Roads, conservation and governance: lessons from BR-163 regional planning process

Ane Alencar
Cuiabá-Santarém Highway

PAN-AMAZON
Cost and benefits of BR-163

**Benefits**

- Integrate Amazon region with southern Brazil
- Enhance transport infrastructure for local populations
- Decrease transport costs for soybean producers and Manaus industrial sector

**Costs**

- Intensification of land occupation (illegal land appropriation and speculation)
- Rapid deforestation and intensive logging
- Increase in migration
- More social conflicts
- Urbanization and social marginalization
- Unbalanced benefits distribution

996 km
Not paved

1756 km
25% nr Pará

75% nr Mato Grosso

30% deforested in 100 km buffer
Majority of stakeholders want the paving
Can we change this scenario?

Source: Alencar et al. 2004. www.ipam.org.br
YES WE CAN!

If the main **stakeholders** are ready to negotiate:

1. Recognize differences in power and information, and level the playing field for negotiation
2. Have clear proposal and objectives
3. Define and negotiate priorities
4. Identify strategies to implement these priorities
5. Ensure a participatory process
Developing a regional plan
Steps taken in this planning process

1. **Knowing the place** (understand the historical context and actual socio-economic dynamics)

2. **Building and strengthening alliances** with local people (identify the main socio-economic actors and their demands)

3. **Exchanging information** (promote discussion and education about future land use trends and make scientific information available)

4. **Defining political strategies** for regional planning process and implementation (joining forces and planning)
Respecting stakeholders’ diversity and territoriality
Simulating Deforestation Scenarios for BR-163

Example of Information brought to the process

Suitability for Mechanized agr.

Suitability for Familiar agr.

Suitability for Cattle ranching

Source: Alencar, A., Soares Filho, B. and Nepstad, D. Manuscript
1) Plan outlining socio-environmental demands

Major themes

1. Infrastructure and Basic Services
2. Land Zoning and Conflict Resolution
3. Productive Strategies and Natural Resources Management
4. Social and Cultural Strength of the local Population
5. Environmental Management, Monitoring and Protected Areas

Available in: www.ipam.org.br
2) Creation of BR-163 socio-environmental consortium

CONDESSA BR163

December 2004
Alter do Chão
BR-163 Socio-environmental Consortium (CONDESSA BR-163)

Associação Floresta Protegida- AFP
*Associação Terra Indígena do Xingu - ATIX
CEAPAC
Central Unica dos Trabalhadores
*Centro de Estudo e Formação dos Trabalhadores do Baixo Amazonas - CEFT-BAM
Conselho Nacional dos Seringueiros – CNS
Federação de Orgãos para a Assistencia Educacional e Social – FASE Amazônia
Federação dos Trabalhadores da Agricultura do Estado do Pará – FETAGRI- PA
*Federação dos Trabalhadores da Agricultura do Baixo Amazonas
Federação dos Trabalhadores da Agricultura da Transamazônica e Xingu
Fórum da Amazônia Oriental – FAOR
Fórum da Produção Familiar do Baixo Amazonas
*Fórum dos Movimentos Sociais da BR-163
*Fórum Mato-Grossense de Meio Ambiente e Cidadania – FORMAD
*Fundação Viver Produzir Preservar – FVPP
Grupo de Defesa da Amazônia – GDA
Grupo Consciência Indígena – GCI
*Grupo de Trabalho Amazônico - GTA Nacional
GTA- Regional BAM
GTA – Regional Norte de Mato Grosso
Grupo Nova Proposta para a Agroecologia- GTNA
*Instituto Centro de Vida – ICV
*Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia – IPAM
Instituto Floresta
Instituto Ouro Verde
Instituto Padre João Peter
*Instituto Socioambiental – ISA
MOAPE
MOPEBAM
Pretender / GTA – BAM
Sindicato dos Trabalhadores Rurais de Castelo dos Sonhos
Sindicato dos Trabalhadores Rurais de Itaituba
Sindicato dos Trabalhadores Rurais de Lucas do Rio Verde
Sindicato dos Trabalhadores Rurais de Rurópolis
Sindicato dos Trabalhadores Rurais de Santarém
Sindicato dos Trabalhadores Rurais de Trairão

Government Partner Researchers (helped in the process)

Embrapa/CPATU, MPEG, UFPA, UNEMAT, UFRA

* Promoting institutions
Government Reaction:
Creation of regional sustainable development plan

1. Land zoning and management
2. Support for sustainable activities
3. Infrastructure for development
4. Social inclusion
## Main Government actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2004 | • Formation of Interministery Working Group (GTI-BR163)  
• Release and discussion of the 1\textsuperscript{st} draft of the BR-163 Government Sustainability Plan (all stakeholders came to table to construct this plan);  
• Creation of first conservation units (2 major extractive reserves) |
| 2005 | • Creation of 8 million hectare area of suspended land use activities (LAP)  
• Release and discussion of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} version of BR-163 Government Sustainability Plan (establishment of a monitoring multi-stakeholder group);  
• Development of several operations to control illegal logging and land grabbing; increased government presence and governance |
| 2006 | • Creation of Forestry district and 6 more conservation units (Fev)  
• Final version of BR-163 Government Sustainability Plan (Jun)  
• License to pave |
| 07/08 | • Zee BR163  
• Management plans (preparing for concessions) |
What did we concretely achieve?

- Call attention to the problem
- Major land zoning
- Increase regional governance
- Temporarily decrease deforestation
Evolution of protected areas along BR163
Evolution of deforestation along BR163
Lessons learned regarding the Government

- Information and social networks played a key role in attracting federal government attention.

- Federal government acknowledged that road infrastructure projects must be treated by several ministries.

- Negotiation began between multiple levels of government (Federal and State).

- Federal government moderated multi-stakeholder negotiation.

- Government incorporated most elements of social movements’ regional plan proposal; however incentives for production strategies are lacking.
Lessons learned regarding the Social-Environmental movements

- Rapid **advances in linking BR-163 social groups**

- Social movements gained strength and organization towards a shared objective (**unique regional plan**)

- Respect stakeholders’ territoriality and sharing of responsibilities in the process

- **Data generation and information were fundamental to** feeding activities and discussions (e.g. maps and modeling tools opened the door to interaction between researchers, policy-makers and other stakeholders)

- **Social-environmental movements played a key role** in changing the business-as-usual government strategy for the region
Challenges to the Government Sustainability Plan

- Conflicting policies related to the destination of public lands (e.g. Colonist settlements created on top of conservation units)

- Regional *commodities* such as soy, cattle, and more recently sugar cane, are considered strategic products by the Federal government

- Credit investment for cattle in Amazon (e.g. in Itaituba, one of the largest municipalities, 96% of credit was for this activity)

- Lack of involvement of mainly municipal governments in actions and discussions of Plan

- Still no monitoring implemented

- Large investments in mining being installed in the same territory (ALCOA Plant in Juriti)

- Promote sustainable economies in the region (e.g. establish a strong and legal logging industry)
Reflections on the role of research(er)

- Time issue: quick turnaround of materials to make them applicable for decision-making; process too dynamic for “traditional” research;

- Redefine priorities for publication (type and destination)

- Identification of gaps in information; directed research to fill those gaps (chance to focus research towards problem-solving)

- Convey information to diverse stakeholders – make information visual; facilitate its interpretation and use
Thank you

www.ipam.org.br

CONDESSA
Consórcio Socioambiental da BR-163
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