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"PCU: autonomy for young people to roam the city, it broke down barriers; freedom to roam the city that is now my city as well."

(Adolescent - LAG)

"Situations happened where an adult would call there to complain about a young person. From the way the adult talked, it was obvious what he thought about being an adolescent, because of the very fact that they are young."

(Technical Partner)

---

1 All of the quotes were taken from individual interviews and focus groups held and are stated in the manner in which they were collected, without any later intervention by the research team to correct, amend or change statements and declarations. All transcribed information was subject to collective validation.
1. Introduction

In this document, we present an Evaluation of the Urban Centers Platform, an initiative inspired by UNICEF, but shared directly or indirectly by a substantial and important group of institutions and social actors in the cities of Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo and Itaquaquecetuba.

IETS consistently focuses on transforming knowledge into public policy, especially in cities. The creation and implementation of the Urban Centers Platform by UNICEF and its partners and allies consist of an important benchmark for reflection at the Institution.

Nevertheless, the implementation of this PCU Evaluations tudy was a challenge for IETS researchers. Firstly, because of how quickly it was drafted - in three months. Moreover, it was drafted in late December, January and February, a time of year seen by Brazilians as not very suitable for holding interviews, since many interviewees are on vacation.

Finally, although the document establishing guidelines for defining the proposal to execute the study contains detailed information, only the act of researching allows the size and complexity of the problems to be faced to be identified.

The PCU is the product of extremely delicate creative work. Implementing it involves highly complex actions and "institutional engineering" whose governance is very hard to operate.
At the same time, we can quite clearly state that it was an initiative that "awoke passions." None of those interviewed spoke with indifference and distance about the PCU. With this being the case, there was significant work when the technical team analyzed the interviews, comparing them with documents and removing any idiosyncrasies driven by "passion." The overwhelming majority of interviewees said that at some point during the PCU project they were overcome with emotion, with most stating that they were "so moved they cried" at some point.

Dealing with this "sensitive universe" therefore posed and will pose major challenges.

Throughout the entire process, we were also convinced that we must perform work that highlighted the positive, yet that could also describe the limitations of PCU performance geared towards contributing to enhancement of the Platform using a robust empirical basis.

In this sense, we need to be clear that the evaluation of a public initiative is not a judgment. It is therefore not characterized by political, moral or ethical values. It is about observing the limitations and positive aspects of an initiative as perceived by the social actors that play a leading role in the process. Because of this, the indications suggested herein do not become a "truth," but rather, since they are recurring and registered by various and different actors participating in the process, they should be seen as a point all of the institutions participating in the process of creating and implementing the public initiative to reflect upon.

Furthermore, the organization responsible for documenting and authoring the evaluation use an academic procedure that is theoretical and methodological in nature, maintaining a "distance" and relativism capable of establishing a separation
from anything that can be regarded as an evaluative perception of a mere idiosyncrasy.

Because of this, in the interviews and focus groups held for us to analyze the perception of PCU actors in relation to their various dimensions, we seek to register those issues that featured constant regularities, excluding those that did not seem to be consistent in the sense that they were not reaffirmed by other actors.

With this perspective, we present the following chapters below:

- Evaluation methodology;
- Brief description of the PCU (2009 / 2012);
- Timeline: situational features of the PCU cycle;
- Positive aspects and limitations;
- Lessons learned;
- Recommendations;
- Annexes.

Finally, our intention is that this document be a reference for dialogue about the PCU and that it may provide records for enhancement of public policies in Brazil. This is our aim.
2. Evaluation Methodology

The methodological aim was developed using analysis of positive aspects and limitations of the Urban Centers Platform created and implemented under the aegis of UNICEF as a general guideline.

In this sense, we chose a non-Manichaean and evaluative assessment that affirms not only the sense of the action, but that qualifies the multiple experiences developed during the PCU cycle, seeking to analyze the process triggered by the action. Thus, document materials and interviews/focus groups played a predominant role. Newspapers and periodicals, social networks and other channels of social communication were also checked. As can be seen, data of a qualitative nature played a central role. Because of this, by using document analysis, consultation of means of communication, interviews and focus groups, we registered the regularities and discontinuities found in relation to a set of established issues. We fundamentally analyzed the regularities found in this empirical material. Discontinuities, particularities, singularities and idiosyncrasies were eliminated; that is to say, non-majority concepts were not considered. However, some issues having to do with specific actions of the actors interviewed were incorporated into the analysis.

Therefore, the robust empirical basis of this research consisted of interviews scheduled beforehand with actors previously defined by the IETS and UNICEF. It also consisted of focus groups held with actors fundamental to the process – representatives of
Articulation Groups (LAGs/AGs) in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo. Because of the particularities\(^2\) of the experience, in Itaquaquecetuba interviews were only done with AG members.

It must be noted that the interviews and focus groups were held based on scripts drafted and discussed with UNICEF.

### 2.1. Documents

In the initial phase, based on guidelines issued by UNICEF, documents drafted by the Institution registering the entire process of creating the PCU and its implementation were studied in-depth. The goal was to understand the internal rationale of the process without worrying about establishing any critical points.

At the same time, we carried out a substantial survey of channels of communication, including newspapers, magazines and social networks, to take note of issues that came up with more frequency in these materials. Our objective was to take down the vision that "external actors" and internal actors – LAG/GA members, strategic partners and others, had of the PCU.

### 2.2. Interviews

Twenty-eight interviews were held from January 25 to April 3, 2013 in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro. Interviews began after UNICEF approval of the WORK PLAN drafted by

---

\(^2\) Only Local Articulator Group members were interviewed, since only one group was recognized.
the IETS technical team on January 21, 2013. In line with the approved timeline, the
document was submitted on January 18, 2013 and on January 21, 2013 it was debated
and modified at a meeting between IETS and UNICEF technicians.

Regarding the Articulator Group in Itaquaquecetuba, a qualitative interview was held
in São Paulo with two members – one adult and one adolescent – due to the
operational difficulty related with the availability and dispersion of its other members.

Interviews lasted an average of 90 minutes and were always held with at least two IETS
researchers in attendance. Only 5 interviews were not conducted face to face and
were held via telephone or Skype: with Gisella Hiche and Helena Cimeno, because they
reside outside of the city of São Paulo, with Mario Volpi and Ana Cristina Matos,
because they reside in Brasília, and the first interview with Adriana Alvarenga of
UNICEF on the social communication developed for the Platform.

Below are summary charts, listing the names of interviewees, institution, date,
whether the interview was face to face or done remotely, and other information we
found to be pertinent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Nature of the Partnership</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Luciana Phebo</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coordinator - Rio de Janeiro District Office</td>
<td>25/Jan</td>
<td>9am</td>
<td>Face to face: UNICEF RJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kátia Maria Braga Edmundo</td>
<td>CEDAPS</td>
<td>Technical partner</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>28/Jan</td>
<td>Noon</td>
<td>Face to face: UNICEF RJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fransérgio Goulart</td>
<td>CEDAPS</td>
<td>Technical partner</td>
<td>Technical Coordinator</td>
<td>28/Jan</td>
<td>Noon</td>
<td>Face to face: UNICEF RJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jacques Schwartzman</td>
<td>Independent Researcher</td>
<td>Technical partner</td>
<td>Former Official for the Rio de Janeiro District Office</td>
<td>31/Jan</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>Face to face: IETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Marisa Vassimon</td>
<td>Canal Futura</td>
<td>Strategic Ally</td>
<td>Community Mobilization Manager</td>
<td>31/Jan</td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>Face to face: Canal Futura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ana Paula da Silva</td>
<td>BEM TV</td>
<td>Technical partner</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>31/Jan</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>Face to face: UNICEF RJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pedro Spadale</td>
<td>RJ State Gov.</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>Undersecretary</td>
<td>15/Feb</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>Face to face: Secretariat of International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Viviane Castelo Branco</td>
<td>Municipal Sec. of Health and Civil Def.</td>
<td>Government Partner</td>
<td>Coord. of Intersectorial Policies and Actions</td>
<td>18/Feb</td>
<td>4pm</td>
<td>Face to face: Secretariat of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alcides Carneiro</td>
<td>Instituto Pereira Passos</td>
<td>Municipal Articulator</td>
<td>Health and Demographics Editor</td>
<td>06/Mar</td>
<td>2:30pm</td>
<td>Face to face: IPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gilberto Fugimotro</td>
<td>SESC</td>
<td>Technical partner</td>
<td>Advisor on Community Relations in the Social Responsibility Department</td>
<td>18/Mar</td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>Face to face: IETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Luiz Fernando Sarmento</td>
<td>SESC</td>
<td>Technical partner</td>
<td>Articulator of social networks</td>
<td>18/Mar</td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>Face to face: IETS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Individual Interviews São Paulo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Nature of Partnership</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adriana Alvarenga</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Communications officer</td>
<td>24/Jan</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>Distance; via skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gisella Hiche</td>
<td>former Viração</td>
<td>Technical Partner</td>
<td>Center Coordinator</td>
<td>14/Feb</td>
<td>5pm</td>
<td>Distance; via skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Helena Cimeno</td>
<td>Formerly with Itaquaquecetuba City</td>
<td>Government Partner</td>
<td>Coordinatoor of Social Aid for City Hall in Itaquaquecetuba</td>
<td>14/Feb</td>
<td>7pm</td>
<td>Distance; via telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elizabeth Alvarenga</td>
<td>CIEDE</td>
<td>Technical Partner</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>19/Feb</td>
<td>2:30pm</td>
<td>Face to face: CIEDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ana Penido</td>
<td>Instituto Inspirare</td>
<td>former Unicef</td>
<td>Former Coordinator - São Paulo District Office</td>
<td>19/Feb</td>
<td>4:30pm</td>
<td>Face to face: Inspirare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ana Lucia Lima</td>
<td>Instituto Paulo Montenegro</td>
<td>Technical Partner Consulting</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>20/Feb</td>
<td>4:30pm</td>
<td>Face to face: Instituto Paulo Montenegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Silvio Kaloustian</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coordinator - São Paulo District Office</td>
<td>21/Feb</td>
<td>9:30pm</td>
<td>Face to face: UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adriana Alvarenga</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Communications Officer</td>
<td>21/Feb</td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>Face to face: UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jucilene Rocha</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Technical Advisor for Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>21/Feb</td>
<td>Noon</td>
<td>Face to face: UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Claudia Frazão</td>
<td>CIEDE</td>
<td>Itaquaquecetuba</td>
<td>Executive Deputy Coordinator</td>
<td>21/Feb</td>
<td>2:30pm</td>
<td>Face to face: CIEDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nelson Harvey da Costa</td>
<td>Government Secretary for São Paulo City Hall</td>
<td>Government Partner</td>
<td>Former Secretary</td>
<td>21/Feb</td>
<td>4:30pm</td>
<td>Face to face: SEBRAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jefferson A. Correia</td>
<td>Kimberly-Clark Brasil</td>
<td>Strategic Ally</td>
<td>Corporate Affairs</td>
<td>22/Feb</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>Face to face: kimberly clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vania Correia</td>
<td>Viração</td>
<td>Itaquaquecetuba</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>22/Feb</td>
<td>11am</td>
<td>Face to face: Viração</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Anna Carolina Bruscheta</td>
<td>Fundação Itaú</td>
<td>Strategic Ally</td>
<td>Senior Analyst</td>
<td>22/Feb</td>
<td>2:30pm</td>
<td>Face to face: Itau Social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also below is a list of people we were supposed to be interviewed, but whom for various reasons we were unable to interview:

### Individual Interviews Brasilia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Nature of Partnership</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mário Volpi</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Area Coordinator - Adolescents</td>
<td>07/Feb</td>
<td>9:30am</td>
<td>Distance; via skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ana Cristina Matos</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Head of Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>03/Apr</td>
<td>11h</td>
<td>Distance; via telephone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AG interview - Itaquaquecetuba

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Interview held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Lideranças / Adultos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local Articulator Group (AG) - Itaquaquecetuba</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Not interviewed in Rio de Janeiro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Nature of Partnership</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Reason why not interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rodrigo Medina</td>
<td>Public Ministry</td>
<td>Government Partner</td>
<td>Federal Prosecutor</td>
<td>Was on vacation, we were unable to schedule an interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Raquel Willadino Braga</td>
<td>Observatório de Favelas</td>
<td>Municipal Committee</td>
<td>Coordinador of the Human Rights Division</td>
<td>Was on vacation, we were unable to schedule an interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Romário Galvão</td>
<td>Municipal Sec. of Educ</td>
<td>Municipal Committee</td>
<td>Former Secretary</td>
<td>No contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Márcia Correa</td>
<td>BEM TV</td>
<td>Technical Partner</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Was on vacation. But recommended doing an interview with Ana Paula da Silva, also of BEM TV, which was done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ricardo Henriques</td>
<td>Former IPP</td>
<td>Government Partner</td>
<td>Former President</td>
<td>Unable to schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fernando William</td>
<td>Municipal Sec. of Social Aid</td>
<td>Government Partner</td>
<td>Former Secretary</td>
<td>Unable to schedule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Not interviewed in São Paulo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Nature of Partnership</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Reason why not interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Renato Nascimento</td>
<td>Ação Educativa</td>
<td>Articulador do Fórum</td>
<td>Project Advisor</td>
<td>We scheduled an interview for 20/Mar, at 2:30pm, at Ação Educativa in São Paulo, but he cancelled. We were unable to reschedule because of scheduling conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giovanni Palermo</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Articulador</td>
<td>Former Municipal Gov. Secretary</td>
<td>No contact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3. Focus Groups

Two focus groups were held: one with AGs in São Paulo and the other with LAGs in Rio de Janeiro.

The Focus Groups were scheduled by technical partners on a date previously stipulated and they were held at Universidade Veiga de Almeida in Rio de Janeiro and at CIEDS in São Paulo. In keeping with the work dynamic during the PCU, travel fare was reimbursed and snacks were provided. The strategy was to invite various actors from different AGs/LAGs to form discussion groups with around 12 people, including participation by communicator adolescents. In Rio de Janeiro, 10 adults and 3 adolescents were present. In São Paulo, there were 10 adults and 4 adolescents.

Focus Groups lasted an average of 3 hours and were notable for their tense and passionate discussions. The result was important and will be presented in the topics discussed below.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Nature of Partnership</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Reason not interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Antonella Scolamiero</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Deputy Representative</td>
<td>Was on vacation; we were unable to schedule the interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gary Stahl</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>National Representative</td>
<td>The decision to interview him at the end of the process coincided with official business outside of Brazil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are summary charts for the focus groups, listing the number of participants, the date, the location, and other information we found to be pertinent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Nome</th>
<th>Número de participantes*</th>
<th>Realização do Grupo Focal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Lideranças / Adultos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grupo Articulador Local (GAL)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Lista de presença em anexo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Nome</th>
<th>Number of participants*</th>
<th>Focus Group Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Leaders / Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grupo Articulador Local (GA) - SP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* List of attendees in annex.

All focus group interviews were recorded. A "summary" was also done of all of the interviews held. This material is located in IETS files and may be made available to UNICEF. All of the face to face interviews held were also documented through photographs. This material only serves to illustrate the presentation material at the end of the study, if so desired.

In short, we can say that the interviews and focus groups held provided substantial empirical material that is capable of translating the vision of each of the actors in creation and implementation process and supporting PCU evaluation.
2.4. Scripts

The general line of the interview scripts prepared for each of the actors taking part in the process, which were submitted for UNICEF consideration, proved to be appropriate in the sense that it dealt with a general guideline to be followed. However, in many interviews the very dynamic of the interaction offered other opportunities to uncover issues that the researchers had not yet perceived. In this sense, we can say that the scripts were followed so that we could establish comparisons between the "discourses" of the various actors as well as particularities based on the specificity of the actor's "place" in the process of implementing the PCU.

Issues investigated were discussed according to the theme to be researched, as defined in the term of reference and detailed in the work plan:

Regarding **Relevance**, questions include: How would you assess the participation of the various social actors in the PCU? How would you assess the specific participation of kids and adolescents in the PCU? How were children and adolescents called upon? What innovations has the PCU offered? What is the importance of developing the Urban Centers? What is the international repercussion of the PCU?

Questions to assess **Efficiency** included: In every stage of creating the PCU, which processes and what results are able to be implemented in the municipality? Describe how the PCU was implemented. How were targets chosen (municipal or community targets)? How was participatory consultation done? Was the team (UNICEF and/or
Technical Partners) sufficient to monitor the PCU? Describe implementation of the Action Plan?

**Efficacy / Results:** Do you see this process as having caused changes in the situation in the community and the city? Why? What do you see as the indicator of this change? What is the overriding factor in achieving this result (whether positive or negative)? Do you think that there were changes in relations between the government and civil society in the locations where the PCUs were implemented?

**Sustainability:** Do you think that the process set in action by the PCU can continue autonomously or not? Why? Which AGs are still working? Did the PCU methodology influence your institution? Were the Municipalities impacted by the Municipal Targets? How much was the children’s and adolescent’s agenda incorporated into the local situation? Do you think that there were changes in relations between the government and civil society in the locations where the PCUs were implemented?

**Transversal themes:** How would you assess the specific participation of adolescents in the PCU? Were you able to see any significant differences in participation between men and women?

**Lessons learned and recommendations:** What suggestions would you make for a new PCU cycle? (list and develop suggestions); What is the first "positive" thing that comes to mind when we talk about the PCU? And "negative"/ limitations? What other major issues would you mention in relation to the PCU? What was the biggest barrier / obstacle to the PCU's action? Why?

The scripts therefore proved to be an excellent tool, since they allowed the process experienced by the Institutions to be "translated" in regards to the theoretical and methodological discourse that guided creation of the PCU.

The Urban Centers Platform is a UNICEF program joining a set of integrated activities and strategies, geared towards behavioral, legal and institutional changes and changes in public initiative management and in social participation. It is aimed at fostering and strengthening feelings of belonging, collective responsibility and social cohesion among various actors. It is executed in cycles, along with Municipal elections. The 1st cycle took place from 2008-2012.

The PCU has four dimensions: National, State, Municipal and Community. It also has international-level articulation with the Child Friendly Cities (CFC) Initiative, through the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre (IRC).

Using intersectorality as a principle, development of the Platform's methodology covers six strategies:

- Social mobilization of governments, national and international organizations, companies, universities, the media, families and society in general, in order to contribute to reducing inequalities that affect the children and adolescent rights in their city;

- Political articulation of the various actors, so that they may work together to promote policies, programs and investments that reduce inequalities and democratize access of children and adolescents to services and opportunities that protect, respect and guarantee their rights;
• Skills development for the agents working in the area of children and adolescents, with the purpose of improving programs and services and responding to challenges and the needs of each child and adolescent;

• Participation of kids and adolescents, through their direct involvement in executing actions involving social mobilization, formulation and control of policies, programs and investments geared towards knowledge and the guarantee of their own rights;

• Permanent monitoring and evaluation of the situation of boys and girls, especially those living in working class communities, based on targets and indicators of impact, management and social participation;

• Certification of cities that reduced inequalities and recognition of working class communities that carried out the activities planned and advanced local targets.

At the municipal level, the Platform is established through three simultaneous and complementary processes:

1. Process of Mobilizing Urban Centers: Permanent mobilization of the city's complex, including all communities enrolled in the Platform, different governmental, corporate and non-governmental actors, and the population at large.

2. Community Recognition Process: Local articulation and mobilization, generation of data that is broken down for more vulnerable territories, skills development, encouragement of social participation, monitoring and systemic evaluation of indicators.

3. Municipal targets and Certification of municipalities: These use the Millennium Development Goals as a reference, reflecting the priorities of the UNICEF Program in
Brazil and those identified by local actors, always considering reduction of inequalities in the city. To receive UNICEF certification, City Halls must fulfill at least 12 out of 20 municipal targets; reduce inequalities in municipal districts, that is, the differences between the indicators in the different program areas, for at least six targets; have at least 30% of the communities recognized by the Platform for their local advancements.

3.1. Key PCU Actors

LAG - Local Articulator Group is the heart of the Platform in the communities. It is responsible for coordinating actions in each location. In theory, the Local Articulator Group consisted of, at least, two representatives from social organizations, two government representatives, two representatives from adolescent groups, and two representatives chosen by the community. In practice, they were constructed in various ways and their compositions were very heterogeneous.

TECHNICAL PARTNERS are responsible for directly monitoring community and adolescent actions, as well as for offering training, mobilizing the communities, collaborating with local articulators and promoting meetings and sessions to expand the methodology according to the features of each region. In Rio de Janeiro, the technical partners were the CEDAPS, responsible for actions executed by LAG community leaders, and BEM TV, responsible for activities executed by communicator adolescents. Technical partners in São Paulo were CIEDS, responsible for AG actions, and Viração, responsible for communicator adolescents. There work happened at various phases, such as:
- Community mobilization
- Training of communicator adolescents
- Construction of instruments
- Mediation of Community Forums
- Strengthening of LAG/AG member skills.

Another Technical Partner was Instituto Paulo Montenegro, which worked in both Rio and São Paulo on developing the participatory consultation instrument and on facilitating execution of these consultations.

**COMMUNICATOR ADOLESCENTS** performed communications actions with the job of mobilizing other adolescents, gathering materials, opinions and proposals, and distributing them at forums, events and through communications channels that mobilize their community. They were named by the Articulator Groups. Through agreements with the São Paulo Municipal Secretariat of Labor and the Rio de Janeiro Municipal Secretariat of Health, these adolescents were given access to pay through a grant.

Together, the Local Articulator Groups and Communicating Adolescents had the job of:

1 – Diagnosing the initial situation in the communities in relation to the targets and indicators defined by UNICEF.

2 – Researching perception among the local actors and collect official data.

3 – Plan of Action to improve the targets.

4 – Implementing actions established and targets.
5 - Participating in forums and various municipal spaces for discussion of child and adolescent rights.

**FORUM**

Although it is an activity, the Forum is held through the actors. Because of this, the results achieved translate the social agents' position.

Two forums were held in each community, with the first early on in the cycle, where the diagnosis and choice of community targets to be developed in the Plan of Action were presented, and the second at the end of the cycle to present the results. The adults that answered the Consultation questionnaire, the Community Leaders, the Communicating Adolescents and other guests participated in the Forums.

**MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE** is one of the most strategic levels of the Urban Centers Platform. Membership on this committee is aimed at articulating the city’s different governmental and non-governmental organizations. Each Committee was comprised of an average of 20 organizations, including: CMDCA, Municipal Secretariats, State Secretariats, PRONASCI, Regional Election Courts, Public Defender, Attorney General, City Council, Civil Society Organizations, Community Representatives (Representatives from the Local Articulator Groups and Representatives from the Communicator Adolescent Groups), Platform Partners (UNICEF, Canal Futura and Multirio).

**STRATEGIC ALLIES** are the Change for Good – British Airways, Kimberly – Clark and MSC Cruzeiros companies and Fundação Itaú Social, which participated in creating the methodology as well as with financial resources.
GOVERNMENT PARTNERS were the Rio de Janeiro State Government, the São Paulo State Government, Rio de Janeiro City Hall, São Paulo City Hall and Itaquaquecetuba City Hall.

3.2. **PCU Methodology**

The first step in the Urban Centers Platform methodology is to carry out in-depth research on the city's socio-economic, historical and geographic data, surveying indicators that show inequalities and data on working class communities, how they are organized, what their current situation is and how their children and adolescents live. In addition to collecting information on problems and priorities, this is also a phase for constructing possibilities, by finding suggestions for topics to be covered and opportunities to be promoted, in addition to networks and actors to be mobilized. The inputs gained through studies and interaction with the various partners and collaborators support selection of Municipal Targets and Community Targets, which use the Millennium Development Goals as a reference, reflecting the priorities of the UNICEF Program in Brazil and those identified by local actors, always considering reduction of inequalities in the city.

The preparation period also involves defining social participation activities that working class communities should develop to facilitate the reach of the targets proposed by the Platform. It stipulates establishment of rules and the point system inherent to the certification process, including the monitoring and evaluation system, which will oversee and verify achievement of the social participation activities and targets by city halls and participating communities.
Mobilization begins at the highest sphere of municipal power, which in Brazil is the City Hall. The Platform cycle therefore starts in a municipal election year and the first discussion occurs with the candidates vying for the positions mayor and city commissioner. At this time, the international recognition of UNICEF's work as a United Nations agency proves to be a major boon to capturing the candidates' attention, as well as the attention of the media covering the election process.

After this stage, the candidates receive a new invitation: this time, they should sign a Term of Agreement, committing to achieving the Municipal Targets proposed by the Platform based on the Millennium Development Goals and validated by UNICEF and its partners.

Right after the election, the Mayor-elect should be encouraged to publically reaffirm his or her commitment to the targets and should appoint a liaison to the Urban Centers Platform, facilitating communication between the municipal secretariats and their teams. In addition, each Mayor appointed a municipal articulator to serve as a Platform liaison and to stipulate the 20 municipal targets:

1. Reduce early neonatal mortality
2. Expand the coverage of family healthcare programs
3. Expand pre-natal coverage
4. Expand daycare for children 3 and under
5. Expand pre-school for 4 and 5 year olds
6. Lower the age-grade distortion in Primary School.
7. Universalize access to primary school for the 6 to 14 year old population

8. Achieve targets related to the Basic Education Development Index (Índice de Desenvolvimento da Educação Básica – Ideb) for the first years of Primary Education in the city's public schools.

9. Lower the rate of traffic accident mortality among those aged 19 and under

10. Ensure implementation and functioning of the municipality's violence against children and adolescents notification system

11. Expand the number Child Protective Services offices and ensure those that already exist are operational

12. Expand the number of Social Aid Reference Centers in relation to the city's population

13. Implement mechanisms to monitor socio-educational measures in the "meio aberto" juvenile delinquency regime

14. Implement mechanisms to monitor investment in children and related social expenditures

15. Expand STD/AIDS prevention actions among adolescents

16. Increase the number of schools implementing Law no. 10.639/03, which stipulates inclusion of the subject of Afro-Brazilian culture and history in school curricula.

17. Lower the homicide rate among adolescents

18. Increase access to regular schooling for kids and adolescents with disabilities
19. Reduce the number of adolescent pregnancies

20. Raise the percentage of adolescents aged 16 to 17 registered with the Regional Election Courts

To participate in the Platform, community representatives should set up a Local Articulator Group (just one per community), comprised of, at least, representatives from two non-governmental organizations, two government institutions, two adolescent groups and two other freely chosen entities. When the decision is made to form an Articulator Group, those interested complete a Registration Form. Like the government, the Articulator Groups also have targets to meet. In this cycle of the Platform, there are 30 community targets to be prioritized by the Articulator Groups. After adhering to the Platform, the Local Articulator Groups take part in a training process, aimed at strengthening their action in order to guarantee the rights of children and adolescents in the working class communities, helping them to achieve the 30 community targets and reinforcing the sense of belonging to the Group.

It is up to the Local Articulator Group to identify young people who will take on the job of Communicator Adolescents. The adolescents nominated by the Local Articulator Groups should fit the profile defined by the Platform:

- Reside in the same community where the Articulator Group works;
- Be enrolled in school or have recently finished high school;
- Have some community experience and time available for Platform activities;
- Show interest in working with different communication strategies to mobilize their community, aimed at local development.
The Diagnosis involves three phases. All of them are executed at two Platform moments, at the start and in the end, to provide a baseline and backing for comparison of the results found. They are:

1) Community Mapping,

2) Consultation of Children / Adolescents and Adults

3) Community Forums.

It all starts with the Speaking Map workshop, a participatory technique providing local knowledge based on a graphic depiction created collectively. This process facilitates the fieldwork needed to carry out the perception Consultation, another stage of the Participatory Diagnosis that will create backing for monitoring and evaluation of the Urban Centers Platform as well as important information for creating the Plans of Action for the Local Articulator Groups.

The Consultation methodology was built based on the lessons gained from Brazil's participation in Child Friendly Cities (www.childfriendlycities.org) and in partnership with Instituto Paulo Montenegro, the social arm of one of the largest and most respected research institutes in Brazil, IBOPE. The Consultation had two phases: the first was carried out by Articulator Group members who gave individual semi-structured questionnaires (combining pre-coded questions with open questions) to people identified as representatives of both public services offered to community residents and participants in civil society movements (NGOs, associations, movements, etc.), religious leaders, cultural producers, etc., in addition to residents from different age groups, representatives of the group of people living and/or working in the community.
A questionnaire was developed that was structured thematically, covering the priority areas of the UNICEF Cooperation Program in Brazil:

Change 1: SURVIVE

Change 2: LEARN

Change 3: PROTECT AGAINST HIV/AIDS

Change 4: GROW UP FREE FROM VIOLENCE

Change 5: ADOLESCENT PARTICIPATION

Change 6: RESPECT FOR DIVERSITY AND PRIORITY IN PUBLIC POLICIES

The same set of questions were asked for each theme:

- General evaluation of the appropriateness of policies and actions geared towards children and adolescents ("Very Good," "Good," "OK," "Bad," "Terrible");
- Evolutonal perception of the conditions of each of the thematic areas ("Improving, at a fast pace;" "Improving, at a slow pace;" "Same;" "Worsening");
- Level of agreement with statements related to the thematic area ("Agree completely," "Agree somewhat," "Do not agree"); Suggestions for each theme of actions that can be implemented to improve the guarantee of child and adolescent rights.
The responses were organized by the Platform Coordination Team and served as the basis for the following steps.

The second phase was led by the Communicator Adolescents, who went out into the field to ask kids and adolescents in the communities about their access to basic rights, such as health, protection, quality education and other topics related to family life where they live. Unlike what happened with the adults, completion of the questionnaire happened at meetings previously held at community schools, with the group receiving clarifications prior to answering each question.

The results of each group in a particular community were later summarized and presented by the Communicator Adolescents at a Community Forum, focusing on defining the areas that each community defined as high-priority for inclusion in the plan of action, built based on the six priority community targets chosen during the forums. Political articulation, social mobilization and skills development actions were established for each of the six targets. Two targets are selected to be the focus of major community mobilization.

The development of Plans of Action is the Skills Development stage activity, with significant importance in UNICEF’s process of recognizing the communities. For this reason, more than just accomplishing a task, creation and implementation of the Plan of Action should be understood by the Local Articulator Groups as fundamental strategies so that their efforts do in fact achieve the intended targets.

It is worth noting that each Plan of Action corresponds to a Communication Plan created by the community's pair of Communicator Adolescents. It is through the Communication Plan that the Adolescents advise on reporting of the Plan of Action to the community, as well as the community's commitment to achieving the targets. To
implement the Plans of Action, the Articulator Groups rely on permanent support from one of the technical partners.

The Urban Centers Platform adopts objective evaluation tools. In the Preparation phase, Municipal Targets and Community Targets were defined. However, a complex program like the Urban Centers Platform that is marked by unforeseen events demands a procedural evaluation, capable of going beyond the quality of life improvement indicators in the participant communities.

If positive, the evaluation of the set of elements will result in recognition by UNICEF of the work developed by the City Hall and by the communities.

To receive UNICEF certification, City Halls must fulfill at least 12 out of 20 municipal targets; reduce inequalities in municipal districts, that is, the differences between the indicators in the different program areas, for at least six targets; have at least 30% of the communities recognized by the Platform for their local advancements. The advancements in community targets are monitored throughout the process, based on information found in the diagnoses prepared by the community. The technical partners help the Articulator Groups to advance. Advancements are perceived and registered by the groups themselves and will be assessed by UNICEF throughout the process.

The point distribution process involves evaluation of six components:

- Action of the Articulator Group;

- Participation of Communicator Adolescents;

- Participatory Mapping;
- Plan of Action;
- Thematic Activities;
- Prioritization of Six Community Targets.

The general system for verifying the results of the Urban Centers Platform followed the rationale below:

I. Municipalities were recommended for certification that
   a) achieved 12 of 20 municipal targets;
   b) achieved reduction of inequalities in 6 of the municipal targets achieved; and
   c) had at least 30% of their communities recognized;

II. Communities that achieved 60 points in the action targets were recommended for recognition.

3.3. Results

3.3.1. Rio de Janeiro

The municipality of Rio de Janeiro achieved 16\(^4\) of the 20 municipal targets established. Reduction of inequalities could be found in a total of 8 targets achieved. Reduction of inequalities was achieved in 5 out of 8 targets achieved (62.5%). Forty-three Local

\(^4\) Data taken from the “Results of the Urban Centers Platform – Rio de Janeiro – 1\(^{st}\) Edition” document, sent by UNICEF.
Articulator Groups (over 30% of participants) were recognized for achieving the agreed upon action targets. The municipality of Rio de Janeiro was certified by UNICEF.

### 3.3.2. São Paulo

The municipality of São Paulo achieved 18\(^5\) out of 20 municipal targets established. Reduction of inequalities could be found in a total of 6 targets achieved. Reduction of inequalities was achieved in 4 out of 6 targets achieved (66.6%). Thirty working class communities (over 30% of participants) were recognized for achieving the agreed upon action targets. UNICEF certified the municipality of São Paulo.

### 3.3.3. Itaquaquecetuba

Out of the 3 working class communities participating in the Urban Centers Platform in the municipality of Itaquaquecetuba, 1 was recognized for achieving the action targets established at the start of the partnership. The municipality of Itaquaquecetuba achieved 10\(^6\) of the 20 municipal targets established; however, it was not possible to measure the reduction in inequalities because desegregated data was not available.

### 4. PCU timeline: situational features of the PCU cycle

\(^5\) Data taken from the "Results of the Urban Centers Platform – São Paulo – 1st Edition" document, sent by UNICEF.
\(^6\) Data taken from the "Results of the Urban Centers Platform – Itaquaquecetuba – 1st Edition" document, sent by UNICEF.
The record of some situational features of the PCU cycle serves to provide greater clarity regarding the socio-political dynamic of the development of public policy.

We understand that some concepts and methods of action were found in the PCU proposal even before it was disclosed to government authorities and even before its ostentatious reporting in the media. This is the case of the concept of articulation of public policies in impoverished territories in the large cities.

The PCU was already based on a clear principle of articulating the set of governmental, private and non-governmental initiatives in the territory. It implicitly acknowledged the "Government" was present in the communities; yet, actions were however not articulated in the territorial space of the location. This concept was later developed when implementing the so-called Social Pacification Police Unit (or UPP Social), which oversaw implementation of the Pacification Police Units (or UPPs) in Rio de Janeiro's favela areas.

This timeline also allowed some notable situational events in the PCU trajectory to be located. We will therefore consider the national, state and municipal dimension and the actions executed by the PCU in this trajectory, as seen below:

4.1. Government Administrations
4.2. Governmental Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Lula</td>
<td>César Maia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Lula</td>
<td>Eduardo Paes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Lula</td>
<td>Eduardo Paes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Lula</td>
<td>Eduardo Paes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Dilma</td>
<td>Eduardo Paes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Dilma</td>
<td>Eduardo Paes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Sérgio Cabral</td>
<td>César Maia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Sérgio Cabral</td>
<td>Eduardo Paes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Sérgio Cabral</td>
<td>Eduardo Paes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Sérgio Cabral</td>
<td>Eduardo Paes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Sérgio Cabral</td>
<td>Eduardo Paes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Sérgio Cabral</td>
<td>Eduardo Paes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>José Serra</td>
<td>Kassab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>José Serra</td>
<td>Kassab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>José Serra</td>
<td>Kassab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>José Serra/Alberto Goldman</td>
<td>Kassab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Geraldo Alckimin</td>
<td>Kassab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Geraldo Alckimin</td>
<td>Kassab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. PCU Actions
5. Positive Aspects and Limitations of the PCU in relation to:

5.1. RELEVANCE

5.1.1. Innovation in the structure of the actions executed by UNICEF.

Considering the trajectory of UNICEF actions, the innovative nature of the PCU in the area of this Organization's initiatives was evident. These innovations can be seen from three angles:

Firstly, based on the choice of implementing a platform in large metropolitan centers. This is a major challenge that will later, under the auspices of this Report, be resumed
in an effort to relativize this decision. Yet there is effectively a change in the scale of action and the decision to take on more complex challenges.

It is also fundamental to highlight UNICEF's closer ties to the working class communities. This Platform went "directly to the people" and was able to interact directly with working class communities, even with the mediation of partner institutions. In the other Platforms, UNICEF's main interlocutor is the City Halls. In this position, it had no direct action with the residents in working class communities. In this sense, the PCU produced knowledge and know-how for UNICEF.

And lastly, the establishment of a four-year cycle for public action, in the mold of what UNICEF has been doing in the Semiarid and Amazon regions. This element distinguishes UNICEF from the immediatist political culture, executed by government entities, establishing quite short timelines for action (6 months/1 year). These timelines seem to be incompatible with the chance of social transformation or change. With the PCU lasting 4 years, a new time cycle of public policies is established, transcending the limited timeframes established and indicating a new culture of medium and long term public actions in urban areas.

"Innovation for UNICEF." (UNICEF)

"Contribution of UNICEF was to manage to work directly with the people, going into the communities." (UNICEF)

"Greater experience, the innovation was the 4 year cycle process, with effect in the community environment. In the semiarid region, the main player is the government." (UNICEF)
"The boldness of UNICEF being willing to go into an unknown environment. Not even at UNICEF international is there more systematic work than at the Urban Centers. It's interesting that UNICEF is open to creating something new, inspired by other Platforms." (former UNICEF)

"Gathering people that already work in the area. A good project. Innovative. Yet it needs more resources." (AG)

5.1.2. Creation of the PCU with significant consultation of local institutions and intense participation of various actors.

Preparations to create the PCU were executed through various seminars and discussion groups, in which different social actors participated, including government, civil society, business, university, working class communities and adolescent group representatives, among others.

At first, UNICEF asked technicians from several institutions and leaders operating in working class communities to specifically think up indicators for the city. After these indicators were formulated, targets to be developed using the Platform were created.

Yet in general, the PCU was formed with significant interlocution with Society and the Government, which accounts for a major element in forming public policies in Brazil's political culture.

"How it was developed was very interesting, with a lot of hands on board, a lot of ears, a lot of seminars, in Rio and in SP; various technical meetings, a
very broad consultation process which resulted in a proposal that was enriched by different channelized visions." (former UNICEF)

"We met to think quickly and concisely about how to comprehend the city, aimed at an agenda for children and adolescents. We created a large number of indicators. It was different in practice. We weren't told that they would be used to establish targets for a program. We didn't know about the PCU." (Municipal Articulator)

5.1.3. Consensual appreciation of the initiative to create the PCU by all actors interviewed.

All actors interviewed were unanimous in expressing the importance of the UNICEF initiative. This was the "discourse" manifested by all of the actors when called on by the IETS to collaborate with the PCU Evaluation process. This "discourse" was supplemented by the ample availability of the people / actors in the process of granting interviews and participating in focus groups.

A distinctively notable trait is people's interest in adjusting their schedules to meet with IETS researchers to discuss the PCU.

This should not be merely understood as abstract availability. Actually, it shows the great interest that the Platform instilled among the participants in the process. Many showed their interest in different ways, by stating that they "had things to say about the PCU." Therefore, regardless of fixes or highlights given to the action, all of the interviewees reaffirmed the importance of the Urban Centers Platform.
“PCU: qualify public policies. UNICEF came to strengthen public policies.”
(Government Partner)

"Importance of the PCU: adolescents and adults join forces to discuss and propose solutions for the community." (AG)

"The PCU brought people together. It brought about a cultural change. The groups accepted the rules. A new process, a different political organization." (Technical Partner)

"Experience with public managers." "Open doors at the secretariats." "Easy to ask for the communities’ demands, it opened the channel of communication that exists up to now." (LAG)

"UNICEF has the potential to mobilize various actors. Moreover, it helps to deconstruct prejudice in relation to adolescents. It greatly contributed to young people playing a leading role." (Government Partner)

"I believe that the PCU brought about changes and built bridges. Some relations consolidated. It also contributed to the recognition of the youth as political actors and to political learning by different city leaders. Based on the PCU, there was increased knowledge of what each actor did and which agendas could be built based on commission meetings." (Strategic Ally).

5.1.4. Relevance given by the actors to reduction of social inequalities.

All of the actors interviewed regarded the topic of reducing social inequalities as being critical, especially because of its aggregating strength, capable of motivating various
actors to join. This consensus seems to indicate that initiatives with this focus or even the development of communication initiatives with this theme as a central element can cause various and different social sectors to join.

"UNICEF is in Brazil because of the disparities, focusing on reducing these disparities, through a set of integrated strategies." (UNICEF).

"Monitoring reduction of inequalities in the large cities is very important; managing to have geo-referenced indicators so that City Halls can have access to this information." (former UNICEF)

The idea of the PCU was to reduce heterogeneities." (Municipal Articulator).

"Visibility of those who have no voice and reduction of inequalities." (UNICEF)

"It has a strong focus on the issue of equality. Combating the reduction of social inequality. A major theme. An important example for UNICEF Brazil, because in practice we can work on this reduction of inequality. Developing plans of action with specific focuses in vulnerable locations. The pilot has already shown how to do this in practice. It is much harder to have results in large municipalities. The pilot has already given us a series of ideas on how to work on vulnerability in metropolitan centers." (UNICEF).
5.1.5. Consensus regarding actions geared towards children and adolescents.

The synergy achieved regarding actions geared towards children and adolescents established total consensus, with the aggregation of interests held by the various social actors interviewed also being a factor. One of the main ideas of the PCU was to provide children and adolescents with a voice, and the actions had this goal. Everyone also valued the importance of the youth playing a leading role.

"It is very opportune to join two such important issues: urban centers and adolescents." (former UNICEF)

"Participation of children and adolescents: it's a right. To change their lives, children and adolescents need to participate. They're not supposed to be cheap labor. They should develop." (UNICEF)

"The PCU made it valid for youth to play a leading role." (Government Partner).

"Adolescent: better understood social policies, to be able to help in the community. Participated in trainings and found that they were important for personal development." (AG)

"Autonomy for young people to roam the city, it broke down barriers; freedom to roam the city that is now my city as well." (LAG)

"Evolution of the PCU: it gave the ECA value." (AG)
5.1.6. Favelas and working class urban settlements as the focus of PCU attention.

UNICEF already had a Platform for acting in cities in the semi-arid region, which were recognized with the "UNICEF Approved Municipality Seal" for having achieved significant advances in improving living conditions for children and adolescents.

With the accelerated process of industrialization and urbanization that has taken place since the '60s and that produced a series of social inequalities in urban areas, UNICEF's action in large metro areas was of the utmost importance.

Once the PCU's goal has been defined as contributing to reducing inequalities in large cities, inequalities that mostly violate the rights of thousands of children and adolescents living in favelas and working class settlements, this formulation was regarded by those interviewed as an important axis for orienting public policies. In addition, by focusing its activities on working class communities, it gained substantial legitimacy.

"The Platform has two dimensions of action: the community and the city. Its aim was to make connections so that public policies were available, so that the potential in the community could happen." (UNICEF)

"The PCU generated learning, connected to the idea of local articulation." (Technical Partner).

"Articulation within the territory was of the utmost importance." (AG).

"The community gained more visibility in the society in general." (LAG)
"Community mobilization was important, we met other groups that existed in our neighborhood." (LAG)

5.1.7. While some non-community actors admit that confronting the issues of reducing social inequalities through the PCU is an important advancement in the area of public responsibilities (partners/government/society), the community actors understand that it is a transfer of responsibility from the government to the community.

At the same time that they state how important the PCU is to the communities and working class settlements, in both focus groups held, in Rio as well as São Paulo, the LAG/AG components said that they oftentimes feel they are working to fill a void left by the government.

"We had to collaborate and we were never paid to do what the government had an obligation to do." (LAG).

"I feel I have been injured by the government when it comes to my rights." (AG)

"We became a parallel city district office to fight for things." (AG)
5.2. EFFICIENCY

5.2.1. Theoretical documentation and systemic methodology.

There are vast materials containing PCU records, such as Results Summary reports from the Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo Participatory Consultations, the Report on Systematization of Methodology and Processes, Plans of Action, Methodological Guide, etc.

This collection can be consulted and provides a transparent look at UNICEF's intentions, which is rare in programs developed by Brazilian institutions.

"The Cedaps have CDs with the plans of action created, all of the documentation from all of the LAGs. All of the groups submitted record books and Cedaps keeps these records." (Technical Partner)

5.2.2. Absence of a focused analysis of the political dynamic in locations (and even cities) in determining strategies for action.

The differences of the political macro dynamic in the various municipalities do not seem to have been considered as an element in building strategies for action.

With this being the case, although UNICEF is concerned with understanding the different dynamics of the territories, when establishing the targets that should be achieved and the planning of actions to reach these targets, this understanding was not actually gained in practice because of the strictness of the methodology, as reported by the actors involved. The favelas and working class settlements have their particularities, with different features in the neighborhoods where they are located.
and even in the city as a whole. In addition, the same city's favelas are different from one to the next. And furthermore, the favelas of Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo and Itaquaquecetuba also show specific characteristics; this makes knowledge of each of these territories and their unique properties necessary for the PCU. Community institutions and leaders are also different. In Rio de Janeiro, they are more corporate in nature and have a "tendency towards professionalization of community activity," while in São Paulo, they work during their "free time," which suggests that this is something of a "volunteer" activity. These differences were not accounted for when determining strategies of action, hindering implementation of PCU methodology.

"But the territories are different in their own right. In São Paulo, the communities are on the city's edges; there isn't the same "mixing" as in Rio. Articulation with the São Paulo government is much harder; it could have been better. The UPPs [Pacification Police Units] in Rio helped the PCU. Different political and cultural variables also created these differences between the two municipalities." (UNICEF).

"In Rio and in São Paulo, the channels of participation are highly dependent on exchange of favors and territorial disputes. On the one hand, there are many strong institutions when thinking about public policy, but without a community basis; on the other hand, there are many base institutions, but with little content. Relations are clientilistic, which ends up creating discontinuity of public policies. Little confidence and therefore relations quickly fall apart. All of this makes this territory very unfavorable for convergence." (Strategic Ally)
"The idea was that SP and RJ were the same, in methodology and targets. As the data came in, we realized the need to make adjustments." (Municipal Articulator).

"You can’t go into the communities without people who really know them. Listen, empower, train so that this community undergoes a change from the inside out." (former UNICEF)

"SP communities are very different from RJ communities. Territorially distributed and very spread out, far away from each other. More than 1300 spread out (slums, favelas) and flat area. In RJ it’s more concentrated. More traditional communities, more structured, with an identity. For the rest it was new." (UNICEF).

"What each community needed should have been identified and not planned the same way for all, without identifying differences." (AG)

"I work as a freelancer, which allowed me to dedicate myself to the AG." (AG)

"I have had a resident association for 12 years. I work day and night for my community." (LAG).

5.2.3. Non-incorporation of substantial issues of the local urban context as a necessary element for methodological adjustments.
Because there was no investment in prior recognizance of the communities, the local urban context was not adequately considered. Needs were not known and, oftentimes, they were not in line with the targets that were supposed to be achieved. The methodology should have been participatory, with actors directly involved; the Local Articulator Groups should have been heard, identifying the differences in each community and outlining Plans of Action marked by distinctive local features, despite the effort to hold participatory consultations.

"The original methodology was no longer participatory once it had covered 60 communities and there was no way to adapt to the situation of each one." (Technical Partner)

"In relation to sustainability, my suggestion is that the Plan of Action start being done based on the Participatory Master Plan for each territory." (Strategic Ally).

"UNICEF should go into the field more, along with its team, go more to the front line to find out about these problems." "Methodology should be more flexible, seeking to understand the problem of each region and how to work in each location." (Government Partner).

"What each community needed should have been identified and not planned the same way for all, without identifying differences." (AG).

"There was no team to oversee each group to raise funds, support projects, inform the community." (AG).

"The community has its own rhythm; sometimes it couldn't get something because we didn't assess this rhythm." (AG).
"The PCU should better analyze and customize the methodology for the location and for the community." (Strategic Ally).

5.2.4. The Territorial unit of Action

The *favela* concept began in the city of Rio de Janeiro in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, with the first infrastructure-free shelters being built on hills. With the enormous demographic growth in Brazilian cities in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century and the consequent appearance of badly constructed housing, the concept of the *favela* expanded across the country.

The spreading of the term created generalizations that oftentimes overlooked the social, cultural and historical specificities of the spatial formation of each city. One example of these local particularities can be understood by comparing the cities of Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, which despite being near each other, have countless heterogeneities.

One element that reflects the differences of each location can be understood through the native discourse referencing poorly constructed housing in each city. While in Rio de Janeiro the terms *favela* or *comunidade* are commonly used, in São Paulo the terms *periferia* or *quebrada* are used. These distinct denominations reflect the particularities of each location’s historical spatial formation.

In Rio de Janeiro, the *favelas* were formed on hills located in central areas of the city, as is the case of Morro da Providência, the city’s first *favela*, which is located between the port zone and the financial district. The spatial proximity between the poorly constructed housing of the *favelas* and the developed central regions creates a contrast showing the city’s social inequalities and spatial segregations. This is a
distinctive factor, since in São Paulo, the formation of this type of housing is not characterized by location on hills, but rather on the city's outskirts or periferias. Zones such as the East and South Zones, characterized by having quebradas in their territories, are spatially far removed from the city's central and wealthier areas.

Based on this difference in the historical spatial formation of the cities of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, it is understandable that the phenomena of the creation of favelas should be analyzed in a more particular manner, including the cultural specificities of each location.

"UNICEF was concerned with the methodology being the same for RJ and SP. The heritage of the UNICEF seal: the same methodology for all of the seals." (UNICEF)

"A community is a territorial cross-section. Ex.: Barra Funda – Institute that already had a project/cross-section. The group itself defined its area, using population criteria of up to 5000 people. During this period, this demarcation changed many times, redefining the area of action." (Technical Partner).

5.2.5. The predominance of the replication process rather than of reapplication of the methodology.

The problem is established insofar as a favela in the city of Rio de Janeiro has a very strong identity and demarcated territorial boundaries – despite nuances that deserve to be discussed separately. Nevertheless, in the city of São Paulo, favela communities and working class settlements in general (with exceptions such as Paraisópolis, Cidade Tiradentes, etc.) do not have very clearly demarcated territories, allowing for multiple
and varied arrangements. With this being the case, the AG demarcates (and at times alters) the territorial cross-section of the action in a somewhat arbitrary manner and according to its strategies and expectations, while in Rio, the "borders" are clearly drawn in relation to the formal city.

"The group defined its area... this demarcation changed many times, redefining the area of action. There was always a center, usually the local institution's." (Technical Partner)

"It can be replicated, but by using influence. It generates learning, connected to the idea of local articulation." (Technical Partner)

"UNICEF wanted a methodology that could be replicated in any urban context. Not considering these urban contexts was a mistake." (UNICEF)

Not incorporating the concept of reapplication caused major impacts in the PCU implementation process, insofar as the particularities of each municipality’s context were not incorporated. The methodological adjustments implemented did not resolve the limitation of the methodology’s Replicability in different urban contexts.

5.2.6. Methodological process seen as strict and called "seized up" and "task-filled" by the actors, especially the community actors.

Because of the excessive number of indicators and the strictness of the methodology through implementation of the so-called "table" (normative and methodological guidelines), all of the actors involved, such as technical partners, LAGs, and the
communicator adolescents, saw the process as having a predominantly "seized up" and "task-filled" culture. The actors understood that they were supposed to follow the scripts suggested by the PCU without being able to change them and that they could not make the adjustments needed for a performance that they considered to be more productive. In addition, whenever the deadline for the action was arriving and, at times, when the team was smaller (excessive turnover of youth LAG/AG components), the work of the PCU was reduced to meeting targets and delivering results. This also had two important results: it was impossible to adapt the methodology to the local reality and the adolescents did not feel motivated to create and participate.

Although the Plans of Action were carried out by the LAGs/AGs based on the PCU proposal, operational conditions for their implementation, both financial and consumer materials, were not found. They also admit that institutional efforts were not made by technical partners to implement these plans of action.

"The questionnaire was enormous… they didn’t use the questionnaire to create stronger relations in the AGs." (Technical Partner)

"UNICEF always had the last word." (Technical Partner)

"The groups complained that they were guinea pigs in a pilot project." (Technical Partner)

"PCU isn’t a spontaneous movement. It was persuasive. Technical persuasion by an important agency (UNICEF)." (Technical Partner).

"We were constrained, monitored; we had to follow a lot of rules." "I just felt like I was carrying out tasks." "There were lots of Plan of Action activities, they held us back." "We performed tasks following lots of
rules, having to present results, there was no space for creativity.” "Plan of action formulated by the LAGs: nothing moved forward. There was no feedback.” (LAG).

"An excess of tasks! Moreover, demands came from UNICEF overnight. Thousands of schedules that could improve if the dialogue improved.” (Government Partner).

"I felt like I was performing tasks, along with the adolescents. Very few times was the space used for debate. It was really hard work, a lot of meetings, meetings to show results, and little importance was given to the process of developing the adolescents. There also wasn't time to discuss the specific issues of each territory.” (Technical Partner)

"A load of tasks with stipulated deadlines. There was no respect for the individuality of each AG.” (AG).

"Sometimes the activities were filled with tasks, but Viração was always trying to give the young people's participation meaning.” (Technical Partner).

5.2.7. Change in the scale of the number of LAGs initially planned could have contributed to problems with implementation.

All of the actors involved mentioned that the change in scale from 10 to around 60 LAGs in Rio and São Paulo hindered the work of UNICEF’s technical partners, since the allocation of resources did not keep pace with this growth. Therefore, one of the
consequences was the lack of structure to monitor the LAGs more closely, not in fact managing to "work directly with the people."

This decision by UNICEF also caused problems in relations between the Institutions because of the two entities in the communities being "accountable for being present" and the operational impossibility of executing the actions planned.

"Before, the PCU had 5 people working at the Institution. To execute the PCU, they had to hire more people to serve the 63 communities in Rio – It took over the institution!" (Technical Partner)

"Start: voluntary process to form groups. Of the 95 LAGs formed, only 64 were accredited. Of the 64 LAGs initially accredited, 43 stayed until the end of the PCU." (Technical Partner).

"They didn't have time to go into the field, they didn't know all of the communities. Deficiency in the change of scale from 10 to 60, which kept them out of the field and got in the way of intermediating the generational clash." (Technical Partner).

"Because it is a pilot project, it should be on a lesser scale – increasing from 10 to 60 did not help." (Strategic Ally).

5.2.8. Lack of structure to implement the PCU

Based on the scale increase in the number of LAGs/AGs and on the cut back in resources throughout the first cycle, the UNICEF team and its partners, especially its technical partners, did not have the operation, logistical and technical operating
conditions to monitor the PCU. Because of this, their presence was limited and it was not possible to interact and hold dialogue with the communities.

"And we also created a monster that became a little monster. It started off as a super proposal, but then came budget cuts and UNICEF backed away. It should have been gradual, to create sustainability." (UNICEF).

"Along the way, UNICEF thought it was too big and expensive, which is why it cut resources and the team." (UNICEF).

"Reduction of partners' team. Reduction in funding: other platforms needed the funds. Raising funds is very hard. The economic crisis made it hard to get donations. Initial idea of expenditures, but in practice, they had to be cut. Cuts in costs became recurring." (UNICEF).

"It was a UNICEF decision to make the PCU smaller, simpler. The directors in Brasilia decided that it would be simpler – they took away money and power. UNICEF had general problems with lack of funds. The PCU was cool; the other programs weren't. When the directors saw the entire result they were shocked." (former UNICEF).

"It rose to 60 with the aim of playing politics and drove UNICEF away from the people. With the momentum, they thought it was worth it, since they had invested in the QUESTIONING methodology that became the product that is being applied with other partners in other programs." (Technical Partner).
"The Team was designed for 10 AGs and it ended up serving 63. Work should be done with the groups with the appropriate resources." (Technical Partner)

"Absence of the support team, of technicians. There was no team to oversee each group to raise funds, support projects, inform the community." (AG).

5.3. EFFICACY/RESULTS

5.3.1. Limited repercussion of the PCU in traditional media, in alternative media and on social networks.7

There was consensus regarding the evaluation that the PCU had little coverage, in traditional media as well as in alternative media and on social networks. This fact, seen as a UNICEF decision based on cutting resources for this purpose and also because of the lack of institutional efforts, could have compromised implementation of the PCU in major urban centers, given that there was no involvement by society in developing actions. There was also no major repercussion in the communities where the PCU was implemented. In many communities, it was not even known by important community members in the location.

7 See "Visibility of the Urban Centers Platform – UNICEF" survey in attachment.
The generality of the actors' perception regarding this theme, along with the regular absence of coverage in traditional media as well as alternative media, points to the low importance given to communications. There were occasional manifestations on social networks that cannot be indicative of a consistent social communication policy, despite justifications of an operational financial nature acknowledged by UNICEF.

"The Platform was not known outside of the community. There was no institutional communication by UNICEF, no visibility, the expected recognition." (UNICEF).

"I think that the partnership with FUTURA was underutilized; after all, it's a TV channel. CEDAPS could have used many things at Futura, but they weren't seen as a Communication Channel. There was no significant publicity of the PCU." (Strategic Ally)

"I don't think that the GOVERNMENT knew about the PCU. There should have been more marketing, publicizing the UNICEF brand more, which is powerful and still appears little in the media. PCU had a communications problem. It should intensify marketing to raise funds. Have more visible recognition. When the city's reach targets, it should be made more public and visible. UNICEF partners should report and take this to the other cities." (Government Partner)

"I think that some things that were sloppy should be made professional: the communication area was very bad, the blog was very bad, for example. Furthermore, I didn't see any of what was produced. I thought that BEM TV was a weak institution, I thought the posters were hideous; there was no pride in anything done in communications. The
communications should have been outstanding. The PCU should have had greater coverage in the media." (Government Partner)

"Media. there was no coverage, the city didn’t know about it. Noise isn’t action, action isn’t publicity." (Government Partner).

5.3.2. Limited repercussion in the favelas and working class settlements where the PCU was implemented.

In the favelas and working class settlements there was also no major coverage of the PCU. Residents had little knowledge of the Platform and even about the work that was being done by the Local Articulator Groups and by the Communicator Adolescents. When the PCU began, there was substantial repercussion based on the possibility of access to financial resources, and later, regarding the use of the UNICEF brand as an identity to negotiate with the government about local demands. Since these two dimensions were idealizations and not UNICEF promises or commitments, there was a certain lack of interest by the PCU. The absence of local communication amplified this disinterest, making the PCU a practically unknown initiative in the locations.

"The communication was not good. Information was not spread in the city or the community. Some things showed up on social networks, blogs; but I wanted to see things spread throughout the city and on TV." (Technical Partner).

"As an institution, I lost credibility. No money came in, people left. It ruined my credibility, I had to close the institution." (LAG)
"Community didn’t believe in the PCU. We lost credibility." (AG)

"We started to form the AG, but when people saw that there were no resources they started quitting. We went until the end because our focus is on kids. Of the 3 AGs that started, ours was the only one that stayed to the end." (AG)

5.3.3. Limited repercussion in cities where the PCU was implemented.

In Rio de Janeiro and in São Paulo, the PCU brand got lost in the tangle of ongoing projects. As a whole, the two cities did not discuss implementation of the PCU. Unlike Itaquaquecetuba, which because of the size of the city used the PCU at the government and society levels as an important reference for public action, the cities of Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo did not include the PCU on their permanent agendas.

"The PCU has to become a city project. UNICEF has a strong brand and the PCU has a unifying effect; it is able to gather a lot of articulated people, but they have to share this space. Raising private funds and involving these companies, so that they’re co-participants, partners, in order to share the pains and gains." (former UNICEF)

"There should be more significant engagement by the state government; the focus was only on the municipality of Rio de Janeiro. Governor Sergio Cabral supports the program. It is practically impossible to find out about the PCU’s participation in the Targets. It doesn’t seem to be so much the goal of the targets, but rather pressing to help map and say where the problem is. Contribution more in articulation. Better
measuring the impact of the PCU’s action for the municipal targets."
(Government Partner).

In Itaquaquecetuba, in addition to the close relationship between City Hall and the PCU, the involvement by the city's first lady, who was also the Secretary of Social Action and was later elected as a State Representative, seems to have been decisive to articulating the various Secretariats with the local Articulator Group that was recognized. There was a permanent and decisive channel of communication between the government authorities and the AG. Because of this, many demands were answered and, with this, there was relative repercussion of the PCU in the city. It must however be noted that the creation of interlocution channels between the government and the community did not guarantee the possibility of joint action, as shown in the statement below:

"Significant effort by the First Lady, Eroilma, who is today a State Representative, in implementing UNICEF actions – substantial care with this agenda, which drew various other actors. Mayor Armando (PR party) had a very close relationship with UNICEF because his wife was working as the Secretary of Social Aid." (Government Partner)

"In ‘Itaquక,’ it was much easier to reach the Mayor and the secretaries; what was hard was understanding." (AG).

5.3.4. The Heart of the Platform: the LAGs | AGs

Considered the heart of the PCU, the formation of one Articulator Group per community, comprised of representatives from two non-governmental organizations,
two government institutions, two adolescent groups and two other freely chosen entities, was the main unit of action.

This unit, as well as the government, also had targets to meet. In this sense, they took part in various training workshops, aimed at strengthening their action in order to guarantee the rights of children and adolescents in working class communities, helping them to achieve the 30 Community Targets and reinforcing the sense of belonging to the Group. It was also up to the Local Articulator Group to identify young people to take on the job of Communicator Adolescents.

A preliminary evaluative evaluation of the LAGs | AGs by those interviewed shows a diverse set of appraisals. Below, we present an overview of the questions first asked by the interviewers, followed by an analysis of some essential elements of the Local Articulator Groups. We can see that:

"Adhesion to the PCU was voluntary: this was a hardship in managing to form the groups." (UNICEF)

"I see worthwhile potential in the LAG to build environments of dialogue, with very strong actors of change in the territory." "At the LAGs, the leaders were empowered, accredited from the top down, reproducing the logic of professionalization of leaders." (Strategic Ally)

"When we came into the PCU, the LAGs were already formed. Each LAG actually had a leader. Most of the LAGs already worked with health and nominated the adolescents. BEM TV was dependent on the LAG. The groups didn’t listen to the adolescents; they were invisible." (Government Partner)
"Of the 95 LAGs formed, only 64 were accredited. The so-called non-recognized LAGs are those that didn't even start (the 31 left over). Of the 64 LAGs initially accredited, 43 stayed until the end of the PCU. The groups worked for recognition. The 43 LAGs achieved the pre-established targets. They held meetings to present the city and community indicators. Only 8 LAGs were LAGs of excellence. These LAGs held meetings/sessions every 15 days to discuss points to be worked on. One of the tasks of the LAGs was to set up Plans of Action." (Technical Partner)

"LAG in Cidade de Deus: an LAG of excellence. The group started out strong because of the presence of strong local institutions, such as the Agency for Local Development, ASVI, schools, residents' association, CUFA (left in the beginning because of a conflict). Adolescents were taking part and it was working. Positive results." (Technical Partner)

"Heart of the PCU: Community organization." (UNICEF)

"At events, the LAGs represent the institutional level." (Technical Partner).

"Certificate: important. The LAGs use it as an identity, display it, use it as a reference for visitors. They value it. They believe that this will be a plus in the 2nd cycle." (Technical Partner)

"The government should be there when setting up the AGs!" (AG)

"We already had a lot of stuff, the PCU made us stronger." (AG)
5.3.5. LAG/AG.

In the table below we show the number of Articulator Groups formed in the three cities where the PCU was implemented. We also show the LAGs / AGs that were recognized and those that were not.

We can see that 2/3 of the LAGs formed in Rio de Janeiro were recognized for having met the targets, while in São Paulo, exactly half were recognized. Because Itaquaquecetuba was an experience with significant particularities, only one of the three AGs was recognized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total LAG/AG</th>
<th>No. of LAG/AG recognized*</th>
<th>No. of LAG/AG not recognized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Paulo</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itaquaquecetuba</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Recognition of the Local Action Groups - LAGs: the working class communities participating in the Urban Centers Platform were recognized for achieving the action targets established at the start of the partnership.

The "recognized / not recognized" polarity goes to the performance of the LAGs / AGs during the PCU cycle. Nevertheless, we would like to underscore that the "non-recognized LAG / AG" category does not translate the content of the process with absolute transparency. These were not just the units of action that did not meet the targets, they were also the groups that signed up and did not start the actions, the groups that quit during the process, and the groups that remained inactive during most of the actions, etc. That is to say, a heterogeneous set of situations.
This categorization with heterogeneous categories does not clearly translate the performance of the unit of action and, contrarily, it helps to minimize the performance of the recognized LAGs / AGs, since regarded generally, all of the groups that developed to the end of the Platform were recognized.

Therefore, creating other categories that more transparently translate the performance of the LAG/AG is desirable.

5.3.6. UNICEF

UNICEF has great prestige and is highly respected among governmental, private, community and non-governmental organizations, therefore establishing a high degree of credibility for its actions. Yet, at the same time, it creates (independent of its intentions) many expectations and idealizations that cannot be met, based on the very nature of the expectation. This component created a lot of "frustration and disappointment with the collective expectation." We suggest establishing a political strategy to confront this issue, with significant social communication content.

"UNICEF can't lend itself to this role. It ended up badly. A ridiculous role of mobilizing our efforts and then not supporting the community as it should. Reputation ruined!" (AG).

"We thought we would have a name! Using the UNICEF name to reach the Secretariats." (AG).

"I think that the UNICEF seal was very important to the institutions." (Technical Partner).
"Initially, everyone was fascinated by the UNICEF money. And also by the visibility UNICEF would give the groups. The articulations didn't work. This caused frustration in the groups, who blamed UNICEF. UNICEF opened doors in the territory, but it didn't go any further. Mobilization (adhesion, enrollment) all because of a call from UNICEF." (Technical Partner).

"UNICEF was always there in tough situations in the communities and was even concerned with the flood victims in the communities." (LAG).

"We couldn't use the UNICEF name, but the secretariats knew that the LAG was from the PCU, and therefore from UNICEF. We were therefore able to discuss community demands and they listened to us." (LAG).

"Expectations were created because at first, everyone understood that there would be financial help; it wasn't stated, but it was understood. We were frustrated. There was no money." (LAG).

"Lack of communication of the LAGs with UNICEF, meeting didn't happen." (LAG).

"Criticism in relation to the smaller UNICEF team, which has internal competency and baggage, but few people." (Strategic Ally).

"UNICEF's strength is its articulation work. They could have used this better. Creating a mechanism to join the three levels of government. UNICEF could also collaborate in raising funding for the articulator groups. Every government administration will want the UNICEF seal." (Government Partner).
"There is no policy without resources. It could be through a sponsorship system. UNICEF could create partnerships to raise funds for the LAG projects. UNICEF could bring projects and ideas from around the world to be used at the PCU." (Government Partner)

"There was no disbursement of (sustainable) funds to the LAGs, just tickets to the events. They could raise funding, even by using the PCU logo. There was a lot going on in terms of community leaders, the PCU brought a visibility to what was already happening (main counterpoint, "bargaining chip")." (UNICEF)

**5.3.7. Creation / Implementation of the PCU**

It is plausible, in a formal summary, that the PCU had an important methodological and theoretical reference, but that its implementation, despite various positive aspects, posed many challenges. Therefore, a new PCU cycle should consider past experiences regarding methodological and theoretical challenges as well as and especially the dilemmas of implementation. We understand that the bottlenecks of the PCU are more specifically related to implementation rather than creation, although there is a need for the methodological and theoretical adjustments previously mentioned in this Final Report.

"The action can’t be superficial, amateur, without money and with a skeletal team. It’s a lot of responsibility to create a movement of this size. Either do it right or don’t do it! UNICEF really puts itself out there doing a slapdash job." (former UNICEF).
"There was a lack of a team to oversee each group to raise funds, support projects, inform the community." (AG).

"UNICEF inflexible, seized up. They aren't savvy about the market, they're not proactive. If they depend on resources, they need to be less vain." (Strategic Ally)

"BEM TV was in charge of training the adolescents, using its methodology. It already had a project called "Olho vivo" that trained adolescents in the media area and they picked the language, in the communications area. This same methodology was used at the PCU." (Technical Partner)

"Many disagreed with the methodology used at the PCU." (Technical Partner)

"There were differences in the Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo PCUs. UNICEF tried to maintain the methodology, the timeline, so that these differences didn't show up. But the territories are different in their own right. In São Paulo, the communities are on the city's edges; there isn't the same "mixing" as in Rio. Different political and cultural variables also created these differences between the two municipalities." (UNICEF)

"Another suggestion is that there should just be one level of work. The working methodology has to be convergent. The way the PCU was implemented, it broke into pieces and broke apart, falling into the same rationale. My suggestion is to review the institutional architecture. The indicators have to be the same and the level of work the same, defining different roles for each actor." (Strategic Ally).
"The Methodology has to be more flexible, seeking to understand the problem of each region and how to work in each location." (Government Partner).

"More partners, to have more team, to think, especially in liaising with the government; perhaps having someone just for this." (Strategic Ally).

5.3.8. Improved indicators based on PCU implementation

Evaluation of the results indicators for municipal and community targets is extremely difficult insofar as only achievement of targets is presented, without a separation of what can be considered endogenous and exogenous. Without exception, both the IETS researchers and those interviewed stated that it is impossible to distinguish between a result that is endogenous (PCU) or exogenous (product of macro policies). Therefore, appropriate coverage of this topic WAS NOT POSSIBLE, with a study geared exclusively towards this issue being needed in order for us to issue a consistent evaluation on the specific impact of the PCU in improving indicators.

5.3.9. Documents serving as records of implementation and results of the action.

There are few documents serving as records of implementation as well as of the results achieved. There is just one document per city that summarizes the results and targets achieved by the PCU. Although a dossier of technical partners exists, the social actors, particularly the local actors, understood that there would not be any feedback
on the final results of the Platform, insofar as the actors do not recognize the certification and recognition events as processes of feedback on results.

One partner summarized the general view of this topic:

"I never found out about results, we never had any feedback."
(Government Partner).

5.3.10. Community demands met by the government.

One of the main results reported by several actors, and especially by community actors, was the chance for direct interlocution between government agencies and the community, represented by the PCU. Participation in the PCU represented an important political asset for dialogue between the parties.

The creation of channels for interlocution between the Government and Community made it possible for various community demands to be met through the PCU. Thus, bus stops, construction of schools, walkways, and a variety of one-off demands were resolved based on the LAGs' direct contact with the government.

"The major appeal of an articulation process isn't influencing this or that, but rather creating a movement in the city." (former UNICEF)

"Articulations at the local level worked. Closer relations and execution of actions in the community. Community leaders and adolescents: they articulated, but they faced hurdles." (Technical Partner).
5.3.11. The Technical Partners.

The Technical Partners were chosen by UNICEF. In Rio de Janeiro there were two and in São Paulo there were two. Their job was to provide technical assistance to the PCU and to the Local Articulator Groups and Communicator Adolescents in particular.

In Rio, CEDAPS and BEM TV were chosen, and for São Paulo they were CIEDS and Viração. All of these Institutions are recognized at the technical community level.

All pointed out that the resources available vis-à-vis the set of activities to be developed were very little, which may have compromised action "directly with the people," especially in relation to the lack of funds for instrumentalizing adolescent communications activities.

5.3.12. Strategic Allies.

The first cycle of the Platform relied on a partnership with Strategic Allies, such as the Change for Good - British Airways, Kimberly – Clark and MSC Cruzeiros companies and Fundação Itaú Social, both in creating the methodology and, fundamentally, with financial resources.

Nevertheless, there does not seem to have been an articulation strategy for the Strategic Allies.

"Other partners involved (MSC, Kimberly): they could have articulated more, exchanged experiences. They never met, they never found out
about the projects. There was no articulation between the companies. Impact on the corporate policies.” (Strategic Ally).

“There was no meeting with the strategic allies, except for planning meetings.” (Strategic Ally)

5.4. SUSTAINABILITY

5.4.1. Methodological adjustments: Social network.

Although the PCU methodology is based on articulation of various social actors, its implementation did not include setting up a network.

Even though the network concept was not planned for, there seems to be a need to develop a methodological adjustment skill during the process to overcome limitations of this nature, since the social actors had few articulation skills, working in a quite isolated manner. Setting up networks as a response to the limitation found could perhaps have improved the PCU’s performance.

We understand that the absence of a horizontal structure in establishing relations at the PCU as well as in Local Articulator Group relations contributed to the creation of hierarchical structures, as we will see later.

The statements below go right to the heart of the matter:

"We were unable to "radiate,” to go on to the other communities.” (UNICEF).
"Thinking in networks, articulating the LAGs like local networks - with no hierarchy, decentralized, mobilizing the communities." (Technical Partner).

"The Platform project has to be a network of the network; but I didn’t see any network happening in practice." (Technical Partner).

5.4.2. Changing government policies.

On the other hand, the PCU did not cause any visible change in government policies, despite the explicitly recognition of the director of the municipality of São Paulo regarding facilitating communication between government agencies and the communities where the PCU was implemented. In Itaquaquecetuba, there was a significant impact on the political culture of the municipal administration; yet, it did not reach translation into government policies.

"It was also a tool for integration at City Hall, a point of convergence and union between the Secretariats. It was a very rich and important moment, mostly enabling the technical team to move forward on the targets." (Government Partner).

In Rio de Janeiro, in the environment where formulation of the PCU was discussed, there was an intense debate regarding the public initiatives in the city, especially in the favelas. One point of debate was integration of public policies in favela territory. There was significant consensus that one-off actions did not bring about the transformative
impact needed. With this being the case, the topic of articulation of public policies in the territory became an important item on the city's social agenda.

Perhaps the PCU was the first initiative to implement this idea, thus it even preceded the so-called Social UPP implemented by the Rio de Janeiro State Government and, later, by City Hall.

"The PCU brought people together. Government presence with the entrance of the UPP." (Technical Partner)

"The ideas of the PCU are very similar to those of the social UPP. The LAGs were the doorway to the social UPPs (reference). Meetings, indicating the groups that existed in the community, etc." (Technical Partner)

"The two processes (PCU and social UPP) are similar, but with different agendas. Children and adolescents were not on the agenda of the social UPP." (Technical Partner)

5.4.3. Creation of interlocution and a channel of communication between the government and community.

Through the PCU, there was construction of a major institutional channel for directing demands and for interlocution between the government and community. This is recognized by all of the actors.

"The gain made by the platform: participating in CRAS meetings, experience with public managers. Today, we don't need to ask
permission to go into public buildings; all of the secretariats have open doors (except for the Municipal Secretariat of Sports and Leisure). We got a partnership with some businesspeople, for jobs. It's easy to ask for the communities' demands, it opened the channel of communication that exists up to now." (LAG).

"Experience with public managers." (LAG).

"We got partnerships with companies. Space for Mini Olympic Village." (LAG)

"I managed to reform daycare, Municipal Secretariat of Health." (LAG)

"Open doors at the secretariats. Except for the secretariat of sports, which didn’t open its doors to Sepetiba." (LAG)

"Partnership with the city’s daycare. The group itself didn’t gain strength, but the daycare did." (LAG)

"We got one adolescent to stop robbing people; today he is already a man." (LAG).

"Partnerships with the Olympic Village." (LAG).

"With the platform, there was the bus line, trash pickup that didn’t come into the community." (LAG).

"We gained more visibility for society in general." (LAG)
"We had major achievements, basic sanitation, paving, etc." (LAG)

"For the community: ties to the government. We could get there. We used the LAG and PCU name. We gained visibility. There was no school, no health unit, nothing. We don't have a lot of structure, but now we have basic sanitation, a van, the 'ônibus da liberdade' project (municipal system). But the PCU's partnership with the state government needs to be reviewed, since it was lacking." (Communicator adolescent).

"The PCU helped open the channel between the community and City Hall 100%." (Government Partner)

"Biggest gain of the PCU was the fact that it put the government at the same level as the communities; big gains were made in this sense. Co-responsibility networks." (Government Partner)

"Paradigm shift: nobody is a victim. The government and the community are both responsible." (UNICEF)

5.4.4. Non-articulation of the public initiatives and actions in the territory.

The creation of channels of interlocution between the PCU and Government and the achievement of some community demands were, however, executed on an ad hoc
basis and in a fragmented manner; they did not constitute an articulated initiative in the territory's plan.

This theme of articulation of public policies in the territory, which is so fundamental as a concept and a guideline of action, was put on the back burner in implementing the PCU, in relation to both creation of Plans of Action and more general strategies. The fragmented demands and social opportunities took center stage in detriment to an articulated public policy action in the territory that could provide for more relevant impacts.

"The LAGs wanted contact with the Secretaries; they expected this articulation." (LAG).

"Ability of the government to dialogue with the community: it wasn’t capable of leveraging this." (LAG).

"Locally, the LAGs feel like they are protagonists; they do local articulation. They demanded participation by the government, by partners. They demanded answers. They wanted more." (LAG).

"One of the tasks of the LAGs was to set up Plans of Action. And to execute the actions for this plan, they needed articulation with the government. Which didn’t always happen." (Technical Partner).

"The articulations didn’t work. For example, the LAGs created a project, using diagnostics, to present to the Secretariat of Sports and Leisure, but the Secretary never showed up. This caused frustration in the groups, who blamed UNICEF." (LAG).
"Discontinuity, limitations: the slowness of the government." (Technical Partner).

"I wish that things hadn’t been so unhinged. They demanded so much. I would like everything that was a demand to be bundled together and met. A different take from within the government." (AG).

"Overall, in the second forum there was no government." (LAG)

"Start: I was 100% dedicated. Direct meetings with the Public Ministry opened channels. The "doing" independent from UNICEF, depends on the government. And this halfway point is frustrating, because actions weren’t moving forward." (AG)

"The support expected from the government wasn’t there; there wasn’t the expected federal articulation. There was good content and good professionals. For example, Pronasci didn’t collaborate, while the Municipal Secretariat of Health did. Federal government support was lacking, communication was lacking." (UNICEF).

"The community aspect didn’t go very well, it ended up petering out at the end. They didn’t manage, they didn’t have enough tenacity to bring the community together; the people who were monitoring were lacking energy. Health was unable to reach the territory level. Perhaps this was very limiting. The PCU is indebted to the communities, because the Secretary had minor participation." (Government Partner)
5.4.5. Unclear role of the government representatives in the LAGs / AGs.

The PCU’s methodological procedures indicated that two government institutions should be included in the makeup of the LAG/AG. Yet, in practice, the government’s was only present in the role of partner, as an institution that paid the communicator adolescents grants or as an articulator of ad hoc policy actions. The government representative was not fully inserted in the Local Articulator Group.

"Contribution more in articulation. I did 2 or 3 visits to the LAG, good relationship, but not very present." (Government Partner)

"I didn't know there were adults in the AG." (Government Partner)

"The government should be there when setting up the AGs and so should UNICEF." (AG).

5.4.6. Action of the Local Articulator Group.

The Local Articulator Group worked in the communities and had a set of activities that should develop targets to be met and other tasks established in its Plans of Action.
5.4.7. In addition to not acting in a network, the LAGs/AGs only had ad hoc experiences exchanging information and knowledge.

The LAGs/AGs do not articulate with each other in a social network format, acting only at certain times during activities promoted by partner activities or by UNICEF. The overwhelming trend was isolated action of the LAGs/AGs, without establishing any partnerships or sharing problems and solutions.

This point was significantly underscored by the Local Articulator Group components, both in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo. They complained about the lack of a systematic exchange of experiences and information provided by the PCU. Therefore, this process was narrow and did not contain a structuring action in implementing the Platform.

"It helped to show that we are capable of all of this. There was already a network, but we didn't believe in each other." (AG).

"We already had a lot of stuff, the PCU made us stronger." (AG).

"Working in a network was a positive aspect." (LAG).

5.4.8. Change in strategic allies' corporate policies.

Fundação Itaú Social clearly admits that the PCU inspired and determined the shape of the "Urban Youth" (Jovens Urbanos) (www.fundaçoaotausocial.org.br) and Kimberly – Clark do Brasil with the "Active Woman" (Mulher Atuação) Project (www.mulheratuacao.com.br).
"Fundação Itaú already had youth and local development projects. They incorporated some processes of the PCU in the projects that already existed at Itaú: Urban Youth." (Strategic Ally)

"We used social projects where Kimberly operated as a target... We wanted a platform there... We called Cieds and Instituto Paulo Montenegro and created our project, Active Woman." (Strategic Ally).

This is actually, as formally stated by the Strategic Allies, about a relevant and decisive heritage from the PCU, establishing an important change in corporate policies implemented through these Companies.

5.4.9. Re-application of the methodology by the strategic allies.

Unlike UNICEF, which did not adopt re-application of the PCU methodology, the Strategic Allies widely used the experience to execute re-application of the methodology.

Fundação Itaú Social and Kimberly-Clark do Brasil were two strategic allies of UNICEF in the Urban Centers Platform. Using the experience and learning from this project, each institution formulated new programs aimed globally at social matters.

Fundação Itaú Social, through its Urban Youth Project, is similar to the PCU because it works with youth from major urban centers. Its main goal "is to expand the socio-cultural repertoire of young people in at-risk situations from the perspective of comprehensive education," in addition to "contributing to access the world of work, as
well as fostering the enjoyment of cultural and social equipment and assets available in the city and encouraging good attendance, staying in school and a connection with new educational processes."

Its methodology is similar to that of the PCU, because it works locally, training youth in different areas such as "world of work, urban mobility, sexuality, sustainability, entrepreneurship, culture and the digital world." It is implemented through NGOs and educators that work in these specific areas.

While the Urban Youth Project sticks to the question of comprehensive education through expansion of the socio-cultural repertoire of young people, Kimberly-Clark do Brasil's Active Woman project is "aimed at improving women's quality of live, seeking to guarantee their rights." The project has a specific feature related to the PCU, since it plans "to join every sector of society to work together around a common goal: women's rights." In other words, it seeks to use a network to articulate various actors in society, such as "residents, public equipment, non-governmental organizations, associations, councils, companies" to work towards a common goal.

The Active Woman Project resembles the PCU methodology in that it forms groups to act in the regions served, as well as local articulator groups, which create their own indicators and targets to be met, in addition to organizing into Community Forums.

Based on this information, we can categorically state that one of the main results was the re-application of UNICEF's Urban Centers Platform methodology, which served as an explicit reference for Strategic Ally projects, including projects by Fundação Itaú Social and Kimberly-Clark do Brasil.

We can furthermore see that any limitations of the PCU were reconsidered when implementing the Urban Youth and Active Woman Projects.
This is actually, as formally stated by the Strategic Allies, about a relevant and decisive heritage from the PCU, establishing an important change in corporate policies implemented through these Companies. The statement below provides an eloquently statement of this process:

"Fundação already had youth and local development projects. We incorporated some processes of the PCU in the projects that already existed at Itaú: Urban Youth. Modeling projects based on the PCU: a routine action." (Strategic Ally).

**5.4.10. Impact of PCU methodology.**

There also seems to be no question that the PCU methodology inspired the creation of other research and action procedures. This can be seen in the statements below.

"Like it or not, this methodology was incorporated by various companies and institutions, adapting the PCU methodology; we had a bunch of things that the methodology inspired." (former UNICEF)

"We invested in the QUESTIONING methodology, which became a product and is being applied with other partners in other programs." (Technical Partner)

**5.4.11. Government partners.**
The PCU concept established a partnership with the three levels of government. The Rio de Janeiro State Government, the São Paulo State Government, Rio de Janeiro City Hall, São Paulo City Hall and Itaquaquecetuba City Hall were invited to participate in the Platform and all of them initially showed a willingness to collaborate. This intention did not, however, manifest itself in effective commitments.

5.4.12. Participation of the three levels of government: municipal, state and federal.

To achieve the goals of the PCU, the LAG/AG initiative was expected to be an articulator of public policies in local action at the national, state and municipal level. However, the articulations really only happened at the municipal level. There was an attempt by the government partner with the state, but the results of this partnership have not been identified, not even by this partner. While at the federal level, there was not even a partner in any action.

"The support expected from the government wasn't there; there wasn't the expected federal articulation." (UNICEF).

"I don't think that the GOVERNMENT knew about the PCU. There should be more significant engagement by the state government; the focus was only on the municipality of Rio de Janeiro. I sent along the Governor’s email address and never got a response from UNICEF, I never found out about results, we never had any feedback. There should be permanent meetings with the state, just like there was a meeting between
adolescents and the Mayor. Don’t let the partner forget what the PCU is; the initial movement died out.” (Government Partner).

“But the PCU’s partnership with the state government needs to be reviewed, since it was lacking.” (Communicator Adolescent).

“Within the PCU, the government wasn’t recognized.” (AG)

“Municipal committee: the state just went once.” (Government Partner).

5.4.13. Predominance of participation by City Halls.

The City Halls participated significantly. All of the mayoral candidates signed a Term of Agreement, committing to achieving the Municipal Targets proposed by the Platform based on the Millennium Development Goals and validated by UNICEF and its partners. Right after the election, the Mayor-elect would appoint a liaison to the Urban Centers Platform, facilitating communication between the municipal secretariats and their teams. In addition, each Mayor would appoint a municipal articulator to serve as a Platform liaison and to stipulate the 20 municipal targets. Articulations with the secretariats were made, but the LAGs/AGs did not recognize this liaison figure appointed directly by the Mayor, attributing these articulations with the secretariats to their own initiatives based on UNICEF’s institutional prestige.

“CEDAPS: would do the articulations with the governments (work that should be done by the LAG, but CEDAPS helped). The PCU brought people together.” (Technical Partner).
"The targets were more important to the City Hall, a lot of stuff was the same as the municipal targets. The City Hall's mobilization was related to the targets. Even because of the bonus for reaching targets." (Municipal Articulator)

"I saw various Secretariats mobilize in relation to the targets and because they didn’t have this data, it was important for the indicators to guide the public policies based on the PCU. Some groups looked to the targets and didn’t see themselves there. How could the Secretariat of Sports contribute to neonatal mortality? For example, with water aerobics. I think that for health, these targets were already clearer; they were more related to health, connected to the Mayor’s targets. During the meetings, there was an attempt to translate the targets so that the other secretariats would also realize that they were part of the same universe." (Government Partner).

"Gain of the platform was participating in CRAS meetings, experience with public managers. Today, they don’t need to ask permission to enter public buildings, doors are open to all of the secretariats, except for the Municipal Secretariat of Social Defense." (LAG).

"They couldn’t use the UNICEF name, but the secretariats knew that the LAG was from the PCU, and therefore from UNICEF. They were therefore able to discuss community demands and they were listened to." (LAG).

"Articulation with the government was a little sloppy, since UNICEF didn’t have any legs to stand on." (Technical Partner).
"The government would come in saying things that had nothing to do with the matter at hand / without listening to the AGs." (Technical Partner).

"PCU was an agenda for the Mayor, who signed on prior to being elected, during the campaign." After being elected, there was a conversation with the Mayor, who said "let's do it." (Government Partner)

"The PCU helped open the channel between the community and City Hall 100%. The city district office is a more common reference. Budget hearings are done regionally. I have no doubt that someone from the PCU took part in the hearing to fight for something." (Government Partner).

"UNICEF opened paths, more assuredness of where make demands, how to reach the government." (AG).

"There was no team to oversee each group to raise funds, support projects, inform the community. Kassab proposed supporting the official launch of the PCU, but didn't follow through on anything that was arranged." (AG).

"Achieving space through our know-how." (AG).

"We were able to do it, but through our own efforts. This government articulation is important, improve this." (AG).

"Open doors to the public sector." (LAG).
"In 'Itaquá,' it was much easier to reach the Mayor and the secretaries; what was hard was understanding. The problem is in the lack of communication between the secretariats." (LAG).

5.4.14. Limited impact on the government agenda

The impact of the PCU at the government level was limited and did not inspire government actions or policies. Because of this, the PCU was not incorporated into the agenda at City Halls.

Actions implemented by government agencies were understood as responses to LAG/AG demands.

On the other hand, government agencies understood that there was no chance of measuring the targets proposed by the PCU, given the difficulty in identifying endogenous and exogenous impacts.

"Locally, the LAGs feel like they are protagonists; they do local articulation. They demanded participation by the government, by partners. They demanded answers. They wanted more." (Technical Partner).

"It could be attributed to other outside happenings, such as the UPP, 'Lei Seca' anti-alcohol legislation, etc." (Government Partner).

"They worked on a set of actions, but many targets matched the government administrations' targets." (Government Partner).
"The fact that the government was involved in 'Itaquá' doesn't mean that it worked." (Government Partner).

"It isn't known whether the PCU influenced the city's public policies, but the belief is that it did. PCU posed a policy for action, in some cases converging with the City Hall’s targets. The thought is that someone else would demand an agenda for kids and adolescents. They never thought of an action to raise the rate of adolescents registering to vote, they saw it at the PCU, it wasn't a City Hall policy. They ended up doing it."

(Government Partner).

"The diagnostic data created by the PCU wasn't used." (Government Partner).

5.5. TRANSVERSAL THEMES

5.5.1 Expansion of youth repertoire.

The process of implementing the PCU, the social practices inaugurated, the trainings held, the dialogues with other actors and the events executed offered a new and transformative discourse and discursive repertoire for the adolescents, greatly impacting their personal growth.

This result is absolutely visible in the adolescents' discourse and represents a substantial and fundamental contribution of the PCU.
"Once a month, everyone met to find out what was happening/make the communication plan. In the first year, meetings were more general, visits to the territory/exchange of information. The adolescents changed out a lot. Later, the meetings became territorial. In the second year, there were three months of specific workshops. The participation of the adolescents was intense." (Technical Partner).

"BEM TV encouraged our voice." (Communicator Adolescent).

"Participation of children and adolescents: it's a right. To change their lives, children and adolescents need to participate. They're not supposed to be cheap labor. They should develop. Focus of the PCU: adolescents!" (UNICEF).

"Strengthening the relationship between the adolescents and the city was important. The adolescents are the most positive aspects, very engaged, enjoying what they were doing, feeling like part of the process, being heard, responsibility for success." (Government Partner)

"UNICEF has the potential to mobilize various actors. Moreover, it helps to deconstruct prejudice in relation to adolescents. It greatly contributed to young people playing a leading role." (Government Partner)

"There were some adolescents, who weren't the majority, that were ready to take off. Most of them were, however, very limited. Based on the PCU, they were able to build life plans. Many went to college." (Technical Partner)

"Transformation happened in individuals." (Technical Partner)
5.5.2 Expanded social borders.

Empowerment, through increasing the youth repertoire, caused the social borders that confined and segregated the adolescents to be "broken," allowing for "social traffic" through the city, through new youth cultures and new social codes and norms.

"I see my neighborhood differently; I see improvements and I see what can be better." (Communicator Adolescent).

"Personal growth, direct contact with UNICEF brought many opportunities for the adolescents. It became critical, which caused some conflict at some LAGs." (Communicator Adolescent)

"For me, autonomy through the city. Now I go wherever I want; I feel free. I know that the city is also mine. I learned to be a critical young person. Not accepting, but in fact questioning. And this created conflict." (Communicator Adolescent)

"Another positive that stood out at the PCU was having taken the kids out of the territory and having them move around the city." (Strategic Ally)

The result of this process uniquely impacted youth trajectories, yet it mostly converged to establish new future outlooks for the adolescents.

5.5.3 New future outlooks for the adolescents.
The majority of the participating adolescents established new parameters for the future based on the experience established at the PCU. Many moved into other social initiatives; some migrated to the university and established new and different projects for the future.

"I didn't have anything to do in the afternoon and I was a very active person. I found out they needed adolescents who could travel around the city and I became interested. It worked, I can no longer see myself without this area. We were inserted into RAP da Saúde (Network of Adolescent Promoters of Health); today, I'm a facilitator for the RAP in Realengo, training other deaf and hearing adolescents." (Communicator Adolescent)

"The adolescents were split into two categories. multipliers (adolescents that were starting out in the project) and facilitators (there longer, more mature, who were responsible for the younger ones)." (Government Partner).

"Many adolescents went to college and also hung out around Paulista and went to movie theaters and other cultural activities." (Technical Partner)

5.6. LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.6.1 Method of joining the PCU.

One of the most complex themes of the PCU regarded the method of joining, insofar as this established a significant impact on the actions proposed.
The interviews held indicate that UNICEF did not expect to enroll a large number of communities, in either Rio de Janeiro or São Paulo, mostly because of the Platform’s voluntary nature. Yet, at the same time, the communities that gained knowledge from the Platform regarded this as an opportunity for access to financial resources. These different expectations created significant impacts on the performance of the PCU.

There was, therefore, a much larger number of enrollments in the PCU than planned. UNICEF's decided to include the communities enrolled.

Planning for a smaller number of communities and its expansion to nearly all of the communities that enrolled established a quantitative size for which the technical partners did not have operational capacity (and perhaps not even the human and financial resources) to operationalize.

This decision seems to have been reflected in the implementation of the PCU, especially in the formation of the units of action – the LAGs/AGs.

5.6.2 Formation of the LAGs / AGs.

In Rio de Janeiro, the LAGs were formed based on decisive action of one of the technical partners: CEDAPS, an institution with great history and experience in community actions. In a way, mobilization through CEDAPS created a "bias" for the substantial joining of traditional community "leaders" connected to the health area, one of CEDAPS' most recognized areas of action.
In São Paulo, the AGs were comprised randomly, since the partner organization, CIEDS (and before CIEDS, the Sou da Paz organization), did not have a major community base in the city and because of the "community politics culture," where a strong "corporate culture" was not prevalent among the "community leaders" as it was in Rio de Janeiro.

In Itaquaquecetuba, the only AG recognized was formed from a pre-existing organizational base that started the process at the location.

"Most of the LAGs already worked with health and nominated the adolescents." (Technical Partner).

"Cedaps experience: they had already worked with UNICEF. A previous relationship. A health agenda." (Technical Partner).

"CEDAPS (previously partnered with Rap da Saúde) worked with the adolescents through the Secretariat of Health." (Government Partner)

"It works with youth to prevent AIDS, CEDAPS' healthy community network, a job they've done for years. The work was already there before the LAGs were formed." (LAG).

"We received 68 enrollments; 5 didn't have enough people to be created. 63 went forward – 32 were certified. We noticed that there were more consolidated groups and others that formed based on the PCU. Some managed to do it, even though they were more fragile. UNICEF hadn't imagined there'd be so much interest." (Technical Partner).

"I liaised with the CEU (Unified Education Center), I established partnerships and from there I signed up for AG and was approved." (AG).
"The PCU came to me because it's a fighter." (AG).

"I worked as the Director at an NGO, serving 1500 people directly. I'm a missionary." (AG).

"I already worked with the community. We found out about the PCU through Instituto Sou da Paz. I've always fought for projects. I didn't have a job; I took part in a healthy eating project and received a stipend." (AG).

5.6.3 Profile of the adult members (community leaders).

In Rio de Janeiro, the groups were formed by "traditional community leaders" that were already consolidated and active in social causes, especially in the health area.

In São Paulo, the members were not connected to the "leadership" issue, but rather had a profile associated more with volunteer work.

As we have seen, in Itaquaquecetuba the AG members came from a local social movement.

"Type and profile of people that are heading up the organizations is totally different than in RJ; they are not directly engaged, only on weekends and nights. In RJ, they are NGOs, more structured institutions." (UNICEF)

"The leaders were invited to the platform. We accepted and went out inviting people; many people came, but with a profile that wanted to learn. Some said yes because they didn't follow this. Expectations were created because at first,
everyone understood that there would be financial help; it wasn't stated, but it was understood. We were frustrated." (LAG)

"I've worked with the Residents' Association since 2004 (people's rights – health council member and ended up on the Platform)." (LAG)

"NGO President." (LAG)

"I founded an NGO in 2007. Founder of the community." (LAG)

"I reconciled it by working at night." (AG)

"First contact with the PCU was through information passed on by Telefonica." (AG)

"The leaders in São Paulo don't do this for a living, so they do it in their free time." (Technical Partner)

We should note two other points regarding the adult members of the LAGs / AGs:

First, we should note that these recruited leaders, especially in Rio de Janeiro, should be seen as important members of the community and not as leaders. There is a large number of local political actors in Rio de Janeiro's favelas and, in this sense, there is also a crisis of political representation. The institutions function with a small social base and little legitimacy since they do not represent local interests. They actually represent private and corporate interests more than public or collective interests. Therefore, the LAG components should be regarded as "important community members" and not as possibly being "leaders." Any use of the "leader" category
compromises the development of the initiative, associating the LAGs with a community representation, which was not intended by either UNICEF or its partners.

The other issue is that given that the Local Articulator Groups were comprised of members from various local institutions, the private causes of each of the members were at times incorporated, creating a dispute for the priority agenda at the LAGs.

"There were serious groups that already had social capital. There were two different results: groups previously established ended up benefitting more and self-promoting, which discouraged other groups who quit. The groups that were in communities longer or had stronger leaders were able to maintain the group." (Technical Partner)

“One particularity: in the communities with a very strong institutional presence, the LAGs were not as successful as the groups from communities with weaker organizations. For large institutions, the lack of money, the presence of Cedaps, as well as the fact that the certificate didn't make sense, the PCU activities of changing the particular agenda of the institution were a hindrance. In the groups, there wasn't an institution that stood out, they were all the same." (Technical Partner)

"Leader: representative of an organization, local community institution. Not a community representative. They were just organizations that did some collective activity, that developed something that was collective in nature. The LAG had to articulate the interests of each of these organizations, mix of actions (soccer, health, women, etc.)." (Technical Partner)
5.6.4 Recruitment of adolescents done using personalist selection methods.

In all of the municipalities, the adolescents that were part of the LAGs / AGs were nominated by leaders and then validated by third parties. According to the prevailing cultural policy in Brazil, selection based on personal criteria was used to the detriment of selection based on meritocracy. Therefore, the adults at the helm of the LAGs / AGs activated their network of personal relationships. The personal network was dominant and especially relevant in relationships with family, friends and kin. This being the case, there was a predominant selection of adolescents with bonds of family, friendship or kinship to the detriment of a "universalist" and "democratic" selection.

"They wanted to avoid relatives in selection, but in practices they weren't really able to. Actually, there wasn't a selection because of how hard it was to get the word out in the communities. Few adolescents were sent. A collective effort was made through workshops – the kids went through various communications activities." (Technical Partner)

"The selection criteria for adolescents were: 2 adolescents per LAG, independence to move around the city, go to school in the morning period (since most PCU activities were in the afternoon), have time for studies and leisure." (LAG)

"I took part in the Viração flash workshop and was selected." (AG)

"However, the AGs only nominated two that ended up taking part in training. Since it was all very fast, some adolescents didn't fit the profile
of the PCU. Many nominated relatives. This ended up compromising the initiative later on." (Technical Partner).

"Initial proposal: that the LAG nominated the adolescent and not UNICEF." (UNICEF)

"Each community nominated 2 adolescents. BEM TV didn't "meddle in the choice" of these adolescents." (Technical Partner)

"I helped out at my mom's radio station; she nominated me." (Communicator Adolescent)

"My dad participated in the LAG as a leader and nominated me. I didn't have any experience." (Communicator Adolescent)

"I was nominated by my aunt, who is a leader of the LAG." (Communicator Adolescent)

"Are we going to pick the adolescent in the 2nd cycle? I can't draw from my relations." (LAG)

"My adolescent daughter also went, they went through the first stage." (AG)

"The choice of young people done based on their relationship with the leaders." (LAG)

"The selection of adolescents for the PCU was different than the selection for the RAP. The PCU should improve its selection criteria." (Government Partner)
5.6.5 Conflicts generated by personalized recruitment.

As pointed out above, although the adolescents underwent "validation" processes by the technical partner after the nomination, they were nominated by the "community leaders"/adults participating in the LAGs/AGs. This process created a set of problems that we will describe below:

When we began the PCU Evaluation, one of the main elements presented by the actors, including UNICEF, regarded the so-called "generational conflict" found at the LAGs/AGs.

And in fact, the age difference was reflected in different (and sometimes irreconcilable) social practices and values. It was therefore predictable that inter-generational conflicts would occur at an action unit comprised of adult community leaders, local government representatives and adolescents.

Nevertheless, there were no actions capable of minimizing these kinds of conflicts from arising, not even an "institutional channel" able to ensure institutional handling of these conflicts.

Conflicts of this nature persisted throughout the entire process, marked by adults "complaints" by the adults about the adolescents and attempts to subordinate the adolescents.

"Many conflicts between the Leaders (adults) and the adolescents. The adults felt threatened by the leading role the adolescents were playing. Since there were few adolescents per LAG, the discussion wasn't
balanced. Many adults made the adolescents into interns. Hardships: generational; a lot of complaints; just two adolescents at the AG; I even heard that I had to stop with this ECA (Children and Adolescents Statute) thing." (Technical Partner)

"Among the groups, there were no gender inequalities; this wasn’t relevant." (Technical Partner)

"Many conflicts between adolescents and adults. Generational/two institutions managing the kids (Rap da Saúde and Bemtv)." (Government Partner).

"The leaders started to call BEM TV "Mal TV" (Translator's note: bem is Portuguese for 'good' while mal means 'bad') – adolescents were little monsters that turned against the leaders." "The adolescents didn’t want to do the same work as before." (LAG)

"In the view of the leaders, BEM TV’s intentions were good; but, at a certain moment, the adolescents were given a lot of power without being prepared for it, it was their work – some leaders thought that it was their right to opine on how to spend the grant." "An adolescent is one thing, an adult is another." "The adolescents felt like they ran the place." (LAG)

"Bem TV isn’t bad. They trained us. The adults picked a fight with Bem TV and created this rivalry. They said that we didn’t do anything in the community. They demanded things that weren’t in our reach. Generalizing that all of us didn’t do anything. They didn’t talk, they just complained. It didn’t make sense. They did pass it on to the community." (Communicator Adolescent)
"At the meetings, the adults’ lunches were great and the adolescents’ were awful, just a sandwich." (Communicator Adolescent)

"Adolescents couldn’t speak. BEM TV encouraged our voice. The coordinators’ meeting was scary, yelling." "Coordinators didn’t go and ordered us to go." (Communicator Adolescent)

"Many adolescents complained of being made into interns by the adults at the AGs. A lot of inter-generational problems." (Technical Partner)

"Situations happened where an adult would call there to complain about a young person. From the way the adult talked, it was obvious what he thought about being an adolescent, because of the very fact that they are young." (Technical Partner)

5.6.6 Promotion of hierarchies

The conflicts generated by the difference in values and social practices between the adolescents and adults and the absences of an instrument to handle and mediate conflicts caused hierarchies to be created among adults and adolescents.

Because of the youth selection criteria, based on nomination by the adults and personalized criteria, the adults said that there was pressure from the community to hold them responsible for "taking care of the adolescent." When moving about the city
in formal activities and even in more everyday activities, the adult LAG participants said that they had to be responsible to the adolescents' parents. Apparently, the parents also pressured the adolescents to "obey" the adult LAG components.

This standard of conduct caused an asymmetry among LAG members, with adults overwhelmingly promoting hierarchical mechanisms that antagonized youth protagonism.

In the state of São Paulo, in both municipalities, because joint work between adolescents and adults happened sporadically, the occurrence of this hierarchical mechanism does not seem visible. Yet it is noteworthy that the methodological mechanisms recommended by the PCU were not used.

This fact deserves particular attention because of the contradiction regarding the PCU's methodological recommendations.

"I participated along with the adolescents at the Bem TV meeting – adults' responsibility!" (LAG)

"We fought a lot for the adolescents and had very little return. We fought a lot for you guys and got little back. We fought for the stipend." (adult speaking directly to the adolescent at the focus group – LAG)

"They were bankrolled by the coordinators, people who were important in the community, who felt responsible for the adolescents. Transport costs only when they got there, transport costs were paid by the coordinator. When the young people went out into the community, the coordinator would be held responsible for any little scratch. The parents' trust in the coordinators." (LAG)
"The adults were disorganized. They don’t know how to listen. Whether or not the adolescents have autonomy, when they go out into the community, we, the LAG adults, would be held responsible for any little scratch. We were there to save the day." (LAG)

5.6.7 Creation of internal hierarchies.

In Rio de Janeiro, faced with the tensions between adults and adolescents under the scope of the LAGs and the absence of mechanisms to handle and mediate conflicts, the figure of the "LAG Coordinator" was created outside of the PCU’s institutional framework, a role always exercised by an adult member. There was an internal resolution, to which the Technical Partner and UNICEF were not privy, that "promoted" the creation of a "coordinator" that delegated tasks and answered for the action unit. And even more. Some LAGs were known by the name of the "coordinator:" "Sonia’s LAG," "John Doe’s LAG," etc.

"At the groups were this happened, the work didn’t flow. It flowed were the adolescents could play a leading role... at those AGs that were able to give the adolescent a voice, the result was much nicer." (Technical Partner)

"For the meetings, the LAGs began to have coordinators. There was always a hierarchy." (LAG)
"It was supposed to be one representative at each meeting. Each LAG had a coordinator. But it was supposed to be self-governed. Since Cedaps only wanted one person to go to the meeting, a coordinator was created, which was an adult." (Communicator Adolescent)

"Each LAG actually had a leader." (Technical Partner).

5.6.8 Conflict of interests

The interests of the adolescents and the adults were different, and it seemed to be difficult to establish consensus around demands, with disputes regarding priorities and with no channels, or at least none that were visible, of interlocution and dialogue or even mediation processes cable of leading to a possible consensus.

"Adolescents were used as a cleaning service for the adults' NGOs." (UNICEF).

"How would I, a 15 year old, organize an event?" (Communicator Adolescent)

"Many adolescents complained of being made into interns by the adults at the AGs." (Technical Partner)

"The adolescent's task was greater than the AG's. They wanted us to work on the projects, but they didn't publicize our names. AG and adolescents weren't the same thing." (Communicator Adolescent)
5.6.9 Conflicts in political culture

Other conflicts arose from different political cultures. While the adolescents did not have any community experience (in the three municipalities), the adults (especially in Rio) had a long tradition of community action. The "tradition" and "the new perspectives" clashed and, again, there were no institutionalized channels to handle and resolve conflicts.

"Leader: representative of an organization, local community institution. Not a community representative. They were just organizations that did some collective activity, that developed something that was collective in nature. The LAG had to articulate the interests of each of these organizations, mix of actions (soccer, health, women, etc.)." (Technical Partner - RJ)

5.6.10. Sao Paulo: no joint work between adolescents and adults.

In São Paulo, there was practically no joint work between adolescents and adults. The AG participants practically only met at ceremonies, events and services sponsored by the PCU.

This fact compromises the elementary principles of the PCU; yet, it also contains a chance for creating action with exclusive participation of the adolescents, greatly reinforcing youth protagonism.
5.6.11 Turnover of LAG/AG members.

In a four-year cycle, there is a predictable turnover of members. Nevertheless, at the PCU this process occurred more quickly, resulting in damages to the continuity of the initiative. In São Paulo, Viração (technical partner) estimates that there were three changes in adolescent components at each AG, with around 400 young people passing through the Institution. Only the first group of adolescents was trained. Because of a lack of time and because of the PCU’s dynamic, the rest were trained "on the job."

"There was a huge turnover. More turnover than expected. More than 400 young people passed through Viração. So they were trained in action, since there wasn’t time to go back." (Technical Partner).

"A lot of replacement of adolescents. I had 7 adolescents. But at the same time I had the Young Apprentice project in the community. They ended up going there because it was better for them." (LAG)

"I gave them a voice, they helped me a lot. But I started to replace them because of the grant, because some didn’t do the work. There were others that were more interested." (LAG)

"The adolescents changed out a lot." (Technical Partner)

5.6.12 Grant / payment.

The grant given created heated conflicts at the LAGs/AGs. Firstly because the Itaquaquecetuba adolescents did not receive one, while in São Paulo, a grant was offered by the municipal government.
On the other hand, in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, those adolescents that received a grant were pressured, especially by the adults, to carry out many tasks "since they were getting paid." In Rio de Janeiro, adolescents receiving grants also had to take part in the "RAP da Saúde" Program, promoted by the Municipal Secretariat of Health, which provided the grant. There was an overloading of tasks (PCU plus RAP da Saúde) in Rio de Janeiro, negatively affecting the adolescent in complying with their academic agenda.

In São Paulo, receiving the grant proved to be much more decisive to the adolescent's participation in the PCU. That is because in São Paulo, young people are under substantial pressure to contribute to family income.

However, receiving the grant generated heated controversy on many levels, as we can see in the statements below:

"The adolescents received a BRL 200 aid grant." (UNICEF)

"The grant also created conflict between the adolescents and adults. There was no money to invest in them. The grant alone doesn't cut it. There was no money for anything else/it overly limited the development of the adolescents' work. Regarding the grant given by the Secretariat of Health, I understand that the adolescent then went on to have a double role as a promoter of health. A parallel agenda for RAP da Saúde, and not all of them had the profile of an adolescent agent of health." (Technical Partner)

"The Secretariat of Health articulated with the PCU and LAGs, through the RAP da Saúde project, and was also responsible for paying the adolescents' grants. Grants for the adolescents were a bad element that
resulted in conflicts and dissatisfaction on the part of the adults, who also wanted to receive some funds." (Technical Partner)

"At the start, we thought we wouldn't receive anything. After a while, a proposal came to receive a grant – BRL 200. Along with the grant came the new task of working at RAP da Saúde (Municipal Secretariat of Health). That's when it got complicated. The grant was only paid to the adolescents that took part in the RAP." (Communicator Adolescent)

"Some leaders felt it was in their right to meddle in how the grant was spent." (Communicator Adolescent)

"The grant was demanded by the LAG leaders. We fought a lot for you guys and got little back. We fought for the stipend. You all didn't even have transport fare." (LAG)

"We didn't let the parents keep the grant; we told them to save it for PCU events. But some adolescents helped out at home with part of the grant money." (LAG)

"To pay or not pay the kids? The grant ended up being an artificial motivation. The adults at the LAGs didn't know if they could really have that accountability or if the adolescents were just shirking their "work." Little articulation of the adolescents and the RAP da Saúde with the LAG." (Government Partner)

"I learned about the PCU through another member. I came on board in 2011, at the end. I didn't understand anything; I started to help out financially because of the grant." (Communicator Adolescent).
"The grant was the only way to get the adolescents; they became more engaged, they saw it as a job, their families respected them more." Fundamental for the next cycle." (UNICEF).

"It was possible to keep the adolescents in the program just by paying the grant. This enabled them to participate longer, since there is significant family pressure at this age to work." (Technical Partner).

5.6.13 Adolescents schedule.

The schedule for the adolescents seems to have been overloaded, especially because of the difficulties in moving around the cities, particularly for the adolescents in Itaquaquecetuba, who had to travel to the city of São Paulo.

In Rio de Janeiro, the adolescents said that the set of tasks forced them to cut classes at school to fulfill the agenda proposed by the PCU. This statement is easy to verify, since the events held in the afternoon were close to the time when classes ended and to get from the West Zone to the Center of the city of Rio de Janeiro, for example, may take over 2 hours. For this reason, most of the adolescents interviewed, the adults participating in the LAGs/AGs and even the technical partners said that this could have hindered regular class attendance. Some adolescents stated that they left school in the break between classes (recess) to take part in scheduled commitments at the PCU, as well as in commitments as members of the RAP do Saúde, an element that gave them the financial aid they received (grant).
With this being the case, it is necessary to note and measure the efforts expended by the adolescents in implementing the PCU so that they are compatible with student activities as well as the young people's activities.

"A parallel agenda for RAP da Saúde, and not all of them had the profile of an adolescent agent of health. Overload! Work improved in the last year, when the adolescents didn't have as many LAG activities." (Technical Partner)

"Some meetings were scheduled in the city, around 1pm. Those adolescents who lived further away sometimes went without lunch, or they left school early, or they missed the meeting. It got in the way of their studies somewhat, because of the overloaded agenda: Trainings; LAG Activities in the community; and RAP Agenda." (Communicator Adolescent)

"The adolescent had to split into 3: BEM TV training, PCU activities and RAP da saúde." (Communicator Adolescent)

"And another 6 hours per week for the LAG." (LAG)

"I had health problems (gastritis) because of the stress from the project. Many adolescents sacrificed their health, school, to handle the schedules." (Communicator Adolescent)

"The adolescents were very overloaded, all of them; we, the coordinators, also helped. There was a lot of pressure to do things because of the grant." (LAG)
"Adolescent activities were to promote results for the RAP. But there were thousands of schedules that could improve if the dialogue improved. There was always the question: Who tells them what to do? Who defines their schedule?" (Government Partner)

5.6.14 Institutional structure of the PCU could have restrained the adolescents' protagonism and autonomy.

At the same time, the increased youth repertoire and the breaking of the city's "social boundaries" could have been minimized based on some limitations of an institutional nature.

The main limitation, as the actors saw it, is associated to the "institutional engineering" of the PCU.

Oftentimes used as interns at the LAGs and even executing excessive tasks in the PCU methodology or restricted at UNICEF events, with previously organized speeches, the adolescents oftentimes did not have a favorable environment for the development of their protagonism and their autonomy in the LAGs and even in the PCU's structure of action.

"The adolescent had to split into 3: BEM TV training, PCU activities and RAP da saúde. And another 6 hours per week for the LAG."
(Communicator Adolescent)

"They demanded things that weren't in our reach. How would I, a 15 year old, organize an event?" (Communicator Adolescent)
"Adolescents couldn’t speak." (Communicator Adolescent)

"Many adolescents sacrificed their health, school, health to handle the schedules." (Communicator Adolescent)

"Adolescents were lost." (AG)

"To understand what was PCU, targets, partners was complicated; it took time, for me and for most of the adolescents." (Communicator Adolescent)

"There were adolescents that weren't familiar with the AG and AGs that weren't familiar with the adolescent. (Communicator Adolescent)

"Many people didn’t know the initiative within the community; this was an obstacle to the adolescents' tasks." (Communicator Adolescent)

"Adults always talked more than the adolescents." (Communicator Adolescent).

5.6.15 BEM TV, Viração, Cieds and Instituto Paulo Montenegro did not have community engagement.

Despite having recognized competency and technical prestige, it is necessary to underscore that these Institutions did not have a substantial background of working with working class communities, especially in their places of residence. The Institutions were not even familiar with the locations where the actions were implemented, and at least one of the Institutions (Viração) was unable to visit all of the communities.
"BEM TV continued to have other activities, but the PCU took over all of BEM TV, because there were few workers (5) and they moreover had to hire new workers for the trainings." (Technical Partner)

"BEM TV was the victim of the project – without any money to work, without resources to develop actions. Professor Augusto did a lot of things on his own." (Communicator Adolescent).

"Cedaps: partnership with good experience in community development, which contributed a lot to the PCU." (UNICEF).

"CEDAPS had little strength." (LAG)

"CEDAPS could have used many things at Canal Futura, but they weren't seen as a Communication Channel. CEDAPS was already a Canal partner, but didn't have the strength to operate the size of the agenda." (Strategic Ally).

"BEM TV ignored the RAP." (LAG)

"I think that BEM TV didn't have a lot of content. The videos in the second stage, with the presence of the RAP, were better; but, overall, the material produced was very bad." (LAG)

"Failure by RAP and CEDAPS, who were unable to handle it; they were really overloaded and that's why they failed." (LAG)

"I thought that BEM TV was a weak institution, I thought the posters were hideous; there was no pride in anything done in communications. The
communications should have been outstanding. The PCU should have had greater coverage in the media." (Government Partner)

"Cieds and Viração did not have community engagement; it was all new to them." (UNICEF)

Cedaps was the only Institution that had significant community engagement in the context of implementing the PCU.

5.6.16 Cedaps and the use of its community network.

Although it had know-how about and contact with the communities selected, Cedaps used the ("its") network of leaders, who were already known by the Institution, and did not allow for a renewal of local actors. This formatted the LAGs in Rio de Janeiro with a structure that restricted and hampered its action, with the consequences to development of the LAGs already discussed above.

At the same time, its background, particularly in relation to the health topic, caused a bias in PCU activities.

"Cedaps experience: they had already worked with UNICEF. A previous relationship. A health agenda." (Technical Partner)

"Most of the LAGs that were set up by CEDAPS already worked with health and nominated the adolescents. When they finalized the LAG Plan of Action, they picked two points and made the Communication Plan. All picked 1 item connected to health, STD/Aids and one other one, miscellaneous, violence, education, etc." (Technical Partner)
"Previous community work in the health area. Work with youth to prevent AIDS, CEDAPS' healthy community network, a job they've done for years. The work was already there before the LAGs were formed."

"Most of the people chosen by Cedaps already had some community experience, especially connected to health." (LAG)

"CEDAPS was already a Canal Futura partner." (Strategic Ally)

"CEDAPS should have had this articulator role, but it didn't have this skill." (Strategic Ally)

"I think that the fact that a small institution was chosen had two negative side effects: 1. It bloated the institution, causing it to lose its focus, 2. It established a client/supplier relationship. So the whole process became TOP DOWN. Protagonism was compromised, favoring subordinate relations. I would therefore suggest a tender to hire a consortium, starting the process more horizontally, favoring work in a network." (Strategic Ally)

"The Secretariat of Health had the same partners and same actors as UNICEF. When... it left, it took its partners and this created conflict. (Technical Partner).

"CEDAPS (previously partnered with the RAP) previously worked with the Secretariat of Health with the adolescents."

"The PCU is anchored in the concepts of Health – for example, the very... the selection of CEDAPS." (Government Partner).
5.6.17 Dis-articulation and "compartmentalization" among technical partners.

There was substantial dis-articulation among the technical partners, who apparently did not seek common planning and actions, since in Rio de Janeiro, Cedaps was in charge of orienting the adults while BEMTV oriented the adolescents; and in São Paulo, Cieds oriented the adults, with Viração orienting the adolescents. This "compartmentalization" was extremely prejudicial to the progress of the action proposed.

"The projects were different, CEDAPS' and BEM TV's. BEM TV had fewer resources. Priority for the adults and not for the adolescent." (Technical Partner).

"CEDAPS – The kids' work depended on the adults, who gummed up the process." (Technical Partner).

"Cedaps took care of the adults and BEM TV, the adolescents. This division caused conflicts in the groups." (Technical Partner).

"Meeting with the coordinators was one discourse; a meeting with "Bad" TV was another. They taught differently." (LAG)

"Bem TV isn't bad. They trained us. The adults picked a fight with Bem TV and created this rivalry." (Communicator Adolescent)

"Lack of communication between BEM TV, CEDAPS and coordination." (LAG).
"Viração and AG did not talk. They were trained, but they didn’t talk to the AG. There were adolescents that weren’t familiar with the AG and AGs that weren’t familiar with the adolescent." (AG).

"At the start, Cieds and Viração worked separately; later they realized that they would have to plan together and meetings were held. But this didn’t last until the end." (UNICEF).

"In many cases there was no involvement of the adolescents in AG activities in the communities. The fact that they were different organizations contributed to this." (Technical Partner)

5.6.18 Single institution implementation of the PCU.

Some actors understood that many of the limitations presented in implementation of the PCU were due to what we called "compartmentalization" and dis-articulation among technical partners above. With this being the case, they understood that there should only be one technical partner in charge of the adults and adolescents as a manner of resolving the problem.

We understand the problem as not just being one of "institutional engineering," but of technical and methodological orientation not planned in creating the PCU. Procedures for articulating actions between technical partners would be necessary in addition to "planning meetings."

"There was a predominant distance, as a result of the design of the PCU, because they are different institutions. The fact that
activities were separate hurt more than the generational conflict." (Technical Partner)

"Cedaps took care of the adults and BEM TV, the adolescents. This division caused conflicts in the groups." (Technical Partner)

"I thought it was bad having two technical partners; this created competition and conflict between the actors (adolescents and adults) – CEDAPS and BEM TV." (Government Partner).

5.6.19 Decentralization of actions, but centralized control of initiatives.

Despite hiring technical partners with the goal of making them responsible for implementing the PCU in the communities, UNICEF maintained control over decisions, limiting the action of the technical partners and impacting the directions of the PCU. Granting a degree of autonomy to the technical partners could have made the PCU actions more creative.

"The groups accepted the rules. Center of work: UNICEF. UNICEF always had the last word." (Technical Partner)

"UNICEF interfered a bit." (Municipal Articulator)

5.6.20 Appreciation of the idea of UNICEF as a brand that added value to the City Hall.
Government Partners recognized the value of the UNICEF brand, both its political and communications value, strengthening their administration before society. The three cities received certification for reaching the targets established.

"Why is the UNICEF certificate so important? Added value! Municipality that receives the UNICEF seal: approved. Important, strength! Yet this importance does not have the same strength in large cities. Dimensions are different." (UNICEF).

"City of Rio de Janeiro was certified, but the Mayor didn't even attend the certification ceremony; he sent Ricardo Henriques to represent him. This certificate would be an important ally to the Mayor, since it offers international recognition, adds value." (UNICEF).

"Every government administration will want the UNICEF seal." (Government Partner).

This being the case, the set of actors involved in the process saw the stamp of approval, whether as the UNICEF seal or institutional brand, as an important value to provide legitimacy to actions in the media and society in general.

### 5.6.21 Social Communication

All of the actors (including UNICEF) admitted there is a need for social communication action of a different nature, capable of impacting those who shape public opinion and social networks and, as a result, the city as a whole.
"There was no institutional communication by UNICEF, no visibility, the expected recognition." (UNICEF).

5.6.22 Publicity

The Strategic Allies (Kimberly-Clark and Fundação Itaú Social) particularly underscored this dimension. The lack of PCU publicity and the fact that it was impossible to connect the PCU brand to the companies’ products was an unmet expectation.

Canal Futura admitted that as a TV channel, it could have been used more; but, it was not activated by the PCU’s institutional framework.

"Presentation of results was missing, there was no disclosure." (Strategic Ally).

"It isn’t appealing for Kimberly, because it can’t use the UNICEF brand; UNICEF doesn’t help to leverage partners." (Strategic Ally).

"We expected more visibility." (Strategic Ally).

"We were unable to "radiate," to go on to the other communities. The Platform was not known outside of the community. There was no institutional communication by UNICEF, no visibility, the expected recognition." (UNICEF).

"I think that the partnership with FUTURA was underutilized; after all, it’s a TV channel. CEDAPS could have used many things
at Futura, but they weren't seen as a Communication Channel. There was no significant publicity of the PCU." (Strategic Ally)

"I don't think that the GOVERNMENT knew about the PCU. There should have been more marketing, publicizing the UNICEF brand more, which is powerful and still appears little in the media. PCU had a communications problem. It should intensify marketing to raise funds. Have more visible recognition. When the city's reach targets, it should be made more public and visible. UNICEF partners should report and take this to the other cities." (Government Partner)

"The communication was not good. Information was not spread in the city or the community. Some things showed up on social networks, blogs; but I wanted to see things spread throughout the city and on TV." (Technical Partner)

"I think that some things that were sloppy should be made professional: the communication area was very bad, the blog was very bad, for example. Furthermore, I didn't see any of what was produced. I thought that BEM TV was a weak institution, I thought the posters were hideous; there was no pride in anything done in communications. The communications should have been outstanding. The PCU should have had greater coverage in the media." (Government Partner).

5.6.23 Delay in creating the PCU brand
As the partners saw it, especially the Strategic Allies, the PCU brand was created too late (almost at the end of the cycle), making its use impossible. According to UNICEF, this brand was made available in time to be used by the partners. This is therefore a controversy in the auspices of the PCU evaluation.

"The PCU brand only came out in the last year to be used. It was no use publicizing, the PCU doesn't add value and the UNICEF brand can't be used." (Strategic Ally).

"They could raise funding, even by using the PCU logo. Added value! They like having the name of the institution associated with UNICEF." (UNICEF).

"The PCU logo took a long time to be released." (Government Partner).

"The logo came very late; but the delay only caused problems in communications, since the bank's policy is to only use its own brand." (Strategic Ally).

5.6.24 Learning process to deal directly with the communities.

UNICEF had always worked in partnership with City Halls, non-governmental organizations and companies. It began to work directly with the communities, which was a new experience. Of course this innovative facet resulted in some difficulties in implementing the PCU, but it led to an important process of learning.

Because of its innovative nature, UNICEF accumulated learning while it executed PCU actions. Therefore, the problems with implementation, mentioned throughout this
report, are quite evident. Nevertheless, the Institution gives important meaning to this new perspective.

"Contribution of UNICEF was to manage to work directly with the people, going into the communities." It bit off more than it could chew." (UNICEF)

"I thought it would be easier than it was, since UNICEF didn't have experience with the community. Little presence by UNICEF; it doesn't have this profile, of going to the community." (UNICEF)

"The boldness of UNICEF being willing to go into an unknown environment." (former UNICEF).

5.6.25 Importance of UNICEF's presence as perceived by the communities.

It was obvious that the expectation created by UNICEF's presence in the communities was very high, based on its institutional identity. This idealized expectation was not therefore reciprocated; in many cases, it became a profound frustration at the LAGs and in the communities as a whole.

"The communities' expectation is natural when UNICEF comes into a community that it never entered before." (UNICEF)

"Physical presence of UNICEF was a mistake. You would have to be there. I visited 15 out of 30 city districts." (UNICEF)
"UNICEF has a strong brand and the PCU has a unifying effect; it is able to gather a lot of articulated people, but they have to share this space. Raising private funds and involving these companies, so that they're co-participants, partners, in order to share the pains and gains." (former UNICEF).

"Initially, everyone was fascinated by the UNICEF money. And also by the visibility UNICEF would give the groups." (Technical Partner).

UNICEF opened doors in the territory, but it didn't go any further." (Technical Partner).

"Lack of communication of the LAGs with UNICEF, meeting didn't happen." (AG).

"It created expectation in the community. Struggle for the PCU to show up." (AG).

"It started to lose support from UNICEF, Cieds, the partners." (AG).

"Nobody from UNICEF really supported us in the actions." (AG).

"How does UNICEF want to prepare us to be an AG? When it's time to act, UNICEF didn't support us." (AG).

"We sensed a lack of support from UNICEF." (AG)
5.6.26 Institutional events, celebrations and ceremonies.

Institutional events, celebrations and ceremonies sponsored by UNICEF on various occasions, especially when attended by public authorities and celebrities, were seen by the community actors, both adolescents and adults, as very formal. Because of this, the actors did not feel like protagonists, but rather like supporting players. Furthermore, they felt controlled and even discriminated, unable to express their "true feelings."

"It happened that they (technical partners and community) agreed what they would say so that demands that weren’t suited to the moment were presented." (Technical Partner)

"Adolescents represented the neighborhood. They seemed like a lure for money." (LAG)

"I suffered discrimination to go to the bathroom at the event." (LAG)

"The launch event was a success, it created expectations, government and partner institutions attended. Adolescents helped to organize and effectively took part in the event." (UNICEF).

5.6.27 Non-corporate behavior of UNICEF

The institutional behavior of UNICEF technicians and directors that did not have a corporate attitude should be noted. To the contrary, even with the evident PCU
identity, they criticized as they saw fit, contributing to the result of the study. At the same time, all of the documents were provided to the researchers, allowing for democratic and positive access.

At no time was any behavior seen that could create questions as to the quality of the information.

5.6.28 What is the best territorial cross-section in the city for PCU action?

There is a discussion of whether the metropolis should remain a territory of action or not; if the favela and working class settlements should or should not incorporate their immediate surroundings; if the neighborhood or even the metropolitan region should be a preferential target or if actions should be concentrated on cities with populations of up to one-hundred thousand as a socially relevant space for action. This debate permeates all of the interviews done.

"More than territorial space, personal and cultural relations define the territory. The people need to understand that they belong to the territory." (UNICEF)

"Why not expand the PCU to the cities? Why just stay in the favela? The initial idea was to work in the favela and surrounding area. When it came time to execute, the groups didn't stay. Especially in the South Zone." (Technical Partner).

"However, a bigger territory could make monitoring difficult." (Technical Partner).
"Criticism of the definition of the territory as just in the communities, behind the times in relating with youth groups that were already beyond the borders of the favelas." (Strategic Ally).

"PCU was important for UNICEF to test the program and be able to go to the other Urban Centers. It would be important to attempt to bring the platform to the metro regions, to the greater Rio metro. Limitation for a pilot program in the municipality could have gone to the Baixada area." (Government Partner)

"I would recommend smaller municipalities. Large metro areas are complicated for this type of program." (Strategic Ally)

6. Targets and Results

The targets established by the PCU were created based on the UNICEF matrix and pursuant to the Millennium Development Goals (MDG).

"UNICEF invited technicians from various institutions to think up indicators for the city at the start. Next, the group of technicians was made smaller; only I, Fiocruz, Instituto Paulo Montenegro (Ana Lima) were left in 2007. Specifically indicators. They hadn't talked about the PCU. A fast and concise way to understand the city, geared towards the agenda of kids and adolescents. We created a large number of indicators. It was different in practice. We weren't told that they would
be used to establish targets for a program. We didn't even know about the PCU." (Municipal Articulator)

"I expected the committee to define the targets, how much the indicators should go up/down. The targets established by the PCUs couldn't differ from the government administrations' targets." (UNICEF)

Nothing indicates that the improvement in indicators, measured at the end of the first cycle, was directly related to the implementation of the PCU. Municipal managers suggested that the targets matched up with the targets in the City Hall Government Plan, and the PCU did not actually impact improvement of indicators.

In the perspective of the actors interviewed, the targets should have been discussed with the public managers and agreed upon with the city as a whole. Moreover, they should be more suited to the reality of each territory.

"I saw various Secretariats mobilize in relation to the targets and because they didn't have this data, it was important for the indicators to guide the public policies based on the PCU. Some groups looked to the targets and didn't see themselves there. How could the Secretariat of Sports contribute to neonatal mortality? For example, with water aerobics. I think that for health, these targets were already clearer; they were more related to health, connected to the Mayor's targets. During the meetings, there was an attempt to translate the targets so that the other secretariats would also realize that they were part of the same universe." (Government Partner)
The actors also stated that there were an excessive number of indicators, making it impossible to attribute indicators going up or down to the PCU. It is unanimous that the positive results gained with the PCU did not go beyond quantitative matters.

"There should be fewer indicators, more focused and more relevant." (Technical Partner)

"The 43 LAGs achieved the pre-established targets. They held meetings to present the city and community indicators. There were a lot of targets. We tried to translate, simplify." (Technical Partner)

"There were a lot of targets. The intention was to reduce these targets from 30 to just 20." (UNICEF).

"I think that the Program defined too many indicators." (Strategic Ally)

Nevertheless, all stated that based on the PCU, the Municipal Secretariats began to talk more and there was more attention paid to matters related to children and adolescents. We can in fact see that the achievements in the cities that guaranteed most of the positive results in the municipalities were part of the Government Plan drafted prior to the launch of the Platform.

Some of those interviewed said that the local diagnosis was a very important instrument to gain know-how of the local situation, as well as to define an agenda for children and adolescents.
"To establish the targets, you have to have good data, a refinement and quality in the data." (Government Partner)

Actually, we can, as an interpretation subject to joint reflection and a more diversified dialogue, say that despite its restricted impact at the city level, the PCU contributed enormously to planting the seed of a new political culture in relation to public matters, especially regarding measuring the results of actions and, particularly, a policy of broad and diverse alliances and partnerships.

7. Lessons learned

- Although they were the focus of the PCU, the adolescents were absent in the decision-making processes, because the "Coordination" of the LAGs was in the hands of the adults;

- The adults cannot be given the task of nominating the adolescents;

- The LAGs should undergo a training process prior to starting the PCU;

- The LAGs need to be more closely monitored;

- Relations at the PCU were made hierarchical;

- Although the approach to PCU themes in the Metro Regions is fundamental, in very large cities the action becomes scattered. While in medium-sized cities, the
PCU takes on an important leading role regarding children and adolescent issues, with much more scope;

- Technical partners function as executors of tasks, which limits their action;

- The UNICEF and Technical Partner teams were insufficient to handle the 60 LAGs in each city;

- Many "predictable" conflicts occurred and were not methodologically handled. Some became chronic and highly prejudicial to implementation of the PCU;

- It is not enough for UNICEF to MANAGE to work directly with the people. It should also REMAIN working directly with the people;

- The PCU's Social Communication was not in line with the ambition of its proposal;

- The local public actor should have had greater participation in the PCU;

- The selection of technical partners compromised implementation of the PCU;

- There was a lack of greater incentives for strategic allies to participate;

- Financial resources were insufficient for implementation of the PCU;

- There were excessive targets, both municipal as well as community targets, which made the process rigid and stuck;
8. **Recommendations**

- Expand the ombudsman or consulting process or the process of listening to children and adolescents in creating and implementing the PCU;

- The LAGs/AGs should be comprised of children and adolescents from the locations, chosen through universal selection processes, using transparent and democratic criteria. We therefore suggest excluding adults/ leaders/ representatives of government entities as Articulator Group participants;

- Create a local meeting arena (LAG territory of action) for dialogue and cooperation among the LAGs, important community members, local institutions and government entities. Strengthening bonds;

- These action units should rely on permanent technical aid for training and assistance for initiatives to be developed;

- The AG/LAGs should function in a network, using advanced technological processes so they may fully function;

- Create other categories that more transparently translate the performance of the LAG/AG;
• Continue the action in urban metro centers, given the importance within this scenario of the theme of reducing inequalities, especially for children and adolescents;

• However, instead of using capital cities as urban metro centers, use regional metropolitan cities as targets. PCU initiatives in capital cities tend to become diluted in the tangle of public policies developed by an extensive group of institutions, having less impact on public initiatives. In contrast, because of the smaller number of ongoing public policies in regional metropolitan cities, major impacts on governmental and societal initiatives can be established;

• Use the city district, seen as a local administrative unit, as a reference unit of territory for PCU action;

• Establish a greater degree of autonomy for technical partners;

• Greater presence of UNICEF representatives among the platform’s direct action authorities;

• Closely assess the use of specific social categories that may express the meaning of the action: the categories of leadership, community, territory, participation and mobilization are being used along the lines of common sense and are not being operationalized as instrumental concepts of action;

• Create channels to resolve conflicts/disagreements, or a conflict management initiative geared towards the actors participating in the process;
• Despite the limited structure of UNICEF offices, an institutional presence by UNICEF in the territories is needed, because this represents an important value for the population’s self-esteem and legitimacy for the initiatives that are being developed;

• Establish arenas for direct interlocution between LAGs and UNICEF;

• Use social networks and media in the locations where the LAGs operate for mass communication of LAG actions;

• Establish communication geared towards traditional media in the city to report on PCU actions, with children and adolescents playing a leading role;

• Create levels of dialogue between the LAGs and other local authorities geared towards the youth theme;

• Consortium of technical organizations to carry out unified management of the technical assistance process for implementing the PCU;

• Bring strategic allies closer to the process of implementing the PCU by carrying out technical visits to the territories;

• Compliance with community demands in a non-fragmented manner, seeking answers that are integrated and articulated in the territory;

• Create incentives for use of the platform brand by strategic allies;
• Perform budgetary planning that serves the established number of LAGs;
• Execute wide-ranging leveling regarding theory and methodology among the various partners;
• Establish more focused goals;
• Define a remuneration/ non-remuneration policy for the PCU;
• Transfer resources capable of making the LAGs’ action feasible.

9. Annexes

• Pictures of actors interviewed
• Summary of the interviews done
• Documents

OBS: These annexes are available to UNICEF in the IETS archives, due to the volume of material collected.
1) **Note 3:** Limited repercussion of the PCU in traditional media, in alternative media and on social networks.

*Visibility Urban Centers Platform - UNICEF*

**UNICEF MEDIA:**

**WEBSITES:**

http://www.unicef.org/brazil/pt/where_13615.htm

http://www.unicef.org/brazil/pt/resources_13713.htm

http://www.unicef.org/brazil/pt/where_9427.htm

http://www.unicef.org/brazil/pt/where_17707.htm


http://www.unicef.org/brazil/pt/where_14678.htm

http://www.unicef.org/brazil/pt/media_15279.htm


EXAMPLE:

GOVERNMENT PARTNER MEDIA:

WEBSITES:

São Paulo City Hall:
http://www.prefeitura.sp.gov.br/cidade/secretarias/subprefeituras/lapa/noticias/?p=1821

Rio de Janeiro City Hall:
http://www.rio.rj.gov.br/web/guest/exibeconteudo?article-id=2872995

EXAMPLE:

TECHNICAL PARTNER MEDIA:

WEBSITES:

Cedaps:

http://www.cedaps.org.br/Plataforma_dos_Centros_Urbanos_anuncia_resultados_da_cidade_do_Rio_de_Janeiro

http://www.cedaps.org.br/11667

Bem TV: http://www.bemtv.org.br/portal/pcu.php

EXAMPLE:
INSIDE THE CITY BLOG – URBAN CENTERS PLATFORM

WEBSITES:

http://pordentrodacidade.blogspot.com.br/

EXAMPLE:
TRADITIONAL MEDIA:

WEB SITES:


Portal Aprendiz UOL: http://aprendiz.uol.com.br/content/pechepronu.mmp


EXAMPLE:

![Agência Brasil](image-url)
Unicef lança Lázaro Ramos e plataforma para crianças

O ator Lázaro Ramos vai ser nomeado o Embaixador do Unicef no Brasil amanhecer, em solenidade em São Paulo, onde também será lançada a Plataforma dos Centros Urbanos. É uma boa ideia, no sentido de se tentar fazer parcerias entre governos (nos três âmbitos), sociedade civil e setor privado pelos direitos das crianças e adolescentes das comunidades populares das cidades brasileiras.

Como o Unicef não capta recursos, a Plataforma vai servir mais ou menos como um elo de ligação entre estes setores, para indicar o melhor caminho a tomar caso alguém queira fazer alguma coisa para mudar o cenário trágico de crianças e adolescentes em situação de risco. A diferença entre todos estes outros projetos com o mesmo interesse, e este, é que, segundo informa a assessoria do evento, "a Plataforma vai ver as comunidades como parte da solução, e não um problema".

Há 20 metas municipais e 30 metas comunitárias a serem cumpridas com esta Plataforma. Mas o maior é fazer do lar dos de fora, esta.

ALTERNATIVE MEDIA:

WEBSITES:


Instituto Crescer para a Cidadania: http://institutocrescer.org.br/noticias/forum-comunitario-plataformas-dos-centros-urbanos-unicef/

EXAMPLE:
COMMUNITY MEDIA:

WEBSITES:

Instituto União Keralux: inker-institutokeralux.blogspot.com.br/2012/04/resultados-da-plataforma-dos-centros.html


EXAMPLE:
SOBRE A PLATAFORMA DOS CENTROS URBANOS.

A Plataforma dos Centros Urbanos é uma ação de mobilização que pretende garantir maior qualidade de vida para as crianças e adolescentes das grandes cidades urbanas, interligando os circuitos sociais entre os diversos atores presentes nas comunidades populares por meio do desenvolvimento de capacidades dos agentes e cidadãos (adultos, crianças e adolescentes) habitantes de territórios vulneráveis.

Contribui para que todas as crianças e adultos das cidades possam crescer e se desenvolver com saúde, aprender mais, ter acesso à cultura, se divertir, praticar esportes e estarem protegidos contra qualquer tipo de violência. Ou seja, busca garantir que meninos e meninas que vivem nas comunidades populares dos centros urbanos frequentem esportes diretrizes e de acordo com o preâmbulo do Estatuto da Criança e do Adolescente.

Dessa maneira, a Plataforma espera reduzir as desigualdades entre quem mora nessas comunidades e quem vive em outros reginos do mundo.

A iniciativa e desenvolvida em ciclos com duração de quatro anos (2004 a 2011) e está sendo implementada inicialmente nas cidades de São Paulo e Itaquerao Luta (SP) e Rio de Janeiro (RJ).