inputs		Remarks	
			CY2005		CY2006		CY2007		CY2008		CY2009		Responsible Persons as per PO ver.1-2	Japanese side		Brazilian side	Progress		
			Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun							Jul-Sep
	a) Hold an annual meeting of the Aman Floodplain Management Committee in the Municipality of Mazagao.																		
	b) Hold meetings for exchanging ideas every quarter or whenever deemed necessary within the project area.																		
Output 2	<b>Project execution staff, in partnership with riverbank dwellers, will conduct sustainable management of the forest.</b>																		
2-1	<u>Establish a forestry and agroforestry association at each Target Site, whose activities include agroforestry systems of riverbank dwellers.</u>																		
	a) Project execution staff will conduct a seminar in riverbank communities on Associations.																		
	b) Formation of Agroforestry Association																		
	c) Establish the forest management section, production section, sawmill section and agroforestry section within the Association.																		
2-2	<u>Conduct monitoring and give training courses to the relevant members to enhance administrative capacity of the associations</u>																		
	a) Accomplishment of the training to enhance the administrative capacity of the Agroforestry Association through the RURAP.																		
	b) Accomplishment of the training to enhance the administrative capacity Agroforestry Association through the RURAP, in partnership with the external Consultants.																		
2-3	<u>Assist each association in preparing its forest management plan and requesting licensing of its forest management plan from IBAMA or SEMA.</u>																		
	a) To execute the first forest inventory.																		
	b) To execute the second forest inventory.																		
	c) Discuss logging with Furniture Complex to plan use of timber species and desired quantity.																		
	d) Obtain authorization of AUTEX (felling of trees license) by SEMA.																		
2-4	<u>Assist members of forest management section of each association in execution of its forest management plan.</u>																		
	a) To elaborate the project of qualification and content, based on the approved forest management plan.																		

Progress: A=completed as planned, AZ=completed by delay, E=going as planned, HZ=going but delayed, U=not started yet, D=not started yet, (delayed).

Annex 7 A sample format of simplified PO

#	Expected Results	Schedule (based on planned date shown in the left column)												Implementors	Responsible Persons as per PO ver-1.2	Other major inputs		Remarks
		CY2006			CY2007			JFY2008			CY2009					Japanese side	Brazilian side	
		Nov-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep					
	Activities (as per PO ver-1.2 except for underlined Activities, which is modified in accordance with PDMe) *Note: There are discrepancy of the text of some of the Sub-activities of PO among different language versions. Due to time constraint, the discrepancies could not be corrected during the period of Mid-term Evaluation. The discrepancies must be corrected through consultations of the concerned parties as soon as possible. a) To research on reduction of costs of the handling and transports of legs equipments. b) Establish equipment lease system by Association management. c) Association will provide support to members in partnership with project execution staff.																	
<b>Output 3</b>	<b>Establishment of agroforestry systems by riverbank dwellers in partnership with project execution staff.</b>																	
3-1	Assist agroforestry section of each association in organizing meetings to prepare an implementation plan for the agroforestry systems adapted to the local conditions																	
	a) Riverbank inhabitants will select components of agroforestry system, according to discussions.																	
	b) Riverbank inhabitants will prepare annual cropping plan with support from project execution staff.																	
	c) Sector will prepare Association operational plan addressing demands of members.																	
3-2	Assist riverbank dwellers (i.e. members of association) in implementing the agroforestry systems according to the prepared plans																	
	a) To execute training of the technique of the SAF and the products quality control, visits the region developed of the SAF, training on the ambient education, processing of the products, creation of domestic animals.																	
	b) Provide technical guidance to riverbank dwellers individually through periodic visits by project execution staff and technical consultant.																	
	c) Sector will provide technical guidance according to economic condition and will act as facilitating agent for access to lines of credit.																	
3-3	Assist members of agroforestry section of each association in organizing collection and shipping of the agroforestry products and in promoting favorable sales conditions																	
	a) Obtain Organic Certification for products from the Brazilian Institute of Organic Certification																	
	b) Sector will organize production and sales																	

Progress: A (completed as of 10/10/06), B (completed but delayed), C (not started), D (not started), E (not started), F (not started), G (not started), H (not started), I (not started), J (not started), K (not started), L (not started), M (not started), N (not started), O (not started), P (not started), Q (not started), R (not started), S (not started), T (not started), U (not started), V (not started), W (not started), X (not started), Y (not started), Z (not started).

Annex 7 A sample format of simplified PO

#	Activities (as per PO ver1-2 except for underlined activities, which is modified in accordance with PD/Me) *Note: There are discrepancy of the text of some of the Sub-activities of PO among different language versions. Due to time constraint, the discrepancies could not be corrected during the period of Mid-term Evaluation. The discrepancies must be corrected through consultations of the concerned parties as soon as possible)	Expected Results	Schedule (based on planned date shown in the left column)												Implementors	Other major inputs		Remarks
			CY2006			CY2007			CY2008			CY2009				Japanese side	Brazilian side	
			Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep				
4	<u>Create and strengthen partnership between riverbank dwellers and furniture makers</u>																	
4-1	<u>Hold periodic meetings between the associations and Furniture Sector to exchange ideas/opinions to establish and strengthen partnership</u>																	
	a) Every two months, hold an exchange meeting according to main topics selected by furniture sector and Association, organized by SEICOM																	
4-2	<u>Assist members of each forestry and agroforestry association in signing and executing a timber supply agreement with the furniture cooperation in Amagué</u>																	
	a) Furniture Complex will intermediate commercialization pursuant to results of meeting on standardization, quality and price																	
	b) Conduct discussions on standards, prices, quality and special timbers between Agroforestry Association and Furniture Sector																	
	c) Agroforestry Association will execute agreement with Furniture Complex																	
	d) Association will log the timber, saw, classify and deliver the product according to requests from Furniture Complex																	
4-3	<u>Enhance entrepreneurial capacity of furniture sector for sustainable development to strengthen partnership with the associations</u>																	
	a) Conduct training on timber enhancement technology																	
	b) Participate in trade fairs in large Brazilian cities.																	

... completed as planned ... A2-completed ... file ... as planned ... on page ... def ... ... started yet (as planned) ... not started yet (delayed)

**A-1 List of Project Staff**

**(1) Project Director**

Name	Academic Background	Title/Organization	F/P	Assignment Period	Remarks
1) Antônio Carlos da Silva Farias	Masters Degree	Secretary of SEDE, State Government of AMAPA	P	May 2007	

**(2) Project Manager**

Name	Academic Background	Title/Organization	F/P	Assignment Period	Remarks
1) Benedito Victor Rabelo	Specialist <sup>1</sup>	Director of IEPA, State Government of AMAPA	P	2006	
2) Sebastião Rosa Máximo	Specialist	Secretary of SEICOM, State Government of AMAPA	P	2007	

**(3)-a Present Technical Staff (Project Implementation Staff)**

Name	Academic Background	Title/Organization	F/P	Assignment Period	Responsible Output and/or Activity of PDM
1) Alandy Patricia do Socorro Cavalcante Simas	- Student of Doctoral Program in Sustainable Development in Humid Tropics - Masters degree in Sustainable Development: Environmental Management and Public Policies.	- Special Advisor for Economical Development - Project Coordinator of International Cooperation with Japan - JICA, SEDE	P	Aug/2005-up to now	Local Coordinator Output 1 Act 1.1a, 1.2, 1-4a&b
2) João Cunha	Undergraduate	President Director, IEF	P	Jan2006 to 2007	Act 1.3, 1-3b/2
3) Mario Roberto Marinho	Specialist in forest criminal expert	Manager of the Forest Extension Nucleus, IEF	P	Aug/2005 to 2007	Act 2.3&2.4
4) Marcos dos Santos Cortés	N/A	Forest Engineer, IEF	P	N/A	Act 2.3&2.4
5) Pablo de Castro Cantuária	N/A	Forest Engineer, IEF	P	N/A	Act2.3&2.4

<sup>1</sup> in Brazil we call 'specialist' those who undertook a graduate course -- of at least 360 hours -- which is neither masters nor doctoral -- it is less than masters. (Translator's Note)

Appendix A Record of Brazilian Inputs (page 2/4)

Name	Academic Background	Title/Organization	F/P	Assignment Period	Responsible Output and/or Activity of PDM
6) Marcelo Carim	Masters degree	Researcher, IEPA	P	Aug/2005 to 2007	Act 4.3a/5
7) Ronaldo Souza	Masters degree	Manager of the Technological Extension Nucleus, RURAP	P	Jan/2006 to 2007	Act 1.1 & 1.4 Output 2 Act 2.1, 2.2, 2.3d Output 3 Act 3.1-3.3 Act 4-3a/3
8) Walberval Ferreira	Technician <sup>2</sup>	Technician, RURAP	P	Jan/2007	PO2 e PO3
9) Antônio Coelho da Cruz	Technical course	Technician of rural extension of RURAP	P	May/2007	PO 2
10) Marco Parro	Technical course in agriculture & stock raising -- Student of undergraduate course in environmental management	Chief of Local Development Office, SDR (to which RURAP is connected)	P	May/2007	PO2
11) Jaito Alves Gomes	Undergraduate	Manager of Timber Furniture Section, SEICOM	P	Aug/2005	Output 4 Act 4.1&4-2, 4-3a/2 4
12) Ailson Picanço	Undergraduate	Technician, SENAI	P	Jan/2007	Act 2.4a/2
13) Nonato Poicanço	Undergraduate	Technician, SENAI	P	Jan/2007	Act 2.4a/2
14) Joseman Pereira	Undergraduate	Technician, SEBRAE	P	Jan/2007	Act 4.3
15) Aristóteles Viana Fernandes	Student of Doctoral program	Secretary, SETEC	P	Aug/2007	Act 2-4b

(3)-b Former Technical Staff

Name	Academic Background	Title/Organization	F/P	Assignment Period	Responsible Output and/or Activity of PDM
1) Sergio Torres	Undergraduate	SEICOM (he just occupied trusting function)	F	2006 a 2007	Administrative activities of the Project

<sup>2</sup> In Brazil we call 'technician' those who undertook a secondary level course in a specific field. (Translator's Note)



Name	Academic Background	Title/Organization	F/P	Assignment Period	Responsible Output and/or Activity of PDM
2) Nelma Pires	Undergraduate	SEBRAE (she was transferred within SEBRAE to other section)	P	2006 a 2007	PO4
3) Juarez Oliveira	Undergraduate	SEBRAE (he was just a consultant and the period of the contract expired)	P	2006 a 2007	PO4
4) Cleuson Alan Barbosa	Undergraduate	SEICOM (he just occupied trusting function)	F	Aug Oct/2007	Administrative activities of the Project
5) Raimundo Rocha	Specialist	SEAF (IEF) (function only)	P	Jan/2006 to Dec/2006	PO2

(4) Administrative Staff

Name	Academic Background	Title/Organization	F/P	Assignment Period	Responsible Output and/or Activity of PDM
1) Mauro Rocha Siqueira	Student of undergraduate course	Administrative Manager, SEICOM	F	Oct/2007	Act 1.1b







**A-2 Running Expenses for the Project (R\$)**

Item	2005	2006	2007	Total
1) daily allowance	0	51,020.00	105,834.42	156,854.42
2) air fare	0	0	10,335.90	10,335.90
3) fuel	0	2,161.09	20,415.00	22,576.09
4) consultant fee	0	7,065.00	23,000.36	30,065.36
5) supplies	0	10,790.00	35,196.50	45,986.50
6) telephone	0	15,254.12	17,104.61	32,358.73
7) tax	0	0	2,738.64	2,738.64
Total (R\$)	0	86,290.21	214,625.43	300,915.64
Total (€) (Approx.)	0	5,061,784	13,197,318	18,529,102



**B-1. Japanese Experts**

	Field	Name	Assignment Period	m/m	Responsible Outputs
1	Chief Advisor/ Forest Management	Toshihiro TSUKAJI	Nov 2005-Sep 2006	11	Overall
			Nov 2006-Mar 2007	5	Output 0~3
			Apr 2007-Present	-	
2	Wood Processing/ Coordinator	Shinichi KATOU	Nov 2005-Present	-	Output 4
3	Agroforestry	Toshihiko TAKAMATSU	Jun 2006-Present	-	Output 3
4	Baseline Survey	Toru INADA	Nov 2005-Mar 2006	5	Output 0 (Preparatory Phase)
5	Market Research	Nobuki TOYOOKA	Feb 2007-Mar 2007	1.4	Output 4

**B-2. Brazilian Project Staff trained in Japan** (4 persons in total)

	Name	Title/Organization	Title of Training Course	Training Period	Responsible Activities of PDM
1	Ronaldo Benedito de Souza	Gerente, RURAP	Project Management for Environment Protection Aiming Life Quality Progress with the Inhabitants' Cooperation	26/February/2007 - 13/March/2007	Activity 2-1 ~ 2-4
2	Mario Roberto Marinho	SENAI (IEF)	Project Management for Environment Protection Aiming Life Quality Progress with the Inhabitants' Cooperation	26/February/2007 - 13/March/2007	Activity 2-1 ~ 2-4
3	Nonato Picanço de Sousa Corrêa	Instructor, SENAI	Job Training and Brand Strategy of the Wood Processing in Amapa	25/Jul/2007- 23/Sep/2007	Activity 4-3
4	Ailson Picanço de Sousa Corrêa	Instructor, SENAI	Job Training and Brand Strategy of the Wood Processing in Amapa	25/Jul/2007- 23/Sep/2007	Activity 4-3

B-3: List of Equipment

JFY	No.	Item and Specialization	Manufacturer	Qn	Date of Delivery	Unit Price(R\$)	Unit Price(JPY)	Responsible Person	Location	Utilization	Management	# of disposed eqpt	# of disposed eqpt	Remarks
	1	4WD Pick Up Truck	MITSUBISHI L200	1	2006/1/15	70,800.00		Katou	SEDE	A	A	0	1	BR
	2	Copy Machine	GESTETNER DSM516pf	1	2006/1/16	4,100.00		Tsukaji	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	1	BR
	3	PC Software	MS PROJECT 2003	1	2006/2/10	1,740.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	1	BR
	4	GPS	garmin60cs	1	2006/2/15	1,831.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	2	BR
	5	shredder	Desfibrador	1	2006/2/16	1,831.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	1	BR
	7	Personal Computer	Pen4 2.4	1	2006/3/8	785.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	0	BR
	8	Personal Computer	Pen4 3	1	2006/3/8	2,786.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	0	BR
	9	Personal Computer	Pen4 3	1	2006/3/8	2,786.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	0	BR
	10	Personal Computer	Pen4 3	1	2006/3/8	2,786.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	0	BR
	11	monitor 19inch CRT	AOC 9Klr	1	2006/3/8	3,286.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	1	BR
	12	monitor 15inch LCD	PHILIPS 150S6	1	2006/3/8	698.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	1	BR
	13	Color Printer	HP 8450	1	2006/3/8	836.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	0	BR
	14	PC Software	MS Officesmail Package	1	2006/3/8	836.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	0	BR
	15	PC Software	GSP-1600	1	2006/3/8	936.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	0	BR
	16	Satellite telephone	(sample for wood-processing seminar)	1	2006/3/13	876.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	1	BR
	17	Sample Chair	Honda BF50	1	2006/3/30	3,000.00		Tsukaji	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	0	BR
	18	Boat Engine	Honda BF20	1	2006/3/30	3,000.00		Tsukaji	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	0	BR
	19	Boat	Metaglass Taruma 7000	1	2006/3/30	2,729.70		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	1	BR
	20	Projector	SONY ES-2	1	2006/3/29	29,585.00		Tsukaji	IG.F.S.H.	A	A	0	0	BR
	21	Note PC	HP NX6120	1	2006/3/29	29,585.00		Tsukaji	IG.F.S.H.	A	A	0	0	BR
	22	Printer	HP Deskjet9800	1	2006/3/29	15,890.00		Tsukaji	IG.F.S.H.	A	A	0	0	BR
	23	Protitor	HP Designjet500 42	1	2006/3/29	15,890.00		Tsukaji	IG.F.S.H.	A	A	0	0	BR
	24	Covering Sheet for Seed bed of Agroforestry	Tela Sombramento	1	2006/3/30	16,166.00		Tsukaji	IG.F.S.H.	A	A	0	0	BR
	25	Finishing Sander	BO5010	1	2006/3/29	16,166.00		Tsukaji	IG.F.S.H.	A	A	0	0	BR
	26	Plunge Router	Model 3612	1	2006/3/29	4,999.00		Tsukaji	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	0	BR
	27	Generator	Gerador	1	2006/3/29	4,599.00		Tsukaji	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	0	BR
	28	Generator	Gerador	1	2006/3/29	2,100.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	0	BR
	29	Generator	Gerador	1	2006/3/29	17,900.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	0	BR
	30	Covering Sheet for Seed bed of Agroforestry	Tela Sombramento	1	2007/2/6	1,470.00		Taka	Mazagaol	A	A	0	1	BR
	31	Finishing Sander	BO5010	1	2007/2/7	665.00		matsu	Macape	A	A	0	0	BR
	32	Plunge Router	Model 3612	1	2007/3/16	1,760.00		Katou	SEDE S.H.	A	A	0	1	BR
	33	Generator	Gerador	1	2007/1/25	1,600.00		Katou	SEDE S.H.	A	A	0	1	BR
	34	Generator	Gerador	1	2007/1/25	1,600.00		Tsukaji	SEDE S.H.	A	A	0	0	BR

**B-4: Local Activity Cost for the Project (Japanese Side)**

(Brazilian R\$)

Item	JFY2005	JFY2006	JFY2007*	Total
Output 0	41,765.79	72,504.06	3,751.70	118,021.55
Output 1	0	0	0	0
Output 2	0	10,381.00	2,612.40	12,993.40
Output 3	0	18,393.08	19,643.15	38,036.23
Output 4	0	38,482.38	590.60	39,072.98
fuel	1,834.54	3,724.65	1,845.00	7,404.19
other allowances, consumptions, etc.	88,090.83	335,221.64	213,860.51	637,172.98
<b>Total (R\$)</b>	<b>131,691.16</b>	<b>478,706.81</b>	<b>242,303.36</b>	<b>852,701.33</b>
Total(JPY)	6,696,000	28,081,000	14,899,000	49,676,000

\*: until August

35	Inverter	MODEL HM530	1	2007/1/25	2,282.94		Katou	SEDE S.H.	A	A	0	1	BR
36	Water Content Meter	Medidor de Umidade	1	2007/1/26	5,397.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	1	BR
37			1	2007/2/6	867.50			SEDE S.H.					BR
38	Screw Propeller	Helic reserva 50cv	1	2007/2/6	867.50			SEDE S.H.					BR
39			1	2007/2/6	867.50			SEDE S.H.					BR
40			1	2007/2/6	867.50			SEDE S.H.					BR
41	Table Saw	Serra de Bancada	1	2007/2/14	3,223.00		Tsukaji	SEDE S.H.	A	A	3	1	BR
42	Sliding Miter Saw	Serra Inclínavel	1	2007/2/14	3,635.00		Katou	CASA DA HOS	A	B	0	1	BR
43	Grinder	Atizador de serra Circular	1	2007/2/14	4,538.00		Katou	CASA DA HOS	A	B	0	1	BR
44	Plate Joiner	Grampo para madeira	1	2007/2/14	1,589.00		Katou	CASA DA HOS	A	B	0	1	BR
45	Boat	Barco Alumínio 5m	1	2007/3/7	7,360.00		Tsukaji	IG.F.S.H.	A	A	0	1	BR
46			1	2007/3/7	7,360.00		Tsukaji	IG.F.S.H.	A	A	0	2	BR
47	Digital Camera	Olympus u720 SW	1	2007/3/21	1,350.00		Tsukaji	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	1	BR
48	Half Sheet Finishing	Lixadeira	1	2007/3/22	1,167.00		Katou	SEDE S.H.	A	A	0	1	BR
49	Drill	Parafusadeira portatil	1	2007/3/22	490.00		Katou	SEDE S.H.	A	A	0	1	BR
50	Drill	Parafusadeira portatil	1	2007/3/22	490.00		Katou	SEDE S.H.	A	A	0	1	BR
51	Laser Distance Meter	Aparelho p/ medicao distancia	1	2007/3/23	1,029.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	1	BR
52			1	2007/3/23	1,029.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	2	BR
53	Software for Forest Management	Software p/ inventario florestal	1	2007/3/23	1,490.00		Tsukaji	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	1	BR
54	Water Cleaner	KATADYN EXPEDITION	1	2007/3/2	3,655.85		Tsukaji	SEDE S.H.	A	A	0	1	BR
55		KFT	1	2007/3/2	3,656.85		Tsukaji	SEDE S.H.	A	A	0	2	BR
56	Bits	882-2274-400	1	2007/3/1	21,600.00		Katou	CASA DA HOS	A	B	0	1	JP
57	Boat Rack	for 5m-sized boat	1	2007/6/13	1,600.00		Tsukaji	IG.F.S.H.	A	A	0	1	BR
58			1	2007/5/31	1,600.00		Tsukaji	IG.F.S.H.	A	A	0	2	BR
59	safe	85kg Coffres Hr. Barros	1	2007/4/17	589.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	1	BR
60	GPS	garmin60csx	1	2007/7/23	1,350.00		Katou	SEDE OFFICE	A	A	0	1	BR
61	Grinder Mill	VDT2000MD	1	2007/7/23	1,700.00		Taka						
62	Roof of the Boat	NAUTICA ROCHA	1	2007/7/30	930.00		matsu	Maraca	A	A	0	1	BR
63			1	2007/7/30	930.00		Tsukaji	IG.F.S.H.	A	A	0	1	BR
64			1	2007/7/30	930.00		Tsukaji	IG.F.S.H.	A	A	0	2	BR
65	Screw Propeller	10BF20	1	2007/7/30	539.60		Tsukaji	SEDE S.H.	A	A	0	1	BR
			1	2007/7/30	539.60		Tsukaji	SEDE S.H.	A	A	0	2	BR



Cost of the Equipment

	Procured in		Total(¥)
	Brazil (R\$)	Japan(¥)	
2005	259,358.70	0.00	13,188,390
2006	60,307.64	21,600.00	3,559,246
2007	9,778.20	0.00	601,262
total (R\$)	329,444.54	21,600.00	17,348,898

