GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

GEF/ME/C.44/Inf. 04
May 23, 2013

GEF Council
June 18-20, 2013
Washington, D.C.

COUNTRY PORTFOLIO EVALUATION REPORT: BRAZIL (1991-2011)

(Prepared by the GEF Evaluation Office)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MAIN CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

BACKGROUND

1. At the request of the GEF Council, the Evaluation Office conducts Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs) every year. CPEs aim to provide the GEF Council and the national Governments with an assessment of results and performance of GEF supported activities at the country level, and of how GEF supported activities fit into the national strategies and priorities as well as within the global environmental mandate of the GEF. As stated in the Brazil CPE Terms of Reference (TOR), Brazil was selected for a CPE given its large portfolio with significant emphasis on biodiversity and climate change, among other considerations.

2. Based on the overall purpose of the GEF CPEs and their standard TORs, the evaluation of GEF support to Brazil had the following specific objectives:

- Independently evaluate the relevance and efficiency of GEF support in the country from several points of view:[1] national environmental frameworks and decision-making processes, the GEF mandate and achievement of global environmental benefits, and GEF policies and procedures.
- Assess the effectiveness and results of completed and ongoing projects in each relevant focal area;[2] and
- Provide feedback and knowledge sharing to (1) the GEF Council in its decision-making process to allocate resources and develop policies and strategies, (2) the country on its participation in the GEF, and (3) the different agencies and organizations involved in the preparation and implementation of GEF support.

3. Brazil's participation in the GEF started during the GEF pilot phase in 1991 with the preparation of the World Bank-implemented projects National Biodiversity Project (PROBIO) and Brazilian Biodiversity Fund (FUNBIO) (GEF ID 58 and 126, respectively). There are 45 national projects in the GEF Brazil portfolio, which together total $336 million (where $ 5 million are for Project Preparation Grant –PPG) with $ 1 billion of co-financing.

4. As Table 1.1 shows, about 49.6 % of GEF funding to national projects has gone to support projects in the biodiversity focal area, 32.4 % to climate change, 10.5 % to multifocal area projects, 3.5 % to international waters, 2.6 % to land degradation, and 1.5 % to persistent organic pollutants (POPs). The level of co-financing has been larger for climate change (80%), followed by multifocal area projects (75%), international waters (71%), biodiversity (70%), POPs (66%), and land degradation (60%).

[1] Relevance: the extent to which the objectives of the GEF activity are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies, including changes over time; Efficiency: The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible (funds, expertise, time, etc.).
[2] Results: the output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of a GEF activity; Effectiveness: the extent to which the GEF activity's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

5. In addition to national projects, Brazil participates in 14 regional and 21 global GEF projects, addressing all of the GEF focal areas, with the exception of land degradation.

Table0-1–National Projects by Focal Area

Focal Area	Number of Projects	GEF support (USD million)	Co-financing (USD million)	% of GEF support
BD	19	180.12	483.27	49.62
CC	12	86.43	346.04	32.35
IW	4	13.36	32.96	3.46
LD	2	13.99	21.05	2.62
MF	6	35.63	104.49	10.48
POPs	2	6.48	13.14	1.47
Total	**45**	**336.01**	**1,000.95**	**100.00**

Objectives, scope and Methodology

6. The Brazil CPE was conducted between October 2011 and June 2012, by an evaluation team comprised of staff from the GEF Evaluation Office and consultants with extensive knowledge of Brazil's environmental sector.

7. The performance of GEF portfolio in Brazil was evaluated in terms of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness as well as the contributing factors to this performance.

8. The main focus of the CPE is the 45 national projects implemented within the boundaries of Brazil.[3] Additionally, some regional and global projects in which Brazil participates were also reviewed, due to their link with the national projects and their relevance for the portfolio. Small Grants Program projects were also evaluated. Until December 2011, Brazil had approved with GEF approximately USD 336 million for the national projects.

9. Several sources of information at different levels (project data, government, civil society, GEF agencies, etc) were the basis of the evaluation. The quantitative analysis started from indicators that measure efficiency of GEF support, using the projects as a unit of analysis (time and costs in preparation and implementation of projects, etc). Some projects were selected for site visits in a manner that would represent a variety of focal areas, biomes, GEF agencies, types of project and geographical location. Review of Outcomes to Impact (ROtI) studies were conducted for five projects that had been concluded since at least two years. These studies included interviews with project stakeholders and triangulation of sources of information. Finally, this evaluation was supported by an Independent National Panel for Quality Assurance formed by experts from the Institutional Performance Evaluation group of the Brazilian Agricultural Research Company (EMBRAPA) and from the Center for Strategic Management and Research (CGEE).

[3] For a list of the 45 national and 35 regional/global projects please refer to the list annexed to this report.

10. The following limitations were considered, being minimized whenever possible during the execution of this evaluation:

- CPEs are challenging, since GEF does not operate under national programs that specify expected results through programmatic objectives, indicators, and targets. In GEF-5 this was changed with the introduction of the voluntary National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE), but Brazil has not developed its NPFE. On the other hand, the Brazil's Operational Focal Point has prepared a list of priority themes for STAR allocation under GEF-5, as well as a list of criteria for selection of proposed projects.

- Attribution is also complex. This was foreseen in the TOR. This evaluation does not intend to indicate direct attribution to GEF for any environmental development or results, but to evaluate the contribution of GEF support to attain global environmental benefits.

- The evaluation of impacts of initiatives funded by GEF is not an easy task. Many projects do not clearly or adequately state their expected impacts and sometimes they do not even state their expected results. This evaluation tried to overcome these difficulties through verification site visits in projects under implementation and through the conduct of five ROtIs.

- Deficiencies in the Monitoring and Evaluation process of GEF projects and programs have been mentioned in previous CPEs and other GEF Evaluation Office reports. This was also a challenge for the Brazil CPE.

11. Despite inconsistencies, lack of data and discrepancies in the initial data, the evaluation team has managed to establish a clear and reliable information database on projects and project documentation.

CONCLUSIONS

Results, Effectiveness and Sustainability

Conclusion 1: The GEF helped pave the way for institutional capacity required for lasting environmental benefits in most focal areas. Also, GEF projects in Brazil often produce quality publications that have remained as leading national references in most focal areas.[4]

12. Institutional and individual capacity building and publication of quality documents are important for maintenance and replication of efforts that lead to global environmental benefits. In Brazil, GEF projects have contributed to the creation and consolidation of key environmental institutions. Also, GEF projects have often resulted in publicly available reports that are used by other projects.

[4] Evaluative evidence presented under Finding 6 also applies here.

Biodiversity

13. The FUNBIO (GEF ID 126) was created with GEF support, establishing a unique institution in Brazil which presently plays a fiduciary role in implementing several biodiversity projects, including GEF projects such as Amazon Region Protected Areas – ARPA (GEF ID 771 and 4085), as well as projects from other national and international, private and public institutions. FUNBIO also developed projects with several important environmental non-governmental organizations (NGOs) still active today. Interestingly, FUNBIO is the first Brazilian institution applying to become a GEF implementing agency.

14. The PROBIO (GEF ID 58) strongly supported biodiversity conservation efforts in Brazil. Before this project, Brazil's Ministry of Environment lacked a Biodiversity division. PROBIO was critical in promoting the creation of the Secretariat of Biodiversity and Forests and its Directorate for Biodiversity - institutions which are now responsible for the national biodiversity program. PROBIO has also been fundamental in structuring the biodiversity legal framework and in formulating the National Biodiversity Strategy. Finally, PROBIO has generated several of the most important publications on biodiversity produced by national government. For instance, stakeholders involved in the ARPA project (GEF ID 771 and 4085) have stated that one PROBIO publication, indicating priority areas for conservation in the Amazon region was used as a key reference in the ARPA project design.

15. GEF projects also induced the creation of biodiversity divisions within some state environmental secretariats. Publications also resulted from state-level biodiversity projects, however, their replication potential has not yet been clearly observed.

16. The GEF also supported Brazil in developing its second national report to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Climate Change

17. Brazil is a party to the Kyoto Protocol and, as such, is bound to present a National Communication on Climate Change to the United Nations Framework on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which, among others, encompasses a national GHG inventory. To date, GEF has provided support to both the First and Second National Communications and is presently supporting the third (GEF ID 337, 1612 and 3999, respectively). Not only the National GHG Inventories, but also the knowledge consolidation presented in those Communications has been of great importance to supporting climate change policies, projects and research. An emblematic example is the fact that the Second National GHG Inventory was used as the reference for the establishment of the national GHG emissions target for 2020.

18. Furthermore, the *Biomass Power Generation: Sugar Cane Bagasse* project (GEF ID 338) has also compiled a high quality publication (Hassuani, Leal and Macedo 2005) consolidating the then dispersed knowledge on sugar cane leaves energetic use, and also the knowledge then created, leveraging further academic research on the theme. Stakeholders regard this publication as a key

reference in the sugar cane sector for improved use of biomass. Additionally, this project also helped build capacity among the university researchers involved.

International Waters

19. In the International Waters focal area, the GEF has been supporting efforts to establish water governance at the basin level. Brazil is divided into twelve hydrographic regions (large basins).[5] The GEF has already provided support to the establishment of an integrated management in two of these – *São Francisco River Basin* and part of the *Brazilian Paraguay Basin* (GED ID 586 and 583, respectively). GEF has also supported a regional project on one of the world's largest groundwater reservoirs – the *Guarani Aquifer* (GEF ID 974).

20. In both *São Francisco* and the *Upper Paraguay Basin* projects, the GEF has provided support to the creation and/or strengthening of basin committees – promoting decentralized basin management, in alignment with the principles of the National Water Resources Policy – paving the way to the establishment of basin agencies. These projects also resulted in several high-quality technical publications,[6] as well as developed Strategic Plans of Action for each hydrographic region. There is clear evidence that at least the São Francisco Basin's Strategic Action Plan has been effectively guiding public policy in the region to this date.

21. Also, the São Francisco River Basin Committee created during the project is now financially independent and remains active with a large open meeting twice a year - a clear indication of the GEF project's lasting benefits.

Land Degradation

22. Land degradation projects are relatively recent and there are few in the GEF portfolio in Brazil. Nonetheless, some lasting benefits are already observed.

23. Perhaps the most important contribution of these projects is in relation to improving agriculture's environmental performance, mainly by restoring riparian forests. Stakeholders have indicated that the environmental and agricultural government entities are closer to one another and working more cooperatively after project completion (GEF ID 2356). Also, rural property owners that participated in the project by offering areas to be restored have not lost any income. On the contrary, additional sources of income have been adopted in consortium with the restored area (e.g., honey production, native fruits, etc). Some report increase in water levels in just a few years. When the project engages local entities, these entities often become specialized in riparian forest restoration.

24. During site visits, several stories of wild animals returning to the area after forest restoration have been told by landowners. Some have stated, for example, having seen a wild cat,

[5] The official basin division in Brazil was defined per the Resolution nº 32 of the National Freshwater Resources Council, in 2003. Further details will be available in the Global Environmental Benefits Report, which will be attached to the CPE report.

[6] Some examples are: ANA/GEF/PNUMA/OEA (2003) and 28 projects developed under project *Integrated Management of Land-Based Activities in the Sao Francisco Basin* (ANA s.d.).

which could refer to the Tiger Cat, a local species rated as vulnerable by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species. However, no consistent study has been undertaken to confirm whether these anecdotal evidences are isolated or whether they indeed represent a recovery of biodiversity in the referred region, representing thus a global environmental benefit resulting from the GEF project.

25. The *Riparian Forest Restoration São Paulo* project (GEF ID 2356), in particular, produced several publications with very pragmatic content for use by government entities, private institutions, NGOs, and local rural associations now working in forest restoration throughout the country, especially in the Atlantic Forest along the extensive Brazilian coastline. At least two local groups that participated in the GEF project have restored more areas after project completion than they did during project execution. This is particularly impressive considering that the project was completed in late 2010.

Persistent Organic Pollutants

26. This focal area is too recent in Brazil to see any clear results at this time.

Conclusion 2: Multifocal area projects have always been present in the Brazilian portfolio, although they have only been recently classified as such.

27. Projects classified as multifocal area represent 11% of the GEF portfolio in Brazil in terms of grant resources, and 13% in terms of number of projects. The first multifocal project in Brazil entered the GEF pipeline in 2001, started implementation in 2004, and was completed in December 2010. There is only one more multifocal project that has been completed and this occurred in November 2011. Current multifocal area projects tend to have a major focus on biodiversity and land degradation and a significant fraction of these projects are oriented to the Caatinga biome. Multifocal projects are expected to become more common due to the interrelations between many GEF focal areas.

28. While the trend in Brazil's project portfolio suggests an increase in multifocal area projects, it is not clear whether multifocal area projects are actually more common now, or whether new projects are simply being classified as multifocal area projects more frequently than they were previously.

29. A review of the Brazilian portfolio suggests that many older GEF projects in Brazil classified under a single focal area in fact have objectives in other focal areas as well. They could easily have been classified as multifocal. This concerns eight full sized projects and one medium sized project.[7] This classification issue is well known in the SGP as well. All SGP projects in Brazil have been classified as biodiversity projects to date, even though most projects addressed a broader range of objectives, and could have been classified as climate change, land degradation, or multifocal area projects. In GEF-5, SGP will be forced to distribute resources in biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation focal areas, although this is not expected to change the type of projects promoted under the SGP in Brazil.

[7]Full size projects: GEF ID 583, 586, 771, 1287, 2356, 2450, 2765, and 4085 ; Medium size projects: GEF ID 3128.

30. Land degradation components are also observed in Medium and Full Size projects. The *Parana Biodiversity Project* (GEF ID 1287) is one example. While classified as a biodiversity project, it is mainly a land degradation project with climate change contributions as well. Interestingly, other GEF projects developed in Brazil that were inspired by the *Parana Biodiversity* project were classified as land degradation and multifocal projects.

31. ARPA (GEF ID 771 and 4085) is also another project classified as biodiversity, but with clear climate change contribution. A recent study indicates that expansion of protected areas during 2003-07 reduced deforestation by 272,000 km^2 (Filho, et al. s.d.)[8]. Using the reduction deforestation as a proxy of biodiversity increase, the ARPA project has resulted in protection of biodiversity and avoided the emission of 0.4 GtC (attributed to 13 protected areas established with ARPA's support).

32. At the same time that there is evidence that multifocal area projects have always been present in GEF portfolio in Brazil, during the workshop in which the preliminary findings of this evaluation were presented several stakeholders commented on impediments to develop multifocal projects. Particularly, the complexity of monitoring was regarded as a major disincentive to submission of multifocal projects. Besides this, it was stated that submission of multifocal projects was discouraged by the fact that they had to go through the approval of evaluators of all focal areas instead of a single focal area evaluator. According to reports, requests for project revisions during the development and review process are more often seen in the case of multifocal projects, which imply more work and may result in further delays to project approval. Nonetheless, while evaluating the records from the GEF Secretariat it was found that the longer time for multifocal project's approval observed during GEF – 3 did not occur during GEF – 4.

33. The SGP is also suffering by the fact that it is now required to be submitted a Full Size multifocal project. This multifocal FSP approval has already resulted in a 2 year delay of the Brazilian SGP.

Conclusion 3: The engagement of the private sector varies in form and size across focal areas. GEF support has been particularly effective in engaging the private sector on climate change, and less effective in other focal areas.

34. There is no clear indication that GEF support is effective in increasing engagement of the private sector on environment in Brazil. The level of private sector[9] engagement in environment-related activities not supported by GEF may or may not differ from that in GEF supported activities. Nonetheless, it is important to point out the frequent participation of the private sector in GEF projects in Brazil.

[8]Soares Filho et al. (2006) apud Soares Filho et. al. (unknown date). Available at: http://www.whrc.org/resources/publications/pdf/SoaresFilhoetal.IPAM.08.pdf. Last access: 03/13/ 2012.

[9] It is important to highlight that the term "private sector" refers here exclusively to institutions which are completely private and profit oriented. This means that micro and family local businesses and state-controlled companies are not included in the private sector category; these were included in separate categories.

35. In climate change projects, private sector participation has been significant - 53% of total co-financing for completed climate change projects came from private entities, while the average in all focal areas is 19%.[10] The *Hydrogen Fuel Cell Buses for Urban Transport* project (GEF ID 6) and the *Biomass Power Generation* project (GEF ID 338) are two climate change projects that engaged national and international private sector companies in the development and testing of the related technologies. There are indications that in the climate change focal area technology transfer has been less successful than technology development. Attempts to promote transfer of technology have failed mainly due to the lack of economic feasibility studies. Development of technology has been observed mainly in agriculture related activities. For example, in the *Biomass Power Generation* project (GEF ID 338), the private research center CTC developed and tested methods for harvesting sugar cane leaves.[11]

36. Private companies from various sectors were also engaged in the development of the National Communications on Climate Change, which have been developed under several GEF projects (GEF ID 337 and 1612).

37. The GEF has also been somewhat effective in engaging private support for GEF biodiversity projects – 1.6% of total co-financing for completed biodiversity projects came from private entities. According to stakeholders interviewed, voluntary corporate contributions to biodiversity projects are considerably smaller than contributions arising from legal obligations, although it was not possible to verify this claim.

38. Local agriculture and extractive associations also participate in land degradation and biodiversity projects (of sustainable use nature) through in-kind contributions. Such associations are either created or strengthened by these projects as a mean to promote riparian forest conservation and/or restoration, often allied to some income generating activity. In these projects, the involvement of local representative is of significant importance for project success, but the extent to which each project accomplishes such an involvement varies considerably from project to project. In the *Parana Biodiversity Project* (GEF ID 1287) in-kind contributions from local farmers and producers were not initially considered at the project start, but after project completion, these contributions translated into 22% of total project co-financing. Such types of in-kind contribution, although acknowledged as important for project success, have not been formally included as co-financing in other similar projects.

39. In international waters, private sector participation seems to be limited to the attendance to public consultation meetings and workshops promoted by the projects. Finally, given the immaturity of the POPs portfolio in Brazil, no evidence of private sector engagement could be verified.

[10] This analysis encompasses all projects in GEF national portfolio in Brazil, and considers only co-financing values at project approval.

[11] Public institutions also contributed to technology development. For example, in the Parana Biodiversity Project (GEF ID 1287), a biodiversity project, EMBRAPA developed methods to recover severely degraded lands. Also, in the Ecosystem Restoration of Riparian Forests in Sao Paulo project (GEF ID 2356), a land degradation project, the Sao Paulo State Secretary of Environment developed methods for restoration of riparian forests for various types of degraded areas.

Conclusion 4: In the International Waters focal area there is evidence that GEF support contributed to strengthen Brazil's commitment to regional cooperation.

40. With respect to regional cooperation, GEF support seems to have contributed to strengthening of Brazil's established commitments to other countries in Latin America in the International Waters focal area. The regional project *Environmental Protection and Sustainable Integrated Management of the Guarani Aquifer* (GEF ID 974) resulted in institutional strengthening and legal harmonization amongst Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay, leading to the Guarani Aquifer Agreement in 2010. Also, the ongoing regional project *Integrated and Sustainable Management of Transboundary Water Resources in the Amazon River Basin Considering Climate Variability and Climate Change* (GEF ID 2364) may result in contributions to an existing established agreement between countries in the Amazon basin – Amazon Cooperation Agreement. In other focal areas there is no evidence that GEF support contributed to strengthening Brazil's regional cooperation commitments.

Conclusion 5: GEF support to Brazil's South-South cooperation efforts has been minimal and informal at best.

41. Guidance for promoting South-South cooperation through the GEF is quite new in Brazil. In 2010, the CBD included promotion of South-South cooperation among the mandates for GEF (CDB 2010), and South-South cooperation has been recently growing in importance in Brazil's national development agenda. Given this context, it is reasonable to expect that GEF projects in Brazil in the near future could present evidence of support to South-South cooperation efforts. That said, the evaluation found no strong evidence to date that GEF projects in Brazil have contributed in any significant or formal manner to South-South cooperation.

42. It is important to note, however, that some GEF projects in Brazil have resulted in informal and uncoordinated cooperation with other Southern countries, especially concerning knowledge sharing. Some examples include individuals from the *Biomass Power Generation* project (GEF ID 338) that provided technical assistance for a similar project in Cuba and some others from the *Sao Francisco* Project (GEF ID 586) that participated in international seminars in Latin America to present project results and lessons learned. Also, the *Enhancing Institutional Capacities on REDD Issues for Sustainable Forest* global project (GEF ID 3818) promoted an event that brought together participants from six countries in Africa and Brazilian counterparts to exchange experiences on "Community Forestry and REDD+". However, these exchanges do not represent a formal South-South Cooperation, which would involve the coordination of government and, in particular, the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC). ABC is not entirely familiar with the GEF portfolio and its potential for South-South cooperation, although it expressed interest in learning about and promoting such potential.

Relevance

Conclusion 6: GEF support has been relevant to Brazil's sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities, particularly in the areas of biodiversity and climate change.

43. GEF projects have been generally relevant to Brazil's national sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities, by both supporting these agendas and in some cases even helping to develop them. This is especially true for the biodiversity and climate change focal areas, which comprise the majority of the Brazilian GEF portfolio. Less evidence exists to assess the relevance of GEF support in the land degradation, international waters, and POPs focal areas, given the small number of projects and the recent nature of their development. That said, the timelines (see Table 4-6) for GEF support, Brazil's approval of international agreements, and the development of the environmental legal framework in Brazil suggest that GEF may be supporting the approval or implementation of new laws and international agreements in all focal areas.

Biodiversity

44. The Biodiversity Timeline (see Chapter 2 - Volume 2) constitutes an illustration of the relevance of GEF support. It indicates that, following Brazil's ratification of the CBD in 1994, GEF provided grants to two significant biodiversity projects to support Brazil's compliance with this Convention. The *National Biodiversity Strategy and National Report* project (GEF ID 421), working closely with the *PROBIO* project (GEF ID 58), favored the preparation of Brazil's First Report to the CBD in 1999, and the development of the National Strategy on Biodiversity – which finally allowed the enacting of the National Policy on Biodiversity in 2002. PROBIO also allowed the strengthening of the national institutional biodiversity framework leading to the establishment of the Secretariat on Biodiversity and Forests (SBF) in the Ministry of the Environment in 1999. In other words, the GEF not only supported Brazil's commitments towards the biodiversity international treaty, but also assisted in the establishment of the national biodiversity priorities.

45. GEF support on biodiversity in Brazil began with strategy-oriented projects FUNBIO and PROBIO that set the stage for Brazil to establish its National Conservation Units System (SNUC) and National Biodiversity Policy, just a few years after the GEF support began.

46. With an overall biodiversity strategy in place, GEF support then began to focus on projects that were biome-specific and usually involved conservation units and their surroundings. The *Amazon Region Protected Areas* project (ARPA) (GEF ID 771 and 4085)—the largest of these projects—demonstrates the relevance of GEF support to the creation of strict and sustainable use conservation units in the Amazon, supporting not only Brazil's commitments to the Convention of Biological Diversity, but also supporting Brazil in meeting its current greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions target, which was an unintended impact of the project.

47. GEF support has also been extremely relevant to the establishment of national and state government institutions. Most notably, prior to GEF support in Brazil, there was no Secretariat of Biodiversity in the Ministry of Environment. The *Parana Biodiversity* project (GEF ID 1287) and the *Ecosystem Restoration of Riparian Forests in Sao Paulo* project (GEF ID 2356) were followed by the creation and/or strengthening of departments of biodiversity within each

state environmental secretariat and are currently developing new strategic biodiversity projects in each state.

48. The GEF also supported Brazil in developing its second national report to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Brazil has submitted four reports to the CBD to date and in all reports the GEF biodiversity projects developed in Brazil are clearly highlighted.

Climate Change

49. The GEF has provided highly relevant support to develop Brazil's National Communications to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (GEF ID 337 and 1612), which included the development of a national GHG emission inventory and the identification of national programs and projects for climate change mitigation and adaptation. These National Communications were the basis for the calculation of a national GHG emissions target and the approval of a National Climate Change Policy in 2009.[12] The GEF is also supporting the preparation of the Third National Communication on Climate Change (GEF ID 4299).

50. Other GEF climate change projects in Brazil focused mainly on alternative fuels, energy efficiency, and renewable energy. A significant focus was put on biomass energy, above all in sugar cane biomass. This focus is relevant given that Brazil is not only a large sugar cane producer, but a primary actor in sugar cane research and development. For example, the ROtI of the *Biomass Power Generation* project (GEF ID 338) clearly indicated that GEF support was crucial to compile and enhance knowledge about sugar cane biomass use for energy generation, especially sugar cane leaves that were traditionally burned in the fields prior to harvesting.

51. Brazil's national GHG emissions target is expected to lead future GEF climate change projects to focus on avoided deforestation and restoration of pasturelands, the main sources of emission reductions as planned by the national government. Although GEF has not supported many projects on these subjects as climate change projects, these subjects have been part of projects classified as biodiversity and land degradation projects.

International Waters

52. Since 1997, when Brazil's National Water Policy was established, much has been done to improve institutional capacity for water basin management across the country. GEF support in this focal area started in 1999, one year prior to the creation of the National Water Agency (ANA). Once ANA was created, it became the executing agency of all GEF projects in this focal area. Three projects have been completed—*Sao Francisco* (GEF ID 586), *Pantanal* (GEF ID 583), and *Guarani Aquifer* (GEF ID 974)—and a fourth project is under implementation, *GEF Amazonas* (GEF ID 2364). These GEF projects were an important laboratory for the technical staff of ANA, and also contributed to the creation of several River Basin Management Committees, River Basin Agencies, and State Hydro Resources Secretariats.

[12]Law 12187 (http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2009/lei/l12187.htm).

53. The *São Francisco Integrated Management of Watershed* project (GEF ID 586) was highly relevant to the development of the national sustainable development strategy. The project helped institutional strengthening and capacity building in one of the most complex river basins in Brazil, covering 8% of the national territory and crossing 7 states with a variety of environmental, social and economic configurations. A Strategic Plan and a 10-year Plan for the Sao Francisco Basin were developed by the project, with a revision of the 10-year plan expected to start soon.

Land Degradation

54. Land degradation projects are relatively new in the GEF portfolio, and to date, only two pure land degradation projects and six multifocal projects have been developed in Brazil. GEF land degradation projects started at the time Brazil was launching its National Action Program to Combat Desertification and Mitigate the Effects of Drought (PAN-Brasil). The Plan makes clear references to the *Sao Francisco* project as an important source of information for the subject, despite the classification of this project under the international waters focal area. Thus, despite the small number of projects in this focal area,[13] it seems that projects classified under other focal areas have made relevant contributions to the land degradation agenda.

Persistent Organic Pollutants

55. The first GEF project approved in this focal area in Brazil is for the Development of a National Implementation Plan in Brazil as a First Step to Implement the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (GEF IC 2096). The intention of the project is clearly relevant, as it plans to generate a publication to comply with an international agreement and guide national policy on the subject.

Conclusion 7: GEF support in Brazil is clearly nationally owned and country-driven.

56. The large majority of GEF projects developed in Brazil originated from ideas of Brazilian individuals or institutions. In addition, most projects recognize that the implementing agencies also contributed to the improvement of the original project ideas.

57. For example, all five projects evaluated in greater depth through ROtIs originated from Brazilian institutions, including government institutions, private sector, NGOs, or a combination of these entities. The ARPA project (GEF ID 771 and 4085) originated from a national pledge to achieve the target of at least 10% strict conservation of all forest types in Brazil, while the *São Francisco* project (GEF ID 586) originated from a direct request from the national government for support from the Organization of American States (OAS). The *Parana Biodiversity* project (GEF ID 1287) was conceived by state government entities working together with NGOs. Finally, the *Biomass Power Generation* project (GEF ID 338) was conceived by the Sugar Cane Technology Center (CTC), a private research center supported by sugar cane mills, with support from the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation, as the use of sugar cane

[13] Two projects are classified as land degradation only and three as multi focal. Only two of these projects have been completed in the last two years.

biomass for electricity and ethanol is part of the national government renewable energy strategy.

58. Other projects visited clearly indicate that they are country-driven. For example, the *Ilha Grande Bay* project (GEF ID 3848), which just started, is a combination of local initiatives with a common goal (i.e., sound environmental management of the Ilha Grande Bay in the state of Rio de Janeiro). According to interviews with project participants, many of these local initiatives have not had success in the past. Their expectation is that a coordinated effort will make all of them succeed together.

Conclusion 8: Co-financing levels are generally satisfactory and in line with GEF support and it is clear that this co-financing generates additional global environmental benefits.

59. In Brazil, the amount of co-financing for GEF projects can be considered satisfactory, although it is lower on average than other large recipient countries. GEF projects in Brazil have leveraged 74% in co-financing, while co-financing has averaged 90% in China, 85% in South Africa, and 84% in India. It is important to note that a deeper analysis on the quality of co-financing in the different countries was not performed. Such evaluation could provide insights for the lower percentage of reported co-financing in the Brazilian case.

60. In Brazil, the climate change focal area showed the greatest capacity to leverage funding, having achieved 80% of co-financing over total funding on average, followed by multifocal area projects (77%), international waters (72%), biodiversity (70%), POPs (68%) and, finally, land degradation (60%). Co-financing resources were directed mainly to biodiversity (43%) and climate change (38%) focal areas, as expected since these focal areas represent the bulk of GEF portfolio in Brazil.

61. It was noticed that GEF projects implemented by the World Bank usually present a share of a World Bank loan as co-financing. Sources of co-financing for projects developed by other GEF agencies tend to be more varied.

62. GEF projects in Brazil received co-financing mainly from: the national public sector (41%), national private sector (19%), state-owned or mixed economy companies (17%) and multilateral institutions (9%). This analysis includes all GEF national projects in Brazil and it considers only the co-financing values and sources expected at the project approval dates, and not the effective amounts. Thus, these percentages are still subject to changes.

63. It is interesting to note that among the 13 projects that had data on effective co-financing available at completion[14] the co-financing amount was, on average, 30% lower than initially estimated. Thus, if the level of expected national resources in co-financing is effectively spent by the ongoing projects, this would be an indication of further increasing national interest in GEF projects.

[14] Projects with co-financing at completion data available: GEF 58, 126, 128, 337, 338, 421, 586, 771, 868, 1287, 1642 e 2817.

64. Co-financing is required by the GEF in order to scale up the global environmental benefits generated by project. In Brazil, co-financing has made critical contributions to overall positive project outcomes in some cases, such as for example the *Biomass Power Generation* project (GEF ID 338). Sugar mills made in-kind contributions to this project (machinery, cane plantations, and technical staff support) that allowed extensive field studies to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of harvesting sugar cane leaves for power generation, as well as the optimum harvesting parameters that could lead to a reduction in herbicide use and increased biological activity and water penetration in the soil.

Conclusion 9: The GEF biodiversity portfolio in Brazil contains projects focusing on both sustainable use and strict protection. Whether a project focuses on sustainable use or strict protection appears to be linked more to the density of the surrounding population than biodiversity parameters.

65. The GEF's sizable biodiversity portfolio in Brazil represents projects that focus on both sustainable use and strict protection. It is difficult to determine the share of investments in each of these categories as many projects cover both and biodiversity components are often integrated into multifocal area projects.

66. In general, strict protection is more often realized in areas with lower population density, while sustainable use is pursued in areas with higher population density, and with less apparent concern for biodiversity indicators such as the presence of endemic species.

67. For example, the *ARPA* project (GEF ID 771 and 4085) and the *Establishment of Private Natural Heritage Reserves in the Brazilian Cerrado* project (GEF ID 868) covered less populated areas, with a focus on strict protection areas. In the ARPA project in particular, stakeholders expressed views that the establishment of strict protection areas seems overvalued and often disregards the previous existence of traditional livelihoods in the conservation unit area. This led to the inclusion of sustainable use areas in the conservation units supported by the project.

68. As another example, the *Parana Biodiversity* project (GEF ID 1287), and other similar projects classified as multi-focal or land degradation projects located in more populated areas of the country, indicate that in these areas there is a clear focus on sustainable use of land. In the Parana Biodiversity project there was heavy criticism from NGOs that the project failed to give proper attention to the strict protection of remnants of the Araucaria Forest, although one of the main objectives of the project was the establishment of biological corridors, with sustainable use areas serving as buffer areas for strict protection areas. In fact, the project paid little attention to strict protection, and illegal logging in the Araucaria Forest continues today according to consensus among NGOs and local government staff in environmental and agricultural departments.

69. An exception to the generally observed relationship between population density and the type of biodiversity protection could be the just-started Ilha Grande Bay project (GEF ID 3848), which is working with a mosaic of conservation units that include strict protection areas

either in the ocean (islands) or surrounded by sustainable use areas that serve as a buffer zone for the strict areas, separating these from the more populated areas. Small Grants Projects (SGP) represent another exception, since even in low density areas the focus of these projects has been on sustainable use of biodiversity in the Cerrado, and more recently, in the Caatinga biomes.

Efficiency

Conclusion 10: The GEF project approval process in Brazil is on average shorter than in other countries, but still perceived as too long by stakeholders.

70. GEF projects in Brazil take on average 3 years from pipeline entry to project start, which is long, but still shorter than GEF projects in other countries. Even so, stakeholders perceive the GEF project approval process as too long, when compared to the approval of much larger loans from international institutions. It was not possible, however, to verify this statement against objective data.

71. On the other hand, the same stakeholders see the GEF approval process rather similar to approval processes of other national funds such as FNMA – National Environment Fund, FID – Diffused Interests Fund, and Petrobras grants. Furthermore, the GEF approval process is facilitated by the support of GEF agencies; no similar support is available in the case of national funds.

72. Key stakeholder individual interviews indicated some concern regarding the 2-step national approval (GEF Focal Point approval, followed by National Cooperation Agency - ABC approval in case of UN agencies). Delays related to this 2-step process could be reduced as ABC has indicated the possibility of evaluating projects prior to GEF Focal Point approval. Other interviewees pointed out that GEF approval process seems to have been streamlined considerably in GEF-4 and hope this will shorten project approval time. Stakeholders also expressed confidence that GEF-5 will bring additional efficiency improvements.

73. The portfolio analysis also indicates that GEF projects in Brazil extend their expected completion dates by 3.5 years on average. This seems excessive when compared to other country portfolios analyzed by the GEF Evaluation Office (see annex for details). Average project extension time in those portfolios is 2 years. For Enabling Activities, Brazil portfolio's average extension is 7 years, compared to less than 3 years in other countries with CPEs. Extension of Full Size projects in Brazil averaged 2.5 years, versus only 1.6 years in other countries. On the other hand, extension of Medium Size projects in Brazil averaged less than one year, while other countries extended these projects by approximately 1.5 year.

Conclusion 11: GEF agencies have worked independently from one another, without any clear overall coordination and/or synergies.

74. The evaluation was unable to identify any overall coordination and/or synergies of ongoing efforts among GEF agencies aimed at sharing tasks or coordinating work by focal area and geographic location, as observed in other countries (e.g. in Turkey). Only one GEF project in

Brazil (GEF ID 2941) is being implemented jointly by two GEF Agencies – a possible evidence of lack of synergies between GEF agencies.

75. The portfolio analysis also indicates lack of coordination and/or synergies. Only one focal area, International Waters, is exclusive to a GEF Agency, UNEP. All other focal areas are covered by at least two GEF agencies. The biodiversity and climate change focal areas are each distributed among 4 different GEF agencies. Some implementing agencies have claimed that fees they receive do not encourage synergies between them.

76. The GEF portfolio in Brazil started with only two GEF agencies: World Bank (78%) and UNDP (22%). In GEF-4, there were six GEF agencies working with projects in Brazil: UNDP (33%), World Bank (26%), IDB (17%, including a joint project with UNDP), UNEP (14%), and FAO (11%). These numbers suggest increasing competition between GEF agencies, a trend that would not be restricted to Brazil as indicated by representatives of GEF agencies during interviews.

77. Competition between GEF agencies seems compatible with the nationally-driven nature of Brazil projects. Brazilian institutions may be looking at GEF agencies as service providers, therefore encouraging competition. Also, as already mentioned, a Brazilian institution, FUNBIO, is applying to become a GEF agency, helping to increase competition even further.

Conclusion 12: Coordination among participating entities in concluded and ongoing GEF projects seems generally efficient. Several GEF projects foster collaborations between agricultural and environmental government institutions that were not coordinating with each other before.

78. Participating entities in GEF projects tend to work in a coordinated and collaborative manner in Brazil.

79. In general, GEF projects have succeeded in bringing together government entities, private companies, NGOs, and community associations to work together towards a common goal. At least six international waters and biodiversity[15]national projects (13% of the portfolio) either created or consolidated River Basin Committees, which are constituted by representatives of government, civil society organizations, and water users (usually private entities or state-owned utilities). Projects for the creation or consolidation of conservation units, such as ARPA (GEF ID 771 and 4085) have also been contributing to the creation of local committees to ensure community participation in the management of protected areas.

80. The *Sao Francisco* project (GEF ID 586) is an example of a project that led to the creation of the River Basin Committee, a very significant accomplishment considering the complexity of the Sao Francisco River Basin. This committee includes representatives from federal, state and municipal governments, as well as representatives from local associations, NGOs, academia and the private sector. The *Ilha Grande Bay* project (GEF ID 3848), which is in its early stage of implementation, also succeeded in promoting the creation of a River Basin Committee that had

[15] With international waters components.

failed to be created in three separate past attempts. The project brought a new model for state and local governments to work together that is expected to enhance efficiency of government actions. Similar levels of harmonic interaction were evidenced through the ARPA project (GEF ID 771 and 4085), as the project development at the state level was nearly a mirror of the project development at the federal level. Also, the *Biomass Power Generation* project (GEF ID 338) presented a high level of interaction among institutions. This project was coordinated by the national government (MCTI) and executed by a private research center (CTC) in collaboration with researchers from federal and state universities (UNICAMP, ESALQ, ITA, etc).

81. Even in projects that included historically distant institutions, such coordination was observed. This was more clearly observed in land degradation projects, which usually include environmental and agricultural government entities. Twenty five stakeholders interviewed for these projects in general agree that the GEF project promoted constructive relationships that last beyond project completion and sometimes beyond project boundaries. On the other hand, in most cases, the environmental government branch is often seen as weaker than the agricultural branch, leading to a focus on sustainable use of resources and little attention to biodiversity protection.

Conclusion 13: GEF projects tend to have an above-average M&E process when compared to similar projects funded by national sources. Periodic evaluations are carried out, and there are indications that adaptive management occurs. On the other hand, it has been observed that biodiversity projects consistently ignored biodiversity indicators during project execution.

82. Usually, GEF projects are seen by stakeholders as projects executed in a coordinated manner with proper M&E procedures. Interestingly, such procedures are often adopted by participating entities in other projects whether related or not related to GEF.

83. Although in GEF projects there is a greater effort towards establishing and implementing sound M&E processes, this varies according to project type. In general, full size and medium size projects have Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), Mid-Term Reviews (MTRs) and Terminal Evaluations (TEs). This is not the case for enabling activities, which have no M&E information and no completion reports.

84. There is evidence from ROtI studies that, whenever projects are successful in implementing an M&E system, the project's adaptive capacity is good. The ARPA project (GEF ID 771 e 4085), for example, shows good evidence of adaptive management. The criticisms included in the terminal evaluation of the project's Phase I were clearly taken into consideration in the design of Phase II. The *Parana Biodiversity* project (GEF ID 1287), on the other hand, responded to criticisms received during project implementation in a manner that was perceived by some stakeholders (including top government officials) as deceptive and dismissive of the main aspect of the criticism – i.e., that the project had failed to protect the last best-preserved remnants of Araucaria Forest as initially intended.

85. With respect to monitoring, desk review of all national projects, field visits to four projects with biodiversity component, and interviews with project stakeholders indicate that biodiversity indicators are consistently ignored, even when they represent a significant component of the

project. Several possible explanations have been provided: lack of staff, training, or funding; poorly designed indicators that are difficult to monitor; and lack of knowledge about biodiversity monitoring. Representatives from the Federal Government have also stated that biodiversity monitoring methodologies tend to be expensive, especially due to the fact that they require specialized personnel.

86. Although not yet observed, new projects may be better prepared for biodiversity monitoring since GEF now provides standardized Tracking Tools by focal area.

87. During the final Workshop, it was pointed out that the monitoring process for multifocal projects is very complex. The monitoring of multifocal projects is the sum of the monitoring of each focal area in which the project is involved, instead of an optimized process for this category of project. The complexity of monitoring was regarded as a major disincentive to submission of multifocal projects.

88. In other focal areas, monitoring seems less challenging, as the indicators are better understood by a large number of stakeholders. Nonetheless, some project stakeholders have indicated that they have had difficulty with GEF Tracking Tools - either difficulty in filling out the spreadsheet or difficulty in understanding the relevance of certain indicators.

Conclusion 14: Moving from funding of Brazil's SGP through the programme core resources to a national Full Size Project modality out of the STAR Brazil's allocation has been slow and has shown characteristics of a learning-by-doing process.

89. The SGP upgrading policy issued in November 2009 is new to everyone.[16] There are 10 countries with their SGPs being upgraded,[17] of which six have received the GEF CEO endorsement in the last year. Brazil, Bolivia, and Philippines have had their PIFs (*Project Identification Form*) approved, but they have not submitted their PPGs (*Project Preparation Grant*) yet, while Chile has not yet submitted a PIF. Given the nascence of the upgrading process, it is too early to fully observe benefits, or even difficulties (and opportunities for lesson learning).

90. Some positive expectations are observed. For example, the SGP agency in Brazil (*ISPN – Instituto Sociedade, População e Natureza*) sees potential to improve M&E in the program, as it is included in the Full Size Project for the Small Grants Program in GEF-5. In the previous SGP Operational Phases the agency had to leverage all of resources required for M&E from other sources. If co-financing failed, M&E would suffer the most.

91. On the other hand, the expectation that the upgrade would have allowed greater allocation of resources for the SGP was frustrated with the limit of $ 5 million for GEF-5 imposed by the GEF, even with the interests of all stakeholders in Brazil in presenting a USD 10 million project.

[16] Council document GEF C.36/4.
[17] Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, India, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan, and Philippines.

92. There are also concerns related to allocation of resources per focal area (biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation) and the use of quantitative standardized indicators that some see as irrelevant to measure project success.

93. Nonetheless, there seems to be a general understanding from all parts that the SGP upgrading process in GEF 5 is a learning-by-doing progress for everyone, including the GEF agencies, SGP agency in Brazil, and GEF Secretariat. The real benefits of the upgrade may be more clearly perceived in GEF 6.

Recommendations

To the GEF Council

Recommendation 1: The burden of monitoring requirements for multifocal area projects should be reduced to a level comparable to that of single focal area projects.

94. As already mentioned, several Brazilian national projects present characteristics of multifocal area projects, even if they are not classified as such, either because this wasn't possible at the time the project was designed, or because there was no interest in committing to a perceived overly complex monitoring procedure.

95. A review of the Brazilian suggests that most of the earliest GEF projects in Brazil classified as a single focal area projects also contained objectives relating to other focal areas. All in all, at least eight Full Size Projects and one Medium Size Project classified under a single focal area could have been presented as multifocal projects. This issue is also present in the Small Grants Programme. So far, all SGP projects in Brazil have been classified as biodiversity projects, however, most of them have targeted a wide range of objectives, which would allow them to be classified also under climate change, land degradation or multifocal. During the GEF - 5 phase, the SGP will have to distribute resources between biodiversity, climate change and land degradation, however, this is not expected to change the type of the projects supported under the Small Grants Programme.

96. During the workshop where the preliminary findings of this evaluation were presented, it was pointed out that the submission of multifocal projects was discouraged by the fact that they had to go through the approval of evaluators of all focal areas instead of a single focal area evaluator. According to reports, requests for project´s revisions during the development and review process are more often seen in the case of multifocal projects, which imply more work and may result in further delays to project´s approval. On the other hand, while evaluating the records from the GEF´s Secretariat it was found that the longer time for multifocal project's approval observed during GEF - 3 did not occur during GEF – 4, indicating that multifocal projects are not being penalized with a longer delay in their approval.

97. It was also pointed out that the monitoring process, which is already perceived as a challenge for single focal area projects, is overly complex for multifocal projects. The monitoring of multifocal projects is the sum of the monitoring of each focal area in which the project is

involved, instead of an optimized process for this category of project. The complexity of monitoring was regarded as a major disincentive to submission of multifocal projects.

98. The optimization of monitoring, specifically aimed for multifocal projects, is highly recommended as a way to encourage submission of a greater number of those. Also, the GEF should give special attention to the SGP Full Size Project approval and allow, where possible, some flexibility in monitoring. It is recommended that the monitoring requirements be more flexible, as to allow for innovating solutions which may present other benefits, such as lower cost, easier applicability and greater acceptability, for instance.

99. An example of innovation in monitoring is participatory monitoring, suggested at the final workshop. In this monitoring procedure, local communities are involved in indicators selection, indicators monitoring and/or reporting, often on a voluntary basis. It was sustained that such monitoring has the benefit of engaging the communities in the projects, besides being cheaper, and, often, more effective.

100. The SGP, in particular, is suffering by the fact that it is now required to submit a Full Size multifocal project. This FSP approval has already resulted in a 2 years delay of the Brazilian SGP and the complexity of the imposed monitoring process may also result in a reduction of these project's impacts. The GEF should give special attention to the SGP Full Size Project approval and allow, where possible, some flexibility in monitoring.

Recommendation 2: The GEF should implement a more robust information and knowledge management system to improve exchange of experiences amongst projects within each country and internationally. Such a system could serve as a tool to promote South-South cooperation.

101. A better dissemination of GEF´s project results could encourage the replication of actions and therefore maximize the generation of Global Environmental Benefits (GEB). There are many publications of GEF's projects that end up restricted to a small number of individuals, due to the lack of a more robust information and knowledge management system. Dissemination of the publications by electronic means should be encouraged and promoted by the GEF.

102. A robust information management system – including both broad dissemination and dissemination to target audience - would benefit not only national but also regional and global projects, presently and in the future. The GEF is an institution with a particularly strong potential to promote South-South cooperation, which is not only a Brazilian government's interest but is also in the GEF's mandate to the CBD.

103. Brazil would have much to cooperate with other developing countries, especially through projects involving agricultural technologies that reduce land degradation, generation of renewable electricity (particularly biomass) and satellite monitoring of deforestation of native vegetation. The combination of GEF's effort with the already existing effort of Implementing Agencies and the

Brazil Operational Focal Point to disseminate projects publications,[18] would help realizing such potential.

Recommendation 3: The GEF should promote and encourage exchange of experiences on monitoring and evaluation procedures, which is perceived by many stakeholders as one of the greatest challenges faced by projects.

104. Although the standardized Tracking Tools have been available for several years and are considered by stakeholders as good references, there is great concern that standardized indicators do not capture the most relevant data for project evaluation. Also, many believe that complex and little relevant indicators for project evaluation lead to excessive allocation of funding for monitoring procedures. Proponents frequently commit to a more complex monitoring that will actually be done, in order to get the project's approval. Even when the proponent is effectively committed in doing a more complex monitoring than he is used to , the procedure is often not performed as originally planned due to lack of knowledge, time, and/or funding. The GEF should also develop reports of best practices, where the benefits stemming from complex monitoring procedures are clearly presented, in order to provide incentives to proper implementation of monitoring procedures, as proposed by project at approval. Simultaneously, the GEF should be opened to receive suggestions of new Monitoring and Evaluation procedures developed by projects that may provide equivalent or even better results, at a lower cost than the standard GEF procedures.

105. Finally, the GEF should promote and encourage exchange of experience of M&E procedures among the representatives of the institutions involved in projects execution. This exchange could be done with the support of implementing agencies and national governments, under GEF's guidance.

To Brazil

Recommendation 4: The Brazilian portfolio could explore new sources of financing and support more technology development and market transformation activities in order to induce greater environmental benefits in the long term.

106. Financing in Brazil from private sector sources, particularly from the financial sector seems timid when compared to other countries. Also, there have been few technology development and market innovation projects in the GEF Brazilian Portfolio, although there is no lack of interest and competence for such projects in the country. It is also important to note that, although co-financing levels in Brazil are generally satisfactory, there is a perception amongst many Brazilian stakeholders that co-financing of GEF projects is not incremental. During the workshop where the preliminary findings of this evaluation were presented, stakeholders have highlighted the need to monitor co-financing not only in terms of quantity, but in terms of quality as well. Many defend that incremental funding should be better evaluated than already budgeted funds.

[18] For further details on the publications dissemination by the Brazil Operational Focal Point, please refer to Recommendation 5 below.

107. Brazilian government should value incremental co-financing in national projects, in order to encourage the search of new sources of co-financing.

Recommendation 5: Brazil's GEF Focal Point should promote exchange of experiences between projects implemented by different GEF Agencies.

108. Projects implemented by the same GEF Agency are already encouraged to exchange experiences among themselves. However, interaction between projects from distinct agencies is rare or nonexistent. This interaction should be promoted so that projects can replicate the good practices and maximize the Global Environmental Benefits generated.

109. During the workshop where the preliminary findings of this evaluation were presented, many participants, especially representatives of implementing agencies, expressed interest in exchanging experiences between projects. It was proposed that SEAIN, the GEF's focal point in Brazil, should promote an annual meeting between the implementing agencies of GEF´s projects.

110. The exchange between agencies could also be promoted through a better dissemination over the internet. SEAIN could support the GEF in keeping the webpages to date. In addition, SEAIN could keep a website, in Portuguese, dedicated to GEF´s projects. This website would not only present general information on each project and their key documents but could also indicate the individual websites and contact details of key representatives of each project in the implementing and executing agencies.

111. It should be noted that SEAIN is already studying the possibility of establishing a project information management system together with the implementing agencies. Also, the Access to Information Law (nº 12.527/2011), recently enacted, assures that all public documents, including those related to GEF projects, are publicly available.