

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: United Nations Foundation

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Brazilian World Heritage Biodiversity Program

Implementation Partners for this Project: Brazilian Government (Ministry of Environment – MMA and Chico Mendes Institute for the conservation of Biodiversity - ICMBio), UNESCO – WHC, UNESCO Brasilia Office, CI-CEPF, WWF and TNC

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): July 1, 2005 – April 30, 2009

Date of Report (month/year): June 2009

II. OPENING REMARKS

Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.

The UN Foundation, UNESCO and the implementing partners of this project thank Conservation International and its CEPF initiative for the trust and commitment shown through the tough effort of bringing this project to life. As we have communicated before, in spite of partner efforts, the project was truncated after the withdrawal of the support from the Government of Brazil.

The results included here are a consequence of the unilateral cancelation of the Program by the Brazilian Government. The withdrawal was communicated in March 2008 through a letter, stating that the strategy adopted at the initial phase of the program was no longer compliant with the current management model used by the Ministry and its bodies. It was stressed by the Government, nevertheless, that such measure did not reflect a lack of commitment from the Brazilian government in identifying, protecting and preserving natural sites in the country's territory, as agreed in the World Heritage Convention. On the contrary, the objectives of the Convention would continue to be met by the Ministry and ICMBio, through other strategies designed for Brazilian protected areas, as the ones consolidated in the National Strategic Plan for Protected Areas – PNAP, instituted in 2006.

The cancelation was received with astonishment by partners, since the government had participated on the revision efforts throughout 2007 and 2008. Detailed information on the impacts is included below (unexpected impacts section).

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: Local leaders, civil society organizations, and local communities are motivated and act to improve the management of conservation within and around the protected areas of the Discovery Coast World Heritage Site.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	

Decrease in the occurrence of criminal fires and wood theft in and around the areas of Discovery, Monte Pascoal, and Pau Brasil National Parks, and Sooretama Biological Reserve.	The implemented activities had a mobilization and participation effect on the stakeholders and local population that should contribute to the goal.
Increase in forest coverage (regeneration), and the conservation of remaining forests that exist, between Discovery and Monte Pascoal National Parks.	The need of this action, as a priority, was established and the stakeholders may adopt it in other programs.
Increase in inter-institutional actions concerning the management of all conservation units, especially in the cases of Discovery, Monte Pascoal, and Pau Brasil National Parks, and Sooretama Biological Reserve.	The project induced an awareness raise at the local level through the participation of stakeholders in programming and priority setting meetings.
Increase in the level of awareness of the importance of native forests and of the in-situ germplasm bank that exists in the region.	Achieved, at least at the local stakeholder's level.
Better conditions to reach decisions and to carry out investments in ecological tourism around the Site, with fewer occurrences of failures with regard to distribution of benefits to local communities in the region.	As stakeholders began working jointly it should facilitate common understandings and, consequently contribute to promote this objective.

Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.

As stakeholders began working jointly and participated on the revision workshops, the project supported the achievement of better conditions to reach decisions in the site and to increase the level of awareness and coordination in an environment with many institutions, all with different approaches and objectives.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

The delay on the signature of the Program and on the structuring of the technical coordination led to some obsolescence in activities previously planned. Given the project's high level of complexity preparing the terrain for effective implementation was considered a critical and high priority task. Local conservation stakeholders required to be involved and activities, both within the framework of the project and those implemented in the ambit of other initiatives, needed to be coordinated. The project had a complex administrative design so that an initial effort on the definition of the above mentioned coordination was fundamental to accomplishing the project's targets.

Some strategic activities were implemented after the initial structuring of the Technical Coordination, e.g the Communication and Capacity building Plans. Also some local actions were taken in the WH Sites, some capacity building training sessions, equipment acquiring, etc.

Focal points in the Brazilian Government were changed throughout the Program's implementation and an institutional change in 2007 also impacted on the Program's implementation. The ICMBio (Chico Mendes Institute for the Conservation of Biodiversity) was created and replaced IBAMA and MMA in the direct implementation of the Program.

At the same time, a series of delays led to a request for an extension. The Program Document was signed with a delay of one year, late in 2003 and became effective only in 2004. In addition, it took some time for government coordination mechanisms to be established, and activities

proposed did not take place due to a lack of timely complementarity with a set of Brazilian government programs. Due to the need for an extension, a substantive revision of the Program was made involving all local stakeholders but the final negotiation and approval of the Revision Document also posed new delays to actual implementation.

In the end of 2008, the revised Project Document with the International Organizations was approved (243BRA4000) but the Brazilian Government PD (914BRA2008) was not, due to several internal restructuring in the Project Management Team in MMA and ICMBio.

In March 2009, the Brazilian Government unilaterally cancelled the Program stating that the strategy adopted at the initial phase of the program was no longer compliant with the current management model used by the Ministry and its bodies.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs: Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: Institutional arrangements for the implementation of Discovery Coast Site established	
1.1. Local executing group defined and recognized by technical national coordination. Activities and actions of phase II of the Program detailed for local executing groups. Annual planning workshop/meeting with local executing group held for the establishment of general supervision, fire control, monitoring and emergency actions for the protection of fauna in the Discovery Coast.	Partially implemented. Local executing group defined and focal point designated. Annual meeting was in planning stage when the project was cancelled.
1.2. Advisory/Consultative councils of Conservation Units (CU) strengthened	Partially implemented.
1.3 Capacity building to CU managers in execution	Capacity building to managers in firefighting and prevention was made during Phase I. Workshop held in Foz do Iguaçu, under the technical supervision of PREVFOGO/IBAMA. 75 managers and CU technicians trained. Equipment acquiring too (04 personal radio equipment acquired under the supervision of Pau Brasil National Park managers). Phase II capacity building actions were being designed by the consultancy hired to lead and expedite local coordination.
Output 2: Proposal for a Protected Areas Mosaic of the Extreme South of Bahia State	
2.1. Research, collection, and organization of the existing information at Discovery Coast	Communication Plan elaborated and approved, ready to be used by partners and stakeholders.

for the formation of a data-base/dossier with environmental, socio-economic and cultural information of Discovery Coast CUs.	
2.2 Ruling for the creation of the Mosaic detailed.	Not implemented
2.3 Mosaic Development Plan in progress.	Not implemented
Output 3. Information on the Discovery Site compiled and diffused .	
3.1. Research, collection, and organization of the existing information at Discovery Coast.	Communication Plan elaborated and approved, ready to be used by partners and stakeholders, including activities of research, collection, and organization of the existing information at Discovery Coast for the formation of a data-base.
3.2. Creation and production and dissemination of information instruments of an educational nature.	Communication Plan elaborated and approved, ready to be used by partners and stakeholders.
Output 4. Long term Forest Monitoring Plan elaborated and executed	
4.1 Plan to monitor the outcomes of the biodiversity conservation Program in progress.	Two studies were developed and paid by an associated project – one for biodiversity evaluation and the other for conservation areas management effectiveness. Results were only partial.
4.2 Reference frame for the monitoring of forest cover established.	Two studies were developed and paid by an associated project – one for biodiversity evaluation and the other for conservation areas management effectiveness. Results were only partial.
Output 5. Projects for Forest recovery implemented based on the regional planning in course	
5.1 Implementing integrated actions to reduce deforestation and fires in the area connecting forests to the Discovery, Pascoal Mount, and Pau Brasil national parks with the socio-environmental involvement of residents in the area.	Phase I training sessions accomplished in a partnership with PREVFOGO/IBAMA. 71 volunteer forest firefighters trained in 05 municipalities (Ituberá, Prado, Cabrália, Porto Seguro and Itamaraju). 100 (one hundred) personal protection equipment acquired under the supervision of IBAMA/PREVFOGO. Advanced negotiations with PREVFOGO IBAMA were taking place to implement this action. Actions cancelled due to Program's interruption.
5.2 Local plant nurseries adequated for the support of forest recovery projects (seeds produced, native seedlings acquired, institutional networks established and in progress)	Only the programming and identification aspects were implemented.

Output 6. Sustainability Studies for the region executed.	
6.1 Study on the economic availability, environmental sustainability and social potential of ecotourism and/or conservationist tourism on the Discovery Coast site in progress	Only the programming and identification aspects were implemented.

Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.

Progress was partial since there were many constraints to the program implementation as a whole. Some partnerships, especially with PREVFOGO (Specialized Center for Forest Fire Prevention and Combat, IBAMA), were important to reach results on the first phase (mainly capacity building courses and equipment acquisition). Also, a satisfactory coordination with the local implementing group (GEL) was possible, with the unofficial designation of a local chief technical focal point, who was working closely with the Technical coordination to implement the activities on the second phase of the Program. With the support the chief technical focal point, a consultancy was hired to lead and expedite local coordination. The project was unexpectedly cancelled by the Brazilian Government, who is legally the actor to implement actions in the conservation units recognized as Sites. Therefore, programming and identification actions, as well as contracts, had to be suspended.

The process started by Bra-Patrimônio's initiative generated collaborations and expectations among local actors in the Discovery Coast Site, especially during the Workshops held in order to discuss and define the action lines of the Program and the revision Workshops as well. Both events validated the activities and raised expectations in various levels. During those moments, the Program led the organizations and institutions to an innovative approach: the World Heritage Site as a planning and territorial management instrument to promote biodiversity conservation and the sustainable development of communities living on the surrounding areas of the Conservation Units recognized as WH Site.

The opportunity to have one more planning and management instrument certainly mobilized organizations and institutions at various levels. Agreements for joint action were made and also the identification of other funding sources and the designing of correlate, complementary projects were possible. Due to the delays in the Program's execution, some organizations started to implement the proposed actions in their strategic design and planning, mobilizing human and financial resources for important conservation actions held in the Site. The organizations which started working or planning to work cooperatively were: IESB, Una Biological Reserve (Rebio Una) and Ecotuba, for Environmental education and social mobilization actions; IESB and Flora Brasil, for environmental monitoring actions and IBIO, iCidades and Natureza Bela, for forest recovery actions.

During March and April 2009, the Program's revision and its renewed implementation phase re-raised expectations and initiatives. The frustration was high after the premature cancellation, since cooperation bonds were being consolidated. In addition to that, the world financial crisis had a great impact on the capacity of these institutions to raise resources for conservation actions. Currently, local organizations wait for the implementation of another program or project of similar regional reach and aggregation capability such as Bra-Patrimônio. Only the Ecological Corridors Program has such prerogatives but it is unfortunately facing implementation problems as well.

Were any outputs unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?

Yes, as previously stated, the project was unexpectedly cancelled by the Brazilian Government, who is legally the actor to implement actions in the conservation units recognized as Sites. Therefore, programming and identification actions, as well as contracts, had to be suspended.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT

Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF’s future performance.

Despite the constraints, great interest of new partners in the Program was verified. Letters of intention to participate were signed by what was then called “future partners” and that should result in national counterparts, especially by State governments and NGOs. UNESCO will try to minimize the impacts on these negotiations and will continue to coordinate efforts for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/failure)

The design process of the Program was very participative, what was important for the Project as a whole, politically wise. Anyhow, that made the Project document very detailed and that caused some trouble in practical terms for the project execution.

Project Execution: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/failure)

The management structure designed, although representing all partners and levels of decisions, proved to be an ineffective instrument for the Project to reach the expected execution rate. The constant change of focal points and the little integration among them also posed some constraint to the actions of the Project.

VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount in USD	Notes

****Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:***

- A** Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)

- B** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF funded project)*
- C** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project.)*
- D** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Unspent funds will be returned to CEPF as soon as possible.

VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Celso Salatino Schenkel (coordinator)/ Bernardo Brummer (officer)/ Juliana Bezerra (assistant)

Organization name: UNESCO Brasilia Office

Mailing address: SAS Qd 5, Lote 6, Ed CNPQ/IBICT/UNESCO 9o andar CEP: 70070-914

Tel: 55 61 2106-3629 / 3633

Fax: 55 61 3322-4261

E-mail: c.schenkel@unesco.org.br/ juliana.bezerra@unesco.org.br