

## Evaluations Management Response, Summary & Lessons Worksheet

### Management Response

Evaluation name: BRA/97/G31 - National Strategy on Biological Diversity and National Report

Evaluation Type: Independent Final Evaluation Report

Responsible Unit for Key action: Environment and Development Unit

Key action time frame: Not applicable

Status of Key action: Not applicable (project is completed)

Issues and recommendations:

Issue:	Recommendation:	Management Response
Cooperation between Executing Agency and several governmental and non-governmental partners is driven informally	In the phase of proposal elaboration of <u>future</u> Projects, the Team could include the elaboration of agreements that make formal the cooperation and responsibilities in the implementation of initiatives or projects between the Executive Agency and several governmental and non-governmental partners for the PANBIO implementation.	Agree. This is a good suggestion for future projects. In the case of this project under evaluation the underlining objective was to support Brazil in the formulation of the National Biodiversity Strategy (NBS) and provide the basis for the Action Plan. As this was under a funding window know as “Enabling Activities”- the formulation format and expected results were extremely standardized. As the NBS was to be formed it would not have been possible to make formal commitments to the implementation of the Action Plan as these had not been identified. However the Plan itself should include this identification and the GoB will be advancing such agreements through their routine work for implementation of the Brazilian NBS
	In the implementation phase of future Projects, it is recommended the realization of annual meetings with related projects in what concerns Technical Cooperation, in order to work together on the initiatives and the dissemination of information among several public institutions and relevant NGOs, which work on the Project issues. It is also recommended a meeting with other Agencies of Implementation of Brazilian Projects, supported by GEF, including the participation in missions for the partial and final Project evaluation.	Agree. This is a good suggestion for future projects. As a matter of fact, this initiative is already taking place within other projects ongoing in the Unit’s portfolio.
Economic approaches and innovative fiscal mechanisms for the reduction of biodiversity loss were not introduced in the project	In the phase of proposal elaboration of future Projects, the Team should be able to plan the use, by the Executive Agency, of legal and fiscal instruments that already exist or to be proposed in the biodiversity field to financially support the sustainability of Project initiatives.	Partially agree. The idea of incorporating into the project design elements for financial sustainability of the project impacts is clearly sound and is undertaken in the design of new projects. As explained above the characteristics of the project under evaluation are very specific and were for developing a strategy and action plan. Again it is within this Strategy and Action Plan rather than with the

Issue:	Recommendation:	Management Response
		<p>project that this recommendation is pertinent. The Government is seeking to a number of approaches to ensure the implementation of the NBASP and the continuation of the processes that were developed for its elaboration. UNDP also has a wide range projects related to biodiversity conservation in Brazil and will seek to address this recommendation within that portfolio and maintain dialogue with the GoB to ensure the full use of existing and emerging fiscal instruments to advance the implementation of the NBSAP.</p>
<p>Dissemination actions of the results implemented not on a large-scale, until the launching of website, and publication initiatives were in a reduced number of printed versions vis-à-vis the national scale demands.</p>	<p>Promote strategy on communication, awareness and dissemination of the achieved results (NBS and PANBIO) through media campaigns at national and state levels. Besides the dissemination, the Project multiplication could be promoted at state level. It is suggested that a pilot project could be supported by the PROBIO II Project at least in three States or one Biome. In this context, a National meeting could be promoted by MMA with State level of participation in order to agree the national basis for a proposition of a National and State Agendas for the Biodiversity.</p>	<p>Partially agree. Given the size of Brazil and the importance of the NBSAP the need for massive dissemination is clear. However the recommendation goes far beyond the purpose of this project which had very clear objectives and restricted actions. Within these the utmost effort has been made to facilitate dissemination at a broader level. Project results and products are already available at MMA's website. In addition, the Government has already planned the 2008 National Conference for the Environment, which is preceded by a series of state meetings.</p>
<p>Low degree of institutional and political priority for biodiversity issues.</p>	<p>Build technical and management capacity on biodiversity of relevant national partners and other federal public agencies that were selected to compose the PANBIO, promoting better conditions to the cross-cut approach of biodiversity within national public policies.</p>	<p>Partially agree. The initial Enabling activities were to focus exclusively on the strategy and action plan. Later "add-ons" of GEF resources were made available by GEF to identify capacity building gaps including those related to participation in policy development. The EA projects however were not permitted to support the actual strengthening of capacities with GEF funds. Rather the Action Plan should identify those resources for capacity building for identified gaps. Capacity building is already provided in the MMA to state and municipal partners in a number of other governmental initiatives. UNDP has a broad range of projects supporting capacity building and will seek to identify potential synergies to further this work.</p>
	<p>Reproduce at the local level the national experience on the proposal of public policies and biodiversity management in partnership with the Program Agenda 21. This initiative would promote the systematization, at local level, of best practices, innovative solutions and lessons learned through guide manuals and publications for the introduction of these issues in new municipalities.</p>	<p>Partially agree. Program Agenda 21 already promotes best practices and innovative solutions at the local level. Partnerships between this and the NBSAP would be interesting idea. While this goes far beyond the purpose of the project under evaluation the idea will be promoted by UNDP with the relevant GoB authorities.</p>

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>Management Response</b>
	<p>A National Agenda for Biodiversity can be promoted - together with the ENV TAL (Environmental Sustainability Agenda Technical Assistance Project), ENV PRL (Programmatic Reform Loan for Environmental Sustainability), and PROBIO II (National Fund for Biodiversity) – through the improvement of proceedings and mechanisms of implementation of the “Principles and Guidelines for the Implementation of the National Policy on Biodiversity” and of the “Guidelines and Priorities of PANBIO”.</p> <p>With the Project conclusion, DCBIO and SBF should: (i) better share the responsibilities of relevant partners, towards the continuation of the implementation process of national policies and action plan; (ii) identify strategies to ensure the collaboration of several stakeholders; and (iii) implement the mechanisms and structures to ensure the sustainability of the planning and management of biodiversity.</p>	<p>Partially agree. Even though this is an interesting idea. While the scope of it goes far beyond the purpose of this project , UNDP will liaise with GoB to promote this recommendation.</p> <p>Agree. DCBIO and SBF are already in charge at MMA for biodiversity issues and implementation of the CBD in the country.</p>
Strategic actions for the improvement of the Monitoring and Evaluation Systems of national public policy implementation (National Agenda on Biodiversity) to comply with article 6 of the CBD are necessary, in relation to the planning and execution of National Government Action Plans (PPA).	A political and institutional instance of higher level could be used to this aim, as proposed to assure the implementation of the ENV TAL and ENV PRL loans (Green, Blue and Brown Agendas).	Partially agree. DCBIO and SBF are already in charge at MMA for biodiversity issues and implementation of the CBD in the country. The niche and mandate of such higher level would need to be carefully identified to avoid overlap with such bodies as CONAMA.
Low participation of the relevant partners in the process of management, monitoring and evaluation of the progress made towards the achievement of targets for the reduction of national	<p>DCBIO/SBF could add to the PANBIO the project and program contributions to be implemented by other relevant partners: NGOs, private sector, and other civil society organizations. This initiative could introduce new levels of collaboration of these partners.</p> <p>Ensure the necessary measures and actions for the continuity /implementation of initiatives carried out by the Project in the forthcoming years, through the realization of a seminar for its conclusion, with the</p>	<p>Partially agree. The PANBIO identify those key actions of the NSP to be implemented. In this sense it is inclusive of a board number of actors. Then implementation of these actions clearly goes far beyond the purpose of this project.</p> <p>Disagree. The scope of this recommendation goes far beyond the purpose of this project. The Brazilian Government has already planned targets for biodiversity loss reduction for the next years within its own activities.</p>

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>Management Response</b>
biodiversity loss.	proposition of planning and targets for the next three to five years.	However there is need for continual adjustments of strategies and goals and in this sense active dialogue with relevant partners should be sought through the 2008 National Conference for the Environment, for example.
	Projects on the proposal of public policies, involving several political and administrative levels and requiring a strong synergy among stakeholders, should count with a formal structure of Project Supervision, with the participation of relevant partners, members of financial and implementation agencies, as well as of the operational Projects management (Strategy, PROBIO, FUNBIO, FNMA, PPG-7; PNAP).	Agree. This overall coordination was established at MMA. However, given the scope of the project and the number of partners involved, representation of the Brazilian society as a whole was always a challenge. Presently, projects count with Steering Committees that have a broader representation of society for decision making and monitoring.
	In the phase of proposal elaboration of future Projects, as a means to increase the likelihood of Project impact and sustainability, it is recommended that the following partners actively participate: civil society members; municipal and state governments; and non-governmental organizations, among others.	Agree. However, given the scope of the project and the number of partners involved, representation of the Brazilian society as a whole was always a challenge.
Cooperation between Executing Agency and several governmental and non-governmental partners is driven informally	In the phase of proposal elaboration of future Projects, the Team could include the elaboration of agreements that make formal the cooperation and responsibilities in the implementation of initiatives or projects between the Executive Agency and several governmental and non-governmental partners for the PANBIO implementation.	Agree. This is a good suggestion for future projects.
	In the implementation phase of future Projects, it is recommended the realization of annual meetings with related projects in what concerns Technical Cooperation, in order to work together on the initiatives and the dissemination of information among several public institutions and relevant NGOs, which work on the Project issues. It is also recommended a meeting with other Agencies of Implementation of Brazilian Projects, supported by GEF, including the participation in missions for the partial and final Project evaluation.	Agree. This is a good suggestion for future projects. As a matter of fact, this initiative is already taking place within other projects ongoing in the Unit's portfolio.

## **Summary & Lessons learned**

### **Summary:**

The objective of this study is to evaluate the results achieved with the conclusion of the Project *National Strategy on Biological Diversity and National Report* started on 20th August 1997 and concluded on 31st July 2006, with MMA as the Brazilian executing agency. The evaluation from 1997 to 2006 should consider the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the Project.

In general, it can be evaluated that the Project Immediate Objectives were achieved in a satisfactory level, considered very useful for the further work of DCBIO and SBF in the planning and management of public policies on biodiversity. The implementation of planned activities for each Output can also be evaluated as satisfactory.

The achieved Results at this final phase can be evaluated as satisfactory, if compared to the initial and final objectives of the Strategy Project. It should be highlighted that the achieved Results can be considered as those that produced the initial favorable conditions for the strengthening of national capacities for the elaboration of public policies on Biodiversity.

The Project effectiveness can be evaluated as satisfactory, since the Immediate Objectives were achieved, with different degrees of implementation. The Project could be classified as very effective due to: (i) it has achieved the majority of expected outcomes (indicators); (ii) the positive perspective to keep the majority/certain benefits for the Project beneficiaries; and (iii) the medium likelihood of achieving in the future outcomes and long term impacts of the Project.

The efficiency of the Project implementation can be considered somewhat satisfactory, as regards to the time used for the achievement of initial results; and as satisfactory due to the significant efforts done by Project and partners (PROBIO I, UNDP Projects, CONABIO, SBF) to obtain the expected Project results at reasonable costs.

Considering the indicators recently selected by GEF for the results achievement envisaging the improvement of actions on biodiversity within the CBD State-Parties, this evaluation considers that the Project, together with other initiatives of MMA, is in a satisfactory way contributing to the initial improvement of the national scenario.

### **Lessons learned:**

- 1) Execution with adaptability increased the chances of success with greater political and technical support. The Project in the first 04 years centralized its actions to build up technical and institutional capacity; additional studies; national diagnosis; and identification of learned lessons and best practices of other countries in proposing National Strategy on Biological Diversity (NBS) and submitting Reports.
- 2) The design for the coordination of budgetary resources of MMA and of external resources for implementation of this Project and others, allowed that GEF resources to NBS could be used as “leverage” by other relevant stakeholders.
- 3) The proposal of the original Project design was not elaborated with the participation of relevant partners of the Brazilian society. This governmental initiative, at the phase of the Project pre-approval, should have counted with the collaboration of relevant partners. This participation could have meant a significant additional improvement of time, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability to the Project.
- 4) During the Project implementation, some initiatives could have been executed in order to strengthen the implementation transference process of the leadership and the ownership of the Project Results to representatives of regional and local communities and the

business sector. These instances levels of participation could have increased the possibilities of management and partnership to decentralization of the implementation of the project; and the monitoring and evaluation of biodiversity loss and share of biodiversity benefits at local and state level and/or per biome.

- 5) The reduced introduction of economic approaches (economic value), the targets to be achieved (costs, risks, benefits to be achieved); and the innovative fiscal mechanisms for the reduction of biodiversity loss in the proposal of NBS and PANBIO (environmental services and sustainable use) promoted less degree of awareness and proposal appropriation by different sectors of the Brazilian society (social, environmental, and indigenous peoples movements, as well as the private sector).
- 6) The Project implementation could have included : (i) the awareness and capacity building on biodiversity issues of relevant project participants; (ii) preliminary activities to the Project implementation for the establishment of communication networks; (iii) activities towards the systematization and publication of learned lessons, best-practices and recommendations for the Project monitoring and evaluation.
- 7) The Project didn't count with resources to implement at least one pilot experience of decentralization of national policies on biodiversity. It should have been included at least one pilot project experience related to the reproduction of Project proceedings of the NBS and PANBIO at state and local levels (or per Biome).