



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean
Country (ies):	Brazil
Project Title:	Integrated Management of the Ilha Grande Bay Ecosystem
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/BRA/078/GFF
GEF ID:	3848
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity
Project Executing Partners:	Rio de Janeiro State Institute of Environment (INEA) of the State Environment Agency (SEA)
Project Size (FSP/MSP):	FSP
Project Duration:	5 years

Milestone Dates:

Date of Entry into GEF Work Programme (MM/DD/YYYY):	24 June 2009
GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	15 March 2011
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	31 August 2011
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	29 July 2016 (original NTE)
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	31 March 2019
Actual Implementation End Date³:	31 March 2019

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2,300,000
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	USD 25,050,700

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	USD 2,273,324
Total estimated co-financing as of June 30, 2019⁵	USD 40,642,670

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	23 May 2013
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	MTE completed
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	May 2015
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No (TE completed in Nov 2018)
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	November 2018
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes

⁴ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here..

⁶ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	MS
Overall implementation progress rating:	S
Overall risk rating:	L

Status

Implementation Status (1 st PIR, 2 nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	Final PIR
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

Project Contacts	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Marie Ikemoto, INEA	ikemoto.inea@gmail.com
Lead Technical Officer	Luis Dias Pereira (since March 2016)	luis.DiasPereira@fao.org
Budget Holder	Rafael Zavala, FAO Representative, FAO Representation in Brazil	rafael.zavala@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Climate and Environment Division, CBC	Valeria Gonzalez Riggio, Natural Resources Officer, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit	valeria.gonzalezriggio@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Component 1: Planning, Policy & Institutional Strengthening						
Outcome 1.1. Improved inter-agency coordination in support of Ecosystem – based Management of BIG Ecosystem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> at least 5 inter-agency conflicts identified and agreements reached on common approaches to improve BIG Ecosystem to include at least one agreement reached over the regularization of land use in BIG drainage area. 	Non-existing agreements	At least 2 agreements reached	5 agreements reached	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four Agreements achieved: Agreement 1- Subsidy study on the negative evaluation regarding the expansion of TEBIG (study coordination INEA (SEA), SEDEIS, SEDRAP. Agreement 2- Creation of RDS Adventurer (State Law 6793, May 28, 2014) resulting from the reduction of the REBIO limit of Praia do Sul and the recategorization of the Aventureiro Marine Park. Agreement 3 - New standards for Licensing aquaculture and mariculture. Agreement 4- Inter-institutional agreement with SPU-INEA-MPF for application New standards for the licensing of marinas 	S
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment and operationalization of a regional and municipal GIS. 			GIS developed and at least 10 regional and 8 municipal staff using it, and accessible to public in through INEA website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •BIG Watershed Committee created; •one conflict resolved •Procedures for definition of environmental licensing of BIG marinas legally promulgated by 	S

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
		No-existent GIS	GIS developed and at least 5 regional staff using it		INEA and the Federal Asset Superintendence (SPU) •GIS established and access protocols for INEA's SUPBIG and the municipalities under definition	
Outcome 1.2. Improved policy framework in support of Ecosystem Management principle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 local policies formulated and adopted that address existing policy failures/gaps undermining the "health" of the BIG ecosystem. 	Non-existing studies and policies	2 local policies formulated	4 local policies formulated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coastal Economic and environmental Zoning (ZEEC) was developed until the prognostic phase. However, since most of the efforts of the INEA technical team responsible for implementing the instrument was concentrated on the development of the BIG2050 Initiative, the ZEEC target has been set aside. Moreover, during the electoral year (2018) public consultations are not allowed. The Water Basin Plan has started and is being finalized by the delegated entity hired by INEA on behalf of the WB Committee, according to schedule of the contract. Mariculture policy study has been completed. The Mariculture Standard for Licensing has been approved of the INEA's Council Board of Directors (output 1.3), sanctioned by the State Environmental Council (CONEMA) in August 11, 2015 Standard for licensing marinas (CONEMA standard) approved for the whole RJ state developed by CONEMA for Standard for nautical structures (piers, boat ramp, etc.) 	<p>MS</p> <p>S</p> <p>S</p>

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					(CONEMA standard) approved by CONEMA for the whole RJ state. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decree controlling the discharge of vessel hold water up to 500 tons promulgated by the Environmental Department of the Municipality of Angra dos Reis. 	S
Outcome 1.3. Evidence of increased “mainstreaming” of Ecosystem Based Management principles in SUPBIG and other relevant public and private sector institutions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipal environmental units participating in Forum IEM Municipal commitments to support IEM principles through 2 signed MOUs with INEA 	<p>Non-existence of Forum</p> <p>No MOUs signed</p>	<p>Municipal environmental units participating in Forum IEM</p> <p>One municipality issuing environmental permitting, hence complying with state government criteria of at least 8 specialized Professionals as a condition for decentralization of environmental permitting (with this new requirement, MOU is not needed anymore)</p>	<p>Municipal environmental units participating in Forum IEM</p> <p>Two municipalities issuing environmental permitting and support IEM principles</p>	<p>Two municipalities (Angra dos Reis and Paraty) are participating as members of the CBH BIG Committee</p> <p>Both municipalities (Angra dos Reis and Paraty) complied with criteria for decentralization and started issuing environmental permits in May, 2013 and February 2016, respectively.</p> <p>Municipalities of Angra and Paraty are represented in CBH.</p>	S
Component 2: Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Areas						
Outcome 2.1. Improved integrated management of ecosystems of global importance in the <i>Bocaina</i> Mosaic.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At minimum 4 actions addressing common issues affecting Mosaic UCs agreed to and implemented (e.g., 	No action identified	Target to be determined early Y3	1 comprehensive action addressing overarching weakness of the Mosaic forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A group of public institutions (municipalities, INEA, IBAMA, ICMBio, Environmental Police) acted in at least five joint enforcement operations in the BIG and its Protected Areas. 	MS

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
3	patrolling and enforcement, biodiversity monitoring, etc.) by UCs.				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 meeting on legal matters and establishment of a permanent forum for conflict resolution (MPF) The Strategic Planning of the Bocaina Mosaic, along with the supportive guidance on financial sustainability has been designed to enhance cooperation among management, civil society and communities thriving in or around Pas • The monitoring and incentive mechanisms (BIG initiative), not directly linked to MB, are estimated to have a potential for the forum' participants in proposing and incubating solutions to improve the environmental health of the Mosaic. 	
Outcome 2.2. Improved management effectiveness of existing, participating Conservation Units in BIG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results from PA METT demonstrate an increase on average of 15% in 7 UCs over 5 years. 	Average score is 33%	5% in 7 UCs	15% in 7 UCs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, PA METT results demonstrate an average 18% increase • 70 Park Guards hired to work in five coastal and marine state PAs • An Environmental Police Unit established to work in the prevention and control of environmental crimes in one PA (Ecological Reserve), to where 22 Environmental Police Officials were deployed. • One Private Protected Areas (RPPN) are being established covering approx.60 Ha. 	HS

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators and baseline defined by BIG RADAR are useful tools to measure the quality of relevant components of biodiversity in Pas in the BIG arera, however- it was not possible to monitor the impact of the project on indicator species. 	
Outcome 2.3 Increased abundance of indicator species and diversity of global importance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Species, parameters and values to be determined in PY 1. 	Individual initiatives with weak coordination and no systematic monitoring	Target to be determined early Y3	Species indicator/s and target selected in the framework of the BIG Radar	A BIG ecosystem health monitoring system has been developed based on the assessment of ecosystem services and the elements that impact and exert pressure on them. Hence, a logical tree was defined with more than 40 indicators that include analysis of provision, regulation, cultural and support services. 34 indicators were measured surveyed/collected in the field, including recent ground surveys supported by the project in partnership with the University of Rio de Janeiro.	MS
Component 3: Threat Analysis, Mitigation and Monitoring and Enforcement						
Outcome 3.1. Reduction in pollution loading in BIG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25% reduction in BOD in BIG Ecosystem over life of project. 	High organic load in fresh and coastal waters. Only 44% of Angra dos Reis population with treated sewage. Quantified information on BOD levels not available (to be measured from PY2 on)	Target to be determined early Y3	Analytical method defined and access to data achieved	Sanitization and sewage treatment plans have been finalized in both Municipalities (Angra dos Reis and Paraty) with the latter progressing in its implementation. However, precedence has been given by the Municipalities in the collection and distribution infrastructure, while the construction of sewage treatments units has been started	U

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					recently, hence the target of reduction in BOD is far to be reached, on the contrary it recorded 7% increase. The project had little influence on local managers' decisions.	
Outcome 3.2. Improvement in environmental quality in BIG marinas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written surveys of recreational marina users indicate increased awareness among 50% of users in participating marinas of environmental "best practices" leading to improved environmental quality in BIG. 	Very low (inexistent) awareness of users of best practices, and very low % of marinas legalized (w/ environmental licenses)	Increased awareness among 15% of users, including 20% of marinas with request for environmental licensing submitted to INEA	Increased awareness among 50% of users and 80% of marinas with request for environmental licensing submitted to INEA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thorough analysis of the marina dynamics and actual users carried out by INEA specialists. 2 licenses issued for entrepreneurial marine activities in the BIG region (5% of marinas in BIG).. INEA and the Federal Property Management Superintendence (SPU) agreed on a simplified procedure aimed at regularization of private exploitation of marine public areas 	MS
Component 4: Public Environmental Awareness and Communication						
Outcome 4.1. Increased public awareness and support for the protection and restoration of the BIG ecosystem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 non-project based activities documented in support of BIG project goals and objectives (e.g., NGO campaigns, non-participating community activities). 50% increase public participation and civil society representation in 	<p>NGO interest, however, no specific support to BIG project goals identified</p> <p>Bocaina Mosaic Council includes participation of 1 Traditional Agro-Brazilian Community and indigenous peoples; No existence of a BIG specific forum</p>	<p>1 non-project based activity documented in support of BIG project goals and objectives</p> <p>Three newsletters published. Constantly updated Project's website Four workshops</p>	<p>2 non-project based activity documented</p> <p>-300 local students participating in strategic activities -300 Inhabitants of BIG attending workshops, courses supported by the project -50 env. managers trained</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25 divulgation materials have been produced and spread (5 folders, 20 releases, 5 articles, 3 videos, 20 posts in social media). Initiative material produced- 3 folders, one summary publication (Portuguese, English and Spanish). Enhancement of public awareness through the Environmental Observatory and Incentive Mechanism being established through the LoA with CERTI Foundation: 163 	HS

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	BIG workshops and forums by end of project.		Three courses based on the principles of IEM	-20 different types of information materials and produced 5000 user achieved by spreading	applications in the first call for proposals ("Funnel, BIG Challenge) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiative site - more than 10000 hits (until Jan 2018) • 32 Funnel participants trained • 13 Funnel participants with coaching and mentoring supported. • the solutions supported by the BIG challenge have developed training courses and lectures for at least 60 people, including 30 students. • 12 technical and academics members capacity to RADAR • 15 managers and technical trained in marinas standards and potential impacts (2012) • 150 marinas' proprietors and managers trained in in marinas standards (2012). • CBH capacitation's- more than 70 CBH members trained along the 5 years. • Bocaina Mosaic- more than 100 members trained along the 4 years (until 2015). 	
Outcome 5: Project Management, M& E, and Information Dissemination						
Outcome 5.1. An effectively managed project that achieves its stated objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program activities executed in a timely and cost-effective manner 	Project working plan established at project preparation phase	-Progress reports prepared by the PMU -Financial reports and budget revisions prepared		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has constantly sought and implemented effective strategies to deal with challenges, such as in the case of the design and implementation since July 2016, 	S

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					of the LoA with CERTI (USD ~500K USD), or the recent efforts in fund raising and seeking partnerships	
Outcome 5.2. Project well monitored.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential risks identified and resolved in the early stages 	M&E needs and project risks identified at project preparation phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project monitoring and evaluation functioning -Workshop and participatory M&E 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PMU has eventually applied the M&E system elaborated by the monitoring consultant, along with a sui generis monitoring that is granting detailed and updated information on the state of execution. Some delay was observed in progress reports and a semester report has been missed. 	MS
Outcome 5.3. Evidence that “lessons learned” from the ecosystem-based approach in BIG is being taken up and replicated elsewhere in the state, country and Latin American region.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brazilian BIG experiences cited in the design, preparation and implementation of at least 2 other projects in the country/region 	No experiences from BIG management being taken by other projects in the country/region	Dissemination of project results to other at least 2 projects/programs and to the national technical chamber on integration of “river basin and to coastal zone management” to induce the ecosystem-based approach in other coastal and estuarine systems	At least 2 other projects in the country/region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As agreed with FAO, INEA and the Federal Ministry of Environment, a proposal for integrated management of Bays based on the concepts and principles IEM of the BIG project had been prepared but has not been endorsed by the new Federal Government. - A section on lesson learnt has been included in the booklet issued by INEA in the framework of the LoA with CERTI Foundation 	S

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>Outcome 1.2. Improved policy framework in support of Ecosystem Management principle</p>	<p>The Initiative BIG 2050 is intended as an alternative approach to achieve in the long timespan an expanded framework encompassing not only public sector but also the society, including the private sector. Hence, the key action is to strengthen the three pillars of the Initiative and build up its Governance and a philanthropic fund to support future activities.</p>	<p>INEA and Initiative partners, including FAO and UERJ/CEBIO (University Centre of Oceanic Studies)</p>	<p>Since March 2019 and beyond</p>
<p>Outcome 2.1. Improved integrated management of ecosystems of global importance in the <i>Bocaina</i> Mosaic.</p>	<p>Intensify efforts aimed at encouraging Managers of the Conservation Units and Traditional Communities thriving within and around them to participate in the Initiative</p>	<p>INEA and Initiative partners</p>	<p>March 2019 and beyond</p>
<p>Outcome 2.3 Increased abundance of indicator species and diversity of global importance</p>	<p>The results and influence of the project could not be evaluated in the short timespan of its implementation. Potential positive impacts will be measured in the coming 10-15 years. Thus, BIG RADAR will be conducted to allow for the associated action of the Initiative and positive impacts on local biota, ecosystem productivity and function, and social benefits. The RADAR was designed to be able to adapt and establish an association with sustainable projects and business and other social answer and environmental modifications associated.</p>	<p>INEA, UERJ and partners</p>	<p>March 2019 and beyond</p>
<p>Outcome 3.1. Reduction in pollution loading in BIG</p>	<p>Increase pressure of Municipalities. Run a specific call of the Funnel focussed on ways and technologies to reduce pollution load in rivers, sea</p>	<p>INEA and Initiative partners, FAO</p>	<p>March 2019 and beyond</p>
<p>Outcome 3.2. Improvement in environmental quality in BIG marinas.</p>	<p>Licensing of Marinas is a mandatory task of INEA and it will continue as routine assignment, hence continuing the action to heal the historic passive.</p>	<p>INEA</p>	<p>March 2019 and beyond</p>

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³						Implement. status at PIR 7 (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs	
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR	6 th PIR			
Component 1. Planning, Policy & Institutional Strengthening.										
1.A. Planning Output 1.1. Establishment of a permanent, financially sustainable, public forum composed of representatives of government agencies, private sector and civil society to address issues of common concern that effect the ecological health and productivity of the BIG Ecosystem.	July 2012	Completed		100%	100%		Completed	100%	100%	The forum has been established and gained technical consistency and social participation over the years. However, the work schedule has suffered significant delays and the Water Basin Plan, scheduled for 2015, has begun in 2017 and its elaboration is being finalized in the first semester 2019.

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new output in the table highlighting the variance in the comments section.

¹² As per latest workplan (latest project revision)

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

<p>Output 1.2. Development and adoption of long-term, multiple-phase strategic plan that will safeguard and promote the ecological restoration of the BIG Ecosystem.</p>	<p>March 2019</p>			<p>30%</p>	<p>30%</p>	<p>60% - The LoA for the startup of the BIG Initiative IEM including a control panel of the environmental health status, an Incentive Mechanism and a fund raising action to address the financial sustainability, is also addressing the Governance of the Initiative itself</p>	<p>80% - The IEM concept was developed, as well as the implementation tools - BIG RADAR and CHALLENGE. The first cycle of the Initiative was tested with excellent results, as previously described. However, the aspects related to Governance and fund raising that are the pillars of the future sustainability was not successful until date. CERTI's performance was uneven, showing weaknesses in some work lines. Another issue is related to the complexity of the mechanisms developed that need more development</p>	<p>90% (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The original strategy to deliver this output has been modified, the new target is the full implementation of the IEM mechanism open to the local stakeholders through BIG 2050 Initiative)</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------	--	--	------------	------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

							time and further tests.		
<p>1.B. Policy Output 1.3. 4 policy studies addressing policy gaps/failures contributing to non-sustainable production/economic practices in BIG (one of which will support the creation of a mariculture permitting system).</p>	Dec. 2015			75%	100% - A study has been concluded on the integration of ZEEC (Coastal Economic Zoning) and Watershed Plan (PBH), in tight association with output 1.2. One major output was the draft ToRs for the integrated implementation of ZEEC and PBH in the BIG watershed. Two studies has been conducted by INEA on continental and salt waters fishing production and standard setting for licensing in	100%	<p>100% - In the BIG challenge, there were gaps in the policy and legislation in the territory of the BIG aimed at the conservation of Ecosystem Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment and opportunity of adaptation of the environmental legislation of Angra dos Reis; - Analysis of the regulatory gap applicable to the control of oil discharge by bilge water in Brazil - Need of adaptation of tools for the development of activities in Conservation 	Complete	Due to the change in the project's focus, with the development of the BIG 2050 initiative, policy analysis studies are linked to the social response (involving public policies) to the pressures on ecosystem services, through indicators. These indicators will be improved in future RADAR cycles. Likewise, in the BIG Challenge, gaps in the legislation and public policies have been addressed by some selected proposals.

					<p>partnership with the state federation of fishing (FIPERJ): licensing of mariculture and aquiculture. Based on work supported by the project, INEA submitted to the state environmental council (CONEMA) two proposals on nautical sector standards for licensing of marinas and nautical infrastructure, respectively.</p>		<p>Units s in BIG (for example, production of honey by native bees) - Analysis of the lack of legislation for the regulation of fishing fences (traditional fishing art in the BIG region)</p>		
<p>Output 1.4. Decentralization of environmental permitting procedures to BIG municipalities</p>	<p>Until Sept. 2015, PY5</p>			50%	<p>100% - Angra dos Reis and Paraty municipalities started processing environmental permits</p>	100%	100%	Complete	

1.C. Institutional Strengthening Output 1.5. Increased institutional capacity in INEA, SUPBIG and other relevant public and private sector institutions.	Sept 2016			60%	336% - 6 training courses have been completed (336% of the final target, 336 instead of 100)	100%	300%	Target exceeded	7 full training courses (instead of 6); 498 participants instead of 100.
Component 2: Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Areas									
2.A. Strengthening Bocaina Mosaic Output 2.1. Completion of a Bocaina. mosaic strategy and action plan	May 2016			20%	100%	100%	100%	Complete	The proposed "Adjustments to Mosaic Strategic Planning Bocaina" was completed in May 2016 with the participation of the Joint Coordination of the Bocaina Mosaic. Although the tools and planning tools of Mosaic have been developed, with the support of the project, they are not being implemented. After the withdrawal of support from the Project to the Mosaic, its Council only held two meetings (one in 2016 and another in 2017). No new election was held for the composition of the

									plenary and only one director (of 6) is responding for the Mosaic. There was a series of changes of managers of UCs in the region, internal facts of the Units that weakened the effectivity of that forum. It is a fact that civil society encounters difficulties to participate in the Council.
Output 2.2. Creation of a sustainable financing mechanism that covers operational costs of mosaic executive secretariat and selected UCs.	March 2016			40%	100%. - The Financial Sustainability Plan has been finalized and submitted to the plenary of the BM for approval, at its 35th Special Meeting.	100%	100%	Complete	The study supported by the project has not been used by the MB stakeholders.
2.B. Strengthening of Existing UCs Output 2.3. Preparation/updating of UC management plans	Dec. 2018			60%	75% - During the reporting period, the management plan of the <i>Parque Estadual do Cunhambebe</i>	75%	75%	Ongoing	MP of APA TAMOIOS and PEIG prepared and published in the Official Gazette of the State of Rio de Janeiro in August 2011. The management plan of the Cunhambebe State Park was finalized in 2016. The MP of the Ecological

					(INEA).has been approved				Reserve of Juatinga is stationary due to delays for its recategorization, which according to technical studies will be categorized part as a State Park and part as a Sustainable Development Reserve.
Output 2.4. Increases in UC staff in individual BIG UCs	2014	UC staff increased during Y1		147%	147%	147%	147%	Complete	
2.C. Creation of New and/or Expansion of Existing CUs in BIG Output 2. 5. Expansion of at minimum 1 UC representing no less than 24,000 ha beyond the base UC area.	Dec. 2018			60%	60%	60%	100%	Ongoing	Extension of the PEIG area in 6,472 ha (from 5,600 to 12,072 ha) and recategorization of the REJ and Paraty Mirim State Recreation Area which provides for an increase in the protected area
Output 2.6. Creation of at minimum of 1 new marine UC in BIG.	Dec. 2018			10%	No progress in the reporting period	No progress – 10%	50%	50%	No new marine PA has been created, however the Marine Paraty Municipal protected area is in the process of redefining its limits, adding a substantial marine area and fragile ecosystems such as mangroves. Currently the council was set up,

									the INEA support in the studies of redefinition of the limits and is in the stage of negotiation with local actors for the definition of the area.
Component 3: Threat Analysis, Mitigation and Monitoring and Enforcement									
3.A. Threat Analysis and Mitigation	Dec. 2015			50%	100% - Paraty and Angra dos Reis municipalities completed their sanitation plans 0% Sewage infrastructure not implemented	100% - Paraty and Angra dos Reis municipalities completed their sanitation plans 0% Sewage infrastructure not implemented	55% (average of preparation and implementation) Both plans have been elaborated. In Paraty Municipality, the sanitation network is being managed through an agreement with the Water Agency of Paraty, which in four years of operation built 30 thousand meters of water network. There are 5,388 standardized connections, representing 68% of the hydrometric connections. Sewage	Complete	.
Output 3.1 Preparation and implementation of municipal waste water pollution plans in 2 BIG municipalities (one that includes Ilha Grande).									

							connections (collection and treatment network) are in the implementation phase		
Output 3.2 Blue Flag certification awarded in at minimum one BIG marina.	Dec. 2018			90%	90% - Environmental standards for Marinas in BIG legally promulgated	95%	100% 4 licenses issued for entrepreneurial marine activities in the BIG region (10% of marinas in BIG).	Complete	One blue flag certification realized: Costamela Marina (see: http://www.marinacostabella.com.br/blue-flag.php and http://www.marinacostabella.com.br/certificado-marina-costabella-2013-2014.pdf)
3.B. Monitoring and Enforcement <i>Output 3.3 Development of dynamic computer model representing BIG Ecosystem structure and processes.</i>	Jan. 2016			0%	100% - Cartographic package finished and delivered to the Municipalities.	100%	In addition to the cartographic base developed by INEA (including ZEEC), the BIG RADAR has been designed to aggregate new physical, chemical, biological and social parameters, that provide strong elements for decision making.	Complete	The original output has been changed into the build-up of the BIG RADAR

Output 3.4 Development and implementation of an environmental quality monitoring program in BIG that includes adoption of biological indicators	By Dec. 2018			70%	75%	85%	100% BIG RADAR developed and undergoing further improvement	Ongoing	The environmental water monitoring campaign led by INEA is ongoing, the integration with other entities performing similar actions is being worked out through the "RADAR" (virtual monitoring system being developed in the framework of the LoA with Certi Foundation). The ToRs of the 30 year monitoring system of an important area within the BIG region has not been elaborated yet.
Component 4: Public Awareness and Communication									
4.A. Public Awareness Strategy						100%	100%	Completed	
Output 4.1. PA & Communication Strategy	June 2012	<i>Completed</i>		100%	100%				
Output 4.2. Strategy Implemented.	By Dec. 2018			30%	60%	80%	100%	Ongoing	The BIG initiative had a work plan attached to the communication that was completed for the first cycle. The development of other communication activities that were not foreseen in the original

									proposal of the communication strategy of the Project is being elaborated.
Component 5: Project Management, M&E and Knowledge Management									
5.A Project Management									
Output 5.1. Project Coordination Unit (UGP) created to manage and coordinate GEF supported activities	Continuou s								
5.B. Monitoring and Evaluation	Continuo us				Monitoring capacity in place at the PMU				
Output 5.2. INEA/SUPBIG's M&E capacity strengthened to supervise GEF supported activities								Ongoing	
5.C Knowledge Management	By Dec.2018			20%	60% - Webpage established. Information material produced (website, newsletter, radio interviews, themes published on the Internet).	80%	80%	80%	It was not possible to exchange experience because no similar initiative was found that could be meaningful for exchange and learning purposes, also due to the limited human resources available in the PMU
Output 5.3. Knowledge management system established and implemented									

					Presentation of the project results at the meeting of MMA and other two congress: GIAL and CONMAR.				
--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

Max 200 words:

The project entered the last fiscal year having achieved most outcomes under the full control of the national executing partner INEA, and the further and last two six month extensions have been requested to consolidate the Initiative BIG 2050. The efforts brought about have been: completing a second cycle of ground surveys of environmental indicators to feed the monitoring system RADAR, and to build up the foundation of a sound fund raising mechanism through a LoA with a charity foundation specialized in crowdfunding of Philanthropic Funds (FF) and the Social and Environmental Revolving Funds (FSR).

In parallel, the project has promoted a smooth legal enabling environment for the build-up of the governance of the Initiative by drafting the MoU between the founding partners of the future Assembly and Council and expanded the pool of potential R&D and financial partners. PMU has also coordinated an ambitious project proposal under a call of the oil giant Petrobras combining the concepts of the Initiative with education and dissemination of good practices. Moreover, a project proposal has been submitted to the Federal Ministry of Environment aimed at disseminating the lessons learnt by the project at national scale in selected bays and coastal areas.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

Max 200 words:

The economic and political situation in the Rio de Janeiro has not been conducive for enhanced engagement by the public sector and for the local municipal administrations. In such context, the failure of raising funding from public and/or private sources to fuel a second and third cycle of the incentive mechanism (BIG challenge) and support further consolidation of the RADAR may have a negative effect on the momentum created between 2017 and 2018, and freeze the enthusiasm spread within the local civil society around the Initiative.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator			Mandatory Ratings/Comments
Budget Holder	MS	S	The national executing partner has been successful in advancing in the consolidation of the continuity /exit strategy designed and tested in the previous two years, showing protagonism and dynamism quite uncommon in public institutions.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	MS	S	Great effort has been put into ensuring the sustainability of the main legacy of the project in the long run. The national executing partner showed strong ownership of the project and strong capacity and motivation to find solutions that enable the continuation of the main project initiative.
CBC-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	S	Despite several project extensions (low efficiency), the project has achieved most of its revised outcomes (adequate effectiveness).

¹⁵ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

3. Risks

Please indicate in the Table below the risks and what measures/actions will be taken with respect to risks rated **Substantial** or **High** and who is responsible to for taking action. Please note that this table should include risks originally identified in the project document and any additional risks faced in the reporting period or anticipated risks in the near future.

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
L	It is still valid. In fact no negative social or environmental impacts gave been verified.

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risks ratings

RISKS TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation.</i>

¹⁸ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Lack of close cooperation among participating INEA Departments	L	NA	NA	Most INEA units contributing with the delivery of outputs of the Initiative are now under the same supervision of the Biodiversity Department
2	Financial resources mobilised by the Incentive Mechanism insufficient to cover the demands	M	Intensifying networking and lobbying for approaching new resource partners	Application for a new call for proposals, deeper negotiations with core potential resource partners Boticario, Sitawi	The result of the Call by the Socio-environmental fund of the Oil giant Petrobras was not positive, other opportunities are now in advanced stage of negotiation (Boticario and other funds)
3	Political interference jeopardizing the independent operation of the Radar (Observatory) and the Incentive Mechanisms	L	Communication with prospective resource partners	Ongoing	The preliminary cycle of operations of the BIG Initiative shows that investors, relevant CSOs and the private sector at large are interested in an independent and authoritative Mechanism

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.

	Risk	Risk rating¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Slow Uptake of Policy Recommendations. This risk is associated with the degree to which policy studies and recommendations in support of ecosystem management generally and biodiversity conservation specifically can be “mainstreamed” into municipal and state policy frameworks.	L	Political lobbying with high level decision makers at State and Municipal level	Ongoing	After project closure in March 2019 there have been scant communication between PTF and former PMU
5	The delays in the delivery impair the achievement of the project’s environmental and development goals by the actual NTE	L	Final project extension requested in November 2018	NTE extended	NTE extension has been submitted and granted for a final NTE at 31 of March, 2019

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
L	L	INEA and the PMU are coping with the new challenges and reporting good preliminary results in the partnership and governance building, along with fund raising. The risks of the new approach to achieve the development and environmental project goals are lower now than as they were in the original conception, in a situation of financial crisis and political instability in the Rio de Janeiro State.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, since the last PIR²¹

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcome Targets or Indicators		
Project Outputs		<p>A review of the Logical Framework was carried out in 2014 and adjustments were made taking into account the changes occurred in the implementation context since the project formulation (six years before). The changes were endorsed by the Independent Mid-term Evaluation.</p> <p>Under Component 3, Output 3.4, a new activity has been added upon request of the national executing partner, namely the elaboration, through a consultation service contract, of the Terms of Reference of the forthcoming environmental monitoring of the area of influence of the Angra 2 nuclear plant, which overlaps 100% with the project area.</p>

²¹ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Major adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be pre-cleared by the GEF Unit, then approved by the whole Project task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the GEF Unit, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: July 2016 Revised NTE: March 30, 2019</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>The project has been extended several time until the eventual NTE of March 31, 2019, while the original one was July, 2016.</p> <p>The main reasons for the adjustments are related to the change of strategy to achieve the development and environmental objectives. The new vision of the Initiative BIG 2050 implied a large package of new tasks and deliverable, which PMU, FAO and INEA decided to include in a very ample and ambitious LoA with a innovatin foundation (CERTI). Since the beginning it was clear that CERTI was not sufficiently equipped and skilled to cope with all front of work, and its difficulty has caused a sequence of delays in delivery which obliged to extend the duration of the LoA, hence of the project as a whole.</p> <p>Since CERTI was eventually not able to release acceptable products in all fronts, it was agreed to PMU to take up some of them, while the very specialist task of fund raising and relative administrative and legal architecture of a future stand-alone Governance mechanism did need a qualified input. The LoA with SITAWI responded to the need, but again it caused the request of the last two timeframe extensions.</p>

5 Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)

At the elaboration and Project inception, the gender dimension was not raised, hence no gender-sensitive M&E tool has been devised. However, all project senior staff at INEA has been of women, and the rate of women vs. men in training and other activities has been balanced. At least 50% of the winners of the Challenge call were women. Were the support to the Bocaina Mosaic had been fruitful, there would have been chances to promote gender oriented activities to promote equal opportunities of women in accessing natural resources within and around the PAs.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

No prevision of work with indigenous peoples has been foreseen and performed.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

List of stakeholders

Category

Engagement mechanism

INEA	State Government	Plan, Coordination, information, consultation and participation in decision making.
State Secretariat for the Environment (RJ)	State Government	Consultation and participation in decision making.
UERJ (Rio de Janeiro State University)	Academic & research institutions	Consultation and participation (RADAR) engagement for INITIATIVE continuation projects
UFRJ (Rio de Janeiro Federal University)	Academic & research institutions	Consultation and participation (RADAR)
Ilha Grande Mariculture Association	Mariculture Organization	Information, consultation and participation (RADAR)
FIPERJ (State Federation of Fishing)	State Government	Consultation and participation (RADAR)
ESEC Tamoios of the Chico Mendez Inst. of Biodiversity	Federal Government	Information, consultation and participation (RADAR)
CERTI Foundation	Non-profit R&D Foundation	LoA
13 start-up micro and small enterprises selected in the framework of the “Funnel” mechanism	Micro envir. Entrepreneurs	PSA contracts for the initial development of solutions to solve environmental issues of the Ilha Grande Bay
Fundação Grupo Boticario	Non-profit R&D Foundation	Engagement for INITIATIVE continuation projects
IPEMAR- Instituto de Pesquisas Marinhas, Arquitetura e Recursos Renováveis	Non-profit R&D Foundation	Consultation and participation (RADAR) and engagement for INITIATIVE continuation projects
Ministry of the Environment	Federal Government	Consultation and participation (RADAR) and engagement for INITIATIVE continuation projects

8. Knowledge Management Activities

of a dedicated webpage under the URL of the national executing partner, the information and innovation generated was nearly undisclosed even to close partners in the academy and the civil society at large.

A substantial improvement has come through the LoA with CERTI, which was bound to upload all past documentation and of course all the novel deliverables produced under the contract terms. Especially notable was the launch of the first version of the RADAR, an internet-based platform fed by a high number of indicators and relative values capable of producing, through an original algorithm, a synthetic index of the health status of the project area (Ilha Grande Bay).

Another leap forward enhanced production and dissemination of information and data produced by the project has been stimulated by the competitive incentive mechanism tagged Challenge. The “BIG challenge”, one of the three arms of the Initiative BIG 2050, has been a cradle of grassroots innovation, sometimes ready for commercial exploitation and/or social dissemination. A few examples:

Bruno’s simple and cheap device to separate fuel oil from the cooling water of the engines of boats below 500 Tons (deregulated) has been adopted by the Angra Municipality. More than 10 thousands touristic boats will be obliged to mount this kind of device, whose commercial production has been already started.

Livia has developed, with a business coaching promoted by the project, a protocol of large scale processing of a common alga used as key ingredient of many cosmetics. The advantage of her novel method is that the fresh, watery algae are used instead of the dehydrated ones, with an extraordinary gain in terms of time and space, hence of production costs. Her cream based on her original receipt is already available on the local market, while patenting and large-scale production are being filed and prepared.

Julio has developed a floating set of digital thermometers transmitting the water temperatures at three depths in real time to the associated sea farmers who will alerted in minutes on the situation, hence saving high value sea fruits from decline or death due to sudden temperature changes.

Sato, a professor at the local campus of the University of Rio de Janeiro, has developed a participative social technology of water management at community level in partnership with the public water agency.

- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

FOLLOWS BELOW

BOLETIM ÁGUAS & TERRITÓRIO

<http://www.inea.rj.gov.br/publicacoes/publicacoes-inea/boletim-aguas-e-territorio/>

☐ Boletim nº 6 - Projeto BIG

☐ Boletim nº 3 - Zoneamento Ecológico-Econômico Costeiro do Estado do Rio de Janeiro

LIVRO DIAGNÓSTICO DO SETOR COSTEIRO DA BAÍA DA ILHA GRANDE: SUBSÍDIOS À ELABORAÇÃO DO ZONEAMENTO ECOLÓGICO-ECONÔMICO COSTEIRO – VOLUME I

www.inea.rj.gov.br/cs/groups/public/documents/document/zwew/mdc4/~edisp/inea0078337.pdf

LIVRO INICIATIVA BIG 2050

<http://www.inea.rj.gov.br/publicacoes/publicacoes-inea/livros/>

PORTAL INICIATIVA BIG 2050

www.inea.rj.gov.br/iniciativabig2050

PÁGINA INSTITUCIONAL GERCO/INEA

<http://www.inea.rj.gov.br/biodiversidade-territorio/gerenciamento-costeiro/>

PORTAL GEOINEA (Disponibilização de informações geoespaciais)

www.inea.rj.gov.br/portalgoinea

- Aba *PROJETOS ESTRATÉGICOS* >> item *APRESENTAÇÃO* >> subitem *ZONEAMENTO ECOLÓGICO-ECONÔMICO DO SETOR COSTEIRO DA BAÍA DA ILHA GRANDE*
- Aba *PROJETOS ESTRATÉGICOS* >> item *VISUALIZADOR DE CAMADAS: PROJETOS ESTRATÉGICOS* >> subitem *ZONEAMENTO ECOLÓGICO-ECONÔMICO COSTEIRO – INEA*
- Aba *PROJETOS ESTRATÉGICOS* >> item *VISUALIZADOR DE CAMADAS: PROJETOS ESTRATÉGICOS* >> subitem *PROJETO BIG2050*

Sources of Co-financing ²² of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁴	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 March 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
State Government RJ	INEA and State Secretary of	Grant	11,000,000	14,165,970	N/A	14,598,402

²² Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

²³ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Other.

²⁴ Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other.

	the Environment					
State Government RJ	INEA	In kind	0	550,000	N/A	735,135
State Government RJ	IABD/ State Government	Loan	0	7,500,000	N/A	7,500,000
State Government RJ	INEA	Other	0	76,000	N/A	76,000
Federal Government	Ministry of Fisheries and Aquaculture	Grant	0	550,000	N/A	550,000
Municipality Paraty	Municipality Paraty	Grant	10,000,000	150,000	N/A	10,000,000
Municipality Angra	Municipality Angra	Grant	4,000,000	17,600,000	N/A	17,600,000
GEF Agency	FAO	In kind	50,700	50,700	N/A	50,700
		TOTAL	25,050,700	40,642,670		51,110,238