


Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project	Effective Conservation and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystems in Brazil
PIMS#	3280
GEF project ID#	2703
TE time frame	December 2017-March 2018
date of TE report	April 2018
Region and countries included in the project	Brazil
GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program	Biodiversity
Executing Agency	UNDP
Implementing Partner and other project partners	ICMBIO
MTR International Consultant	José Antonio CABO BUJÁN

Acknowledgements

The consultant would like to thank the community members of the RESEX Delta do Parnaíba for taking the time to share their vision, knowledge and understanding of the situation and vision of mangrove dwellers in Brazil. Special thanks also to the ICMBIO officials and Ministry of Environment for facilitating the conduct of interviews during the evaluation mission. Special thanks too to the UNDP country office team for their patience and support and the UNDP regional technical advisor for the thorough review, which has greatly improved this report.

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations	6
Executive Summary	7
Project Information Table	7
Project Description	7
Project Progress Summary	8
Evaluation Rating Table	8
Concise summary of conclusions	9
Recommendations	10
Lessons Learned	11
Introduction	12
Purpose of the TE and objectives	12
Scope & Methodology	12
Methods	13
Limitations	14
Structure of the TE report	14
Project Description and Background Context	15
Project start and duration	15
Problems that the project sought to address	15
Brazilian mangroves	15
The National Protected Area System (SNUC)	16
Project supported protected areas	17
Threats and barriers	19
Immediate and development objectives of the project	20
Baseline indicators established	20
Main stakeholders	20
Expected results	22
Findings	24
3.1 Project design/ formulation	24
Analysis of LFA/Results Framework	24
Assumptions and risks	24
Lessons from other relevant projects	25

Planned stakeholder participation	25
Replication approach	26
UNDP comparative advantage	26
Linkages with other interventions in the sector	26
Management arrangements	27
3.2 Project Implementation	28
Adaptive management	28
Partnership arrangements	28
Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management	29
Project finance and co-finance	29
Financial execution	29
Co-finance	32
Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation	33
UNDP and Implementing Partner Implementation/ Execution, coordination and operational issues	36
3.3 Project Results	38
 SEP	38
Relevance	38
Effectiveness and efficiency	40
Overall results (attainment of objectives)	40
No change in status of population of threatened and overexploited species	40
Crabs of economic importance	41
No change in vegetation cover of mangroves in project intervention PA	43
Proportion of protected mangrove ecosystems under SU or SC management categories	43
70% of pilot PAs achieve Management effectiveness (METT) of good or excellent	44
Half of pilot PAs testing 1 or more of financing strategies developed in the project	46
80% of all sub-national agencies with jurisdiction in the project clusters agreed to and signed to the Mangrove Plan	47
Cost-effectiveness	50
Incremental cost criteria	50
Completion of planned activities and achievement of global environmental benefits as cost-effective as planned	50
Comparison with similar projects	51
Cost-effectiveness of acquisition of goods and services	51
Outcome Effectiveness	55
	3

Outcome 1. The enabling environment for a sub-system of mangrove ecosystem protected areas is in place, including policy, regulatory, and financial mechanisms	55
80% of mangrove states with a set of norms and guidelines agreed with and coordinated between federal, state and municipal agencies on the management of mangroves.	55
Existence of a core group of trained staff members (of IBAMA/ICMBIO, OEMAs and/or municipal agencies) capable of implementing and using those norms and regulations	58
Trainings conducted by the project involved mostly ICMBIO officials. While undoubtedly capacities for mangrove conservation have been created at central ICMBIO level and federal-managed PA, there is no evidence of the existence of a "core group of staff members trained" at each OEMA involved.	58
Regulations tailored to mangroves in at least: PA management categories, management plans guidelines, financing mechanisms, integrating water planning to mangroves, fisheries management plans for mangrove PA	58
Outcome 2. Replicable models are in place for the management of mangrove resources in SNUC sustainable-use protected areas	60
70,000 ha under ecosystem-based, integrated fisheries resource plan.	60
Three no-take zones established in pilot PAs	60
25% decrease in mortality and harvesting at levels [established] in resource plan	60
100 potential local small entrepreneurs trained in the preparation of a business plan	60
25 PA management councils reaching agreement on harvesting levels and enforcement	60
Outcome 3. Conservation of mangroves is improved by piloting the alignment of PA management with sectors and spatial planning	61
6 water management instruments agreed upon by the Mamanguape water basin committee that take into account the water quantity and quality for mangroves	61
APA Cananéia-Iguape-Peruibe management plan reflects zoning and limits of all main economic activities	61
6 municipalities (200,000 persons) in the APA have agreed on the zoning	61
50% of the key actors in the APA sign formal document of adherence to zoning regulations	61
Outcome 4. Mangrove-related outreach, dissemination and adaptive management is increased	62

Awareness among private and public stakeholders on the management of mangrove PA and the ecosystem services they provide increase by 30%.	62
Mangrove biodiversity monitoring programs coordinated and linked to national system	63
Country ownership	63
Mainstreaming	64
Sustainability	65
Financial sustainability	65
Institutional sustainability	65
Socio-economic sustainability	65
Environmental sustainability	66
Impact	66
Conclusions and Recommendations 	68
5. Annexes	72

Acronyms and Abbreviations

APA	Área de Proteção Ambiental
ARIE	Área de Relevante Interesse Ecológico
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BAU	Business as Usual
BRL	Brazilian Real (LCU)
CBD	Convention for Biological Diversity
CDP	Country Programme Document
CDR	Combined Delivery Report
CE	State of Ceará
CIP	Cananéia-Iguapé-Peruíbe
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EOP	End-of-project
FDG	Focus Discussion Group
FUNBIO	Fundo Nacional para a Biodiversidade
GADM	Global Administrative Areas Database
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GOB	Government of Brazil
IBAMA	Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis
ICMBIO	Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
LCU	Local Currency Unit
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
MA	Maranhão
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
MMA	Ministério do Meio Ambiente
MPGO	Ministério do Planejamento, Desenvolvimento e Gestão
NIM	National Implementation Modality
PA	Protected Area/ State of Pará
PB	State of Paraíba
PI	State of Piauí
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PR	State of Paraná
RESEX	Reserva Extrativista
SC	Strict Conservation Management Category
SNUC	Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação
SP	São Paulo
SU	Sustainable Use Management Category
UC	Unidades de Conservação
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
USD	Dollars of the United States of America
WCPA	World Commission on Protected Areas
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

Executive Summary

Project Information Table

Project title	Effective Conservation and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystems in Brazil		
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #)	3280	PIF approval date	01/06/2007
GEF Project ID (PMIS #):	2703	CEO endorsement date	28/05/2008
ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Proj. ID:	00055992	ProDoc signature date	31/07/2008
Country(ies):	Brazil	Date project manager hired	
		Inception workshop date	17/12/2014
Region:	LAC	MTR completion date	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Original planned closing date	31/07/2013
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:	Objective 1	Revised closing date	31/12/2020
Trust Fund	GEF TF		
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner:	ICMBIO		
Other execution partners:			
Project financing	At CEO endorsement (US\$)	At terminal evaluation (US\$)	
[1] GEF financing	5,000,000	4,889,312	
[2] UNDP contribution	-	-	
[3] Government	14,900,000	45,700,000	
[4] Other partners	-	-	
[5] Total co-financing [2]+[3]+[4] :	14,900,000	45,700,000	
Project total costs [1+5] :	19,900,000	50,589,312	

Project Description

The project, Effective Conservation and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystem in Brazil was executed between 2008 and 2017. Originally planned to be closed in 2013, the need for consolidation of the then recently created implementation agency, ICMBIO delayed implementation for almost four years.

Mangroves in Brazil are estimated to cover 13,989.66 km² along the 6,800 km of Brazilian coast from the state of Amapá to Paraná. **Brazilian mangroves constitute 30% and 10% of the LAC and global mangroves** respectively. Brazilian mangroves also host globally significant biodiversity and sustain important artisanal fisheries that are the only or main source of sustenance for millions of households along the Brazilian coast. As most of the mangroves are contained within federal or state protected areas, the project strategy aimed to strengthen management effectiveness at federal protected areas while strengthening licensing processes that affect mangrove areas, such as upstream industrial activities, together with state and municipal environmental agencies. The project also expected to positively influence the socio-economic status of artisanal fishing households inhabiting sustainable use federal protected areas.

Project Progress Summary

The project needed four years to effectively take off, due to the consolidation of the project's implementing partner, which was only established on paper in 2007. Once a stable team was in place, the implementation of the project elapsed without any significant trouble. The project made important efforts to advance towards the over 21 targets of its logical framework, achieving some significant results, such as tracking changes in management effectiveness in 17 federal areas from 2012 to 2016, crafting fishery agreements in 8 federal sustainable use protected areas, establishing participatory biodiversity monitoring protocols and in general upgrading the relevance of mangrove ecosystems in the federal biodiversity governance structures.

Evaluation Rating Table

Rating Project Performance		
Criteria	Rating	Comments
Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall quality of M&E	MS	Despite the shortcomings of the indicator framework, the project did use the M&E system for adaptive management
M&E design at project start up	MS	The project's indicator framework had too many redundant indicators, making it not cost-effective
M&E Plan Implementation	S	The project regularly monitored and used the M&E system for adaptive management
IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution	S	Disbursement and administration performed without problems
Implementing Agency Execution	S	UNDP provided sufficient technical and administrative support
Executing Agency Execution	S	IP engaged proactively to solve implementation challenges
Outcomes: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall quality of project outcomes	MS	Project achievements may strengthen mangrove protected areas, but original targets only partially achieved
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	R	Project supported national policies and MEA commitments
Effectiveness	S	Project brought mangrove forests to national attention and set up several fishery management agreements with some potential to enhance delivery of ecological and social outcomes of sustainable use protected areas
Cost-effectiveness	MS	Implementation over 9 years, with increasing implementation costs, but good general cost-effectiveness

Sustainability: Likely (L), Moderately likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU), Unlikely (U)		
Criteria	Rating	Comments
Overall sustainability	ML	Average of the four risk dimensions. See below
Financial resources	ML	Budget allocations for PAs still very limited. State and municipal environmental agencies still weak. Need to mobilize new resources toward mangroves
Socio-economic	ML	Increased awareness of importance of PAs among mangrove stakeholders, but many resource users and managers still not sufficiently aware
Institutional framework and governance	ML	Environmental institutions at state level remain weak and ancillary economic interests
Environmental	L	Wildlife populations in PAs have the potential to recover, provided threat levels do not increase. Climate change will become an increasing threat for southern mangroves
Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)		
Environmental status improvement	M	Mangrove cover and status remain the same
Environmental stress reduction	S	Increased awareness and ownership by resource users
Progress towards stress/ status change	S	Project mangrove forests to the attention of biodiversity institutions at federal level (ICMBIO and MMA)
Overall progress results: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall progress results	MS	The project has made significant improvements over the business-as-usual scenario. However, it could not achieved all its targets within implementation period

Concise summary of conclusions

The project strategy was relevant and significantly raised the visibility and importance of mangrove forests in the eyes of national environmental institutions, formerly focused solely on inland biomes.

The project underwent a prolonged development phase, lasting from at least 2005 to 2008, which led to an “accumulation” of expected results, given the modest grant amount of USD 5 million, for a target area exceeding 5,000 km², dispersed over 6,000 km of coast. However, the project selected clusters of protected areas with different main threats, ecological and socio-economic conditions, which enabled different approaches to be tested. However, the project strategy underestimated the transaction costs (negotiations, travel) involved when dealing with multiple geographic areas AND multiple institutional partners.

The implementation phase was significantly delayed, due to the new creation of ICMBIO. The new organization needed time to build up its structure, and hence the project only really took off by 2011, three years later than planned, which forced a no-cost extension first until 2015 and finally to 2017. The fact that the project implementation extended over 9 years on the same original grant bears down on its efficiency, as the executing agency's cost kept mounting over time. Thus, the project focused its attention on instruments of national application, such as the national mangrove plan, while abandoning some of the most significant mangrove areas of the country (Reentrâncias Maranhenses).

While the project did not deliver all the originally intended products it was able to produce a consistent set of products, namely PA management plans, fishery management agreements, a new national management plan for *Ucides cordatus*, and a comprehensive atlas of Brazilian mangroves, as well as initiated an important biodiversity monitoring program, an environmental restoration plan, zoning agreements and set up the concept of a fund for coastal and marine biodiversity. During the implementation time, there were no significant changes in mangrove area or a worsening of the status of threatened or overexploited organisms associated with mangroves and/or estuaries according to both national threatened lists and the IUCN Red List[®]. Thus, the project has put mangroves in the forefront of environmental agencies at federal level.

However, protected area management effectiveness has not improved at most of the protected area supported by the project. Moreover, the limited resources available to protected area management councils hampers or downright out precludes the implementation of the very tools produced by the project.

Thus, expected ecological and social outcomes, namely, increases in population numbers for fishery species or improvement of socio-economic status of mangrove fishing communities did not materialize. Population status would depend on management effectiveness, which, as we have exposed has not yet sufficiently improved, but also on biological and abiotic factors that would have delayed the effect of effective implementation of any of the management instruments devised by the project. More importantly, socio-economic status of fishing communities may improve if the management plans developed by the project are effectively implemented and these communities succeed in keeping the fishery resources on which they depend closed to new entries or increases in effort. Even in ideal conditions, their monthly income still depends on a market dominated by few, much wealthier, and presumably much better connected buyers. Therefore, continuous support from transfer programs, such as the one administered by the Ministry of Environment (Bolsa Verde), as well as the updating of fishers' registries and consequent access to social benefits is paramount for the well-being of coastal communities and, in return for the mangroves of Brazil. Weak finances for protected areas constitute the main risk for the sustainability of the project, together with the still suboptimal engagement of local governments and business operators in the management of drivers of mangrove degradation and destruction.

Recommendations

1. ICMBIO could elevate the mangrove biome to the same status as the other six current Brazilian biomes to enhance its visibility and raise issues about its importance and conservation. Mangroves risk not being given enough attention and fall between administrative divisions.

2. Financial sustainability of mangrove federal protected areas must be strengthened by increasing their current meagre budget allocation, as well as by posting more personnel and crafting agreements across agencies to strengthen enforcement.
3. ICMBIO and MMA should strengthen monitoring programs of biodiversity and specifically support the participatory monitoring program developed by the project. Knowledge on the status of biodiversity in mangroves is less than satisfactory, as shown by the challenges faced by the project and this terminal evaluation to gather information on the project's indicators. The participatory monitoring program has the potential to start bridging this gap.
4. Fishery management plans cannot be implemented in the absence of fishery data. ICMBIO and the MMA must both increase efforts to coordinate with state or federal fishery administrations and include monitoring of catch within federal protected areas of sustainable use. Moreover, catch and effort data must be incorporated in the participatory monitoring program established by the project.
5. UNDP must take a proactive role orienting executive agencies in the administration of tracking tools, especially METT and review results

Lessons Learned

1. Projects should not be implemented by recently created agencies, otherwise the project becomes inefficient due to long implementation times and cumulative costs on a constant grant.
2. Future projects should not underestimate the costs involved not only in setting up implementation of a geographically challenging project but more importantly the transaction costs involved in dealing with a multitude of actors
3. Socio-ecological systems are complex and there are rarely simple cause-effects relationships. For instance, projects that have the enhancement of management effectiveness of protected areas as a goal cannot deliver maintenance or increase of population numbers or of habitat quality for big areas. Project outcome indicators should be restricted to the immediate effect of the project
4. Project outcome indicators should not include overlapping and/ or output indicators at outcome level. Moreover, project design should evaluate the costs of collecting data on the relevant matter, for instance, whether or not there is sufficient information on populations for a certain habitat should be carefully assessed.
5. Management instruments, like PA management plans, or fishery management plans need resources to be implemented and to achieve the ecological and social benefits intended. The sustainability of this project's achievements is going to be determined by the ability of ICMBIO and its national and international partners to mobilize such resources for the execution and continuation of the plans and agreements developed and facilitated by the project.

1. Introduction

Purpose of the TE and objectives


As mandatory for all GEF-funded, UNDP-implemented projects, a terminal evaluation conducted by an independent party was commissioned¹ in Brazil in November 2017, to produce a systematic, independent assessment of the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. Terminal project evaluations serve the dual purpose of disclosing project results and implementation processes, fostering transparency and accountability, and providing lessons learned for the improvement of design and implementation of future projects².

Scope & Methodology

The UNDP-GEF guidelines for the conduct of project terminal evaluation are aligned with the five DAC³ evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, and along three dimensions: project formulation and strategy, project results, project implementation and adaptive management and sustainability.

Project strategy and formulation. This dimension comprises the project's logical framework and the project's national and local ownership (at design stage), linkages to past and current initiatives and UNDP comparative advantage. Examining the project logic entails examining the project's activities-impact pathway⁴ (figure 1), thus analyzing the validity of the project assumptions and impact drivers, especially identified risks, as well as the likelihood of the necessary (implicit) intermediate states between outcomes and final impacts.

Figure 1. conceptual model of the activities-impact path and the conditioning factors that the project can influence (impact drivers) and the ones it cannot (assumptions). Based on the GEF Evaluation Office (2009) ROTI Handbook.



Project implementation & adaptive management includes adaptive management, partnership agreements, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, finances and co-

¹ (UNDP, 2012)

² (UNDP, 2012)

³ Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

⁴ (GEF Evaluation Office, 2009)

financing and implementing and executing agency performance will be evaluated. These concepts are defined and measured as described in the following table:

Construct	Operational definition and measurement
Adaptive management	Project management structures managed implementation challenges, risks and context changes, as documented in project reports
Partnership agreements	Extent to which all groups that are affected or can influence the project and its outcomes were included in the project governance structures
M&E system	Sensitiveness, cost-effectiveness and reliability of indicators, and degree to which the M&E system has guided project implementation as documented in work plans and steering committee minutes
Financial execution	Disbursement and expenditure conducted in timely, transparent manner (concordance of budgets and expenditure), reporting and accountability lines clear and in compliance with UNDP and national rules (audit reports) and degree to which the project has coordinated with co-financiers
Agency performance	Project agencies provided necessary technical and administrative support as shown in quality of reports (candidness and truthfulness) and work plans (compliance with logical framework)

Project results. This dimension refers to how the project results, or outcomes, comply with the evaluation criteria, as shown in the following table

Evaluation criteria	Operational definition and measurement
Relevance	Project supported specific, formal or informal, policy objectives at community, state and national level, together with concordance with GEF-4 results framework and UNDP's CDP
Effectiveness	Degree of achievement of targets defined in the project's LFA
Efficiency	The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
Impact	Changes of status of populations and habitats and drivers of degradation, behavior and attitudes of stakeholders, as well as socio-economic impact of the project on coastal communities.
Sustainability	Trends of public budgets and/ or expenditure on mangrove protected areas, existence of legal instruments to sustain project outputs and interest of stakeholders, as well as viability of mangrove habitats considering likely impacts of climate change

Additionally, the terminal evaluation has examined the degree to which the project has produced public goods and the degree to which the project has contributed to broader development topics, including gender and indigenous issues.

Methods

This evaluation employed a mix of qualitative and quantitative research methods including, focus discussion groups (FDG) individual interviews, questionnaires (METT) and structured observation. Semi-structured, individual interviews and focus discussion groups (FDG) were held with representatives of the project's main stakeholders, Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBIO), Ministry of Environment (MMA) and UNDP at national level, including the project team (ICMBIO) and project analyst (UNDP). Representatives of relevant departments of

the ICMBIO (Protected Areas, Research, Threatened Species and Knowledge Management) and the MMA (Biodiversity, Ecosystem Conservation) were also interviewed. At field level, three PA managers (ICMBIO) were interviewed at the sustainable use PAs of APA and RESEX Delta do Parnaíba (Maranhão) and APA and ARIE Rio Mamanguape (Paraíba). Also, six individual interviews and FDGs were held with local stakeholders in and around the two protected areas of the Delta do Parnaíba, including fishers and crab merchants. These interviews provided first-hand information on stakeholder perceptions and experiences in the implementation and results of the project. Structured observation was applied to assess ecosystem status, crab collection and value chain during the field visit to the protected areas at the Delta do Parnaíba.

METT questionnaires and CDRs were analysed using descriptive statistics. Also, drivers of effects (METT scores and threat scores) were identified through correlation analysis, using Excel® software. Geographical information systems, QGIS® software and Google Earth® imagery were used to calculate locations, ecosystem cover and extension of protected areas, using data from WWF (mangrove ecosystem extension), WCPA (protected area location and extension) and GADM (administrative borders).

The project's performance against the five evaluation criteria was rated based on ordinal scales: two-point scale for relevance (relevant, non-relevant), 6-point scale for effectiveness and efficiency ("highly unsatisfactory" to "highly satisfactory"), three-point scale for impact and four-point scale (likely, moderately likely, moderately unlikely, unlikely) for sustainability.

Limitations

The vastness of the project area (nearly 7,000 km of coastal Brazil and 5,000 km² of mangrove) and the number of protected areas included (24) against a mission length of merely 15 days severely limited the reach of the first-hand information obtained for this evaluation. Thus, project actions outside the protected area visited were based on a limited number of interviews, an important amount of project publications, peer-reviewed literature and online databases, and, more importantly, the evaluation relies to an important degree on the METT and threat scores, which were administered by the project's coordination unit to draw conclusions.

Structure of the TE report

This report contains a description of the project, its context and strategy (section 2), a discussion of its strategy (section 3.1) implementation (3.2) and results (3.3) followed by conclusions and recommendations based on said discussions (section 4). Annexes including list of persons interviewed, evaluation matrix, documents consulted, progress against results framework indicators, summary of field visits and audit trail are attached to this report.

2. Project Description and Background Context

Project start and duration

The project concept was developed between 2005 and 2007. Implementation was planned for the period 2008-2012 with a GEF 4 grant amounting to US\$ 5 million. However, the consolidation of the then newly created implementing partner, the Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBIO) delayed the implementation phase that eventually extended from 2008 to 2017.

Problems that the project sought to address

Brazilian mangroves

Mangroves in Brazil are estimated to cover between 10 to 14,000 km^{2,5}, variations due to methodological factors. Earlier figures of 25,000 km² are now considered as gross overestimations⁶. The most recent estimations based on detailed satellite images and produced with the support of this project, assess the actual cover at nearly 13,989.66 km² above of the previous accepted figure of 11,144 km²⁽⁷⁾. Mangroves are not equally distributed along the 6,800 km of Brazilian coast: over 85% or 9,250 km² of Brazilian mangroves occur at the Northern coast sector from Amapá to Maranhão, with the state of Pará accounting for half of the total national mangroves. This coastal area is characterized by humid, equatorial climate, and continuous, tall stands of mangrove along the coast and estuaries, interrupted only by the estuary of the Amazon river. The coastal sector from the states of Piauí to Rio de Janeiro (Northeast coast) comprises approximately 10% of the Brazilian mangroves (1,180 km²) and has a climate ranging from semi-arid to sub-humid, being increasingly seasonal and humid towards the South. Mangrove forests in this sector consist of smaller, shorter fringing stands, which have a greater development in the more humid conditions from the state of Bahia towards the South. The last most southern sector comprises 670 km² of mangroves (5% of the total), with humid, seasonal climate⁸. These main sectors can be subdivided in finer 8 sections according to physical factors (tides, evapotranspiration and temperature) and forest structure (dominant species, zonation, stand dimension and average tree height)⁹. Typical for the South American Atlantic, four mangrove species dominate all sectors and their associated fauna is highly dependent on adjacent ecosystem both terrestrial (Amazonian or Atlantic tropical moist forest, Cerrado or Caatinga shrublands) and marine (tidal flats, seagrass meadows).

⁵ (Giri, et al., 2011) based on LANDSAT images from 2000 and (Kjerfve & Lacerda, 1993) based on local estimations from different authors

⁶ (Kjerfve & Lacerda, 1993)

⁷ (Magris & Barreto, 2010) based on 2007-09 LANDSAT images

⁸ (Kjerfve & Lacerda, 1993), (Schaeffer-Novelli, et al., 2000) and (Magris & Barreto, 2010)

⁹ (Schaeffer-Novelli, et al., 2000))

The importance of Brazilian mangrove at regional and global scale cannot be underestimated: accepting estimations of 40,623 km²⁽¹⁰⁾ for LAC mangroves and 137,760 km²⁽¹¹⁾, for global cover, **Brazilian mangroves (13,990 km²) would constitute 30% and 10% of the LAC and global mangroves respectively.**

The National Protected Area System (SNUC)

The national protected area system, consolidated through a federal act and several decrees between 2000 and 2006¹² comprises 2,468,493 km² of land (28.94% of national land area) and 61,881 km² of marine area (1.68% of the Brazilian EEZ)¹³. The SNUC includes protected areas, named Unidades de Conservação (UC) at three governance levels: federal, state and municipal, divided among two broad management categories: sustainable use (IUCN categories IV-VI) and strict protection (IUCN categories I-III). Of these designations (table 1), the project worked with ESECs and PARES (strict conservation) and ARIEs, APAs, RESEX and FLOEs (sustainable development).




Figure 2. Biomes of Brazil. Moist forest corresponds to the Amazonian and Atlantic forest biomes, Xeric shrubland to the Caatinga biome, Grasslands comprise the Cerrado and Pampa biome, as well as a portion of the Llanos ecoregion in the North, while flooded grassland is the Pantanal biome. Mangroves are barely visible at this scale as a purple fringe in Pará and Maranhão (85% of the Brazilian mangroves) and spotted along the coast adjacent to the Caatinga and Atlantic forest biomes.

Data from (Olson, et al., 2001) , (Protected Planet, 2018) and (GADM, 2015)

Table 1. SNUC management categories¹⁴

Type	Management category (Abbreviation)	IUCN cat.
Strict conservation/ <i>Proteção Integral</i>	Ecological Station/ Estação Ecológica (ESEC)	Ia
	Biological Reserve/ Reserva Biológica (REBIO)	Ia

¹⁰ (Lacerda, et al., 1993)

¹¹ (Giri, et al., 2011)

¹² Law # 9985, 18/07/2000 and Decrees # 4340 of 22/08/2002, # 5746 of 5/04/2006 and # 5758 of 13/04/2006 (Ministério do Meio Ambiente, 2011)

¹³ (Protected Planet, 2018)

¹⁴ (Ministério do Meio Ambiente, n.d.)

	National/ State Park/ Parque Nacional/ Estadual (PARNA/ PARE)	II
	Natural Monument/ Monumento Natural (MONA)	III
	Wildlife Refuge/ Refúgio da Vida Silvestre (RVS)	III
Sustainable Use/ Uso Sustentável	Environmental Protection Area/ Área de Proteção Ambiental (APA)	V
	Area of Relevant Ecological Interest / Área de Relevante Interesse Ecológico (ARIE)	IV

The PRODOC reports 132 protected areas with mangroves, protecting between 56¹⁵ to 87%^{16, 17} of mangroves in Brazil under the different SNUC categories (21-17% of Integral Protection; 79¹⁸-83%¹⁹ of Sustainable Use, especially APA and RESEX). Of the 132 mangrove PA, 44 are federal, 79 are declared and managed at 9 are municipal²⁰. However, the total number of mangrove PA is estimated at 120 (55 federal, 46 state run and 19 municipal) in project reports by 2017²¹. Most mangrove PAs are in the Amapá-Pará-Maranhão sector, which accounts for at least 8,108 km² (88%) of protected mangroves, with just 2,717 km² (23%) and 520 km² (70%) for the northeastern and southeastern sectors respectively²².

Project supported protected areas

The PRODOC includes 34 federal protected areas to be extended project support²³. However, the terminal evaluation only found evidence of 24 PAs being supported at some point during the implementation of the project, extending over an area of 42,969 km² of which 9,254 km² corresponded to mangrove forests, fringes and patches²⁴. Most project areas were designated as sustainable use (SU) areas (IUCN management categories V and VI), with 54 SU PAs (48 federal, 6 state PAs) against just 18 PAs (3 federal, 15 state PAs) in the strict conservation categories (SC). In terms of area, SU PAs extended over 125,004 km² against just 3,904 km² of strict conservation PAs.

By cluster, state and strict protection areas occurred mostly on the southern São Paulo/ Paraná cluster (figure 5), with 6 state PAs. While accepting the figure of 132 PAs containing mangroves nationwide²⁵, the project's 24 PA constitute just 20% in number, but **they would amount to 83% of mangrove cover in Brazil**. However, much of this was due to the inclusion of the enormous state PA Reentrâncias Maranhenses that expands over 26,809 km², of which **this report** estimates that 3,974 km² are covered by mangrove forest. As this PA dropped off the project, and discounting other PAs which had not been with the project throughout its implementation timeframe, the list is reduced to 17 PAs, expanding over 12,049 km² and containing 4,185 km² of

¹⁵ (UNDP Brazil, 2008)

¹⁶ (Magris & Barreto, 2010)

¹⁷ (FUNBIO, 2016)

¹⁸ (Magris & Barreto, 2010)

¹⁹ (FUNBIO, 2016)

²⁰ (UNDP Brazil, 2008)

²¹ (PMU, 2017), (FUNBIO, 2016)

²² (Magris & Barreto, 2010)

²³ (UNDP Brazil, 2008)

²⁴ Calculated based on the interception of the PA with Olson, et al. (2001) data for mangrove ecoregions in Brazil. As the interception of Neotropical Atlantic mangrove ecoregions with GADM (2015) Brazil area yields 27,000 km², a correction factor of 0.41 was applied to account for the more accurate estimation of Magris & Barreto (2010). For one area (Palmito FLOES) the mangrove area (just under 1 km²) was estimated using Google Earth® images.

²⁵ (FUNBIO, 2016)

mangroves, in this report's estimation (a significant 30% of the national mangrove cover)²⁶. The PRODOC however, estimated that the project's intervention PAs contained 5,680 km² of mangrove area (40% of Brazilian mangroves) and project reports put that figure at 4,975 km² (35%)²⁷.

Table 2. PAs by cluster, type and area

Cluster	State code	# PA	Federal PA	Sustainable Use PA	Km ²	Km ² mangrove
Pará	PA	9	9	9	2,607	2,492
Maranhão	MA	2	1	2	28,659	4,759
Maranhão ⁽¹⁾	MA	1	1	1	1,850	410
Maranhão/Piauí/Ceará	MA/PI/CE	2	2	2	3,346	900
Paraíba	PB	2	2	2	207	58
São Paulo/ Paraná	SP/ PR	9	3	3	8,150	1,044
TOTAL		24	17	18	42,969	9,253

(1) Maranhão cluster without the PA Reentrâncias Maranhenses, which was later drop off the project.




Figure 3: PA clusters selected for the project.

Map scale approximately 1:16,000,000. Data from (Olson, et al., 2001), (Protected Planet, 2018) and (GADM, 2015)

Figure 3b. Project protected areas.

²⁶ That is, accepting the project's figure of 13,990 km² of mangroves

²⁷ (FUNBIO, 2016)



Threats and barriers

While it is estimated that only 500 km² or 5% of Brazilian mangroves have been lost or degraded over the last 25 years²⁸, the drivers of mangrove destruction and degradation are expected to increase, pushed by a rising coastal population and economic growth²⁹: conversion into shrimp or salt ponds, over-exploitation of timber and fishery resources, construction of road infrastructure, housing, tourism and industrial facilities, as well as diversion and pollution of freshwater sources. Moreover, and even as the misconception of mangroves as wastelands has been gradually changing among government and private actors, policy-making and spatial planning processes at national, state and municipal level have failed to grant mangroves a value according to the ecosystem services they provide³⁰.

Although mangroves in Brazil are protected under the Federal Forest Code and 132 PA³¹, this has not been sufficient to prevent loss and degradation of mangrove forests³². The project document identifies 3 main barriers hampering effective conservation of mangrove forests:

- Failures in the design of protected areas and their buffer zones which exclude marginal, yet critical parts of mangrove forests and associated ecosystems, such as mudflats.
- Weak enforcement capacity by federal, state and municipal environmental actors due to insufficient financial resources for the management of PAs, but also due to unsatisfactory inclusion of resource users in decision-making processes.
- Failure to include impacts on mangrove forests in licensing and spatial planning processes,

²⁸ (Magris & Barreto, 2010)

²⁹ (UNDP Brazil, 2008)

³⁰ (UNDP Brazil, 2008)

³¹ (Magris & Barreto, 2010), (Ferreira & Lacerda, 2016)

³² (UNDP Brazil, 2008), (Magris & Barreto, 2010), (Ferreira & Lacerda, 2016)

as water rights, aquaculture, and infrastructure licenses and permits are granted by federal and state authorities with little or no recognition of the impacts³³.

Immediate and development objectives of the project

Several alternatives were considered to overcome the barriers, including increasing the area of mangroves under strict protection and mainstreaming biodiversity, and enhancing capacities to mitigate mangrove impacts across sectoral plans. However, these strategies were discarded considering the high costs of expanding strict conservation PAs and the complexities of mainstreaming biodiversity along almost 7,000 km of coast and multiple sectors at the coast and upstream that may have potential effects on mangrove forests³⁴. Thus, the preferred strategy was to improve management effectiveness and representativeness of the current network of coastal protected areas and to include impacts on mangrove forests in spatial planning and licensing processes. Considering the complexities, diversity and dimensions of the Brazilian mangrove forests, the project was designed to test different models in five protected area clusters (figure 4).

Baseline indicators established

The project's framework provided 21 indicators, plus 7 sub-indicators for objective and outcome level. Indicators did not fit SMART criteria, many not being very sensitive to the constructs they intended to measure, had cost-effectiveness issues, overlap or measured the delivery of an output, instead of the outcome (see table 3, Quality Assessment of Project indicators). Moreover, three of the four objective indicators did not establish a baseline during the whole period of project implementation or only at the end of it (table 7).

Main stakeholders

The project's main stakeholders are ICMBIO and the resource users of mangrove federal protected areas, mainly RESEX. The project document planned for a relevant role of the Special Secretary of Fisheries and the State Environment and Protected Area agencies. However, the reorganization and later disappearance of the Secretary prevented any role in the project. State Agencies were involved in the implementation of the project but only marginally. The focus of the project was on federal protected areas, under full jurisdiction of ICMBIO. While IBAMA still maintains a role in the enforcement of environmental laws, including protected areas, it was not involved in this project, which focused rather on creating and disseminating knowledge on mangrove areas, crafting of fishery management agreements and development of the capacity of protected area managers.

Table 3. Main stakeholders

Stakeholder	Description
ICMBIO	Created in 2007, it is the government organization responsible for the management of biodiversity, as well as the management of the current 548 federal protected areas. It is managed independently "under special regime" but linked with the MMA and part of the National Environmental System (SINAMA).

³³ (UNDP Brazil, 2008)

³⁴ (UNDP Brazil, 2008)

MMA	The Ministry of Environment is the national government organization that proposes public policy and programs aiming to promote sustainability, restore and conserve ecosystems and reduce pollution
UNDP	UNDP in Brazil supports government programs and policies and develops capacities to improve service delivery, reduce inequality and poverty and improve management of natural resources, as well as ecosystem conservation
Mangrove resource users	Mostly marginalized fishers, mangrove communities live on subsistence, small-scale fisheries of crustaceans and finfish and depend on the sustainable delivery of mangrove ecosystem services for their dwellings and livelihoods.

Stakeholder	Description
OEMAS	State and municipal environmental agencies were foreseen to have a more important role in the project document than they did, as the project focused on protected areas (PA) under federal jurisdiction. The Maranhão state environmental agency (SEMAR) stopped being relevant to the project when the PA Reentrâncias was excluded from the project. Moreover, there is potential for future conflict as it maintains an area, APA Pequenos Lençóis that greatly overlaps with two federal, project-supported PAs: RESEX and APA Delta do Parnaíba. The Paraíba state environmental agency (SUDEMA) was involved in the discussions and study that were intended to lead to the implementation of an environmental management plan in the Mamanguape river PAs, but did not committed itself to its development and implementation.
IBAMA	The crucial role of IBAMA foreseen in the project document was not realized as jurisdiction over federal protected areas was transferred to ICMBIO. However, IBAMA still maintains a role in the enforcement of environmental laws, including protected areas and management plans, such as as the Uca crab management plan. Moreover, the remote sensing centre of OBAMA participated in the crafting of the Mangrove Atlas produced by the project.
Academic organizations	Staff from the Federal University of Piauí (UFPI), the Federal University of São Paulo (USP), the Federal University of Pará (UFPA) were trained by the project. Federal University of Para, the Federal University of Piauí and the Federal University of São Paulo will be involved in the participatory monitoring scheme of federal PAs set up by the project. The Federal University of Paraíba monitored water quality in the Mamanguape river on behalf of the project.
EMBRAPA	The Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (EMBRAPA) could implement its 2006-proposed crab transport system, as the project tested and supported its adoption for captures from the RESEX Delta do Parnaíba.


Expected results

The project strategy included the delivery of studies on economic valuation of mangrove ecosystem services, strengthening of community organizations and participatory planning, fostering dialogue processes, review and proposal of more effective regulatory instruments, as well as building individual and institutional capacity at several levels, from community to federal organizations. The project deliverables were expected to result in three outcomes:

1. Strengthened regulatory framework for mangrove PAs, with specific guidelines and clarification of mandates among government organizations, as well as enhanced financial management.
2. Improved sustainability of coastal livelihoods through enhanced participatory resource management plans.
3. Enhanced spatial planning and licensing processes that acknowledge and curtail negative direct and upstream impacts on mangrove forests.

4. Improved knowledge management and awareness on the importance of mangroves, across the public and institutional actors

Figure 4. Project strategy, from outputs (left, dark blue) and outcomes to impacts (right, bright green), through (assumed) intermediate stages



3. Findings

3.1 Project design/ formulation

Analysis of LFA/Results Framework

The project, *Effective Conservation and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystems in Brazil* had the goal of enhancing conservation of mangrove ecosystems through improved management effectiveness of protected areas that include mangroves in five clusters along the coast of Brazil. Specifically, (purpose, immediate objective), the project *would contribute to the maturation and sustainability of the Brazilian Protected Area System (SNUC) by increasing the currently under-represented mangrove ecosystem in the SNUC, defining appropriate management categories and practices for mangrove protected areas and by supporting national, state, municipal and community level regulatory structures required for effective management of this complex ecosystem*³⁵. Thus, the project logic fits within GEF-4's program of providing new and additional funding to enable sustainable and effective systems of protected areas, particularly in the coastal and marine domain. Moreover, the project strategy also follows the established quality standards of UNDP project design, following a LFA structure that links activities to outputs to outcomes to objectives (figure 4).

Assumptions and risks

The project explicitly assumed a response of mangrove ecosystems to improved management effectiveness. Thus, it expected increases in population densities of key mangrove-associated species. Beyond the fact that the project eventually chose species that do not serve as indicators of the health of mangrove ecosystems and were not monitored nor have baseline data, responses of biological populations to improvements of management effectiveness, all other things equal, would exceed the planned implementation period of the project. Positive social outcomes were also assumed, which is to be expected, but not necessary, from better managed fisheries. More importantly, the project did (rightly) assume a continuation of the weak financing of protected areas, but did not think it would affect management effectiveness. However, weak finances of protected areas could well preclude the implementation of the project's outputs, and severely affect management effectiveness.

The project strategy also assumed stability of the environmental institutional and regulatory framework and the interest of key stakeholders, including the federal fisheries entity and state environmental agencies, which did not hold true throughout project implementation. Thus, the assumptions of integration of project outputs into the national regulatory framework were only possible at federal level, and applicable to areas under ICMBIO jurisdiction. Private actors, which were in principle attracted to cooperation as they saw benefits in the better regulation of potentially polluting effluents did not commit to non-binding resolutions, which would allow free riders to continue harmful behaviour. Moreover, the project strategy underestimated the transaction costs involved in dealing with a great number of actors across a vast area. This is also partially contradictory with the project strategy, which called on a focus on federal protected

³⁵ (PMU Project PIMS 3280, 2017)

areas, to avoid, precisely, jurisdictional conflicts. However, mangrove communities maintained a keen interest in the effective enforcement of protected area rules throughout the implementation period.

Finally, the project rightfully assumed the continuation of social programs benefiting mangrove-dwelling population, e.g. Bolsa Verde, a conditional transfer program, which constituted the bulk of this project's co-finance.

The project strategy explicitly considered the risk of its assumptions not holding true, but assumed that the project strategy was robust enough even to maintain commitments from actors which it could not influence.

Lessons from other relevant projects

The project strategy, although with some unrealistic assumptions (see above), employed lessons learned from protected area projects implemented in Brazil and other areas. Thus, it stressed:

1. Community participation and empowerment as key to success
2. Importance of improving management effectiveness of protected areas to deliver social and ecological benefits
3. Working in protected area geographical clusters to optimize project resources and attend the different social and ecological characteristics of the mangroves along the Brazilian coast.

Planned stakeholder participation

The project strategy identified 27 different groups and organizations that should be involved to different degrees in the implementation of the project. These included the federal environmental administration, the Ministry of Environment (MMA), ICMBIO, and IBAMA and, critically, state and municipal environmental agencies.

While ICMBIO, as implementing partner and MMA were indeed key project partners, the involvement of IBAMA was marginal, due to the expanded role of ICMBIO, which took some functions assigned to IBAMA at the time of the project formulation, notably ICMBIO's role as manager of extractive reserves through its traditional populations directorate. Other federal entities which were to be involved in the project, such as the Secretary of Fisheries and Agriculture and the Department of Tourism or the National Water Agencies did not participate in the implementation of the project. International conservation NGOs cited in the project strategy also did not take part in project activities.

Participation of state and municipal agencies did take part along the lines suggested by the project strategy, but to a much lesser degree. The role in the whole strategy also declined after the abandonment of the large mangrove protected area of Reentrâncias Maranhenses (state-managed) in favour of the federal CIP protected area.


Several research organizations, notably federal universities and the Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (EMBRAPA) were successfully engaged by the project to conduct studies and project outputs.

The project also managed to engage with private sector and fisherfolk/ community representatives, albeit more in a local manner rather than dealing with national associations as provided for in the project strategy. Dealing with local communities individually and facilitating workshops and conferences to craft fisheries managements was time-consuming but also constitute some of the best project outputs.

Replication approach

The project based its replication strategy on the assumption by the federal government of regulatory instruments and knowledge products developed by the project, the permanence of capacities of protected area managers developed by the project and the crafting of improved coordination mechanisms between federal and state/ municipal protected area/ environmental agencies. While the latter did not work out as planned, the knowledge and regulatory products of the project, notably the mangrove atlas, fishery studies, monitoring programs and fishery agreements do have a high replication potential, and have been assumed by ICMBIO institutionally. Their weak financial allocation, however, is an important risk for successful replication.

UNDP comparative advantage

The UNDP comparative advantage in the implementation of the GEF project lies in its *global network of country offices, its experience in integrated policy development, human resources development, institutional strengthening, and non-governmental and community participation*³⁶. 

UNDP is a relatively minor player in the implementation of GEF projects in Brazil, which is dominated by the World Bank with larger projects, dedicated thematically to the larger terrestrial biomes, with an investment dimension: of the over US\$ 661 millions GEF grants invested in Brazil, UNDP has implemented 19% of the total and 14% of GEF projects of the biodiversity focal area. This project offered an opportunity for the UNDP to apply its regional and global expertise to a smaller, yet dispersed biome; the project team could have profited from strengthened support in the administration of tracking tools. However, a new financial tool for marine protected areas now being developed under the World Bank-implemented Marine and Coastal Protected Area project (ID# 4637) had its origin in the studies of finances of mangrove protected areas, under this project. Biodiversity funds have been actively promoted and developed by GEF-funded, UNPD-implemented projects worldwide.

Linkages with other interventions in the sector

The project is well framed within the biome-based biodiversity GEF projects implemented and being implemented in Brazil: of the 214 million GEF-grants that have funded biodiversity projects in Brazil to date, 38% have been for the implementation of biome-wide projects, including the Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (World Bank-implemented), Sustainable Cerrado Initiative (UNDP-implemented), and the extensive World Bank-implemented Amazon Region Protected Area Program. This project had close links with the Amazonian and Coastal GEF projects, which include its executing agency, ICMBIO, reflecting also the close link of the mangrove biome with the other two large Brazilian biomes.

³⁶ (GEF Council, 2007)

Management arrangements

The project was implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), under its National Implementation (NIM) modality under the direction of the MMA, and governed by a project board presided by the MMA and composed of representatives of ICMBIO, the Brazilian Institute for the Environment (IBAMA), the (disappeared) Special Secretariat for Fisheries and Aquaculture (SEAP)³⁷ and UNDP, as well as state environmental agencies and local stakeholders. The project was executed by ICMBIO through an implementation structure composed of a centrally located project management unit (PMU) and five field-located pilot site technical coordination units³⁸ which were staffed by the project PA managers and staff.

³⁷ The SEAP was upgraded to Ministry of Fisheries in 2008 to be absorbed into the Ministry of Agriculture by 2015. The changes profoundly affected the organization, which not only did not take part in the project, but has not been providing fishery data since 2008. Its status is still being debated (Senado Federal, 2017) (Sganzerla, 2017)

³⁸ (UNDP Brazil, 2008)

3.2 Project Implementation

Adaptive management

The project was intended to be implemented between 2008 and 2012 (five years), however, actual implementation extended from 2009 to 2017 (nine years). The project concept was first approved by the GEF council in 2007, after being modified from a concept originally endorsed by the GOB in 2005³⁹. The project was approved for implementation by the GEF Council on May 2008, and the project document was signed by its stakeholders in July that year⁴⁰. However, the rearrangements of competencies and functions between the MMA, the IBAMA and the ICMBIO, which was only created in August 2007⁴¹ meant that actual implementation began in 2009 and only took off in 2011, when the delivery rate⁴² had merely attained 12%.

Between late 2012 and early 2013 the project underwent its midterm review as delivery was just nearing 25%. The midterm review process did not prompt any significant changes and was not cited as groundwork for the substantive revision of the project outputs and intervention areas finalized in January 2014, which included the concentration on the Para, Parnaíba (MAPICE) and São Paulo-Paraná clusters, abandoning direct interventions at the Maranhão cluster. The increased focus on federal-managed areas responded to the limited interest and resources of state environmental agencies.

The project also had to adapt to the restructuring and partial dissolution of the federal fisheries entity. Thus, in crafting fishery management plans, the project team interacted directly with communities in extractive reserves (RESEX).

Partnership arrangements

The project was governed as foreseen in the project document, except for the composition of the board, as political changes at the Secretary of Fisheries and Aquaculture prevented it from participating in the project board or providing the committed co-financing. As cited in section planned stakeholder participation, the project strategy foresaw a wide array of stakeholders and project partners, which were eventually reduced. Critically, the project could not develop a strong partnership with municipal and state environmental agencies nor with private sector operators, as foreseen in the strategy.

However, the project established successful partnerships with the Federal University of Paraíba and the Federal Institute to monitor water quality in the Foz of Mamanguape protected area (PB), the Federal University of Piauí (UFPI), the Federal University of São Paulo (USP), the Federal University of Pará (UFPA), for the implementation of the National Strategy for Participatory Monitoring of Mangroves and with EMBRAPA to develop and implement better transportation solutions for captured mangrove crabs. The project also developed strong partnerships with communities within the federal RESEX in Pará and Maranhão.

³⁹ (MPOG, 2005)

⁴⁰ (UNDP Brazil, 2014)

⁴¹ (Presidência da República, 2007)

⁴² Delivery rate is the rate of expenditure of the project GEF grant

Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

The PMU conducted regular monitoring and duly reported accomplishments and challenges in the project implementation reports (PIR). Moreover, adjustments to the project framework were based on monitoring results: by 2014 a substantive review of the project was undertaken, resulting in the abandonment of direct intervention in the Maranhão cluster, due to the remoteness and vastness of the area, and the numerous, yet dispersed actors the project actions in that area entailed. Instead, actions on spatial planning and zoning integrating mangroves impacts were directed to the more compact APA Cananéia-Iguapé-Peruíbe (APA CIP). Also, the review directs the project to focus on the development of a National Mangrove Plan and management instruments at the individual PA level as a means to achieve improvements in the socio-economic conditions of mangrove communities.

The great number and numerous overlaps among indicators meant that reporting was repetitive. For instance, the 2017 PIR report reports without much detail on the four basic accomplishments of the project: The National Mangrove Plan, the *Ucides Cordatus* Management Plan, the Fisheries Agreement in PAs in Pará and the Coastal Biodiversity Fund over 57 pages, mostly by repeating the same accomplishments. More importantly, the absence of a monitoring program for the selected species and the fact that the participatory mangrove protected area monitoring program was only established during the last year of implementation, means that the project team struggled, mostly unsuccessfully, to provide figures for key indicators such as populations of key species and mangrove cover. Moreover, the key species chosen do not reflect changes in drivers of destruction or degradation of mangroves. The unwieldy monitoring framework was not addressed by the midterm review (MTR). The MTR process was plagued with problems and the usefulness of the MTR report, even after its consolidation into a GEF format is questionable. The project report do not mention it and it is not cited as the basis for the important substantive review conducted in 2014.

Project finance and co-finance

1 Financial execution

The implementation rate increased during the 2014-2015 period, stabilizing during a “consolidation phase” (2016-2017) leading to the final closure of the project in 2017, having attained virtually 100% delivery of the GEF grant (figure 5 and 6).

The project was budgeted with a total cost of USD 20,345,692, funded by a GEF-4 grant of USD 5,000,000 and co-funding of 15,345,692. Financial execution of the project started in 2009 under its first annual work plan. Delivery rate was low for the first two years of implementation, but took off by 2013 and had virtually exhausted its budget by the end of 2017.

There were deviations from the original budget, notably in terms of personnel costs, as the PRODOC foresaw those costs mostly under the national and international consultant categories, while severely underestimating travel costs, especially considering the vast project area. Personnel costs were re-distributed during implementation among contractual services (the PMU team) and travel, thus not affecting project operations. There were some minor adjustments too between

accounting categories between annual work plan budgets and actual expenditures, which did not affect the execution of the work plan (figure 8). Moreover, budgets were adjusted yearly according to the rate of execution of output activities, all based on the original and 2014-adjusted logical framework, thus not deviating from the originally planned outputs and outcomes.

In terms of outcomes, there were no major differences between what was budgeted and what was implemented, except for some redistribution between outcomes 1, 3 and 4. Miscellaneous costs were kept under 5% of total expenditure (2% only) and management costs were almost identical to the original budget for project management, in both cases not exceeding 10%. Outcomes 1 and 2 were the costliest, demanding 60% of total expenditure (table 4).

Figure 5. Annual budget (2009-2012 from PRODOC, 2013-2017 from AWP) and expenditure (from CDR) and cumulative expenditure. All figures in USD




Figure 6. Delivery rate, as % of expenditure over year budget (column) and cumulative delivery against total GEF grant (red line).




Figure 7. Expenditure and budget per accounting categories. Main differences are due to the budget lines used, the change of categories not affecting implementation.




Figure 8. Example of budget categories in the AWP 2014 and actual expenditure for the same year. The main differences are that the work was accounted as “companies” instead of under individual “local consultants”.




Table 4. Expenditure per outcome. All figures in USD

Year	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Outcome 5	Expenditure
2009	200.00	43,216.35	10,993.34	5,847.93		60,257.62
2010	26,871.01	11,895.94	4,107.54	43,890.91	47,710.42	134,475.82
2011	35,977.59	66,634.24	35,123.06	179,126.73	78,829.83	395,691.45
2012	162,510.02	170,422.19	30,898.04	52,381.84	74,084.33	490,296.42
2013	148,202.16	282,059.69	15,997.92	206,396.28	70,309.73	722,965.78
2014	315,721.71	238,203.68	39,165.10	168,197.72	102,930.71	864,218.92
2015	266,557.41	263,007.68	177,562.81	112,129.73	74,980.57	894,238.20
2016	343,364.47	187,869.67	94,093.06	62,366.06	21,629.45	709,322.71
2017	71,426.48	252,551.28	182,290.76	111,577.33		617,845.85
TOTAL	1,370,830.85	1,515,860.72	590,231.63	941,914.53	470,475.04	4,889,312.77

2 Co-finance

Co-funding was to be provided mostly by the national government through the Ministry of Environment (MMA), the executing agency, Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBIO), as well as the Secretariat for Fisheries and Aquaculture (SAP) (84% of the total, 48% cash), the governments of the states of Ceará, Paraíba and São Paulo (13%, 17% cash) and the international non-government organisation Conservation International (3%, 16% cash)⁴³. SAP underwent several transformations and did not participate in the project. Co-financing from ICMBIO consisted in its regular budget allocation for federal PAs, the costs of the facilities used by the project team and fully funding both the positions of project national director and project coordinator.

The MMA co-financing related to the programs “Bolsa Verde” and ATER was destined for communities in protected areas. “Bolsa Verde”, is a subsidy paid to communities living within federal, sustainable use protected areas, such as RESEX, FLONAS and RDS, and under the national poverty line as payment for ecosystem services, in recognition of their role in the preservation of ecosystems. The program is financially supported by Conservation International. ATER is a household subsidy granted by the Ministry of Rural Development in three northern states, including Pará, for the development of “forest communities”, including communities using RESEX resources. These programs operated in the project’s pilot areas.

Finally, the UNDP, with its Biodiversity Conservation and Social Development project (BRA/08/023) supports households residing within federal, sustainable use protected areas to have access to social services. This project assisted families in the Mamanguape PA (Paraíba cluster). Information on the execution of this program for the project area only exists up to 2013, but, as the government programs and PA budget allocation have been implemented without interruption to date, it is assumed here that disbursement continued as it was in 2013. Under this assumption, total disbursement under identified co-finance programs would have reached USD 45,734,944, well over the committed total co-finance of 15,345,692 (table 6).

Table 5. Co-finance calculations⁴⁴

Co-finance source	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Federal PA budget	167,789	654,099	693,681	1,557,926	1,584,757	1,584,757	1,584,757	1,584,757	1,584,757	10,997,282
Bolsa Verde					7,953,600	7,689,600	7,689,600	7,689,600	7,689,600	38,712,000
ATER						16,914,117	16,914,117	16,914,117	16,914,117	67,656,469
Cadastro						610,214				610,214
TOTAL BRL	167,789	654,099	693,681	1,557,927	9,538,357	26,798,689	26,188,475	26,188,475	26,798,689	118,586,180
Total USD	91,499	327,143	394,310	931,313	4,883,780	12,429,305	11,130,051	7,871,724	7,675,819	45,734,944
BRL per USD ⁴⁵	1.84	2.00	1.76	1.67	1.95	2.16	2.35	3.33	3.49	

⁴³ (UNDP Brazil, 2008)

⁴⁴ Data provided by PMU till 2013, from which point figures have been extrapolated. Figures have been rounded after summing and/or transforming them.

⁴⁵ (World Bank, n.d.)

Table 6. Project co-finance table

Co-financing (type/ source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner agency* (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	actual	Planned	actual	planned	actual	planned	actual
Grant	-	-	2.6	34.7	4.0	11.0	6.6	45.7
Credits	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Equity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
In-kind	-	-	3.8	No data	5.0	No data	8.8	No data
Non-grant Instruments	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Types	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	6.4	45.7	9.0	11.0	15.4	45.7

Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation

The project's 21 indicators, plus 7 sub-indicators for objective and outcome level did not all fit SMART criteria: some of them were not very sensitive to the construct they intended to measure, had cost-effectiveness issues, overlap or measured the delivery of an output, instead of the outcome as detailed in the following table (table 7).

Table 7. Quality assessment of project indicators

LFA level	Indicator and target	Issues
Objective	Populations of threatened and overexploited species remain stable	The project was expected to enhance management effectiveness of mangrove PAs so this outcome could be expected for species strongly associated with those PAs. This indicator would have needed very solid baselines, and either an existing monitoring program or the capabilities, within the project to set up one. However, the indicator species eventually chosen, <i>Eudocimus ruber</i> and <i>Ucides cordatus</i> did not have monitoring programs and the former is not a good indicator of mangrove ecosystems in Brazil (see section 3). Moreover, populations' responses depend on several factors including generation time, and changes in the range of occurrence. The project established a monitoring program for RESEX which has yet to produce first results.
	Vegetation cover of mangroves in project PA remains stable	A good indicator of the performance of the project which, however, would have needed a very solid baseline. However, measuring how much mangrove cover exists presents many methodological complexities and this was only settled by the project's final product: the Atlas of Brazilian Mangroves. Thus, only the baseline value is known.

LFA level	Indicator and target	Issues
Objective	Proportion of protected mangroves in SU or SC management categories	The project originally had different protected area increase targets for the VIII mangrove units identified in Brazil. However, costs of expansion of protected areas into not yet protected mangroves are very different in the extensive northern mangrove belts and in the constrained southern mangrove patches, where population density is also much higher. Moreover, there are jurisdictional issues as ICMBIO has limited control on the declaration of protected areas over state or even municipal authorities. Thus, the project simply reported on mangrove areas under protection. However, the estimation of this is limited by the same methodological issues of the previous indicators.
	70% of project PA with good or excellent METT scores	No issues. Excellent indicator of project performance. However, administration of METT was not optimal, as many questionnaires were not completed and lacked enough justification of the scores. Moreover, the protected area sample varied greatly during project implementation making cross-section comparison challenging or impossible.
	Half of pilot PAs testing 1 or more of financing strategies developed in the project	No issues. However, no direct testing of any financial mechanism was ever conducted by the project. Instead, the project tallied the development of a proposed fund for coastal and marine protected areas as the project's one financial mechanism
	80% of all sub-national agencies with jurisdiction in the project clusters agreed to and signed the Mangrove Plan	High transaction costs in terms of negotiations and limited political leverage of ICMBIO to move state or municipal environmental agencies to agree to a mangrove plan to be developed by the project.
Outcome 1	80 % of "Mangrove" states with a set of norms and guidelines agreed with and coordinated between federal, state and municipal agencies on the management of mangroves	Same as above. Both indicators are very similar and overlapping: a comprehensive "mangrove plan" would have included coordinated guidelines or norms, presumably voluntary, to which the "mangrove states", that is, those with jurisdiction of project cluster's mangroves would have to agree.
	Existence of a core group of trained staff members at national and subnational environmental agencies capable of implementing and using those norms and regulations	Good output indicator, hardly an indicator for an outcome.
	1 regulation tailored to mangroves for each of the following topics: PA management categories, management plans guidelines, financing mechanisms, water planning, fisheries management	This indicator is redundant with several others: #4 objective indicator and #4 outcome 1 indicator on financial mechanisms, #1 outcome 1 indicator, #1, #2 and #4 outcome 2 indicators, #1, #2 outcome 3 indicators

LFA level	Indicator and target	Issues
Outcome 1	PA funding to increase 30% through project design mechanisms in the states of Bahia and São Paulo	This target makes the fourth objective indicator useless, as it goes beyond the requirement of “testing financial mechanism”. This indicator may be a “fossil” of the long project development phase, as the state of Bahia appears nowhere else in the project strategy.
	Existence of a national mangroves plan in Brazil's Wetland Plan	Redundant with the fourth objective indicator.
Outcome 2	1. 700 km ² of mangrove area under integrated fisheries resource plan	No issues
	2. Establishment of 3 no-take areas in the 3 pilot UCs	
	Reduction of capture rates and mortality of <i>Ucides cordatus</i> to 45% of those captured	No issues
	1. 100 potential local small entrepreneurs trained in the preparation of a business plan 2. 100 families in the pilot UCs involved in sustainable alternatives including women and youth	First sub-indicator is an output indicator. Number 2, no issues
	25 PA management councils reaching agreement on harvesting levels and enforcement	No issues
Outcome 3	2 water management instruments agreed upon by the Mamanguape watershed committee that consider the water quantity and quality for mangroves	No issues
	1. Degree that mangrove conservation is incorporated in Zoning of the APA Reentrâncias Maranhenses 2. Zoning restriction on main sectors reflected in PA management plan 3. 16 municipalities agreed to APA zoning 4. 50% of the key actors in the APA sign formal document of adherence to zoning regulations	No issues, in 2014 changed to the APA Cananéia-Iguapé-Peruíbe (CIP)

LFA level	Indicator and target	Issues
Outcome 4	30% awareness among private and public stakeholders on the management of mangrove PA and the ecosystem services they provide.	Verification of this indicator would have required a survey for which funds were not allocated. Conduct of a survey would have been expensive and the project's main objective was not to raise awareness among the public.
	Frequency and quality of monitoring of mangrove land cover	No definition of what "frequent" and "quality" mean. Qualification would be needed for this indicator to become operative
	6 instances in which adaptive management takes place considering M&E results	This indicator refers not to results but to project implementation processes
	3 replications of the project pilots in another mangrove PA	It would need further clarification of what replication means.

UNDP and Implementing Partner Implementation/ Execution, coordination and operational issues

Both the implementing (UNDP) and executing agencies (ICMBIO) proactively supported the implementation of the project.

UNDP carried on its duties providing administrative and assistance for the implementation of the activities of the annual work plans and the delivery of the project outputs. UNDP administrative support was considered critical considering the rigidity and cumbersome nature of government budgets and procedures. The role of UNDP was perceived very positively and as facilitating for project implementation by the national government agencies involved: ICMBIO and MMA.

However, UNDP managed the MTR process weakly, thus losing the opportunity to modify a cumbersome, non-SMART and overlapping indicator framework. Also, UNDP regional and global expertise should have oriented administration of the METT, included the capacity development scorecard in the indicator framework and promote a more energetic development of financial sustainability solutions to be applied in individual PAs, rather than just a general concept for the development of a proposal for a fund. This notwithstanding, UNDP adequately provided support to reorient the project in the 2014 substantive review. Moreover, UNDP's role is perceived as positive by stakeholders and compares well with other GEF implementing agencies of projects also executed by ICMBIO.

The project developed institutional, organizational and individual capacities at ICMBIO, with UNDP support. UNDP was also intimately involved in the development of the project strategy. However, UNDP could have better strengthened the administration of the tracking tools, particularly METT, and provide better insights on financial sustainability of protected areas, which are some of UNDP strengths.

ICMBIO implemented the project as one of its core programs. ICMBIO provided both the facilities for the PMU and allocated two top officials from its Social and Environmental Actions in Protected

Areas⁴⁶ department to serve as national director and project manager, as well as engaging protected area staff in project activities. The PMU coordinated and shared results and efforts with other ICMBIO units and departments and the results of the project are rated very positively by the Research and Biodiversity Monitoring and Establishment, Planning and Management of Protected Areas⁴⁷ divisions of ICMBIO as stepping stones to achieve the monitoring, knowledge management and PA establishment targets of the institution.

The time needed for the establishment of this new agency and the learning curve for the implementation of UNPD-GEF projects unnecessarily delayed the implementation of the project four years, extending the planned end-of-project date from 2012 to 2017. However, once the agency had established itself, it appropriated and properly managed this and other projects, dedicating a team embedded in its structure and physically housed at its headquarters, also providing adequate national direction and project management decisions.

⁴⁶ The official designation is Diretoria de Ações Socioambientais e Consolidação em Unidades de Conservação


⁴⁷ Officially the Diretoria de Pesquisa, Avaliação e Monitoramento da Biodiversidade and Coordenação Geral de Criação, Planejamento e Avaliação de Unidades de Conservação

3.3 Project Results

Relevance


The project is relevant to the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and is one of the key projects for Brazil to achieve its conservation targets, aligned with the Aichi targets and contributing to the Convention's Program of Work on Protected Areas. Thus, it has contributed to consolidate protection of critical coastal ecosystems, a crucial issue considering the low level of protection given to marine and coastal ecosystems in Brazil. The significance of the project for the national biodiversity policy was confirmed by environmental officials both at the MMA and ICMBIO and is reflected in national policy documents (Figure 9).

Figure 9. Quotes of mangrove ecosystems and the project itself in national communications to the CBD show the increasing relevance of the project. Quotes expressed as percentage of mentions of the mangrove ecosystem relative to the quotes of coastal/ marine ecosystems and the percentage of project quotes relative to the times GEF projects are mentioned in the communications.



Moreover, the project development itself responded to the increasing momentum in international attention gained by mangrove ecosystems in the post 2004 Asian tsunami context. This is also reflected in the amount of GEF funding for mangrove-related projects since the early 2000s (Figure 10).

Figure 10. GEF grants to biodiversity and mangrove projects. This project is one of the very few “true” mangrove projects, i.e. projects with their sole focus on protected areas within the mangrove biome. Other GEF projects do dedicate some partial attention to mangroves⁴⁸



At local level, interviews with resource users revealed the importance attached by this sector to the continuation of protection within the Extractive Reserves where they operate. Maintenance of protection and support from ICMBIO is deemed to be a determinant for the maintenance of their livelihoods and improvement of their socio-economic conditions, and, more importantly as the only viable mechanism to impede the entry of outsiders and the conversion of sustainable fisheries into open commons bound for degradation. While conceding that conservation objectives do sometimes counter their livelihoods options, respondents of this terminal evaluation considered that the costs imposed onto them in terms of catch restriction and cooperation with management tasks, including reporting and monitoring are compensated by the benefits obtained by their **exclusive access to the fishery resources contained in the RESEX.**

While not directly consulted in the frame of the terminal evaluation, the agro-industrial sector, in this case operators of sugar cane plantation around the lower watershed of the Mamanguape river have signalled their interest in cooperation agreements to develop more efficient production methods and pollution abatement measures which they would see in their benefit, **if it creates a set of standards that prevent the entry of “rogue players” and improves their acceptance and standing in the communities where they are based.**

⁴⁸ (GEF, 2018)

Effectiveness and efficiency

Overall results (attainment of objectives)

The following section follows the objective indicators of the project.

No change in status of population of threatened and overexploited species

The project document exposes a scenario in which several mangrove-associated species are threatened by habitat destruction/ conversion: *Eudocimus ruber*, scarlet ibis (guará), two primates: *Alouatta belzebul ululata*, red-handed Howler Monkey, (guariba-de-mãos-ruivas) and the manatee, *Trichechus manatus* (peixe-boi marinho). *Eudocimus ruber* is not included in the 2003 or the 2014 Brazilian threatened species list and has been consistently classified as least concern by the IUCN red list since its populations are large, and widely distributed from Argentina to the Caribbean⁴⁹. In fact, the project document also indicated that this species was only considered threatened at the southern end of its Brazilian range⁵⁰. The fact that this species is not threatened and its lack of economic importance, if we make exception of its role as a tourist attraction, accounts for the lack of an official monitoring program for this species. **The project team tried to obtain data for its populations, to no avail.** However, this species is included in the list of critical species of the national mangrove plan produced with project support, as it is classified as threatened in the southern states of Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo and Paraná. *Alouatta belzebul* is associated with moist tropical forests, such as the Amazon forests and Atlantic moist forests and its destiny is tied to those two ecosystems. Thus, their population status does not depend on the health of mangrove ecosystems. *A. belzebul* is included in both the 2003 and 2014 versions of the Brazilian threatened species list and the IUCN Red List as vulnerable⁵¹. *Trichetus manatus* is strongly dependent on seagrass meadows and it would occur in mangrove forests if seagrass is present and the salinity not too high. The threatened status of this species has not been modified over the last 10 years in Brazil and throughout its range, and it remains endangered and vulnerable in the national and IUCN threatened lists respectively⁵².

The project document also included a list of “key species associated with mangroves in Brazil” that included 112 animals: 34 crustaceans⁵³, 12 mollusks⁵⁴, 15 bony fishes, 6 elasmobranchs, 6 reptiles and 39 birds. However, of these, only 44 (39%), mostly crustaceans, half of them *Uca sp.* (fiddler crabs, catanhão-tesoura) and bivalves, show a strong association with mangroves. Of the species strongly associated with mangroves, only 3, two exploited mangrove crabs, *Ucides cordatus*, *Cardisoma guanhumí* and a shark, *Isogomphodon oxyrinchus* (daggernose shark, cação-quati) were included in the threatened species list of 2003-4⁵⁵. Of them, only *Cardisoma guanhumí* and, *Isogomphodon oxyrhyncus* are still included in the 2014 list of threatened species, both classified as critical (CR). The daggernose shark, endemic to the coastal waters of South America is also

⁴⁹ (BirdLife International, 2016)

⁵⁰ (MMA and UNDP, 2008)

⁵¹ (Veiga, et al., 2008), (Ministério de Meio Ambiente, 2003), (Ministério de Meio Ambiente, 2014)

⁵² (Deutsch, et al., 2008), (Ministério de Meio Ambiente, 2014)(Ministério de Meio Ambiente, 2003)

⁵³ 32 Decapoda (crabs and shrimps), 1 Sessilia (acorn barnacles) and 1 Tanaidaceae (tanaid, shrimp-like creature)

⁵⁴ 11 Bivalvia (mussels, oysters, cockles and shipworms) and 1 gastropod (bean snail)

⁵⁵ (Ministério do Meio Ambiente, 2004)

classified a critically endangered in the IUCN Red List of threatened species, due to large population declines compounded by a restricted distribution⁵⁶. To these species listed in the project document, this report adds two threatened and exploited fish species which depend strongly on mangrove areas as nurseries for their young: *Epinephelus itajara* (Atlantic goliath grouper, mero) and *Megalops atlanticus* (tarpon, camaripim). While none of the two are listed in the threatened list of 2004, they appear in the 2014 list as critically endangered and vulnerable respectively, which is also their classification under the IUCN Red List⁵⁷. See complete list of species at annex 9.

Table 8. Threatened species assessed by the IUCN Red List that have some degree of dependence on Brazilian mangroves

Species	Threatened status (2018)	Change in status (2004-2018)
<i>Alouatta belzebul</i>	VU	No
<i>Trichechus manatus</i>	EN	No
<i>Isogomphodon oxyrinchus</i>	CR	No
<i>Epinephelus itajara</i>	CR	No
<i>Megalops atlanticus</i>	VU	No

The national action plan for mangrove habitats of 2015 developed with project support intends to protect 74 species⁵⁸, including 19 threatened species and 49 commercially significant species. 15 species included in the mangrove plan were also listed in the PRODOC.

Crabs of economic importance

The project document adds to the concern expressed by authors in the first part of the 2000s about the stocks of two economically important crustacean species, *Cardisoma guanhumi* (blue land crab, guaiaumum) and *Ucides cordatus* (mangrove crab, carangejo uçá)⁵⁹. These assessments prompted a series of federal and state regulations on the fishery, including gear limitations and closed seasons, which were, however, largely disregarded, both within and outside protected areas. **Both crab species were included in the 2004 list of threatened species, as exposed above, but in the newest list (2014) published by the MMA, *Ucides cordatus* was excluded.** The project, based on data provided by federal universities⁶⁰ estimated that populations are stable and growing. This is confirmed by the review of the most recent scientific literature on the matter: despite the intense fishing pressure, populations of *Ucides cordatus* assessed between 2003 and 2011 seem to remain healthy and stable in from Pará to São Paulo^{61,62, 63, 64}. **None of the two**

⁵⁶ (Lessa, et al., 2006)

⁵⁷ (Adams, et al., 2012), (Craig, 2011)

⁵⁸ 7 plants (all mangrove species), 5 bivalves (oysters and mussels), 13 decapods (shrimps and crabs), 5 elasmobranchs (sharks and rays), 30 bony fishes, 9 birds and 6 mammals

⁵⁹ (De Oliveira, et al., 2013)

⁶⁰ UFSB in Bahia; UFPA in Pará; EMBRAPA in Delta do Parnaíba; UEPB in Paraíba; UNESP in São Paulo; FAPESP in Paraná

⁶¹ (Glaser & Diele, 2004) with data from 1997-2001

⁶² (Silva, et al., 2013) with data from 2010-12

⁶³ (De Oliveira, et al., 2013) with data from 2008-09

⁶⁴ (Duarte, et al., 2014) with data from 2010-11

crustaceans have been yet assessed for the Red List, but their wide distribution makes it unlikely that they would meet the threatened criteria.

No change in vegetation cover of mangroves in project intervention PA

Estimations of mangrove cover in Brazil show that it has changed little over the last two decades, particularly at the extensive northern mangrove belt. The project self-reported baseline for hectares of mangrove forest in the project's protected areas varies between of 5,680 km² and 5,285 km² ⁽⁶⁵⁾. However, this value refers to the total mangrove area under federal protection and the indicator refers to project-supported PAs. The number of areas supported by the project has changed during the implementation period, as described in section 2. This report estimates the mangrove area in protected areas supported by the project by EOP at 3,725 km², which would increase to 8,879 km² if all areas supported by the project at one time or another are counted (Reentrâncias Maranhenses alone is estimated to have 3,973 km² of mangroves) ⁽⁶⁶⁾. While methodological factors very likely account for these differences, we can take Magris & Barreto's estimation of 4,253 km² of mangroves under protected areas of any category as a baseline ⁽⁶⁷⁾. On this baseline, the project did support the declaration of three additional marine RESEX, Mocapajuba, Mestre Lucindo, Cuinarana, that account for an additional 585 km² of protected area ⁽⁶⁸⁾ (IUCN VI) of mostly mangroves with some small *restinga* pockets ⁽⁶⁹⁾. Moreover, the project has given impulse to the move to declare the whole, continuous northern mangrove belt, from the states of Amapá to Maranhão as a single RAMSAR site, which is expected to attract national and international attention toward mangroves and the need to invest in their conservation.

The project itself has contributed to the newest and most accurate estimation of area covered by mangroves and the proportion of the area under protected areas: together with the remote sensing center of IBAMA, the project has co-produced the Atlas of Brazilian Mangroves. While the final product was not yet ready by the time of the terminal evaluation, its main results are known.

Proportion of protected mangrove ecosystems under SU or SC management categories

At the PRODOC stage, the project intended to create a representative sub-system of mangrove protected areas within the SNUC and thus was given explicit targets for protected areas to be created in sustainable use and strict conservation categories for each of the eight morphological units of Brazilian mangroves. However, the project then faced the fact that 1) it did not have the power to extend PA over areas beyond federal jurisdiction 2) the costs of extending protected areas differ drastically between the sparsely populated, mangrove rich northern belt (PA, MA) and the densely populated, mangrove poorer South. Thus, the project did not attempt to attain the targets stated in the PRODOC but limited itself to recalculating the mangrove area protected by federal PA, resulting in 55 federal PAs covering 5,285.2 km², which is less than the mangrove area protected given in the PRODOC but more than Magris & Barreto and this report's estimates (see above and annex 10). The project does not report the proportion of SU and SC protected areas at those 55-federal mangrove PA. However, the project did support the creation of three additional RESEX PA in Pará, accounting for 585 additional km² of mangrove forest under protection, in the SU category.

⁶⁵ The PRODOC baseline, included in the PIRs is of 5,680 km² as project protected area, as the project intended to support all federal PAs with mangroves. At the 2017 PIR, the total value of mangrove under protection (federal or local) is reported as 5,285 km².

⁶⁶ This report's estimations can be consulted in Annex 10

⁶⁷ (Magris & Barreto, 2010)

⁶⁸ (MMA, n.d.)

⁶⁹ (Protected Planet, 2018) and (Google Earth V 7.3.1.4507 (64-bit), 2018)

70% of pilot PAs achieve Management effectiveness (METT) of good or excellent


Of the project's 24 PAs, seven, all from the São Paulo-Parana cluster, only have a one year value (2012) and two PAs from the Maranhão cluster dropped off in 2014 and one, Mãe Grande, from the Pará cluster, does not have METT scores for 2016. Thus, only 11 of the 24 project PAs, for the Pará, Maranhão Piauí and Parnaíba clusters counted with METT records for 2006 (prior to project start), 2012 (midterm) and 2016 (project end).

Figure 11 shows a brusque inflexion point in the scores, abruptly descending between 2006 and 2012 from relatively high values of 0.7-0.5 to 0.2-0.4. Considering that the METT questionnaire used in 2006 was different from the one used in 2012 and 2016, we conclude that 2006 values are not comparable with the 2012-2016 series. Thus, the analysis of METT scores will only be considering 12 PAs that have applied METT in 2012 and 2016. Moreover, the period 2012-16 marks the influence of the project as implementation was delayed and only started effectively in 2011-12.

METT questionnaires were not completed for all questions for all years, and although they include some comments to justify the scores, most scores were left unjustified. None of the comments makes references to this project, so the project's effects will be inferred by the changes in the METT components (planning, inputs, outputs, processes, outcomes), rather than by direct reference.

On average, project PA with METT scores presented a moderate increase, of merely 4% (table 8). However, this 4% is not statistically significant but the negative difference between the 2006 and 2012 score is indeed statistically significant (figure 11). Thus, we cannot conclude that there has been any real increase in management effectiveness⁷⁰. All clusters experiment modest increases except for the two PAs at the estuary of the Mamanguape river, in Paraíba. Both Mamanguape river PAs share the same mangrove area and differ just in the inclusion of the coastal area and Restinga habitats outside the estuary.

Figure 11. Standardized METT score for baseline (2006), midterm (2012) and EOP (2016). Boxes represent interquartile range; dark line is the median and error bars the range.



⁷⁰ Change between 2012 and 2016: mean (2012)=0.40 mean(2016)=0.45, t(paired)=-1.69, p>0.10, df=13

Table 8. METT scores. The protected areas of these sample are different from the ones included in figure 11 as not all counted with 2006 scores.

Cluster	Designation	Name	METT 2012	METT 2016	ΔMETT
PA	RESEX	Tracuateua	24%	37%	13
PA	RESEX	Soure	39%	51%	12
PA	RESEX	Maracanã	30%	41%	11
PA	RESEX	Arai-Peroba	24%	34%	10
PA	RESEX	Chocoaré	40%	45%	5
PA	RESEX	Caeté-Taperaçú	41%	41%	0
PA	RESEX	Gurupi-Piríá	35%	33%	-2
PA	RESEX	São João da Ponta	57%	39%	-18
MAPICE	APA	Delta do Parnaíba	44%	53%	9
MAPICE	RESEX	Delta do Parnaíba	38%	55%	7
PB	ARIE	Foz do Mamanpague	56%	56%	0
PB	APA	Barra do Mamanguape	60%	57%	-3
SPPR	APA	Cananéia-Iguapé-Peruíbe (CIP)	48%	44%	-4
SPPR	ESEC	Guaraqueçaba	34%	42%	8

5 out 14 (35%) PAs have achieved a score beyond 50% or “good”, 20 points short of the target. Also, changes in score have been minimal, except for the RESEX and APA Delta do Parnaíba. This protected area, visited during the terminal evaluation mission owes its difference in score to project activities. Also, other areas with strong project interaction show significant increases. Score increases are driven mostly by the “planning” and “processes” dimensions of METT, which is consistent with the work of the project. However, the strongest factor driving the management effectiveness score is the years of existence of the PA. PA denomination or budget do not influence the score, but difference in the score of inputs and processes are the strongest predictors of the total effectiveness score, **indicating that budget, staff, and equipment, but also how capable the PA management is to utilize these inputs are the strongest drivers of management effectiveness**. The project has not caused any significant changes in the financial sustainability of federal mangrove protected areas, also reflected in the METT scores (figure 12).

Project support to protected areas differed according to cluster: fisheries management in Pará and Parnaíba and spatial zoning in Paraíba and São Paulo Paraná, including the facilitation of meetings, workshops and trainings. But the project also supported the development of the management plans for two protected areas: APA CIP and ARIE *Foz do Mamanpague*. Through the interaction with communities at and around federal protected areas, the project has likely contributed to the remarkable increase in scores related to local and indigenous communities (figure 12).

The field visits to protected areas confirmed the METT results in that:

- Enforcement of rules and agreements is still very weak
- Awareness is low on importance and benefits of protected areas among private (e.g. tourist, energy operators) and institutional actors (municipal councils), and still seen widely as a hindrance to development
- Capacities of PA management are extremely low, plagued by chronic shortages or no budget, equipment and training

Figure 12. METT scores differences between 2016 and 2012 per indicator. Negative values indicate worsening and positive values improvement of the score.



Half of pilot PAs testing 1 or more of financing strategies developed in the project

For the 24 project PAs, staff numbers ranged between 1 and 107, with the 2006-2016 average being 6 staff members (permanent and temporary). Federal areas tended to have less staff, with average staff of 21 at state PAs, against an average of three for federal PAs and just 1 or two permanent staff was common (9 PAs). The annual operational budget, i.e., excluding personnel costs, allocated to state PAs averaged USD 40,403 against an annual average of just USD 11,943 for federal PAs. However, these annual averages hide the fact that annual budget allocation was very variable from year to year and from PA to PA. Moreover, the operational budget, particularly for federal areas, was, and is still dependent on external projects. In this regard, the PAs with the highest budgets corresponded to the São Paulo-Paraná cluster, which includes the second (SP) and fifth (PR) states with the highest income per capita in Brazil after the Federal District⁷¹.

⁷¹ (UNDP, n.d.)

The project completed the groundwork for the financial sustainability of mangrove protected areas. Together with the Brazilian Fund for Biodiversity (FUNBIO), the project funded a series of technical reports that revealed costs and benefits for mangrove protected areas, which served as a basis for the conception of a sinking fund, patterned on the fund developed for the Amazonian biome by the GEF-funded ARPA project. This new fund, the Blue Fund, that expects to receive donations from national, sub-national and international organizations is now being developed by the GEF-funded project Marine Protected Area project implemented by FUNBIO with the World Bank.

Based on a sample of 28 federal mangrove PA, the FUNBIO study estimated annual operational costs of US\$ 4.7 million, with additional US\$ 4.5 million for personnel costs, that is total financial needs of US\$ 9.3 million or US\$ 93 million for the period 2016-2025⁷².

Actual staff costs were given at US\$ 3.6 million for 2015 and actual operational costs estimated at US\$ 1.6 million, that is a total of US\$ 5.2 million, for federal mangrove PA, with the budget coming exclusively from ICMBIO. Over the 2016-2015 10-year period, assuming all remains the same, the total budgetary allocations for federal mangrove PA would be of US\$ 52 million, subtracted from the estimated financial needs above gives a financial gap of US\$ 41 million or US\$ 4.1 million annually. Alternatively, based on figures reported in the METT for federal mangrove PA (n=6) we estimated average budget allocation, excluding personnel, at US\$ 0.012 million, which multiplied by the 55 federal mangrove PA would put actual operational expenses at US\$ 0.66 million. Adding the given personnel expenditures amounting to US\$ 3.6 million annually⁷³, actual expenditures would amount to US\$ 4.3 million or US\$ 43 million over the 10 period, or a financial gap of US\$ 4.3 million annually.

The technical studies that gave rise to the idea of the sinking fund were released in 2016, together with a course for 25 ICMBIO officials. The Blue Fund is to be developed under the GEF-5 project Coastal and Marine Protected Areas implemented by FUNBIO and ICMBIO. The Blue Fund is expected to reach US\$ 140 million by 2022, which is by far more than the estimated mangrove PA financing gap. However, the fund is intended mostly to support reaching protection of 10% of the Brazilian marine area from the current 1.4 %, so we assume that most of the fund's intended US\$ 140 million will be dedicated to support the establishment and consolidation of marine protected areas covering mostly coral reefs and other marine habitats, rather than existing mangrove PA. This notwithstanding, the fund would also support the expansion of the protected area system over an additional 6,087 km² of mangroves on the Maranhão and Pará coast⁷⁴.

80% of all sub-national agencies with jurisdiction in the project clusters agreed to and signed to the Mangrove Plan

Patterned after the existing 332 actions plans for the conservation of threatened species, the project developed and got approval by 2015 of a national action plan for mangrove habitats (PAN Manguezal), which includes actions for the conservation of 74 key mangrove-associated species, described above.

⁷² Exchange rate for 2015 used for all conversions: US\$ 3.327 per BRL (World Bank, n.d.)

⁷³ Extrapolating data from 2015 (FUNBIO, 2016)

⁷⁴ (Maretti & Manfrinato, 2017)

The plan was developed through consultations and trainings and released in January 2015⁷⁵. It applies to 30 “strategic areas”, including all the PA supported by the project, across the VIII mangrove units of Brazil, and includes protected areas under federal jurisdiction (27 PA), state (19 PA, 9 states) and municipal (2 PA, 2 municipalities). However, the action plan is to be implemented by ICMBIO through its Traditional Populations and Research and Biodiversity Monitoring directorates⁷⁶ and there is no formal agreement with the state and municipal authorities implicitly included in the plan. Moreover, no annual reports or review on the implementation of the plan have been published yet.

Table 9. PA included in the National Action Plan for Mangrove

Mangrove units	PA Type	Name	Governance
I-III	PARNA	Cabo Orange	ICMBIO
I-III	ESEC	Maracá Jipioca	ICMBIO
I-III	RESBIO	Piratuba	ICMBIO
I-III	RESEX	Soure	ICMBIO
I-III	RESEX	Mocapajuba	ICMBIO
I-III	RESEX	Mae Grande De Curuça	ICMBIO
I-III	RESEX	Chocoaré-Mato Grosso	ICMBIO
I-III	RESEX	Tracuateua	ICMBIO
I-III	RESEX	Caetétaperaçu	ICMBIO
I-III	RESEX	Arai-Peroba	ICMBIO
I-III	RESEX	Gurupi-Piriá	ICMBIO
IV-VI	PARNA	Lenções Maranhenses- Rio das Preguiças	ICMBIO
IV-VI	APA	Delta do Parnaíba	ICMBIO
IV-VI	APA	Barra do Mamanguape	ICMBIO
IV-VI	RESEX	Acau-Goiana	ICMBIO
IV-VI	APA	Costa dos Corais	ICMBIO
IV-VI	Reserva Particular	Caju	ICMBIO
IV-VI	RESEX	Baia de Iguape	ICMBIO
IV-VI	RESEX	Canavieiras	ICMBIO
IV-VI	RESEX	Cassurubá	ICMBIO
IV-VI	RESEX	Corumbau	ICMBIO
VII-VIII	RESEX	Guapi-Mirim	ICMBIO
VII-VIII	APA	Guaraqueçaba	ICMBIO
VII-VIII	APA	Cananéia-Iguape-Peruíbe	ICMBIO
VII-VIII	APA	Baleia Franca	ICMBIO
VII-VIII	APA	Anhatomirim	ICMBIO
VII-VIII	RESBIO	Arvoredo	ICMBIO
VII-VIII	PARES	Acarai	Fundação de Meio Ambiente de Santa Catarina
VII-VIII	APA	Litoral Norte	Fundação para Conservação e a Produção Florestal do Estado de São Paulo
VII-VIII	APA	Litoral Centro	Fundação para Conservação e a Produção Florestal do Estado de São Paulo
VII-VIII	ESEC	Juréia-Itatins	Fundação para Conservação e a Produção Florestal do Estado de São Paulo

⁷⁵ (ICMBIO, 2015)

⁷⁶ (ICMBIO, 2015)

VII-VIII	APA	Litoral Sur	Fundação para Conservação e a Produção Florestal do Estado de São Paulo
Mangrove units	PA Type	Name	Governance
VII-VIII	ESEC	Ilha Do Mel	Instituto Ambiental do Paraná
VII-VIII	APA	Guaratuba	Instituto Ambiental do Paraná
I-III	APA	Ilha do Marajó	Instituto de Desenvolvimento Florestal e da Biodiversidade do Pará
IV-VI	RDS	Ponta Do Tubarão	Instituto de Desenvolvimento Sustentável e Meio Ambiente do Rio Grande do Norte
IV-VI	APA	Conceição Da Barra	Instituto Estadual de Meio Ambiente e Recursos Hídricos do Espírito Santo
VII-VIII	Reserva Particular	Fazenda Caruara	Instituto Estadual do Ambiente do Rio de Janeiro
VII-VIII	RESBIO	Guaratiba	Instituto Estadual do Ambiente do Rio de Janeiro
VII-VIII	RDS	Aventureiro	Instituto Estadual do Ambiente do Rio de Janeiro
IV-VI	APA	Baía De Todos Os Santos	Secretaria do Meio Ambiente da Bahia
IV-VI	APA	Baía De Camamu	Secretaria do Meio Ambiente da Bahia
IV-VI	APA	Santo Antonio	Secretaria do Meio Ambiente da Bahia
IV-VI	APA	Caraíva/ Trancoso	Secretaria do Meio Ambiente da Bahia
I-III	APA	Reentrancias Maranhenses	Secretaria de Meio Ambiente e Recursos Naturais, Maranhão
IV-VI	APA	Upaon-Açu / Miritiba / Alto Preguiças	Secretaria de Meio Ambiente e Recursos Naturais, Maranhão
IV-VI	APA	Manguezal Da Barra Grande, Icapuí (CE)	Secretaria de Desenvolvimento e Meio Ambiente de Icapuí - CE
VII-VIII	APA	Suruí	Secretaria Municipal de Turismo e Meio Ambiente de Magé - RJ
IV-VI	NA	Foz Rio Coreaú and Tatajuba (CE)	NO PA
IV-VI	NA	Estuário do rio Jaguaribe (CE)	NO PA
IV-VI	NA	Mucuri (BA)	NO PA

The plan is articulated around 11 objectives: spatial planning, participatory management/ co-management, fisheries management, mitigation of pollution and alien species effects, participatory monitoring of mangrove biodiversity, prevention of harmful spills and other accidents, reforms to licensing processes, mitigation of harm from private developments, including shrimp farming, as well as capacity development and communication.

Spatial planning includes actions to map, zone and develop management plans for federal mangrove PA, **co-management** includes strengthening participation of local communities and resource users, including private sector to solve use conflicts, **fisheries management** includes development of studies and agreements of fishery regulations and species management plans, **pollution mitigation** includes control and monitoring of effluents and invasive species coordinated licensing processes.

The plan includes a budget amounting to US\$ 31 million over a period of 5 years, i.e. till 2020 or approximately US\$ 6 million annually, which amounts to just 6% of the average annual budget of ICMBIO⁷⁷. Some actions included in the plan have been executed by the project, including efforts

⁷⁷ The average ICMBIO budget for the period 2012-2017 amounts to BRL 254.3 million (MMA, n.d.), or, by the year exchange rates (World Bank, n.d.), US\$ 94.4 million.

to strengthen licensing processes in the APA and ARIE Mamanguape, together with the consolidation of the management plan for the same APA, strengthening spatial planning in the APA CIP (SP), development of a management plan for mangrove fisheries for the Pará RESEX, development of a management plan for the fishery of *Ucides cordatus* in all mangrove areas, and development and adoption of a monitoring plan for mangrove biodiversity. However, there are no implementation reports available for the whole plan. Moreover, as the plan applies only to federal PA, it has not yet been adopted by state-level and municipal-level agencies as explicit in the indicator.

Cost-effectiveness

Estimation of the project cost-effectiveness is based on the following elements:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (costs beyond normal expenditure to achieve global environmental benefits) and securing co-funding and associated funding
- Completion of planned activities and achievement of global environmental benefits according to schedule and as cost-effective as planned
- Benchmark or comparison approach: the project did not exceed the cost of similar projects
- Cost-effectiveness of acquisition of goods and services

Incremental cost criteria

The project complied with the incremental cost criteria: actions implemented in mangrove protected areas would not have taken place without the GEF grant and the committed co-financing amount has been accounted for (see co-financing, page 32). Several project alternatives were considered during the project design phase,

Completion of planned activities and achievement of global environmental benefits as cost-effective as planned


As the project implementation period has extended over 7 years (2010-2017), **costs borne by both the UNDP and ICMBIO in terms** of own resources dedicated to the project, not paid by the GEF grant: use **of facilities, staff time, supplies and utilities** (not quantified) have increased with each additional implementation year.

In terms of the project's own management costs (costs accounted under outcome five in the CDRs) the project has exceeded the management cost foreseen in the project document by just 5%, hence not significantly affecting the amount of management costs (figure 13).

Comparison with similar projects

GEF has funded several “biome” biodiversity projects in Brazil that involved expansion and/ or improve the management of protected areas since the early 2,000s. Nine projects, including this project, had been evaluated and given overall ratings. For those projects evaluated, the average cost per km² of protected area (in terms of GEF grant) has been of USD 1,436, against just USD 415 for this project (29%), and constituting the median of the nine projects. However, the project stands out for its cost per km² of target biome, amounting to USD 357, or 630% of the average value. This may accounted for the wide, patchy distribution of the mangrove biome compared to other terrestrial biomes. Also note that there seems to be a weak trend towards more cost-effective projects from GEF 2 to 4 (Table 10 and figure 14).

Figure 13. Project management costs (outcome 5) according to the project document budget (Prodoc cumulative) and actual expenditure (CDR cumulative)



Cost-effectiveness of acquisition of goods and services

Projects implemented through a external agency, in this case UNDP constitute an important part of the budget for implementation of environmental agencies in Brazil and they are as well considered by the implementing partners as an agile yet rigorous manner of implementing needed actions compared to the rigidity and cumbersome nature of government budgets and procedures.


In this project, all good and services were procured through UNDP, the main cost categories can be seen in figures 7 and 8, page 30 (project finances). There were no significant issues with procurement or recruitment processes.

Table 10. Cost-effectiveness of GEF-funded “biome” projects in Brazil in terms of cost per unit protected area and biome

Project title	GEF period	GEF agency	GEF Grant (USD)	Rating	PA area (km2)	Biome area (km2)	USD/ Biome (GEF grant)	USD/ PA (GEF grant)
Promoting Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in the Frontier Forest of Northwestern Mato Grosso	2	UNDP	6,704,000	MS	35,500	108,624	61.72	188.85
Integrated Watershed Management Program for the Pantanal and Upper Paraguay River Basin	2	UNEP	13,000,000	S	30,000	496,000	26.21	433.33
Sustainable Cerrado Initiative	3	World Bank	13,000,000	MS	46,000	2,000,000	6.50	282.61
Amazon Region Protected Areas Program Phase 2	4	World Bank	15,890,000	MS	45,500	5,000,000	3.18	349.23
Effective Conservation and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystems in Brazil	4	UNDP	5,000,000	MS	12,049	14,000	357.14	414.97
Amazon Region Protected Areas Program	2	World Bank	30,000,000	S	18,000.	5,000,000	6.00	1,666.67
Rio Grande do Sul Biodiversity Conservation	4	World Bank	5,000,000	S	2,234.00	176,496	28.33	2,238.14
Caatinga Conservation and Sustainable Management Project	3	World Bank	10,000,000	MS	3,670.00	844,000	11.85	2,724.80

Parana Biodiversity Project	2	World Bank	8,000,000	MS	1,730.00	336,000	23.81	4,624.28
Average			11,843,778	MS	21,631	1,552,791	58.30	1,435.87

Figure 14. A. Comparison with other biome projects in terms of cost per unit biome and protected area. B. Cost per km2 protected area (GEF grant) against GEF period.



Outcome Effectiveness

Outcome 1. The enabling environment for a sub-system of mangrove ecosystem protected areas is in place, including policy, regulatory, and financial mechanisms

80% of mangrove states with a set of norms and guidelines agreed with and coordinated between federal, state and municipal agencies on the management of mangroves.

The project reports accomplishment of the target by the approval of the following instruments:

1. Normative Instruction 09/07/2013 dealing with transportation and revision of national normative framework and elaboration of normative proposals on *Ucides cordatus*
2. Qualified management agreements in “Salgado Paraense” (coastal strip of the state of Pará)
3. National Action Plan for Mangrove conservation (discussed above)
4. Management Plan of the APA Cananéia-Iguape-Peruíbe
5. Guidelines for the evaluation of the impact of shrimp culture on mangrove areas
6. Environmental Regularization Plan in Mamanguape

The normative instruction of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries number 9 of July 2013⁷⁸, was issued with project support after findings of the Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation in 2006⁷⁹, on high mortality of captured mangrove crabs (*Ucides cordatus*) during transport to markets. The measure is applicable in the **states of Pará, Maranhão, Piauí and Ceará**. The terminal evaluation checked in situ the application of this measure at the landing point of Tatús, Piauí, where crabs captured in the project-supported RESEX Delta do Parnaíba are selected and readied for transport. The cages have reduced mortality by 25% at destination, thus reducing demand for crabs. The value chain for *Ucides cordatus* is dominated by few wholesalers that controlled supply to the main demand zones, namely growing coastal tourist centers, especially Fortaleza for the Parnaíba Delta region. Fishing effort on crabs is determined mostly by seasonal demand, as bulk buyers commission crab collectors for precise amounts of crabs. Crabs are also sold locally to cover local demand by both restaurants and a smaller proportion is directly sold to consumers by peddling or at the local market. Wholesalers are supportive of the improved transport standard as it considerably sinks their costs. Ironically, **crab collectors interviewed**, while acknowledging the positive effect on fishing effort and understanding the need to keep effort low to prevent population collapse, **have seen their income reduced as demand for crabs subsided**. Wholesalers can earn over 10 times more than an individual crab collector monthly. For both groups, **the main threat to the fishery is the unregulated collection of crabs, using illegal gear and disrespectful of closed seasons (during the crab’s mating season, when they are most vulnerable)**. Formal crab collectors in the protected area visited collect crabs by hand, and complete their assigned catch within four hours, averaging 40 crabs in this period. Low prices have already discouraged some interviewed households from the fishery, while other, better off households have started to engage in the growing tourism industry at the delta of Parnaíba. Judging by the amount of travel

⁷⁸ (MAP, 2013)

⁷⁹ (Legat, et al., 2006)

articles in national newspapers (see below), and the observations and interviews made in the framework of the terminal evaluation, mangrove areas are becoming increasingly attractive as leisure and gastronomic destinations.

The project conducted extensive consultations throughout all clusters, with participation of resource users to elaborate a national plan for the management of the *Ucides cordatus* fishery. The socio-economic importance of this crustacean in mangrove areas of Brazil cannot be understated. Most mangrove communities, especially in Pará and Maranhão depend to a very high degree on the fishery. The management plan still needs to be implemented, but its existence and their participation in the process leading to its development was rated very positively during interviews conducted in the context of this terminal evaluation. Moreover, the management plan for *Ucides cordatus* is setting the basis for the development of a management plan for the endangered blue land crab *Cardisoma guanhumi*, which is an important fishery species from Paraíba towards the south of the country.

Attempts to regulate the fishery of *Ucides cordatus* date back to at least 2003. At least four instruments have been enacted since 2003 that imposed closed seasons (during mating periods), prohibition to capture female crabs, gear limitations and minimum sizes for the states of Espírito Santo, Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Paraná and Santa Catalina⁸⁰, Pará, Maranhão, Piauí, Ceará, Rio Grande do Norte, Paraíba, Pernambuco, Alagoas, Sergipe e Bahia⁸¹. For *C. guanhumi*, two legal instruments regulating its fishery were enacted in 2003 (Southeast and Southern coasts) and 2006 (Northeast coast) in similar terms to *U. cordatus*⁸². In 2011, with the support of the UNDP-implemented project⁸³ on fisheries management, IBAMA developed a proposal for the sustainable fishery of *Callinectes sapidus* (blue crab), *C. guanhumi* and *U. cordatus*. However, this proposal did not contain any specific measures, and, indeed there are no continuous records or monitoring of the fishery for any of the three crustaceans after 2008. While there is virtually no enforcement of fishery regulations, even within protected areas⁸⁴, the project enabled the conduct of participatory workshops culminating in a proposal for self-regulation of the crab fishery in one protected area: RESEX Delta do Parnaíba (270 km²). However, fishery agreements crafted with project support (see below) include regulations for the crab fishery (*U. cordatus*). The management plans for the *U. cordatus* fishery includes regulations akin to the existing legal instruments, monitoring of biodiversity, socio-economics and effort, as well as proposals for declaring temporary no-take zones. While local stakeholders have great expectations from the implementation of the plan, as it restricts use of the resources to the registered inhabitants/ users of the PA, the plan has not yet been officially sanctioned and approved.

Management Agreement Salgado Paraense. The project supported a participatory and scientific assessment of the state, challenges and socio-economics of the finfish fisheries at nine sustainable use protected areas of the state of Pará⁸⁵, covering 2,607 km². Based upon the result of the

⁸⁰ (IBAMA, 2003)

⁸¹ (IBAMA, 2003)

⁸² (IBAMA, 2011)

⁸³ Project BRA/01/037 – *Projeto de Gestão e Conservação da Fauna e dos Recursos Pesqueiros*

⁸⁴ Interviews with stakeholders and (Saint-Paul, 2006)

⁸⁵ RESEX Soure, São João da Ponta, Curuçá, Maracanã, Chocoaré-Mato Grosso, Tracateua, Caeté-Taperaçu, Arai-Peroba and Gurupi-Piriá

diagnostics, five years later, in 2017, legally binding management plans (porterias) were proposed for the nine PA. The regulations prohibit commercial fishery and aquaculture, but allows sport fishery and reserves the fishery within the PA to the registered PA dwellers. The regulations include limitations for the crab fishery along the lines of the national regulations, and gear limitations (e.g. mesh size and prohibited gears) for the finfish fishery. Moreover, 29 no-take zones are defined for the fishery agreement of the RESEX Maracanã (300 km², total, no information on the size of the no-take zones)⁸⁶.

The plans allow extraction of timber and mud for construction purposes, exclusively for registered residents. These legal instruments (porterias) must yet be enacted and duly signed and approved.

Management Plan of the APA Cananéia-Iguape-Peruíbe. Its management plan was developed with project support in 2015. The APA CIP, which covers 2,500 km², is located in the state of São Paulo. The plan was elaborated in consultation with representatives of local communities, other federal organizations (e.g. FUNAI), NGOs and representatives of five of the six municipalities whose territories are within the PA, contains an exhaustive description of the legal, social and ecological context relevant to the three habitats encountered within the PA: Atlantic Rainforest (2,340 km²), Restinga and Mangroves (95 km²)⁸⁷. In terms of regulations, the plan does not go beyond the existing legal instruments for effluents and solid waste. Only sport fisheries and navigation are regulated while the management of artisanal and commercial fishery is left for a comprehensive agreement to be reached later, in a participatory manner. The plan also includes a zoning scheme, including mangrove protection zones, restricted-access zones, and cetacean protection zones. In mangrove protection zones, artisanal fishing, and “low impact” native species aquaculture is allowed. Restricted access zones are limited to the Atlantic rainforest, and permit access through established trails.

Guidelines for the evaluation of the impact of shrimp culture on mangrove areas. A study commissioned by the project was conducted in two sustainable use protected areas: RESEX Delta do Parnaíba (MA) and RESEX Canavieiras (BA) in 2017. The study estimates damages to mangrove ecosystem services, including recreational and research values, carbon sink, fishery, coastal protection and biodiversity conservation, based on the monetary value needed to, at least partially, restore said services. This value per hectare is taken from the literature for the USA, and assumed to be US\$ 9,318 per hectare to which the researchers add fishery losses estimated by the value of forfeited *U. cordatus*, estimated at US\$ 2,320 per hectare resulting in an estimation of monetary losses of US\$ 114,812 per mangrove hectare destroyed or degraded summed over a period of 20 years. This value is consistent with economic valuations performed in other mangrove areas worldwide⁸⁸. However, the study does not consider the opportunity costs of maintaining mangrove areas, and there are important uncertainties associated with the unit price estimations for mangrove services. This notwithstanding, the study offers a baseline economic value for the mangrove ecosystem which can be compared with expected benefits from shrimp farming or other undertakings that degrade and/ or destroy mangroves. The results of the study could be applied to any mangrove area in Brazil. However, the method and/ or its results have not been officially assumed in any official policy document to date. Also, the project supported the

⁸⁶ The Fishery Agreement of the RESEX Chocoaré-Mato Grosso also includes non-take zones but these coincide with the ones of the adjacent, and 10 times bigger RESEX Maracanã.

⁸⁷ Page 111 of (ICMBIO, 2015)

⁸⁸ (Salem & Mercer, 2012)

establishment of an Aquaculture Technical Group within ICMBIO to elaborate a plan to monitor and reduce the impact of aquaculture which is still being developed at the time of the terminal evaluation.

Environmental Regularization Plan in Mamanguape. The project initiated and facilitated the development of an environmental regularization plan for the protected estuary and lower watershed of the Mamanguape river. Industrial agricultural activities, mostly sugar cane plantations, municipal actors and indigenous communities contribute pollution loads and modifications of banks that affect the hydrology of the ecosystem. The agro industrial sector (ethanol producers) was attracted to the idea of cooperation with local universities and the ICMBIO to enable more efficient production that would reduce pollution loads. However, other sectors, including the state environmental agency, which has jurisdiction over environmental monitoring and licensing, as well as indigenous actors did not show the same degree of engagement. Moreover, the study commissioned by the project disclosed the existence of unlicensed operations that pollute the watershed by undetermined magnitudes. Thus, the project developed a plan which includes monitoring of water quality by local universities, a process which is still ongoing at the time of the terminal evaluation. The last values for water quality known were taken by the Environmental Administration (SUDEMA) of the state of Paraíba in 2012⁸⁹.

Thus, measures supported by the project were developed for implementation, and, in the case of the national action plan for mangroves and transport regulations for *U. cordatus*, approved, for 12 of the 15 mangrove states⁹⁰ or 80% of the states. However, there is no confirmation of the actual involvement of the state environmental offices (OEMAS) or their adoption of the instruments and proposals developed by the project.

Existence of a core group of trained staff members (of IBAMA/ICMBIO, OEMAs and/or municipal agencies) capable of implementing and using those norms and regulations

Trainings conducted by the project involved mostly ICMBIO officials. While undoubtedly capacities for mangrove conservation have been created at central ICMBIO level and federal-managed PA, there is no evidence of the existence of a "core group of staff members trained" at each OEMA involved.

Regulations tailored to mangroves in at least: PA management categories, management plans guidelines, financing mechanisms, integrating water planning to mangroves, fisheries management plans for mangrove PA

The indicator's target specified that the regulations should have been 1 regulation for each PA management category, 4 PA management plans, one resolution presented to National Water Resources Council (CNRH) linking classification of water bodies upstream from mangroves to needs of these ecosystems and one resolution outlining rules and procedures for ecosystem-

⁸⁹ (ICMBIO, 2014)

⁹⁰ Mangrove states: AM, PA, MA, PI, CE, RN, PB, AL, SE, BA, ES, RJ, SP, PR, SC. States included in the *U. cordatus* transport regulation: PA, MA, PI, CE. States included in the PAN: MA, RN, ES, RJ, SP, PR, SC. States included in the fishery agreements: 0 (only federal units). States included in the economic valuation of mangrove areas: in principle all, but based on a sample of two federal areas, and not yet used elsewhere. States included in the strengthening of licensing procedures: PB.

based, integrated fisheries resources management. The project considered the targets achieved, based on the delivery of the following products:

1. Seven Management Agreements for RESEX category and two Management Plans for APA and ARIE categories (agreements for different PA management categories)
2. Management Plan of the APA CIP and the Mamanguape APA and ARIE have been approved (four management plans guidelines)
3. Blue Fund initiative was developed by the Project as a financial mechanism for coastal-marine conservation units
4. Environmental Regularization Plan in Mamanguape (resolution presented to National Water Resources Council (CNRH) linking the classification of water bodies upstream of mangroves to needs).
5. Collaboration agreement with Rio de Janeiro State University to develop guidelines for the economic evaluation of the environmental impact of shrimp production (procedures for ecosystem-based, integrated fisheries resources management).

All products, except for the management plan of the APA and ARIE Foz do Mamanguape have been discussed above. The plan for both areas, which occupy virtually the same physical space⁹¹ was developed with project support in 2014. The plan contains a description of the regulatory, and ecological context: the area is notable for the presence of manatees, which serves as one of the main reasons for the existence of the protected area. The situational analysis includes a description of threats, which in the case of these two protected areas include shrimp farming in adjacent indigenous lands, presence of effluents from sugar cane, agro- and textile industries, and overfishing. The plan includes a zoning scheme and allows only artisanal fishery (boats of less than 12 meters) by registered fisherfolk, with provisions to ensure safety for the manatees. The plan acknowledges conflict between its zoning scheme and actual land uses, particularly on zones of the PA that overlap with indigenous lands. The main partners identified in the plan are several federal and state universities, the Agricultural Development Institute (EMBRAPA) and NGOs.

The products, except for the management plan for the APA and ARIE Mamanguape have already been reported for other indicators. The products reported do not completely match the indicator's targets, but the project has produced agreements in several categories of PA, although they still need to be implemented. The management plans supported by the project are critical for the success of the PA, and may constitute guidelines for similar areas. However, they lack information about budget and expenditures. Attempts supported by the project have been made in terms of achieving some sort of binding regulation and monitoring for mangrove watersheds in the case of Mamanguape, but these have not been completed nor any proposal elevated to any national body.

⁹¹ The ARIE is contained within the APA, and excludes the coastal area, which is included in the APA

Outcome 2. Replicable models are in place for the management of mangrove resources in SNUC sustainable-use protected areas

70,000 ha under ecosystem-based, integrated fisheries resource plan.

260,700 hectares of RESEX in Pará under yet to be approved fishery management agreements (see above) together with additional 27,000 ha and 14,900 ha under crab fishery and finfish fishery agreements in the RESEX Delta do Parnaíba and APA Barra do Rio Mamanguape for a total of 302,600 hectares. The fishery management plans include gear regulations but no allowable catch as catch and effort are not known.

Three no-take zones established in pilot PAs

Over 29 no-take zone defined for two adjacent RESEX in Pará: Chocoaré-Mato Grosso and Maracanã. No information on size of the no-take zones. Temporary no-take zones (0.5-1 year) are defined for the RESEX Delta do Parnaíba

25% decrease in mortality and harvesting at levels [established] in resource plan

EMBRAPA designed cages have reduced mortality by 25% at destination. There is no actual data on the crab fishery as total catch and effort are not known. The *U. cordatus* fishery management plan for RESEX Delta do Paranaíba, and fishery agreements for RESEXs in Pará include gear regulations, but no total allowable catches.

100 potential local small entrepreneurs trained in the preparation of a business plan

Trainings on business plans did not take place. Instead the project proposes that the indicator would be covered by the development of fishery agreements (described above), as they could contribute to more sustainable catch. Thus, fishery agreements and crab fishery regulations could potentially increase income for registered fisherfolk, **but only if** they can exclude outsiders, and there are no other externalities (e.g. pollution) or abiotic factors affecting the fishery stocks. However, enforcement levels are still low and there is a fundamental lack of catch, effort and household income data.

25 PA management councils reaching agreement on harvesting levels and enforcement

The project considers the nine fishery agreements drafted for Pará RESEX and the fishery regulations for the RESEX Delta do Paranaíba (adding the APA Delta do Parnaíba, which encompasses the former; however, the latter has yet to formulate a management plan and it overlaps with a state-managed APA, also without management plan). Together with the fishery regulations contained in the management plan of the APA and ARIE at the Mamanguape river, the total number of councils adopting some sort of regulations on fishery would ascend to 11. However, not one of these agreements contains catch limits. Other than scattered data for some Pará RESEX compiled by mostly German academic researchers, there is no data on catch and effort for any mangrove PA.

Outcome 3. Conservation of mangroves is improved by piloting the alignment of PA management with sectors and spatial planning

6 water management instruments agreed upon by the Mamanguape water basin committee that take into account the water quantity and quality for mangroves

For this indicator, the project includes two agreements to conduct water quality monitoring signed with the Federal University of Paraíba, included in the environmental adjustment plan for the Mamanguape estuary described above. However, the latest monitoring of water quality dates back to 2012, conducted by the Paraíba State Environmental Administration. The monitoring scheme designed with project support is yet to be implemented.

APA Cananéia-Iguape-Peruíbe management plan reflects zoning and limits of all main economic activities

As standard for management plans for protected areas in Brazil⁹², the management plan of the APA CIP divides the PA in the following zones: overlaps (with other PAs), recovery, sustainable use (terrestrial), sustainable use (rivers and estuary), sustainable use (marine) and cetacean conservation zone, restricted use zone and mangrove conservation zone. Activities permitted in the mangrove conservation zone include artisanal fishery and aquaculture, and bird watching. In terms of economic activities affecting mangrove areas within the PA, the management plan introduces regulations for the sport fishery, while a general management plan for fisheries must still be developed. The rules for the sport fishery include monitoring by registered tourist operators, minimum sizes and total allowable catch per boat.

6 municipalities (200,000 persons) in the APA have agreed on the zoning

The management plan cites the participation of the six municipalities (145,000 persons in 2010)⁹³ in the PA governance. The APA CIP covers between 3 and 43% of the six municipalities. However, the planning methodology of the management plan only acknowledges consultations with 5 of the six municipalities, excluding the municipality of Miracatu (7.45% of its territory within the PA 20,606 people in 2010)⁹⁴.

50% of the key actors in the APA sign formal document of adherence to zoning regulations

The management plan cites 35 organizations which act and have influence within the territory of the APA CIP: 10 NGOs, 9 people's organizations (e.g., fisherfolk association), five state government departments, 3 federal government agencies, 3 municipal agencies, 3 private sector associations, 1 academic institution and 1 watershed management committee. During the plan development, representatives of 12 organizations (34%) were present: 2 federal government agencies (ICMBIO and FUNAI), 1 state agency (Fisheries and Forest Department), 3 municipal agencies (Iguape and Ilha Comprida and Peruíbe) and four people's organizations. While the management plan assigns

⁹² (CEAMP, 2015)

⁹³ (ICMBIO, 2015)

⁹⁴ (ICMBIO, 2015)

roles and responsibilities to further organizations in the implementation of its zoning rules it is not clear to what extent they would be bound by the plan.

Outcome 4. Mangrove-related outreach, dissemination and adaptive management is increased

Awareness among private and public stakeholders on the management of mangrove PA and the ecosystem services they provide increase by 30%.

The project has developed a national protocol for the monitoring of biodiversity in (federal) mangrove protected areas, which includes participatory monitoring of fishery resources and vegetation cover through self-reported catches and transect-quadrat methods. This protocol is being applied already at least in the RESEX delta do Parnaíba. The research and knowledge management divisions of ICMBIO rate this development as highly positive, as they acknowledge the very limited information and data on mangrove areas. For the community members involved in the data collection, it is an important endeavor, but they raise concerns about the local significance of the methods and the time and resources they would have to volunteer.

Additionally, the project supported the dissemination in Brazil of the SocMon participatory method of monitoring social outcomes of protected areas by organizing trainings and translating manuals into Portuguese.

The project also supported general awareness measures including the preparation and online launching of videos on the work of the project and the livelihood of PA communities. These videos have been available through UNDP webpages and the Youtube® platform, but they have achieved a very limited diffusion, with their views well below 500. In this regard, and while this project, as the only mangrove project of national scope implemented in the last decade, has increased awareness among local stakeholders, there is no evidence of the project exerting any influence beyond actors living or making a living at or around mangrove areas. The project intended to conduct a survey among the public to assess the level of increased awareness about mangrove areas. However, this survey was never conducted. Moreover, without a solid baseline, the survey would only inform about the current understanding or awareness of the public on mangrove areas. A small survey of online publications and articles referring to mangroves, mangrove protected areas, and this very project in Brazil conducted for this evaluation yielded no general trend. While there is certainly interest in mangroves and outcry about their degradation, there is no linkage between the number of yearly publications and the project. While this does not mean that the project has not been a significant influence on the national environmental institutions, as shown in the relevance section, determination of the actual influence of the project cannot be determined as the opinion survey committed in the ProDoc was not conducted.

Figure 15. Online references to mangroves in Brazil and to the project, 2010-2017. Project scores on the right axis and mangrove scores on the left⁹⁵.

⁹⁵ Search with Google® engine, search parameters: mangue OR manguezal OR manguezais for Brazil for year: 2010-2017. Date of search: 01/03/2018





Figure 16. A, globo.com online articles on mangroves 2011-2017. B, Topics of the articles⁹⁶



Mangrove biodiversity monitoring programs coordinated and linked to national system

A participatory monitoring protocol has been developed and tested in four RESEX. The monitoring protocol is rated as a very significant and positive development by the monitoring division of ICMBIO. Local actors at the PA level acknowledge the usefulness of the protocols, but are worried about the support needed and costs in terms of time and resources. Actual data has yet to start flowing.

Country ownership

Elements of country ownership include project concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans, project results incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans or regulatory framework, country representatives actively involved in project identification,

⁹⁶ Search with globo.com search engine conducted on 01/03/2018

planning and/or implementation, and maintenance of financial commitment to the project by the government.

While the project concept had its origin in a regional project, and not in national policies, it has secured the adoption of a national policy on mangrove forests (the Mangrove Plan) and several regulatory instruments (Normative Instruction 9/7/13 and two protected area management plans), together with the fishery management agreements (Uçá crab and Salgado Paraense) which are likely to be approved for protected areas under federal jurisdiction. Interest of the government agencies concerned (ICMBIO and MMA) is notable and the participatory monitoring program, the visibility given to the mangrove biome and its federal sustainable use protected areas, as well as the ground idea for the marine protected area fund are specially appreciated by both agencies. Finally, the project has been implemented as a ICMBIO project, with the project management unit completely embedded into its structure.

Mainstreaming

Mainstreaming refers to the extent that the project has successfully mainstreamed other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and women's empowerment, which are part of the United Nations Development Agreement Framework (UNDAF) and the aligned Country Program Action Plan (CPAP) of the UNDP. The project started implementation during the 2007-11 CPAP cycle in a context where economic growth, which was not benefiting vast tracts of Brazilian society and high inequality were the main concerns. In terms of environmental sustainability, the CPAP's main concerns were housing, and access to water and sanitation⁹⁷. The emphasis of the CPAP was on achieving the MDGs at disaggregated level, i.e. beyond national and state averages, focusing on human development at municipal level. Thus, the CPAP intended to 1) promote access to basic public services (education, health, housing, water and sanitation), 2) reduce racial inequalities, 3) reducing vulnerability to violence, 4) promoting transparent policies and human rights and 5) promoting more efficient use of resources for an environmentally sustainable economic development, including cash transfers and sustainable management of biodiversity.

The project has made a significant contribution to the outcome 5 of the CPAP 2006-2011, by establishing regulatory instruments and policy and knowledge products (monitoring, mangrove atlas, management plans) and, indirectly, it may have set conditions for the improvement of living conditions, including housing, of mangrove communities. To have an impact, the fisheries management plans must be approved, adopted and implemented and access to the fishery must be effectively limited to mangrove communities currently inhabiting sustainable use federal extractive reserves.

⁹⁷ (UNDP, 2010)

Sustainability

Financial sustainability

The project succeeded in developing several management instruments, including protected area management plans, one water management plan and several fisheries management plans. However, additional budget allocation for federal protected areas for the implementation of these plans by the national government is very unlikely, based on past trends and the opinion of key informants. Management of federal protected areas will still depend to a high degree on external investments. GEF is a major part of those investments, and it is currently supporting several initiatives, notably the USD 18 million project on marine protected areas, which will continue the development of the coastal biodiversity fund, “Blue Fund”. However, this project explicitly excludes protected areas that have been supported by the present project.

Institutional sustainability

Brazil possesses sufficient legal instruments at national, state and municipal level to sustain protection of mangrove areas, namely, protected areas, environmental impact assessment processes and fishery regulations. However, and although the project has initiated the integration of downstream impacts on mangroves in two spatial planning and licensing processes (Estuary of the Mamanguape, and CIP), this it is still far from being mainstreamed. The only incentives for stakeholders to continue the process towards a comprehensive management of the estuary is increased efficiency, compliance with environmental regulations and improved image by sugar cane industry actors and funding for research in water quality for the academic actors. Municipal and state actors have shown limited interest in the continuation of the process.

The federal forest code was recently modified to allow for commercial operation in mudflats and landward boundary of mangrove forests. While this does not mean that it opens a door for degradation, as, legally, all environmental safeguards would apply for these potential commercial operations, including habitation and aquaculture, it is feared that it exposes a “flank” of mangrove forests to an increased threat level, considering the current capacity weaknesses of environmental institutions at subnational level and the general low level of enforcement of regulations, including impact assessments, fishery regulations and protected areas. These threats could be exacerbated by population growth and affluence, especially in growing coastal centers, driving demand for space, fishery products, and energy.

Socio-economic sustainability

Population growth and affluence will be likely drivers of degradation for natural ecosystem and mangrove areas as a larger, more affluent population would have bigger demands of space, water, energy and other resources.

We consider here evaluation of population and wealth, measured as income per capita for mangrove states, that is, all coastal states except the Southern Santa Catarina and Rio Grande do Sul⁹⁸, as well as population evaluation in some key coastal cities that directly drive demand for

⁹⁸ That is: Maranhão (MA), Alagoas (AL), Amapá (AP), Bahia (BA), Ceará (CE), Espírito Santo (ES), Pará (PA), Paraíba (PB), Pernambuco (PE), Piauí (PI), Paraná (PR), Rio de Janeiro (RJ), Rio Grande do Norte (RN), Sergipe (SE) and São Paulo (SP)

mangrove resources: Belem (PA), Fortaleza (CE), Recife (PE), Rio de Janeiro (RJ), Salvador (BA) and São Paulo (SP).

Wealth, measured as income per capita has experienced a modest increase by BRL 38 per capita or 7% between 2011 and 2015 on average for the 15 states considered. The effects of the economic crisis can be seen in the downward inflexion of the curve from 2014 onwards (Figure 16). In terms of population, there has been also a significant, yet moderate 7% rise in the population of the “mangrove states” for the same period (Figure 17). Also, important coastal cities have experienced moderate population increases and changes in affluence commensurate with their states.

Figure 17. Average per capita income of mangrove states, as compared with the national trend⁹⁹





Figure 18. Change in population in mangrove states (left vertical axis), compared with the total national population change (right vertical axis)¹⁰⁰



Environmental sustainability

The vast expansions of mangrove forest in the states of Amapá, Pará and Maranhão, combined with relatively low population densities in those areas are grounds for confidence that mangrove forests and their associated fauna would survive unscathed the next decades if protection is maintained at the same level. In fact, neither mangrove cover nor status of threatened species has recently worsened.

However, this is not necessarily true for the constraint mangroves forest of the south and southeastern sections, which are also located in densely populated areas and near thriving coastal urban centers. Considering that climate change will cause gradual rise of sea level and the limited possibilities for the gradual migration of southern mangrove forest, the threats facing them will only increase over the next decades.

Impact

As described in the previous section, the project has not yet had any significant impact on ecological parameters: even if the project had succeeded in significantly improving the management effectiveness of all mangrove protected areas, the effects on population densities or

⁹⁹ (UNDP, n.d.)

¹⁰⁰ (UNDP, n.d.)

vegetation cover would need at least half a decade to materialize. This notwithstanding, the project has contributed to increase awareness and confidence of primary resource users, namely fishers and crab collectors in some sustainable use protected areas. Moreover, the project has facilitated the crafting of fishery management plans, which, if ever implemented, could potentially not only ease drivers of overexploitation, but also provide social benefits in terms of increased income to mangrove dwelling populations.

3 Conclusions and Recommendations

The project strategy was very relevant and significantly raised the visibility and importance of mangrove forest in the eyes of national environmental institutions, formerly focused solely on inland biomes. The project has contributed to the increased attention given by the Brazilian government to coastal areas and mangrove forests.

The project underwent a prolonged development phase, lasting from at least 2005 to 2008, having its origins in an early project proposal for a regional project. The long preparation led to an “accumulation” of expected results. The ensuing project strategy was ambitious for the modest grant amount of USD 5 million, for a target area exceeding 5,000 km², dispersed over 6,000 km of coast, solely considering the project’s pilot areas. As a comparison, the GEF-funded marine protected area project counts with a GEF grant amounting to USD 18.2 million, and the goal of strengthening protection over 9,300 km² of marine area. Even with a conservative estimate 5000 km² (mangrove area only) for this project’s intervention area, the cost/km² is just USD 1,000/km² against the USD 1,950/km², almost double, in the case of the new marine protected areas project.

However, the project was efficiently designed, as it selected clusters of protected areas with different main threats, ecological and socio-economic conditions, which enabled different approaches to be tested. This notwithstanding, the logistical complexities and high transaction costs of a project involving such a vast area and an important number of institutional and private actors forced the project management to refocus their attention toward instruments of national application, such as the national mangrove plan, while abandoning some of the most significant mangrove areas of the country (Reentrâncias Maranhenses). This shows both the complexity and ambition of the project design and the capabilities of the project management to achieve tangible results with limited resources. However, the project indicator framework was not modified and remained burdensome and redundant. Moreover, the indicator framework did assume the existence of a comprehensive database both for mangrove cover and area, which was far from reality. In fact, the project has significantly contributed to knowledge on the mangrove areas of Brazil through the development of management instruments and the mapping exercise conducted with IBAMA.

The implementation phase was significantly delayed, due to the new creation of ICMBIO. The new organization needed time to build up its structure, and hence the project only really took off by 2011, three years later than planned, which forced a no-cost extension first till 2015 and finally to 2017. The fact that the project implementation extended over 10 years on the same original grant bears down on its efficiency, as the executing agency’s cost kept mounting over time. Moreover, the project strategy underestimated the transaction costs (negotiations, travel) involved when dealing with multiple geographic areas AND multiple institutional partners, i.e., the state and environmental agencies. Eventually the project struggled to deliver its outputs on time, some of them, e.g. the flagship product of the Atlas of Brazilian Mangroves not yet released at the time of the terminal evaluation. However, the overall cost-effectiveness of the project was in line with similar GEF-funded projects.

The project did not deliver all the originally intended products but was able to produce a consistent set of products, namely PA management plans, fishery management agreements, national management plan for *Ucides cordatus*, and the new mangrove atlas, as well as initiated

an important biodiversity monitoring program, an environmental restoration plan, zoning agreements and set up the concept of a fund for coastal and marine biodiversity. While the history of non-enforcement or implementation of previous enacted/ developed management plans and legal instruments does not allow much optimism about the fate of the ones developed by the project, project stakeholders at the implementing agencies and local stakeholders stress the participatory nature of the plans developed under the project, which, in their view, will guarantee their successful implementation.

During the implementation time, there was no significant changes in mangrove area or a worsening of the status of threatened or overexploited organisms associated with mangroves and/ or estuaries by both national threatened lists and IUCN Red List ®. What would have happened if the project was not there? The terminal evaluation concludes that, in terms of biological indicators there would not be much difference. However, we would not know the extent of Brazilian mangroves and protected areas containing them, and we would not have initiated programs for the management and monitoring of mangrove biodiversity.

It is the assessment of the terminal evaluation that, had the project not been implemented, mangrove ecosystem would have continued to be marginalized in national biodiversity management plans and policies. The project may not have contributed to raise the attention of the public on mangroves, but has put mangroves in the forefront of environmental agencies at federal level.

However, and despite being implemented by the national protected area agency, we see no significant improvement of management effectiveness scores. As we have seen, the limited resources available to protected area management councils hampers or outright precludes the implementation of the very tools produced by the project. Moreover, the expected ecological and social outcomes, namely, increase in population numbers for fishery species or improvement of socio-economic status of mangrove fishing communities did not materialize. Population status would depend on management effectiveness, which, as we have exposed has not yet sufficiently improved, but also on biological and abiotic factors that would have delayed the effect of effective implementation of any of the management instruments devised by the project. More importantly, socio-economic status of fishing communities may improve if the management plans developed by the project are effectively implemented and these communities succeed in keeping the fishery resources on which they depend closed to new entries or increases in effort. Even in ideal conditions, their monthly income still depends on a semi-oligopolistic market dominated by few, much wealthier, and presumably much better connected buyers. Therefore, continuous support from transfer programs, such as the one administered by the Ministry of Environment (Bolsa Verde), as well as the updating of fishers' registries and consequent access to social benefits is paramount for the well-being of coastal communities and, in return for the mangroves of Brazil.

Weak finances for protected areas constitute the main risk for the sustainability of the project, together with the still suboptimal engagement of local governments and business operators in the management of drivers of mangrove degradation and destruction.

Thus, the terminal evaluation recommends:

1. ICMBIO could elevate the mangrove biome to the same status as the other six current Brazilian biomes (Amazônia, Caatinga, Cerrado, Mata Atlântica, Pampa and Pantanal), and separate from other “coastal ecosystems”, to enhance its visibility and raise issues about its importance and conservation. Mangroves risk not being given enough attention and fall between administrative divisions.
2. Financial sustainability of mangrove federal protected areas must be strengthened by increasing their current meagre budget allocation, as well as by posting more personnel and crafting agreements across agencies to strengthen enforcement. Currently, many areas count with only one or two staff allocated to areas expanding over hundreds of square kilometres, making enforcement nearly impossible.
3. ICMBIO and MMA should strengthen monitoring programs of biodiversity and specifically support the participatory monitoring program developed by the project. Knowledge on the status of biodiversity in mangroves is less than satisfactory, as shown by the challenges faced by the project and this terminal evaluation to gather information on the project’s indicators. The participatory monitoring program has the potential to start bridging this gap.
4. Fishery management plans cannot be implemented in the absence of fishery data. ICMBIO and the MMA must both increase efforts to coordinate with state or federal fishery administrations and include monitoring of catch within federal protected areas of sustainable use. Moreover, catch and effort data must be incorporated in the participatory monitoring program established by the project.
5. UNDP must take a proactive role in inducing and orienting application of tracking tools, including METT and the capacity development scorecard.

Additionally, the terminal evaluation draws the following lessons learned:

1. While government restructuring seeking efficiencies or new synergies are unavoidable, projects should not be implemented by recently created agencies, otherwise the project becomes inefficient due to long implementation times and cumulative costs on a constant grant.
2. National scope should not mean trying to include all possible actors and habitat sub-types, particularly when the biome concerned, Brazilian mangroves, is of such dimensions. Future projects should not underestimate the costs involved not only in setting up implementation of a geographically challenging project but more importantly the transaction costs involved in dealing with a multitude of actors. This transaction costs should be seriously studied and a convenient standard of investment per area considered.
3. Socio-ecological systems are complex and there are rarely simple cause-effects relationships. For instance, projects that have the enhancement of management effectiveness of protected areas as a goal cannot deliver maintenance or increase of population numbers or of habitat quality for big areas. Project outcome indicators should be restricted to the immediate effect of the project.

4. Indicator frameworks should not exceed three-four indicators per outcome, and the existing knowledge on the relevant matter, for instance it should be carefully assessed if there is sufficient information on populations for a certain habitat. A project could also attempt to produce new knowledge or a monitoring program, but the cost of gathering and processing information should be considered, i.e. cost-effectiveness must be an elimination criterion for the selection of indicators.

5. Management instruments, like PA management plans, or fishery management plans need resources to be implemented and to achieve the ecological and social benefits intended. The sustainability of this project's achievements is going to be determined by the ability of ICMBIO and its national and international partners to mobilize such resources for the execution and continuation of the plans and agreements developed and facilitated by the project.

4 5. Annexes

1. Terms of Reference
2. Itinerary
3. List of persons interviewed
4. Summary of field visits
5. List of documents reviewed
6. Evaluation Question Matrix
7. METT questionnaire used and summary of results
8. Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
9. Project progress table
10. Audit trail
11. Species list

Annex 2. Mission itinerary

Date	Location	Description
4/12/2017	Brasilia (DF)	Interview with UNDP team and group interview with ICMBIO project management unit, as well as project/ implementing partner director
5/12/2017	Cabedelo (PB)	Interview with manager of APA and ARIE Mamanguape
6/12/2017	Cabedelo-Parnaíba	All day travel by plane and car
7/12/2017	Parnaíba (PI)	Interview with management of APA and RESEX Delta do Parnaíba. Travel to communities in the RESEX and interviews with fishermen in three communities
8/12/2017	Araioses (MA)	Field visit to mangrove areas and interaction with fishing communities. Formal interview with representatives of two mangrove communities. Interviews with people involved in the value-chain of mangrove crabs, from collectors to middlemen to final buyers.
9/12/2017	Parnaíba-Brasilia	Write-up notes and travel to Brasilia
10/12/2017	Brasilia	Report write up
11/12/2017	Brasilia	Interviews with officials of the Ministry of Environment and ICMBIO
12/12/2017	Brasilia	Report write up
13/12/2017	Brasilia	Presentation of preliminary results and travel to home base

Annex 3. List of Persons Interviewed

Person	Organization
Mrs. Luana Lopes	UNDP
Mrs. Rose Diegues	UNDP
Mrs. Adriana Risuenho Leão	ICMBIO
Mr. Matteo Fumi	ICMBIO
Mr. Vinicius Nora	ICMBIO
Mrs. Daniela America	ICMBIO
Mrs. Ana Tres Cruz	ICMBIO
Mr. Claudio Maretti	ICMBIO
Mrs. Renata Vargas	ICMBIO
Mrs. Tatiana Rehder	ICMBIO
Mr. Mauricio Pompeu	MMA
Community members	Community of Canárias
Community members	Community of Passarinho
Community members	Community of Caiçara
Community members	Community of Torto
Crab traders	Porto dos Tatús
Mrs. Luciane Paixão	MMA
Mrs. Ana Paula Prates	MMA
Mr. Bernardo Brito	ICMBIO
Mr. Katia Torres Ribeiro	ICMBIO

Annex 4. Summary of Field Visits

RESEX Delta do Parnaíba

8 December 2017

From the city of Parnaíba to Porto dos Tatus, prefeitura de Ilha Grande, where a passage for Canárias was negotiated. Arrived in the island with the same name on the left bank of the Parnaíba river, and greeted by informant. First stop was at the Associação de Moradores e Pescadores de Canárias, where “aulas de reforço” were being held for some 10 students of between 10 to 14 years of age. The secretary of the organisation was imparting the class. In another room a computer lab was idle, but very much in use during the day, said the volunteer (estagiário) of the prefeitura who was in charge. We drove on his quad (quadriciclo) for over 15 minutes and arrived at the community of Passarinho, where we stopped at a “club”, a brick enclosure with a bar where I met with three crab collectors. We continued towards the community of Caiçara, where we met with informant. The drive to Caiçara took probably half an hour and then we moved towards Torto, our final stop. Conducted extra tour around the community of Caiçara with community informant and the tour took much longer than anticipated. The island is sandy, covered in low vegetation, including *Byrsonima crassifolia* (murici) and *Anacardium occidentale*, as well as *Copernicia prunifera* (carnauba). Bounded by mangrove forest on its river (South) side and dunes and beaches on its seaward (North) side. There is at least a big, now dry pond or lagoon, maybe some 10 hectares big. It dries yearly. There, according to informant, fish and turtles thrive, then bury in the mud during the dry season, although he is not sure if the fish do that or it is just the newly hatched juveniles out of eggs left in the mud, who fill the lake when the rains come. However, informant said that people grow tilapia, and other fishes enter the lagoon from the sea in the rainy season, notably cumurupin (*Megalops atlanticus*) and cará (*Geophagus brasiliensis*). Most houses I saw were tilled and with brick walls, consisting of a main body and an open, covered hall. Many had satellite dishes.

Crab collectors’ attitude to the project and its results, here, mostly the management of the Uçá crab fishery depended mostly on how successfully they have been for the last five years. Thus, some more entrepreneurial community members have taken advantage of the incipient tourism to setup apparently successful business, inducing catering, fishing and tourism guiding undertaking. Active members of crab collector associations are optimistic about what they perceive to be further security of tenure over the fishery resources in the RESEX granted by the protected area management plan. Less active members transmitted a rather pessimistic picture of their communities and way of life. Concern about perceived environmental degradation was high, but moderated by experience and knowledge by older members that assume changes as part of wider natural changes. However, transformational changes such as the drying up of an economically important seasonal lagoon were observed with deep concern and linked to climate change. However, some younger community members also associated changes in delta channels and associated mangrove mortality to climate change, which was dismissed by older, more experienced collectors. As to the involvement of future generations, almost all interviewed did not wish their offspring to continue in this way of life, and generally aspired to provide for education and off-site jobs. This notwithstanding, there were also perceived opportunities in tourism development. Moreover, collector’s children accompanied the mission and the collectors stressed the importance of them learning the trade, as a security and means of ensuring a steady livelihood in times of crisis.

9 December 2017

Walking tour of the community of Torto we collected and eat murici. Many carnauba groves were along our path: wax lies at the leaves, which must be cut with great care, as the palm's spines can inflict deep wounds. Leaves are burned, to reduce volume for transport. The wax is exported. Basin mangroves seem to be mostly *Avicennia spp*, tall of 15-20 meters. *Avicennia spp* (siriúba) is the preferred mangrove for fences, while *R. mangle* (mague vermelho) is preferred for roof beams and ceiling joists. We came across areas of some hectares of dead *Avicennia germinans*. Informant mentioned that they have no explanation and that it is a recent phenomenon. However, such mortality would not be uncommon, associated with dry years and changes and shifts in the dunes and water streams. In fact, *Avicennia germinans* is prone to plagues and mass mortalities have been recorded in Latin American mangroves. The water edge is dominated by *Rhizophora mangle*, also reaching 20 meters tall, with some *Laguncularia racemosa* on the land edge of the *Rhizophora* belt. *Conocarpus erectus* (Mangue botão) also to be seen on the landward fringe of the mangrove forest. This species is the preferred one for charcoal. We came across one pit used to make charcoal. Several species of bird, *Cebus paella* (tufted capuchins), domestic donkeys and tracks by tufted capuchins and racoons (guaxinin) along the way. Encounter with crab "catador" who had completed his quota of 10 cords (40 crabs) within three hours. The only target species is *Ucides cordatus*. Informant keeps crabs collected from the wild in a pen of brick, some 3 square meters (2x1x1) with an incline to keep an end with water. Crabs (*Ucides cordatus*) are kept on mangrove mud and *Rhizophora mangle* leaves. Uça crabs preferred these leaves. Informant also keeps oysters. The purpose is to have them ready for sale, without needing to go on capture some for each order.

Short ride in a rented speed boat took the group composed of crab collector association members, as well as two ICMBio representatives. The shore is normally dominated by *R. mangle*, but at some spots along the water edge, there are *Spartina-Batis* marshes, flanked by *Conocarpus erectus*, like our landing point. The basin forest behind the water fringe is mixed of *Avicennia germinans* and *Rhizophora mangle*. Crab collection takes place mostly at burrows closed to prop roots of *R. mangle*. Our expert companions managed to capture 16 crabs in one hour. The trick lies in capturing the crab with all its legs; and incomplete crab would be discarded, although the collector may keep it for self-consumption. Extracting a single crab takes just five minutes, and involves introducing a metal hook with an approximately one meter long handle, bypassing and trapping the crab inside its burrow with the hook, and carefully pulling the crab till the collector can safely catch it with his/her hand. The crab is then tied up with a palm string. The mangrove forest is infested with sandflies and midges that feast on the uncovered visitor. Sesamid and fiddler crabs are also common but are left unmolested by crab collectors. Crab eating racoon (*Procyon cancrivorus*) tracks were also seen. We proceeded to interviews at a riverside restaurant. As we sat there, two groups of tourists, probably from Parnaíba came by. Sport fishing and motor water sports have become very popular and e.g. the port of Tatús at Ilha Grande has a new jetty for fast craft. While tourists would normally hire somebody from the community to serve as guide and assistant, this is not yet a rule. The riverside wharf (River Igaraçu) at Parnaíba has several agencies offering delta tours. According to ICMBIO staff they would normally pass by the reserve on their way to a sandy beach just at the Eastern mouth, at the private Ilha dos Poldos. Ilha dos Poldos and Ilha do Cajú, at the Western mouth of the Parnaíba river are claimed by big families, Spanish in the first case and Brazilian in the second. The presence of two groups of tourists may be due to the holiday of Nossa Senhora da Conceição. During our visit, ICMBio staff pointed out the importance of their current good relationship with the municipal government (prefeitura).

We proceeded to a dunar belt on a South-Western corner of Ilha das Canárias. A section of dunes, bordered by water on the Southern edge and restinga on their northern move in crescent shapes from west to east, leaving vegetated, grassy “valleys” in between. Satellite pictures (Google Earth) shows that almost the entire southern section of the island is “scarred” formed by vegetated dunes, which we traversed in a quad on arrival. It would seem that the island, effectively a barrier island, is accreting west. Upon arrival to the dunes, we came across a group of fishermen in a canoe about to settle for the night in one of the three fishing huts at the shore. They were equipped with a motorised canoe and what appear to be an entangling net. Their main target is pescada amarela (*Cynoscion acoupa*), although camurupin (*Megalops atlanticus*) is also an important fishing target. The dunes reach some 20-20 meters high and are made of fine yellowish sand.

Our last stop was at the island of the guarás (*Eudocimus ruber*). *E. ruber* is a gorgeous scarlet ibis which flocks in mass to roost at this island.

From 19:00 hours, already dark, in Porto dos Tatus, boats started arriving, loaded with uçá crabs and castanha de cajú (cashew nuts). Cashew nuts are collected from the wild cashew trees on the islands, in response to a growing demand for it. Some of the crab “packages”, i.e. several “cordas” of crab bound together are collected by purchasers, who had them previously ordered. No money is exchanged openly at the pier. A truck apparently from Fortaleza showed up with a professional appraiser who selected and classified the crabs into plastic baskets. Many other crabs were already packed in covered plastic baskets. At least three persons, of whom one, at least was a restaurant owner gathered to collect their orders. We took the change to interview two of them.

The value chain for *Ucides cordatus* is dominated by few wholesalers that controlled supply to the main demand zones, namely growing coastal tourist centers, especially Fortaleza for the Parnaíba Delta region. Fishing effort on crabs is determined mostly by seasonal demand, as bulk buyers commission crab collectors for precise amounts of crabs. Crabs are also sold locally to cover local demand by both restaurants and a smaller proportion is directly sold to consumers by peddling or at the local market. Wholesalers are supportive of the improved transport standard as it considerably sinks their costs. Ironically, **crab collectors interviewed**, while acknowledging the positive effect on fishing effort and understanding the need to keep effort low to prevent population collapse, **have seen their income reduced as demand for crabs subsided**. Wholesalers can earn over 10 times more than an individual crab collector monthly. For both groups, **the main threat to the fishery is the unregulated collection of crabs, using illegal gear and disrespectful of closed seasons (during the crab’s mating season, when they are most vulnerable)**. Formal crab collectors in the protected area visited collect crabs by hand, and complete their assigned catch within four hours, averaging 40 crabs in this period. Low prices have already discouraged some interviewed households from the fishery, while other, better off households have started to engage in the growing tourism industry at the delta of Parnaíba. Judging by the amount of travel articles in national newspapers (see below), and the observations and interviews made in the framework of the terminal evaluation, mangrove areas are becoming increasingly attractive as leisure and gastronomic destinations.

10 December 2017

City of Parnaíba. At one fresh market, at Avenida Deputado Pinheiro Machado, fresh crabs were being retailed, but outside the building, not at the stalls. Further away at least two people were peddling crabs. The market was divided into vegetable, meat and fish section. At the fish section, shrimp was the most common item, followed by Spanish mackerels and snappers. No tarpon in sight. Also, Characid fresh water fishes and tilapia were being sold.

Annex 5. List of Documents Reviewed

- Assembleia da República, 1997. *Lei n.º 20/97 de 1 de Outubro*. s.l.:s.n.
- Assembleia da República, 1999. *Lei n.º 10/99 de 7 de Julho*. s.l.:s.n.
- Assembleia da República, 2004. *Lei n.º 4/2004, Lei do Turismo*. Maputo: Imprensa Nacional de Moçambique.
- Assembleia da República, 2017. *Lei n.º 16/2014 de 20 de Junho, Lei da Protecção, Conservação e Uso Sustentável da Diversidade Biológica*. Maputo: Imprensa Nacional de Moçambique.
- Assembleia da República, 2017. *Lei n.º 5/2017*. Maputo: Imprensa Nacional de Moçambique.
- CEAMP, 2015. *Compilação dos conteúdos produzidos no âmbito da Comunidade de Ensino e Aprendizagem em Planeamento de UC*, Brasília: s.n.
- Dinerstein, E. et al., 1995. *A Conservation Assessment of the Terrestrial Ecoregions of Latin America and the Caribbean*, Washington: World Bank.
- FUNBIO, 2016. *Análise dos Custos e Lacuna Financeira das Unidades de Conservação com Manguezais*, Brasília: FUNBIO.
- Glaser, M. & Oliveira, R. d. S., 2003. *Whose rights, whose duties and whose priorities? The prospects for co-management of mangrove ecosystems on the North Brazilian coast*. Stockholm, Sweden, s.n.
- GADM, 2015. *GADM database of Global Administrative Areas*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.gadm.org> [Accessed 18 February 2018].
- GEF Council, 2007. *Comparative Advantages of GEF Agencies*, Washinton, USA: GEF.
- GEF Evaluation Office, 2009. *The ROTI Handbook*, Whashington, USA: GEF.
- GEF, 2018. *GEF Project Data Base*. [Online] Available at: www.thegef.org [Accessed 15 February 2018].
- Giri, C. et al., 2011. Status and distribution of mangrove forests of the world using earth observation satellite data. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, Issue 20, p. 154–159.
- Google Earth V 7.3.1.4507 (64-bit), 2018. *São Caetano de Odivelas, Curuça and Marapanim, Oº48.092' S; 47º57.583' W eye alt. 49.96 km*. s.l.:s.n.
- IBAMA, 2003. *Portaria Nº34/03-N, de 24 de Julho de 2003*. Brasília: s.n.
- IBAMA, 2003. *Portaria Nº52, de 30 de Setembro de 2003*. Brasília: s.n.
- IBAMA, 2011. *Proposta de Plano Nacional de Gestão Para o Uso Sustentável do Carangejo-Uçá do Guaíamum e do Siri-Azul*, Brasília: IBAMA.
- ICMBIO, 2014. *Plano de Maneio, APA Barra do Rio Mamanguape, ARIE Manguezais da Foz do Rio Mamanguape*, Brasília: ICMBIO.
- ICMBIO, 2015. *Plano de Manejo Área de Protecção Ambiental Cananeia-Iguape-Peruíbe, SP*, s.l.: s.n.
- ICMBIO, 2015. *Portaria Nº9, de 29 de Janeiro de 2015*. Brasília: Diário Oficial da União.

- ICMBIO, 2015. *Portaria nº9, do 29 de Janeiro de 2015*. Brasília: Diário Oficial da União.
- Kjerfve, B. & Lacerda, L., 1993. Mangroves of Brazil. In: L. Lacerda, ed. *Conservation and sustainable utilization of mangrove forest in Latin America and Africa regions*. Okinawa: ISME.
- Lacerda, L. et al., 1993. Mangrove Ecosystems of Latin America and the Caribbean: a Summary. In: L. Lacerda, ed. *Conservation and Sustainable Utilization of Mangrove Forests In Latin America and Africa Regions*. Okinawa: ISME.
- Legat, J. F. A. et al., 2006. *Caranguejo-Ucá: Métodos para captura, estocagem e transporte*, Brasília: EMBRAPA.
- Mace, G., Masundire, H. & Baillie, J., 2005. Chapter 4. Biodiversity. In: R. Hassan, R. Scholes & N. Ash., eds. *Ecosystems and human well-being : current state and trends : findings of the Condition and Trends Working Group*. Washington: Island Press.
- Magris, R. A. & Barreto, R., 2010. Mapping and assessment of protection of mangrove habitats in Brazil. *Pan-American Journal of Aquatic Sciences*, 5(4), pp. 546-556.
- MAP, 2013. *Instrução Normativa Nº9, de 2 de Julho de 2013*. Brasília: s.n.
- Maretti, C. & Manfrinato, W., 2017. *Brazilian Blue Initiative a strategy for nature conservation (10%) and sustainable development of the coastal-marine zone, focused on protected areas and a sustainable finance mechanism*, Brasília: ICMBIO, MMA.
- Ministério do Meio Ambiente, 2003. *Instrução Normativa Nº 003, de 26 de Maio de 2003*. Brasília: Ministério de Meio Ambiente.
- Ministério do Meio Ambiente, 2004. *Instrução Normativa Nº5, de 21 de Maio de 2004*. Brasília: Ministério de Meio Ambiente.
- Ministério do Meio Ambiente, 2011. *SNUC Sistema Nacional de Unidades da Conservação da Natureza*, Brasília: Ministério de Meio Ambiente.
- Ministério do Meio Ambiente, 2014. *Portaria Nº444, de 17 de Dezembro de 2014*. Brasília: Ministério de Meio Ambiente.
- Ministério do Meio Ambiente, n.d. *Unidades de Conservação. Categorias*. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.mma.gov.br/areas-protegidas/unidades-de-conservacao/categorias>
[Accessed 22 December 2017].
- MMA, n.d. *Consulta Relatórios de UC*. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.mma.gov.br/areas-protegidas/cadastro-nacional-de-ucs/consulta-gerar-relatorio-de-uc>
[Accessed 13 April 2018].
- MMA, n.d. *Orçamento*. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.mma.gov.br/mma-em-numeros/orçamento>
[Accessed 17 April 2018].
- MPOG, 2005. *Projeto GEF: Strengthening the Effective Conservation and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystems In Brazil through the SNUC*. s.l.:s.n.
- Olson, D. M. et al., 2001. Terrestrial ecoregions of the world: a new map of life on Earth. *Bioscience*, 51(11), pp. 933-938.

- PMU, 2017. *Project Implementation Review, Effective Management and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystems in Brazil*, Brasilia-DF: ICMBIO-UNDP.
- PMU, 2016. *Project Implementation Review, Effective Management and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystems in Brazil*, Brasilia-DF: ICMBIO-UNDP.
- PMU, 2015. *Project Implementation Review, Effective Management and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystems in Brazil*, Brasilia-DF: ICMBIO-UNDP.
- Presidência da República, 2007. *Lei nº 11516 de 28 de Agosto 2007*. [Online] Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2007/lei/l11516.htm [Accessed 1 March 2018].
- Protected Planet, 2018. *WDPA Dataset*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.protectedplanet.net> [Accessed 20 January 2018].
- Saint-Paul, U., 2006. Interrelations among Mangroves, the Local Economy and Social Sustainability: a Review from a Case Study in North Brazil . In: C. Hoanh, T. Tuong, J. Gowing & B. Hardy, eds. *Environment and Livelihoods in Tropical Coastal Zone*. Cambridge, USA: CAB International.
- Salem, M. E. & Mercer, D. E., 2012. The Economic Value of Mangroves: A Meta-Analysis. *Sustainability*, Issue 4, pp. 359-383.
- Schaeffer-Novelli, Y., Cintron-Molero, G., Soares, M. & De-Rosa, T., 2000. Brazilian mangroves. *Aquatic Ecosystem Health and Management*, 3(4), pp. 561-570.
- Schaeffer-Novelli, Y., Cintrón-Molero, G., Adaime, R. R. & Camargo, T. M. d., 1990. Variability of Mangrove Ecosystems along the Brazilian Coast. *Estuaries*, 13(2), pp. 204-218.
- Senado Federal, 2017. *Mudança da Secretaria da Pesca para o Ministério da Indústria causa divergência*. [Online] Available at: <https://www12.senado.leg.br/noticias/materias/2017/04/05/mudanca-da-secretaria-da-pesca-para-o-ministerio-da-industria-causa-divergencia> [Accessed 28 February 2018].
- Sganzerla, T., 2017. *Oceana*. [Online] Available at: oceana.org [Accessed 28 February 2018].
- UNDP Brazil, 2008. *Project Document, Effective Conservation and Sustainable Use of Mangroves in Brazil*, Brasilia: UNDP-GEF.
- UNDP Brazil, 2014. *Revisão Substantiva Projeto BRA/007/G32 Conservação e Uso Sustentável Efetivos de Ecossistemas Manguezais no Brasil*, Brasilia: UNDP.
- UNDP, 2012. *Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*, New York: UNDP.
- UNDP, n.d. *Atlas do Desenvolvimento Humano do Brasil*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.atlasbrasil.org.br/2013/pt/> [Accessed 14 February 2018].
- World Bank, n.d. *World Bank Data*. [Online] Available at: data.worldbank.org [Accessed 10 February 2018].

Annex 6. Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation criterion/ dimension	Questions	Indicator	Means of verification	Methodology
Project strategy and formulation	Are the project assumptions valid?	Project assumptions are confirmed by peer reviewed literature, government policy documents and other relevant literature	Peer reviewed literature, government policy documents and other relevant literature	Document analysis
	Were all the risks to the project strategy properly considered?			
	Do the proposed sequence of activities and deliverables lead to the hypothesized outcomes and impacts (given the time and resources constraints)?	Assessment by key project stakeholders	Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or Focus group discussion (FDG)
	Have lessons learned from other similar initiatives been incorporated into the project design?			
	Was the project prompted by national assessments or policies or at national initiative?	Project concept and idea can be traced back to government policy and initiative	Government policy documents	Document analysis
			Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG

Evaluation criterion/ dimension	Questions	Indicator	Means of verification	Methodology
Project implementation & adaptive management.	Did the project cope with challenges, risks and socio-political changes during the project implementation?	Documented changes effected in the project document/ work plans/ management arrangements in response to challenges	Project reports and minutes of meetings	Document analysis
		Assessment by key project stakeholders	Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
Partnership agreements	Did the project management structures or local participatory venues/ groups include all groups/ organizations affected by the project or with capacity to affect the project?	Degree to which relevant groups were included in the project management structures or participatory venues/ groups	Project reports and minutes of meetings Government, NGO and private sectors papers and reports	Document analysis
		Assessment by key project stakeholders	Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
M&E system	Did the logframe indicators comply with SMART criteria?	Logframe indicators have SMART characteristics	Project logical framework	Document analysis
		Assessment by implementing, executing agency and PMU	by implementing, executing agency and PMU	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
	Did the M&E system guide project implementation?	Degree to which the M&E system guided project implementation	minutes of steering/ technical committee meetings, documented modifications of work plans and project document based on monitoring results, and project management of the midterm review ^[1] _{SEP}	Document analysis

Evaluation criterion/ dimension	Questions	Indicator	Means of verification	Methodology
Co-finance	Was committed co-finance delivered as committed?	PMU quantified and documented committed co-funds	Project and audit reports	Document analysis
		Assessment by co-financiers	Co-financiers	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
	Did the project and its implementing/ executing agencies coordinate with co-financiers projects and initiatives?	Project and co-financier's reports reflect coordination and mutually acknowledge results	Project and co-financiers reports	Document analysis
		Assessment by co-financiers	Co-financiers	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
Financial execution	Was disbursement and expenditure effected in a timely and transparent manner?	Concordance between yearly budgets and expenditure and delivery schedule) and if	Work plans and combined delivery reports (CDR)	Document analysis
	Were reporting and accountability lines clear and in compliance with UNDP and national rules (as shown in)	External audit reports reveal compliance with actions required	External audit reports	

Evaluation criterion/ dimension	Questions	Indicator	Means of verification	Methodology
Agency performance	Did implementing and executing agency provide the necessary resources and technical and administrative support for the implementation of the project?	Reports are honest and truthfully reveal project progress and shortcomings	PIRs	Document analysis
		Assessment by key project stakeholders	Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
		Work plans concord with the project's logical framework	Project work plans	Document analysis
		Key stakeholders aware of project objectives, outcomes, outputs and actions	Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
Relevance	Did the project support national, subnational or local, formal or informal policy objectives?	Agreement between project objective and outcomes with policy objective	Policy documents	Document analysis
		Assessment by key project stakeholders	Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
	Was the project framed within GEF biodiversity strategy, UNDP's CPD and UNDAF?	Agreement between project objective and outcomes with GEF 4, CPD and UNDAF	Policy documents	Document analysis
		Assessment by key project stakeholders	Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
Effectiveness	Did the project achieve its expected targets?	Logical framework indicators	Project reports, grey literature, peer reviewed literature	Document analysis
		Assessment by key project stakeholders	Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
Efficiency	Was the project cost-effective?	Positive cost-benefit analysis	Project reports, grey literature, peer reviewed literature	Document analysis

Evaluation criterion/ dimension	Questions	Indicator	Means of verification	Methodology
Impact	Did the project cause changes in drivers of ecological status?	Number and distribution of threatened species associated with mangroves	Project reports, grey literature, peer reviewed literature	Document analysis
		Changes in area covered by mangroves	Project reports, grey literature, peer reviewed literature, maps, aerial or satellite imagery	Document analysis
	Has the project caused changes in the socio-economic status of intended beneficiaries?	Changes in average monthly household income or consumption	Project reports, grey literature, peer reviewed literature	Document analysis
		Assessment by key project stakeholders	Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
	Has the project caused behavioral or value changes of key stakeholders?	Assessment by key project stakeholders	Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
				Structured observation
Sustainability	Are there any financial risks to project sustainability?	Status and trends of public budgets and expenditure on mangrove protected areas	Project reports, grey literature, peer reviewed literature	Document analysis
			Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
		Status and trends of the protected area financial gap	Project reports, grey literature, peer reviewed literature	Document analysis
			Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG

Evaluation criterion/ dimension	Questions	Indicator	Means of verification	Methodology
Sustainability	Are there any socio-economic risks to project sustainability?	Degree to which project stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow	Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
			Policy documents produced by project stakeholders	Document analysis
	Are there institutional risks to project sustainability?	The current or foreseeable policy and regulatory framework sustain project-developed mechanisms	Project reports, policy and legal documents, grey literature, peer reviewed literature	Document analysis
		Assessment by key project stakeholders	Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG
	Are there environmental risks to project sustainability?	Threatened species associated with mangroves have the capacity to recover at the current threat level	Project reports, grey literature, peer reviewed literature	Document analysis
		Assessment by key project stakeholders	Key project stakeholders	Individual semi-structured interview and/or FDG

Annex 7. METT results

Cluster	Governance	Type	Designation	Km2	Mangrove	Years since declaration	Name	Year of METT application	Total score	Total maximum score	% maximum score	Input	Outcomes	Output	Planning	Process
MA	State	SU	APA	26809	4349.72	25	Reentrancias	2006	32	74	0.43	7	4	2	4	12
MA	State	SU	APA	26809	4349.72	25	Reentrancias	2012	34	99	0.34	8	4	1	5	13
MA	State	SU	APA	26809	4349.72	25	Reentrancias	2016	ND	99	NA	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Federal	SU	RESEX	1850	410	14	Cururupu	2006	32	74	0.43	7	5	1	5	11
MA	Federal	SU	RESEX	1850	410	14	Cururupu	2012	32	99	0.32	5	4	1	4	15
MA	Federal	SU	RESEX	1850	410	14	Cururupu	2016	ND	99	NA	0	0	0	0	0
MAPICE	Federal	SU	APA	3076	630	22	APA Delta do Parnaiba	2006	29	74	0.39	8	1	2	6	9
MAPICE	Federal	SU	APA	3076	630	22	APA Delta do Parnaiba	2012	44	99	0.44	11	4	0	8	18
MAPICE	Federal	SU	APA	3076	630	22	APA Delta do Parnaiba	2016	52	99	0.53	10	3	2	5	29
MAPICE	Federal	SU	RESEX	270	270	18	RESEX Delta do Parnaiba	2006	35	74	0.47	7	4	3	6	12
MAPICE	Federal	SU	RESEX	270	270	18	RESEX Delta do Parnaiba	2012	38	99	0.38	3	3	2	10	17
MAPICE	Federal	SU	RESEX	270	270	18	RESEX Delta do Parnaiba	2016	54	99	0.55	8	7	3	9	24
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	149	34.03	13	Arai-Peroba	2006	44	74	0.59	5	5	2	7	22
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	149	34.03	13	Arai-Peroba	2012	24	99	0.24	3	4	1	7	6
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	149	34.03	13	Arai-Peroba	2016	34	99	0.34	7	3	1	9	11
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	425	425	13	Caeté-Taperaçú	2006	37	74	0.50	5	4	2	4	19
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	425	425	13	Caeté-Taperaçú	2012	41	99	0.41	9	5	2	8	14
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	425	425	13	Caeté-Taperaçú	2016	41	99	0.41	6	5	1	11	15
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	28	28	16	Chocoaré	2006	44	74	0.59	7	2	2	9	21
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	28	28	16	Chocoaré	2012	40	99	0.40	10	4	0	8	15

PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	28	28	16	Chocoaré	2016	45	99	0.45	10	6	1	7	18
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	728	728	13	Gurupi-Piriá	2006	33	74	0.45	4	2	3	4	17
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	728	728	13	Gurupi-Piriá	2012	35	99	0.35	7	5	0	8	12
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	728	728	13	Gurupi-Piriá	2016	33	99	0.33	2	5	0	6	17
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	368	368	16	Mãe Grande	2006	41	74	0.55	7	4	2	5	20
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	368	368	16	Mãe Grande	2012	47	99	0.47	10	5	2	7	20
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	368	368	16	Mãe Grande	2016	ND	99	NA	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	300	300	16	Maracanã	2006	51	74	0.69	14	4	2	7	21
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	300	300	16	Maracanã	2012	30	99	0.30	4	4	2	7	10
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	300	300	16	Maracanã	2016	41	99	0.41	5	2	3	9	19
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	34	34	16	São João da Ponta	2006	36	74	0.49	7	4	2	7	13
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	34	34	16	São João da Ponta	2012	56	99	0.57	11	5	3	13	21
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	34	34	16	São João da Ponta	2016	39	99	0.39	6	2	2	10	16
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	296	296	17	Soure	2006	35	74	0.47	4	2	3	6	17
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	296	296	17	Soure	2012	39	99	0.39	10	3	2	9	12
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	296	296	17	Soure	2016	50	99	0.51	10	5	3	10	19
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	279	279	13	Tracuateua	2006	33	74	0.45	4	4	2	9	11
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	279	279	13	Tracuateua	2012	24	99	0.24	3	3	1	5	9
PA	Federal	SU	RESEX	279	279	13	Tracuateua	2016	37	99	0.37	4	4	1	6	19
PB	Federal	SU	APA	149	0	25	Barra do Mamanguape	2006	ND	ND	NA	0	0	0	0	0
PB	Federal	SU	APA	149	0	25	Barra do Mamanguape	2012	59	99	0.60	13	6	3	9	25
PB	Federal	SU	APA	149	0	25	Barra do Mamanguape	2016	56	99	0.57	10	6	3	16	18
PB	Federal	SU	ARIE	58	58	33	Foz do Mamanpague	2006	35	74	0.47	3	4	3	8	14
PB	Federal	SU	ARIE	58	58	33	Foz do Mamanpague	2012	55	99	0.56	10	7	3	8	24
PB	Federal	SU	ARIE	58	58	33	Foz do Mamanpague	2016	55	99	0.56	9	6	2	17	18

SPPR	Federal	SC	ESEC	43	556	36	ESEC Guaraqueçaba	2006	ND	74	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	Federal	SC	ESEC	43	556	36	ESEC Guaraqueçaba	2012	34	99	0.34	7	2	3	6	13
SPPR	Federal	SC	ESEC	43	556	36	ESEC Guaraqueçaba	2016	42	99	0.42	10	6	1	8	14
SPPR	Federal	SU	APA	2824	43	33	APA Guarequeçaba	2006	ND	74	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	Federal	SU	APA	2824	43	33	APA Guarequeçaba	2012	47	99	0.47	11	1	3	10	19
SPPR	Federal	SU	APA	2824	43	33	APA Guarequeçaba	2016	ND	99	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	Federal	SU	APA	2023	333	35	CIP	2006	ND	74	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	Federal	SU	APA	2023	333	35	CIP	2012	48	99	0.48	11	6	5	8	15
SPPR	Federal	SU	APA	2023	333	35	CIP	2016	44	99	0.44	7	5	2	14	13
SPPR	State	SC	FLOES	5.3	1	20	Palmito	2006	ND	74	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	State	SC	FLOES	5.3	1	20	Palmito	2012	65	99	0.66	16	7	4	15	22
SPPR	State	SC	FLOES	5.3	1	20	Palmito	2016	ND	99	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	State	SC	ESEC	12	4.1	26	Guaraguaçu	2006	ND	74	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	State	SC	ESEC	12	4.1	26	Guaraguaçu	2012	58	99	0.59	5	6	2	19	23
SPPR	State	SC	ESEC	12	4.1	26	Guaraguaçu	2016	ND	99	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	State	SC	PARE	14	14	26	Ilha do Cardoso	2006	ND	74	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	State	SC	PARE	14	14	26	Ilha do Cardoso	2012	57	99	0.58	11	9	2	15	17
SPPR	State	SC	PARE	14	14	26	Ilha do Cardoso	2016	ND	99	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	State	SC	PARE	383	43	20	Bogaçu	2006	ND	74	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	State	SC	PARE	383	43	20	Bogaçu	2012	29	99	0.29	10	2	0	5	9
SPPR	State	SC	PARE	383	43	20	Bogaçu	2016	ND	99	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	State	SC	ESEC	844	50	22	Juréia-Itatins	2006	ND	74	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	State	SC	ESEC	844	50	22	Juréia-Itatins	2012	58	99	0.59	14	7	2	12	20
SPPR	State	SC	ESEC	844	50	22	Juréia-Itatins	2016	ND	99	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0
SPPR	State	SU	APA	2002	0	26	Guaratuba	2006	ND	74	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0

SPPR	State	SU	APA	2002	0	26	Guaratuba	2012	62	99	0.63	12	5	2	12	28
SPPR	State	SU	APA	2002	0	26	Guaratuba	2016	ND	99	#VALUE!	0	0	0	0	0

Annex 8. Evaluation consultant code of conduct and agreement form

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form¹

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: José Antonio Cabo Buján

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *Mexico City* on *30/11/2017*



Signature:

¹www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Annex 9. Progress towards targets

Result	Indicator	Target at End of ProjectOP	Baseline	EOP assessment (self-reported)	Terminal evaluation
Objective	Populations of <i>Eudocimus ruber</i> and <i>Ucides cordatus</i>	Same as baseline	Not determined	Target accomplished. No data on <i>E. ruber</i> , or [added 2017] <i>Cardisoma guanhumi</i> . Data on average <i>U. cordatus</i> density for 2009. <i>"All the actions implemented during the project have promoted the conservation and sustainable use of mangrove natural resources. So the impacts of these activities indeed improve this indicator"</i>	Project only established monitoring mechanism (National Strategy for Participatory Monitoring of Biodiversity) by 2017 and <i>E. ruber</i> bad indicator of mangrove stand status. Project did not change indicator nor assess or research conservation status of other species cited in ProDoc. No apparent change in conservation status of any mangrove associated species has been found by the terminal evaluation
	Vegetation cover of mangroves in project intervention Ucs	Same as baseline	568,000 hectares	<i>"Accomplished and exceeded [by] the creation and enlargement of CU in Pará State in 2014: the project is supporting the completion of studies underway for the creation of new RESEX, thus expanding mangrove protected area"</i>	PRODOC baseline does not match more recent assessments, although the TE estimate, the baseline and Magris and Barreto (2010) agree on the baseline value being somewhere around 4,000 km ² . The project has supported the declaration of three additional RESEX in mangrove areas, adding 585 km ² of mangrove vegetation. There is no indication of any significant reduction of mangrove cover in any of the project PAs.

% of mangrove ecosystems in mangrove UCs under management categories or other legal instruments that allow sustainable use (SU) and or limit any use and targets strict conservation (SC)	Dominance of sustainable use protected areas	Increase proportion of strict conservation units across all mangrove units	<i>"The indicator is not completely adequate, in so far as ICMBio has limited governance on the change of category of PA. It must be mentioned that all mangroves areas are in some way exploited by users, especially local communities"</i>	The specific targets for SU and SC proportions in each mangrove unit responded to the goal of increasing ecological representativeness of a mangrove SNUC "sub-system". However, ecological differences in terms of biodiversity not well documented enough to compensate for the high costs of expanding the system in the densely populated Southern states
% Management effectiveness (METT) of pilot mangrove PAs	70% of sample PAs good or excellent score	Only 28% of sampled PAs good or excellent METT score	70% accomplished, An initial analysis shows that: comparisons with previous METT scores (2005 and 2012) and METT 2016 show some increase in the effectiveness of target protected areas. If we consolidate the scoring per cluster (2012 vs 2016)	Only 12 PAs had METT scores valid for 2012 and 2016, while 2006 values (baseline) were not comparable. 5 out 14 (35%) PAs have achieved a score beyond 50% or "good". Score increases are driven mostly by the "planning" and "processes" dimensions of METT, which is consistent with the work of the project with the PA management boards, whereas inputs, outputs and outcomes remain mostly unchanged

% of other pilot PAs testing 1 or more of financing strategies developed in the project	50%	0%	<p>50%. The indicator will be exceeded. All PAs with mangrove areas are eligible for the Blue Fund, which is a financial solution proposed by the Project and adopted by the government specifically for Brazil. The Blue Fund initiative was developed by the Project as a financial mechanism for coastal-marine conservation units. "Fundo Azul" aims to raise funds in the order of US\$ 140 million from national and international organizations by 2022.</p> <p>The project funded the conduct of technical studies and a course for 25 ICMBIO officials on environmental economics and application for financing mangrove PAs. The technical reports exposed a funding gap of at least US\$ 4 million a year for federal mangrove PA. ICMBIO and FUNBIO, implementing partner of the GEF-5 project Coastal and Marine Protected Areas, decided to develop a sinking fund for marine protected areas based on the designs explored by this project's technical reports. The fund's objective would be to expand the protection to marine and coastal area to achieve the policy objective of 10% of the national marine area under protection</p>
80% of all sub-national agencies with jurisdiction in the project clusters agreed to and signed to the Mangrove Plan	80%	0%	<p>Ongoing. Strategic Plan for Mangrove areas. This Plan aims to promote the conservation and sustainable use of this ecosystem. For this purpose, the project has been consolidating many partnerships with different organizations and institutions in the private, public and non governmental areas</p> <p>Action plan for mangrove habitats approved in 2015 applicable only to federal PA hence not adopted by state-level or municipal agencies. Some actions of the plan have been executed by the project</p>

Outcome 1	% of mangrove states with a set of norms and guidelines agreed with and coordinated between federal, state and municipal agencies (OEMAS) on the management of mangroves.	80%	0%	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Normative Instruction 09/07/2013 dealing with the crab transportation 2. Fishery management agreements in "Salgado Paraense" 3. the PAN-mangrove 4. Management Plan of the APA CIP 5. Guidelines shrimp culture 6. Environmental regularization Mamanguape 	The project has indeed developed proposals for legal instruments and decision support processes. Two of the instruments, the normative instruction and the PAN have been officially approved and are applicable over 12 of 15 mangrove states. However, there is no confirmation of adoption of said instruments by the OEMAS
	Existence of a core group of trained staff members (of IBAMA/ICMBIO, OEMAs and/or municipal agencies) capable of implementing and using those norms and regulations	All OEMAs (BA, CE, MA, PA, PB, PI, PR, SP) involved, have a core group of staff-members trained in procedures of licensing and enforcement for mangrove conservation	30% of States have core group of trained staff in key aspects of mangrove management	Accomplished and exceeded. In Piaui, Ceara, Maranhão, Pará, Sao Paulo, Parana, Paraiba, CU managers and other ICMBio servants, OEMAs and municipal staff, and employees of local civil society organizations, participated in training on issues directly related to mangrove conservation	Trainings conducted by the project involved mostly ICMBIO officials. While undoubtedly capacities for mangrove conservation have been created at central ICMBIO level and federal-managed PA, there is no evidence of the existence of a "core group of staff members trained" at each OEMA involved.

<p># regulations tailored to mangroves in at least: PA management categories, management plans guidelines, financing mechanisms, integrating water planning to mangroves, fisheries management plans for mangrove PA</p>	<p>1 regulation for each PA management category, 4 PA management plans, one resolution presented to CNRH linking classification of water bodies upstream from mangroves to needs of these ecosystems and one resolution outlining rules and procedures for ecosystem-based, integrated fisheries resources management</p>	<p>1) UC management categories: Seven Management Agreements for RESEX category and two Management Plans for APA and ARIE categories 2) Management plans guidelines: Management Plan of the APA CIP and the Mamanguape APA and ARIE have been approved 3) Financing mechanisms: Blue Fund initiative was developed by the Project as a financial mechanism for coastal-marine conservation units 4) Integrating water planning with mangroves: the project mapped all Legal Reserves (RL) and Permanent Protected Areas (APP), identifying water bodies in private areas [in Mamanguape]. These areas are part of the discussion with the private sector and SUDEMA, in order to register and update RL and APP areas officially registered in rural properties (through the government tool CAR), thus entrusting effective protection status to those water sources in the estuarine area. 5) Collaboration agreement with UERJ to develop guidelines for the economic evaluation of environmental impact of shrimp production</p>	<p>The products, with the exception of the management plan for the APA and ARIE Mamanguape have already been reported for other indicators. The products reported do not completely match the indicator's targets, but yet, the project has produced agreements in several categories of PA, although they still need to be implemented. The management plans supported by the project are critical for the success of the PA, and may constitute guidelines for similar areas. However, they lack information about budget and expenditures. Attempts supported by the project have been made in terms of achieving some sort of binding regulation and monitoring for mangrove watersheds in the case of Mamanguape, but this has not been completed nor any proposal elevated to any national body.</p>
--	---	---	--

Outcome 2	Composition/source of financing in the project intervention areas that will develop new financing strategies	Tested mechanisms increase PA funding 30% in the two pilot intervention areas (Bahia and SP)	Funding comes from Federal and State budgets with an average funding gap of 50% in mangrove PAs	Blue Fund	The idea of the Blue Fund was originated by technical reports commissioned by the project. However, this fund has the objective of achieving 10% protection of the national marine area, rather than strengthening protection of mangroves
	Existence of a national mangroves plan in Brazil's Wetland Plan	Mangrove Plan agreed and legally formalized as part of Wetlands and contributes to target of national PA Plan	No plan . Activities for conserving mangroves are ad hoc and un-coordinated with on-going plans and programmes	National action plan for mangroves	Redundant indicator. Mangrove plan reported above.
	# hectares under integrated fisheries resource plan	70,000 ha under ecosystem-based, integrated fisheries resource plan.	0 ha under fisheries resource plan that limit practices and catches.	300.000 hectares under integrated fishery management plan in Para	260,700 hectares of RESEX in Pará under yet to be approved fishery management together with additional 27,000 ha and 14,900 ha under crab fishery and finfish fishery agreements in the RESEX Delta do Parnaíba and APA Barra do Rio Mamanguape for a total of 302,600 hectares. The fishery management plans include gear regulations but no allowable catch as catch and effort are not known.

# no-take areas in the 3 pilot Ucs	0 no-take areas agreed	3 no-take zones agreed	no-take zones in 7 RESEX in Pará state have been defined within the Management Agreements	Over 29 no-take zones defined for two adjacent RESEX in Pará: Chocoaré-Mato Grosso and Maracanã. No information on size of the no-take zones. Temporary no-take zones (0.5-1 year) are defined for the RESEX Delta do Parnaíba
Degree of exploitation of the uçá crab resources in Piauí, Maranhão and Ceará	25% decrease in mortality and harvesting at levels established in resource plan	60% mortality in [captured] uçá crabs	Mortality decreased to less than 5% and capture decreased by 20%. The model was replicated in 4 states (Para, Maranhão, Piauí, Ceará). However, it is expected that it could be replicated in all of the 55 Federal Protected Areas with mangroves	EMBRAPA designed cages have reduced mortality by 25% at destination. There is no actual data on crab fishery as total catch and effort are not known.
Development and marketing of new Mangrove products	100 potential local small entrepreneurs trained in the preparation of a business plan	Most local communities and populations lack the capacity to produce and market potential new products from mangrove areas	100 families in the pilot areas on sustainable exploitation of natural resources (especially in the northern states where the focus is on fishery resources and crab specifically). Additionally, the Crab Management Plan in Delta do Parnaíba (three states, two PAs)	Trainings on business plans did not take place. Fishery agreements and crab fishery regulations could potentially increase income for registered fisherfolk, as long as they can exclude outsiders. However, enforcement levels are still low and there is a fundamental lack of catch, effort and household income data.
# of PA management councils reaching agreement on harvesting levels and enforcement	25	5	12 Protected areas in Para, 2 Protected Areas in Delta do Parnaíba, total 55 PAs in all the Brazilian coast	It is unknown where the baseline figure comes from. Other than scattered data for some Pará RESEX compiled by mostly German academic researchers, there are no data on catch and effort

Outcome 3	# of water management instruments agreed upon by the Mamanguape waterbasin committee that take into account the water quantity and quality for mangroves Degree [to which] mangrove conservation is incorporated in [the] zoning of the APA Reentrâncias Maranhenses [later changed to APA CIP)	6	0	2 agreements were signed for the implementation of a cost-effective and permanent water quality monitoring protocol, elaborated in 2015	The latest monitoring of water quality dates back to 2012 conducted by the Paraíba State Environmental Administration. The monitoring scheme designed with project support yet to be implemented
	Zoning restriction on main sectors reflected in UC plan	PA management plan reflects zoning and limits of all main economic activities	Initial zoning for agro-ecological activities, shrimp farming, and indicators starting for deforestation but reflected in PA-planning and management.	The APA CIP Management Plan has been approved and gazetted, reflecting zoning and limits of all main economic activities (aprox. 250.000 ha). A specific zone has been created (Mangrove Conservation Zone); innovative legal restrictions have been proposed on amateur fishery (which is a fast-growing activity linked to local tourism) and on the ban of Invasive alien species (IAS) in aquaculture in all APA territory.	As standard for management plans for protected areas in Brazil, the management plan of the APA CIP divides the PA in the following zones: overlaps (with other PAs), recovery, sustainable use (terrestrial), sustainable use (rivers and estuary), sustainable use (marine) and cetacean conservation zone, restricted use zone and mangrove conservation zone. Activities permitted in the mangrove conservation zone include artisanal fishery and aquaculture, and bird watching

Outcome 4	- # municipalities agreed on APA zoning	6 municipalities (200,000 ha.) in the APA have agreed on the zoning	1 municipality in the APA has a development plan that considers mangrove needs zoning	Six municipalities of the state of São Paulo have part of their territories inside the APA CIP limits. They participated in the elaboration and agreed with the Plan.	Management plan only acknowledges consultations with 5 of the six municipalities, excluding the municipality of Miracatu (7.45% of its territory within the PA 20,606 people in 2010)
	- % of the key actors in APA have signed a formal document of adherence to zoning regulations	50% of the key actors in the APA sign formal document of adherence to zoning regulations	0% of the key actors in APA have signed a formal document of adherence to zoning regulations	The APA also embraces 19 CU of different categories (Strict Conservation and Sustainable Use) and jurisdictions (State and municipal levels), that participated in the plan's elaboration	12 out of 35 relevant organizations participated in the development of the management plan. The plan examined lacks signatures or formal memorandum of understanding or agreement for its execution
	Awareness among private and public stakeholders on the management of mangrove UCs and the ecosystem services they provide	Increased by at least 30% compared to baseline survey	Not determined	During this reporting period, the mangrove ecosystem was very present in different media so it can be inferred that the social awareness and sensitization related with this ecosystem have increased	Baseline was never determined. Interest in mangroves seems to be increasing by number of media articles but this does not seem to be related to the project.

Frequency and quality of monitoring of mangrove land cover	Programs coordinated and linked to national system	Uncoordinated individual state M&E programs	The national strategy and operational protocols for participatory monitoring of biodiversity were developed by the project and are being tested in three Conservation Units	A participatory monitoring protocol has been developed and tested in four RESEX. The monitoring protocol is rated as a very significant and positive development by the monitoring division of ICMBIO. Local actors at PA level acknowledge the usefulness of the protocols, but are worried about the support needed and costs in terms of time and resources. Actual data have yet to start flowing.
Number of instances in which adaptive management takes place taking into account M&E results	6	0	There are more than six instances in which M&E reports determined adaptations in the management of the project	This indicator refers to project implementation processes, not results. Work plans execution has been oriented at monitoring results

Annex 10. Audit Trail

Author	#	Location	Comment	Response
AF	1	Cover page	Cover page should include all relevant information as per the template.	All relevant information contained in cover page. Please refer to Evaluation Office (2012) Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects, Annex 2 Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference, page 36
MGP	2	Cover page	Please complete Project Summary Table	Project Summary table completed in executive summary. Please refer to Evaluation Office (2012) Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects, Annex 2 Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference, page 36
AF	3	Cover page	Please mention national consultant if there was one involved. There should also be acknowledgements at the bottom of the page	Thank you. No national consultant involved. Acknowledgements included in final version
MGP	4	Cover page	Please insert Executive Summary Section	Please refer to comment #2
AF	5	Acronyms and Abbreviations	Need to include English translations of all acronyms.	All acronyms are explained in the report. Please refer to UNDP (2014) UNDP Editorial Style Manual, page 7: <i>Acronyms derived from languages other than the language of the document should be avoided. However, if they are used, the full name in the original language should be supplied</i>

AF	6	Evaluation rating table	The overall rating cannot be higher than any of the sub-ratings. So in this case, for example, if the M&E rating at start up is MS, then the overall quality would need to be MS	Thank you. Rating corrected in final version
AF	7	Evaluation rating table	Please use the sub-headings from the 2012 UNDP/GEF template for Terminal Evaluations, page 34.	Rating scales used in accordance with Evaluation Office (2012) Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects
AF	8	Evaluation rating table	Overall project results should be assessed using the 6-point scale from HU to HS	Thank you. The scales used are in accordance with Evaluation Office (2012) Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported GEF Projects
AF	9	Introduction	Executive Summary is missing before this Introduction.	Executive summary not included in draft as explained and agreed with UNDP CO and implementing partner. It has now been added.
AF	10	Introduction	Please include paragraph numbering for the entire report	Numbering required for titles 1 to 5 in accordance with Evaluation Office (2012) Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects
AF	11	Introduction	2016!!	Typo. Correct year is 2017, not 2016
AF	12	Scope and methodology	See page 30 of the UNDP/GEF TE evaluation guide. Definition of efficiency is: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.	Thank you. That's why the project has not been efficient as its implementation dragged for over 10 years.

AF	13	Scope and methodology	Such as?	Public goods in the economic sense: good that is non-rivalrous and non-excludable. See Evaluation Office (2012) Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects, page 23: the evaluator should consider the extent to which the project has demonstrated: a) production of a public good, b) demonstration, c) replication, and d) scaling up
AF	14	Scope and methodology	Why was I not interviewed?	Involvement of the RTA agreed with UNDP CO. Consultant expected CO to concert date
AF	15	Scope and methodology	Adjust title	Comment is not understood. All titles in draft and final in accordance with Evaluation Office (2012) Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects
AF	16	Structure of the TE report	Where are the Annexes? This list of Annexes is not comprehensive- see UNDP/GEF 2012 template.	This report is a first draft. Annexes are included in the final report.
AF	17	Project description and background context	Some of the detail in this paragraph is irrelevant to this Terminal Evaluation.	Strongly disagree, the differences in structure and context of mangrove forests of utmost relevance for their conservation
AF	18	Project description and background context	So I'm not sure if this Figure is relevant to include.	Figure shows extent of mangrove biome in relation to the other 6 Brazilian biomes.

AF	19	Project objectives, outcomes and expected results	Four?	Thank you. Four outcomes. Corrected
AF	20	Project objectives, outcomes and expected results	They're not shown on the right but rather the left!	Thank you, this has been corrected
MGP	21	Description of project sites	Pls consider adding this section to the context section	Thank you. Section must include description of project sites in accordance with Evaluation Office (2012) Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects
AF	22	Description of project sites	?	Thank you. Abbreviation explained at beginning of paragraph: Sustainable use (SU) and strict conservation (SC).
AF	23	Project timing and milestones	Unable to find: Immediate and development objectives of the project, Baseline Indicators established	Thank you. First item described in precedent section, item two in M&E section. Sections rearranged in final version
AF	24	Main stakeholders: summary table	This is incomplete. For example, where are IBAMA, state environmental agencies, other local stakeholders, SEAP, etc.?	Thank you. The list refers to the main stakeholder. OEMAS, i.e. state agencies with little relevance based on evidence presented and interviews held. IBAMA's role in protected areas assumed by ICMBIO. SEAP does not exist since 2015 and never took role in the project as described in the report. No other relevant stakeholders according to project documentation and mission interviews

MGP	25	Project implementation and adaptive management	<p>Unable to find: Project Design / Formulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) • Assumptions and Risks • Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design • Planned stakeholder participation • Replication approach • UNDP comparative advantage • Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector • Management arrangements 	<p>Thank you. Please note: Analysis of LFA result framework: included in draft Assumptions and risks: included in final Lessons from other projects: partially included in draft, but as separated section in final Planned stakeholder participation: better articulated in a separate section in final Replication approach: better articulated in a separate section in final UNDP comparative advantage: added to final Linkages between project and other interventions: better articulated in a separate section in final Management arrangements: included in draft</p>
AF	26	Project implementation and adaptive management	? sentence not clear.	Thank you. Actions on spatial planning and zoning
MGP	27	Project implementation and adaptive management	<p>Unable to find: Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management •UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues 	Thank you. All sections listed missing were included in draft, but have been separated in separate sections
AF	28	Monitoring and evaluation	This information on indicators should go under a section called Project Design, Analysis of the LFA/ Results Framework	Thank you. Sections have been modified accordingly in final version.

AF	29	Monitoring and evaluation	Inconsistent with information presented in the table. For example, two of the last indicators were not measurable if certain words were not adequately defined, such as “frequent”, “quality” and “replication”.	Thank you. It is true that indicator framework of very low quality
AF	30	Monitoring and evaluation	explain what RESEX is referring to.	Thank you. What RESEX are is explained in preceding sections.
AF	31	Monitoring and evaluation	Explain what these are for this indicator.	The same as for the preceding indicators: different methodologies
AF	32	Monitoring and evaluation	From APA Reentrâncias Maranhenses?	Yes, it was changed for APA Reentrancias
AF	33	Monitoring and evaluation	Increase of 30%? or 30% total level of awareness?	30% increase in awareness. Baseline and EOP level not established by project. TE report contains a small survey of online articles to cover for this indicator
AF	34	Monitoring and evaluation	I disagree- I think it makes sense- M&E should inform adaptive management but it is not always the case.	Thank you. Either way, it is an output, not an outcome indicator
AF	35	Monitoring and evaluation	Missing verb of the sentence. Also what is 57 pages- the PIR?	Yes, the PIR was too long, and repetitive: the same outputs were used for almost all indicators
AF	36	Monitoring and evaluation	Was the MTR management response acted upon?	Based on interviews with project stakeholders, MTR was of no relevance. Management response not presented. All relevant interviews indicated MTR of no consequence. 2014 substantive revision does not once mention the MTR
AF	37	Monitoring and evaluation	PIRs?	And others, e.g. substantive revisions

AF	38	Finance and co-finance	Please insert with CoFin Table as indicated in the Terminal Evaluation Guidance	Thank you. CoFin table in CoFin section
AF	39	Finance and co-finance	PMC is capped at 5%- was that the case? The wording of the sentence suggests that it could have been up to 10%.	Thank you. It was budgeted to 10%. Correct: PMC shall not exceed 5% of the GEF project grant for projects requesting GEF project grants of \$2 million or more
AF	40	Finance and co-finance	This line is strange appearing after the total and doesn't show what the actual management expenditure was.	Thank you. Clarified in final. Expenditure under 'Outcome 5'
AF	41	Finance and co-finance	So I assume it didn't provide the promised co-financing?	Yes, It ceased to exist
AF	42	Finance and co-finance	? incomplete sentence.	Thank you. Sentence has been corrected
AF	43	Finance and co-finance	Include footnote to explain what forest communities are.	Thank you. Clarification included
AF	44	Finance and co-finance	?? what is "this programs"?	Typo. It refers to Bolsa Verde
AF	45	Finance and co-finance	Why are there no data after that?	Requested PMU. This was all info provided. Assumption of continuation based on Bolsa Verde annual reports
AF	46	Agency performance	Insufficient detail on Implementing Agency performance- only one paragraph. See TE Guidelines for all issues that should be discussed.	Thank you. More detail has been added
AF	47	Agency performance	Insufficient detail on Executing Agency performance- only one paragraph- see TE Guidelines for all issues that should be discussed.	Thank you. More detail has been added

MGP	48	Agency performance	Please highlight the learning and communication products along the project's life	Thank you. More detail has been added
MGP	49	Project results	<p>The following sections are missing:</p> <p>Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness & Efficiency (*) • Sustainability (*) <p>Socio-political:</p> <p>Institutional framework and governance:</p>	Thank you. More detail has been added
AF	50	Project results	Rating on project relevance must be provided (relevant or not relevant).	Thank you. Rating already provided in rating table
AF	51	Project results	Add dates.	Thank you, dates have been added
AF	52	Project results	This Figure is not necessary to include for this TE-off topic.	Thank you. Graph has been removed
AF	52	Project results	Specify which sector.	Thank you. More detail has been added

AF	53	Project results	<p>Ratings for both project effectiveness and efficiency must be provided and substantiated.</p> <p>Definition of effectiveness acc- to UNDP 2012 TE guide: The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.</p> <p>Definition of efficiency: The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.</p> <p>There also needs to be a section on Results: The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short to medium-term. This also needs a rating that should be substantiated.</p> <p>Please provide detailed project results for each project outcome. Also describe what the project did to systematize the learning in terms of knowledge management and communication activities.</p>	Thank you. More detail has been added
AF	54	Project results	? what do you mean here?	Overexploited species
AF	55	Project results	<p>See comment above- we need sections on effectiveness, efficiency and results, so I'm not sure why there is detail on each indicator included here. You could report on each indicator as part of the</p>	Thank you. More detail has been added

			results section but this needs to be part of a discussion on project outputs, results and impacts	
AF	56	Project results	All this general information on the status of different species should not be included here. No link to the project is made. You could mention in the project design section that some indicators were not appropriate as they did not consider the most relevant species and you could comment in the Results section the extent to which the target related to species populations was met but this general information with no linkage to the project is not relevant here.	Disagree. All species explicitly included in the indicator framework, PIRs and project documents
AF	57	Project results	Endangered and vulnerable at the same time? Depending on location?	In Brazil and throughout its range
AF	58	Project results	Why it this information included here? See previous comment.	See comment above
AF	59	Project results	Include this information in the Results section under the relevant Outcome.	Indicator of development objective
AF	60	Project results	Again, see previous comments- TE should not include general information like this. Needs to be linked to project impact and to the results section.	Indicator of the LFA
AF	61	Project results	For METT scores?	Yes
AF	62	Project results	Leaving 17 PAs with what?	with more than one-year value
AF	63	Project results	? were taken out of the project?	Yes

AF	64	Project results	What is an inflexion point?	2012
AF	65	Project results	? the METT questionnaire in 2006 suggested that it would not be compatible with future measurements? This is not clear.	No. The sharp decline in scores AND the different questionnaire used
AF	66	Project results	? some of the above changes exceed 4%. For example the first PA shows a 13% increase. Do you mean that the average increase was 4%?	Yes. Not significant
AF	67	Project results	Present this information on METT scores in the results section under the appropriate Outcome.	Objective indicator
AF	68	Project results	What do you mean by “to the letter of the indicator”?	What the indicator says
AF	69	Project results	“where there was a decrease”, right?	Not correct. Increase
AF	70	Project results	Were these established or strengthened through the project?	Not changed by project
AF	71	Project results	This general information is not relevant when not linked to the project results!	Not general information but how “inputs” have contribute to the METT scores of the project PAs
AF	72	Project results	What is the relevance of this Figure to the TE?	Difference in METT score (as% of maximum score) explained by differences in Process score. Project acts on process drivers, process drivers act on METT score
AF	73	Project results	See previous comment on other Figure.	See comment above
MGP	74	Project results	Is it possible to expand the on importance and linkage of the project with the Blue Fund?	Thank you. More detail has been added
AF	75	Project results	I agree: this is a significant project achievement and more details should be included on the project contribution and on the impact that this Fund could	Thank you. More detail has been added

			have in terms of providing future resources for mangroves and more widely, coastal conservation.	
AF	76	Project results	What is the state of approval of this plan now?	Expanded in final report
AF	77	Project results	Please add more detail on this achievement in the Results section under the relevant Project Outcome.	Thank you. More detail has been added
AF	78	Project results	There is no reference to licensing processes in the paragraph below.	Thank you. More detail has been added
AF	79	Project results	Add a footnote or an explanation on what this environmental regularization plan is.	Expanded in final report
AF	80	Project results	Add more detail- what kind of management plan?	Thank you. More detail has been added
AF	81	Project results	For which time period?	Expanded in final report
AF	82	Project results	Write out acronym.	Explained in previous section
AF	83	Project results	Add more detail on the project's contribution to the establishment of this Group and to these guidelines in the results section under the appropriate Outcome.	Thank you. More detail has been added
AF	84	Project results	as opposed to? What was used before?	Nothing
AF	85	Project results	And monitoring	OK
AF	86	Project results	I don't understand the numbers on the left that go up to 500,000.	Axis titles added in final
AF	87	Project results	Rating on sustainability must be provided for sustainability as a whole and for each sub-component of sustainability. Various aspects of sustainability are missing here. see TE guide	Rating for sustainability provided

AF	88	Project results	This Fund?	Correct
AF	89	Project results	<p>As per the UNDP/GEF guide for Terminal Evaluations, the following risks that could affect sustainability should be assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -financial risks -socio-economic risks -institutional framework and governance risks -environmental risks <p>Please analyze each separately</p>	Thank you. More detail has been added
AF	90	Project results	Describe any measures the project put in place for environmental sustainability, rather than this general information.	No project measures
AF	91	Project results	Should also include lessons learned.	Thank you. Lessons learned added
AF	92	Conclusions and recommendations	Add footnote with full name and GEF ID	Thank you. More detail has been added
AF	93	Conclusions and recommendations	Double check the name of the fund.	Done
AF	94	Evaluation rating table	The term executive agency is synonymous with Implementing Partner and there should only be one IP... are you referring to Responsible Parties?	Thank you. Yes, sentence was wrong, it should read the implementing partner. Other project actors not considered responsible partners
AF	95	Evaluation rating table	As per page 5 of the ToRs for this evaluation, please include a rating for Overall Project Results using the 6 point scale.	Thank you. Two lines missing in evaluation rating table added.

AF	96	Summary of recommendations	Do you mean- gathering information above and beyond existing information?	Thank you. The sentence was confusing. It meant that the project M&E framework assumed the existence of data on all the indicators, which turned out to be false. Sentence has been reformulated.
AF	97	Structure of the TE report	The TE ToRs should also be included.	Thank you. Noted
AF	98	Baseline indicators established	Please check. Table 3 is the main stakeholders.	Thank you. Number has been changed.
AF	99	Main stakeholders	What about IBAMA, Embrapa, state environmental agencies, local stakeholders? You mention these elsewhere in the text- some of these were even on the project board, so please mention here as well.	Neither IBAMA nor OEMAS had the relevance in the implementation or results of the project foreseen in the project document. However, both have been added to the table. Embrapa and the federal universities involved in water quality studies acted as project contractors. However, they have also been added to the list.
AF	100	UNDP comparative advantage	This section should only focus on UNDP comparative advantage to take on the role of implementing agency. Please include the comments on UNDP's actual performance in the section on Implementation- agency performance.	Thank you. Noted and moved.
AF	101	Adaptive management	However, there was a "substantive review" carried out in 2014 that did prompt significant changes. Please mention this here as well in this section on adaptive management.	However, the substantive review was not based on the MTR and the substantive review is indeed mentioned in the sentence following this comment.

AF	102	Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management	(this is the heading in the 2012 TE guide.)	Thank you.
AF	103	Project finances	If PMC was almost identical to original budget, it would have been 5% not 10%... Please adjust.	Thank you, but original project management budget (PRODOC) amounted to 450,000 or 9% of the GEF grant of 5,000,000.
AF	104	Project finances	When you say “format”, do you mean the budget lines associated with personal costs?	Thank you, that is correct.
AF	105	Project co-finance	Incomplete sentence.	Thank you. Sentence left over from previous edition now erased.
AF	106	Project co-finance	Incomplete sentence.	Thank you. Sentence left over from previous edition now erased.
AF	107	Project co-finance	Here based on Table 6 you are only referring to total government co-financing not total disbursement, right? Please check the figures as they don’t match exactly.	Thank you. That is correct, only government co-financing, amounting to the rounded sum of USD 45.7 million, which together with expenditures from the GEF grant amount to the total USD 56.7 million. Corrections made to co-finance table too.
AF	108	Project relevance	Please increase the size of the figure as it is difficult to see the true mangroves grey bar.	Thank you. Graph size increased and pie chart added

AF	109	Effectiveness and efficiency	While the text below provides substantial detail on effectiveness, please also include a sub-heading on cost-efficiency.	Thank you. Sub-heading on cost-efficiency added
AF	110	Overall results (attainment of objectives)	Missing subject of sentence- the project?	Thanks! Yes, “the project” was missing
AF	111	Overall results (attainment of objectives)	Do you mean figure 12?	Thank you. Indeed figure 12
AF	112	Overall results (attainment of objectives)	Incomplete sentence.	Thank you. The sentence has been corrected
AF	113	Outcome 3	Accounts? What do you mean?	Thank you. Typo. The sentence has been corrected
AF	114	Country ownership and Mainstreaming	Missing the following sections as per 2012 TE guide: -Country Ownership -Mainstreaming	Thank you. The missing sections have been added.
AF	115	Annexes	Terms of Reference for TE should also be included as an Annex.	Thank you. Terms of reference attached as annex 1.
AF	116	Annex 2. Itinerary	Were they any interviews with other government agencies and institutions that were involved in the project?	No

AF	117	Annex 4. Summary of field visits	<p>This Annex can be short but should summarize the main information collected during the field visits about the project. For example, what did the crab collectors have to say about the project, activities they participated in, the project's impact/ possible shortcomings?</p> <p>Same for the rest of the text</p>	Thank you. Information on the crab collectors and their perceptions is included in the effectiveness and impact sections of the report. However, a summary of interviews has been added.
AF	118	Annex 4. Summary of field visits	See my previous comment- this Annex should focus on information collected on the project not general ecological information. The information presented here is largely irrelevant to the evaluation per se.	Thank you. I strongly disagree with the comment and consider contextual information, collected during structured observation and qualitative in-depth interviews as extremely relevant to the evaluation.
AF	119	Annex 5. List of documents reviewed	I just moved a few references so it would all be alphabetical.	Thank you very much
AF	120	Annex 7. METT	Is this the year in which the METT tool was applied?	Thank you. Yes. Clarification added
AF	121	Annex 9. Progress table	What is EOP?	End of project. Clarification added
AF	122	Annex 9. Progress table	As you mentioned under a previous indicator, this fund is to expand the protection of marine and coastal areas- the latter includes mangroves.	Yes, but not quite. The GEF project on marine protected areas which will set up the fund explicitly excludes support for this project's PAs. This means that any potential support from this fund, if successful will occur in a period of three to five years from now. Moreover, neither ICMBIO

				presentations nor the Marine Protected Areas project document acknowledge the role played by this project in developing the idea of the fund.
AF	123	Annex 11. Species list	I don't know if this Annex is needed.	Thank you, but strongly disagree. This list was included in the project document (some species have been added) as critical list of mangrove-associated species. The project was expected to have an impact in the status of their populations.

Annex 11. List of mangrove-associated species according to the Project Document with two bony fish additions

Order	Family	Genus	Species	Common name (Port)	Mangrove associated	Estuary specialist	Migratory	Conservation status PRODOC (2008)	Conservation status 2004 ¹	Conservation status 2014 ²	Conservation status (IUCN)
Decapoda	Ucididae	Ucides	<i>cordatus</i>	Caranguejo-uçá	1	1	0	Overexploited	1	0	0
Decapoda	Atyidae	<i>Atya</i>	<i>scabra</i>	Coruca	0	0	0	VU	1	0	LC (2013)
Decapoda	Chthamalidae	Microeuraphia	<i>rhizophorae</i>	ND	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Gecarcinidae	Cardisoma	<i>guanhumi</i>	Guaíamum,	1	1	0	Overexploited	1	CR	0
Decapoda	Grapsidae	Goniopsis	<i>cruentata</i>	ND	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Kalliapseudidae	Kalliapseudes	<i>schubartii</i>	ND	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Merguiidae	Merguia	<i>rhizophorae</i>	ND	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Ocypodidae	Uca	<i>burguesi</i>	catanhão-tesoura	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Ocypodidae	Uca	<i>cumulanta</i>	catanhão-tesoura	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Ocypodidae	Uca	<i>leptodactyla</i>	catanhão-tesoura	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Ocypodidae	Uca	<i>maracoani</i>	catanhão-tesoura	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Ocypodidae	Uca	<i>mordax</i>	catanhão-tesoura	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Ocypodidae	Uca	<i>olympioi</i>	catanhão-tesoura	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Ocypodidae	Uca	<i>victoriae</i>	catanhão-tesoura	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Ocypodidae	Uca	<i>rapax</i>	catanhão-tesoura	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Ocypodidae	Uca	<i>thayeri</i>	catanhão-tesoura	1	1	0	0	0	0	0

¹ Instrução normativa nº5, 21/05/04 and Instrução normativa nº3, 26/05/03

² Portaria nº445, 17/12/2014 and Portaria nº 444/2014 Fauna Ameaçada

Order	Family	Genus	Species	Common name (Port)	Mangrove associated	Estuary specialist	Migratory	Conservation status PRODOC (2008)	Conservation status 2004 ³	Conservation status 2014 ⁴	Conservation status (IUCN)
Decapoda	Ocypodidae	Uca	<i>uruguayensis</i>	catanhão-tesoura	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Ocypodidae	Uca	<i>vocator</i>	catanhão-tesoura	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Palaemonidae	Macrobrachium	<i>carcinus</i>	Pitu, lagosta-de-água-doce	0	1	0	VU	1	0	LC (2013)
Decapoda	Palaemonidae	Macrobrachium	<i>heterochirus</i>	Pitu, lagosta-de-água-doce	0	yes	0	DD	0	0	LC (2013)
Decapoda	Penaeidae	Farfantepenaeus	<i>brasiliensis</i>	Camarão-rosa	0	yes	0	Overexploited	1	0	0
Decapoda	Penaeidae	Penaeus	<i>notialis</i>	ND	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Penaeidae	Farfantepenaeus	<i>paulensis</i>	Camarão-rosa	0	1	0	Overexploited	1	0	0
Decapoda	Penaeidae	Litopenaeus	<i>schmitti</i>	Camarão-branco	0	1	0	Overexploited	1	0	0
Decapoda	Penaeidae	Xiphopenaeus	<i>kroyeri</i>	Camarão-sete-barbas	0	1	0	Overexploited	1	0	0
Decapoda	Porcellanidae	Minyocerus	<i>angustus</i>	ND	0	1	0	VU	1	0	0
Decapoda	Portunidae	Callinectes	<i>sapidus</i>	Siri-azul	0	1	0	Overexploited	1	0	0
Decapoda	Sesarmidae	<i>Aratus</i>	<i>pisonii</i>	Aratu	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Sesarmidae	<i>Metasesarma</i>	<i>rubripes</i>	ND	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Sesarmidae	Sesarma	<i>augustipes</i>	Aratu	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Sesarmidae	Sesarma	<i>crassipes</i>	Aratu	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Decapoda	Sesarmidae	Sesarma	<i>rectum</i>	Aratu	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Sessilia	Varunidae	Neohelice	<i>granulata</i>	Catanhão	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Tanaidacea	Xanthoidea	Eurytium	<i>limosum</i>	ND	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Venerida	Veneridae	<i>Anomalocardia</i>	<i>brasiliiana</i>	Sarnambi	1	1	0	DD	0	0	0
Ostreida	Ostreidae	<i>Crassostrea</i>	<i>brasiliiana</i>	Ostra	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Ostreida	Ostreidae	<i>Magallana (Crassostrea)</i>	<i>gigas</i>	Ostra-gigante	1	1	0	0	0	0	0

³ Instrução normativa nº5, 21/05/04 and Instrução normativa nº3, 26/05/03

⁴ Portaria nº445, 17/12/2014 and Portaria nº 444/2014 Fauna Ameaçada

Order	Family	Genus	Species	Common name (Port)	Mangrove associated	Estuary specialist	Migratory	Conservation status PRODOC (2008)	Conservation status 2004 ⁵	Conservation status 2014 ⁶	Conservation status (IUCN)
Eupulmonata	Ellobiidae	<i>Melampus</i>	<i>coffeus</i>	ND	1	1	0	DD	0	0	0
Mytilida	Mytilidae	<i>Mitylus</i>	<i>edulis</i>	Mexilhão	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mytilida	Mytilidae	<i>Mytella</i>	<i>charruana (falcata)</i>	Sururu	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mytilida	Mytilidae	<i>Mytella</i>	<i>guyanensis</i>	ND	1	1	0	DD	0	0	0
Myida	Teredinidae	<i>Neoteredo</i>	<i>reynei</i>	Turu	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Ostreida	Ostreidae	<i>Crassostrea</i>	<i>rhizophorae</i>	Ostra	1	1	0	DD	0	0	0
Myida	Teredinidae	<i>Psiloteredo</i>	<i>healdi</i>	ND	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Cardiida	Solecurtidae	<i>Tagelus</i>	<i>gibbus</i>	ND	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Cardiida	Solecurtidae	<i>Tagelus</i>	<i>plebeius</i>	ND	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Rhinopristiformes	Pristidae	<i>Pristis</i>	<i>pristis (perotteti)</i>	Peixe-serra	0	1	1	CR	1	CR	CR (2013)
Rhinopristiformes	Rhinobatidae	<i>Pseudobatus</i>	<i>horkellii</i>	Raia-viola	0	0	0	Overexploited	1	CR	CR (2000, 2007, 2015)
Testudines	Cheloniidae	<i>Caretta</i>	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	Tartaruga-cabeçuda	0	0	1	VU	1	EN	VU
Testudines	Cheloniidae	<i>Chelonia</i>	<i>mydas</i>	Tartaruga-verde, aruanã	0	0	1	VU	1	VU	EN
Testudines	Cheloniidae	<i>Dermochelys</i>	<i>coriacea</i>	Tartaruga-de-couro	0	0	1	CR	1	CR	VU
Testudines	Cheloniidae	<i>Eretmochelys</i>	<i>imbricata</i>	Tartaruga-de-pente	0	0	1	EN	1	CR	CR
Testudines	Cheloniidae	<i>Lepidochelys</i>	<i>olivacea</i>	Tartaruga-oliva	0	0	1	VU	1	EN	VU
Crocodylia	Alligatoridae	<i>Caiman</i>	<i>latirostris</i>	ND	0	0	0	Locally threatened (VII) ⁷	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	<i>Actitis</i>	<i>macularius</i>	Spotted Sandpiper	0	1	1		0	0	LC
Psittaciformes	Psittacidae	<i>Amazona</i>	<i>brasiliensis</i>	Papagaio-da-cara-roxa	0	0	0	VU	1	0	VU (2004-16), NT (2017)
Anseriformes	Anatidae	<i>Anas</i>	<i>bahamensis</i>	White-cheeked Pintail	0	1	0	Locally threatened (VII)	0	0	LC

⁵ Instrução normativa nº5, 21/05/04 and Instrução normativa nº3, 26/05/03

⁶ Portaria nº445, 17/12/2014 and Portaria nº 444/2014 Fauna Ameaçada

⁷ (VII) refers to the VIII mangrove units identified in Brazil. Unit VII roughly correspond to São Paulo

Order	Family	Genus	Species	Common name (Port)	Mangrove associated	Estuary specialist	Migratory	Conservation status PRODOC (2008)	Conservation status 2004 ⁸	Conservation status 2014 ⁹	Conservation status (IUCN)
Gruiformes	Rallidae	Aramides	<i>cajanea</i>	Grey-necked Wood-rail	1	1	0	0	0	0	LC
Gruiformes	Rallidae	Aramides	<i>mangle</i>	Little Wood-rail	0	1	0	0	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Arenaria	<i>interpres</i>	Ruddy Turnstone	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Accipitriformes	Accipitridae	Buteogallus	<i>aequinoctialis</i>	Rufous Crab-hawk	1	1	0	Locally threatened (VII)	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Calidris	<i>alba</i>	Maçarico	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Calidris	<i>pusilla</i>	Maçarico-rasteirinho	0	1	1	0	0	EN	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Calidris	<i>minutilla</i>	Maçarico	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Calidris	<i>fuscicollis</i>	Maçarico	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Calidris	<i>canutus</i>	Maçarico-de-papo-vermelho	0	1	1	0	0	CR	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Calidris	<i>bairdii</i>	Maçarico	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Calidris	<i>melanotus</i>	Maçarico	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Calidris	<i>himantopus</i>	Maçarico	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Calidris	<i>melanocephalus</i>	Maçarico	0	0	0	VU	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Charadriidae	Charadrius	<i>collaris</i>	Collared Plover	0	0	1	0	0	LC	LC
Charadriiformes	Charadriidae	Charadrius	<i>semipalmatus</i>	Semipalmated Plover	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Charadriidae	Charadrius	<i>wilsonia</i>	Wilson's Plover	1	1	0	0	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Charadriidae	Charadrius	<i>melodus</i>	Piping Plover	0	1	1	IUCN - NT	0	0	VU (2004) NT (2005-2012)
Passeriformes	Thraupidae	Conirostrum	<i>bicolor</i>	Bicolored Conebill	1	1	0	0	0	0	LC (2004-09), NT (2012)
Pelecaniformes	Threskiornithidae	Eudocimus	<i>ruber</i>	Guará	0	1	0	Locally threatened (VII)	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Laridae	Gelochelidon	<i>nilotica</i>	Common Gull-billed Tern	0	1	1	DD	0	0	LC

⁸ Instrução normativa nº5, 21/05/04 and Instrução normativa nº3, 26/05/03

⁹ Portaria nº445, 17/12/2014 and Portaria nº 444/2014 Fauna Ameaçada

Order	Family	Genus	Species	Common name (Port)	Mangrove associated	Estuary specialist	Migratory	Conservation status PRODOC (2008)	Conservation status 2004 ¹⁰	Conservation status 2014 ¹¹	Conservation status (IUCN)
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Limnodromus	<i>griseus</i>	Short-billed Dowitcher	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Limosa	<i>haemastica</i>	Hudsonian Godwit	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Limosa	<i>fedoa</i>	Marbled Godwit	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Anseriformes	Anatidae	Netta	<i>erythrophthalma</i>	Southern Pochard	0	0	0	Locally threatened (VII)	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Scolopacidae	Numenius	<i>phaeopus</i>	Whimbrel	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Pelecaniformes	Ardeidae	Nyctanassa	<i>violacea</i>	Yellow-crowned Night-heron	1	1	0	0	0	0	LC
Accipitriformes	Accipitridae	Parabuteo	<i>unicinctus</i>	Harris's Hawk	0	0	0	Locally threatened (SP)	0	0	LC
Accipitriformes	Pandionidae	Pandion	<i>haliaetus</i>	Osprey	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Phoenicopteriformes	Phoenicopteridae	Phoenicopus	<i>ruber</i>	American Flamingo	0	0	0	DD	0	0	LC
Passeriformes	Tyrannidae	Phylloscartes	<i>kronei</i>	Maria-da-restinga	0	0	0	VU	1	0	VU (2013)
Charadriiformes	Charadriidae	Pluvialis	<i>dominica</i>	American Golden Plover	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Charadriidae	Pluvialis	<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>	Grey plover	0	1	1	0	0	0	LC
Gruiformes	Rallidae	Rallus	<i>longirostris</i>	Mangrove Rail	1	1	0	0	0	0	LC
Charadriiformes	Laridae	Sterna	<i>hirundinacea</i>	Trinta-réis-de-bico-vermelho	0	1	0	Locally threatened (VII)	0	VU	LC
Charadriiformes	Laridae	Sterna	<i>dougallii</i>	Trinta-réis-róseo	0	1	1	DD	0	VU	LC
Charadriiformes	Laridae	Thalasseus	<i>sandvicensis</i>	Trinta-réis	0	1	0	Locally threatened (VII)	0	0	LC
Primates	Atelidae	Alouatta	<i>belzebul</i>	Guariba-de-mãos-ruivas	0	0	0	0	1	VU	VU (2008)
Sirenia	Trichetidae	Trichetus	<i>manatus</i>	Peixe-boi marinho	0	1	0	0	1	EN	VU (2008)

¹⁰ Instrução normativa nº5, 21/05/04 and Instrução normativa nº3, 26/05/03

¹¹ Portaria nº445, 17/12/2014 and Portaria nº 444/2014 Fauna Ameaçada