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**IMPORTANT: The reporting period is GEF Fiscal Year (July 1st, 2020 to June 30th, 2021)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION** | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| **Project Name:** | Capacity Building and Institutional Strengthening on the National Framework for Access and Benefit Sharing under the Nagoya Protocol | | | | | |
| **Project’s GEF ID:** | 5760 | **Project’s IDB ID:** | BR-T1304 | **Overall Stage:** | Disbursing (From eligibility until all the Operations are closed) | |
| **Country/ies:** | Brazil | | | | | |
| **GEF Focal Area:** | Biodiversity | | | | | |
| **Executing Agency:** | UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM | | | | | |
| **Project Finance:** | Total disbursements of GEF Grant resources as of end of June 30th, 2021 (cumulative) | | | | | US$1,340,403.05 |
| **Project Dates:** | Date of First Disbursement | | | | | 8/15/2018 |
| Agency Approval Date | | | | | 5/18/2017 |
| Effectiveness (Start) Date | | | | | 11/8/2017 |
| Original Last Disbursement Expiration Date[[1]](#footnote-1) (OED) | | | | | 3/8/2022 |
| Current CED | | | | | 3/8/2022 |
| Estimated Operational Close Date[[2]](#footnote-2) (EOC) | | | | | 6/6/2022 |
| Actual Date of EOC, if applicable | | | | |  |
| **Project Evaluation:** | Mid-term Date (Expected) | | | | | 8/10/2021 |
| Terminal evaluation Date (Expected) | | | | | 6/8/2022 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE RATING (DO) & ASSESSMENT** | | |
| Make an overall assessment and provide a rating[[3]](#footnote-3) of “likelihood of achieving project objective” during the period (2020-2021). Describe any significant environmental or other changes attributable to project implementation. | | |
| **Project Objective:** Support Brazil implement a clear, robust, and transparent national legal and regulatory framework, the governance and institutional capacity necessary to manage the access and benefit sharing of genetic resources (ABS) and associated traditional knowledge (ATK) and improve knowledge of providers and users of such resources, enabling Brazil to fulfill the ABS provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Nagoya Protocol. | | |
| OVERALL ASSESSMENT (DO) | PREVIOUS RATING | NEW RATING |
| Overall performance by the Project is considered Moderately Unsatisfactory. Despite 2020/2021 being challenging years, due to the severe impacts of Covid-19 pandemic in Brazil, which strongly impacted the implementation, particularly of components 1 and 3, governance issues persisted and constant structural changes in the Ministry of Environment (MMA), resulted in further delays considering the time required for new teams and management to be up to speed and, mainly, changes in directives for the project execution with impacts on ongoing processes, cancelation of contracts and product analysis. As reported for the last reporting cycle, components 1 and 2 presented good progress with the development of the National System for the Management of Genetic Heritage and Associated Traditional Knowledge (SisGen), under component 2, which was crucial in creating the enabling conditions for Congress´ ratification of the Nagoya Protocol in July 2020. The new guidelines changes by the Ministry and successive cancellations of the Work Plan monitoring and planning meetings, including the Tripartite Meeting (Management Committee), which should have been held on December 2020 but, after several attempts, only took place on June 2021. As detailed on the status update tab, after a series of cancelation of ongoing and planned contracts for the progress of activities, planning for 2021 was only resumed in March 2021, with the involvement of UNDP and IDB's senior management along with senior representatives of the Ministry. Despite the constant effort to resume the execution, only in June 2021, after more than three Work Plan proposals were discussed, the Ministry presented a proposal for changes, during the tripartite meeting held on June 24, which was formalized through letter 2837/MMA/2021, June 25, sent to the IDB with a copy to the executing agency (UNDP). The official letter presents the justifications for the proposed changes, but does include a detailed Work Plan, which the Ministry informed that it would be sent by July. In this sense, many of the Project's activities are paralyzed, and the validity of the proposed changes by the Ministry and its impacts to the goals of the project can only be properly analyzed by the executing agency and the Bank when the new Work Plan is sent by the Ministry. | MS | MU |

|  |
| --- |
| **PROJECT STATUS** **UPDATE** |
|  |
| As recorded in the previous reporting cycle, in addition to the challenges related to the COVID-19 Pandemic which directly affected training and other field activities, a new slowdown was registered in the implementation of the Project, starting in the second half of 2020, due to a new restructuring experienced by the Ministry of the Environment (MMA) by Decree No. 10,455, of August 11, 2020.  Although the Project had shown very important progress during the first half of 2020, the Ministry signaled interest in making changes to the Project Work Plan (project execution plan) and requested the cancellation of ongoing processes and contracts. It is worth mentioning that those contracts were planned and carried out in partnership with the Ministry, in all stages of the contracting processes (preparation of Term of References, evaluation of proposals and selection of contractors). The Ministry informed that the cancellations, as well as the changes to be proposed to the Work Plan for 2021, aim to align the Project with the current expectations and priorities of the Ministry in Brazil. As detailed bellow, at this moment, the definition about the changes to the project execution plan, as proposed by the MMA, including the extension of the project execution period, has not been reached. Once the detailed technical information about the proposal is shared with the Bank, it will be analyzed, and a decision is expected during the third quarter of 2021. If an extension is granted, it will be reflected in the updated version of the results matrix, to be presented during the next reporting cycle and in PIR 2022.  The execution of Project activities was substantially impacted by the lack of detailed work plan that could allow for the continuation of the execution. This resulted in delays in the analysis of project outputs, the need of having many follow-up meetings on the status of contracts and the definition of the Work Plan, an exercise that had beginning in October 2020. The executing agency and IDB have continuously offered their support to the Ministry in the revision of the Work and Procurement Plans within the Project objectives and goals; as well as in the monitoring and suggestion of proposals for the mitigation of impacts related to the cancellation of contracts, with aiming at achieving the Project expected results.  The UNDP team presented to the new Ministry team the Project's details and status in October 2020 to support the preparation of the Project Work Plan proposal. In addition, on December 30, 2020, UNDP prepared a proposal for a Work Plan consolidating the strategies that had already been discussed in previous meetings with the Department of Genetic Heritage (DPG-MMA). However, as mentioned, the planning exercise for 2021 could not be completed in December. The Ministry informed that it was working internally on the new Execution Plan to be presented to the UNDP and later submitted for analysis to the Bank. Planning for the year 2021 was only resumed in March 2021, with the involvement of UNDP and IDB's senior management along with senior representatives of the Ministry.  In June 2021, after different draft Work Plan proposals were discussed, the Ministry presented a proposal for changes, later included in letter 2837/MMA/2021. The aforementioned letter presents a general justification and requests a 18-month period of extension for the proposed changes. The Ministry informed that a detailed Work Plan and justification within the Project objectives and goals were under preparation and would be sent by the end of July. During a meeting among representatives of UNDP, IDB, MMA and Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC), in June, it was emphasized that the presentation of the activities/inputs details and their relation to the project objectives, goals and outcomes is key for the analysis of the proposal. The feasibility and risks analysis of this new work plan, including the proposed extension, will be conducted by the executing agency (UNDP) and revised by the Bank as soon as the plan and its technical background is sent by the Ministry.  Considering that the TC’s current execution period ends in November 2021, a viable work plan by the Ministry and a project extension to execute this plan will be required for the project goals to be achieved. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING (IP) & ASSESSMENT** | | |
| Insert here an assessment and provide ratings[[4]](#footnote-4) of overall Implementation Progress, including information on progress, challenges and outcomes on project implementation activities from July 1st, 2020, until June 30th, 2021. As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19. | | |
| OVERALL ASSESSMENT (IP) | PREVIOUS RATING | NEW RATING |
| Implementation Progress is considered Unsatisfactory. Although the Nagoya Protocol was ratified by Congress and the development of management systems supported by the Project played a role, activities were hampered by governance and capacity issues. Alongside the impacts of Covid-19 pandemic, changes in Ministry structure and new guidelines for the execution of the project led to a significant delay of the planned activities. Despite the efforts to keep the ongoing activities, loss of institutional memory, and a steep learning curve for the incoming team of the Ministry resulted in further delays. Under Brazilian new government guidelines, the Ministry requested the cancelation of several ongoing process and contracts, despite the warnings by the executing agency (UNDP), IDB and the Mid-Term Evaluation of the negative impacts that those cancellations would have for the project goals. Only in June 2021, the MMA presented a proposal for changes, during the tripartite meeting held on June 24, which was formalized through official letter 2837/MMA/2021, of June 25, sent to IDB, The official letter presents some briefly justification for the changes in the Work Plan for 2021/2022, requests a 18- month period of extension for the project, but lack the detailed information of the execution plan and, therefore, could not yet be analyzed in the light of impacts on the goals of the project. The Ministry confirmed that the detailed Work Plan is being formulated but recent changes of the Ministry and the Director's board have once again delayed this delivery. In this sense, many of the Project's activities are paralyzed, and the validity of the proposed changes by the Ministry and its impacts to the goals of the project can only be further analyzed by the EA and the Bank when the new Work Plan is sent by the Ministry. | MU | U |

|  |
| --- |
| **RISK RATING & ASSESSMENT** |
| Make any adjustments necessary to the assessment ratings[[5]](#footnote-5) of overall Project Risk[[6]](#footnote-6) that you provided in the last PIR (2019-2020). Please include details and remedial measures for High and Substantial Risks, specifying who will be responsible for these measures. |

| OVERALL ASSESSMENT (RISK) | PREVIOUS RATING | NEW RATING |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Risks to the project achieving its results are substantial and stem basically from lack of ownership at the Brazilian Ministry of the Environment. Recent progress, especially with the ratification of the Nagoya Protocol results from congressional efforts to mitigate the negative impacts of Brazil´s environmental policy, especially vis-a-vis international public opinion and investors. It is of public domain that the empowerment of local communities and indigenous peoples is fundamentally against the grain of the current administration perspective on the use of natural resources and rights of minorities. Also, constant changes in management at SBio/MMA led to a redirection of the (Genetic Heritage Department) DPG/MMA technicians, with the removal of the team that worked on the Project. The Government's guidelines for Indigenous Peoples demonstrate that they can be responsible for the misalignment between what was planned in the Project and the intentions for 2021 onwards, as the requests for cancellations are also accompanied by an intention to reallocate resources and propose a new Work Plan. | S | S |

|  |
| --- |
| **STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT** |
| Please add information on any progress, challenges, and outcomes with regards to stakeholder engagement, based on the project’s activities during its implementation through the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year. As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19. |
| The project was designed to ensure the engagement and participation of all parties involved in the construction of the regulatory framework for benefit-sharing. In addition to training and capacity building in the tools, frameworks and systems of the process, the project provided for the collaborative participation of traditional knowledge providers and producers through the development of community protocols (output indicator 3.5) and a pedagogical plan (output indicator 3.4) aimed at indigenous peoples and traditional communities, pointing out detailed strategies to address their peculiarities and specific demands of each different group.  **Recommendations:**   * Ensure that the challenges and new measures proposed by the Ministry are adequate and satisfactorily include and engage the most vulnerable stakeholders, especially representatives of different indigenous peoples, traditional communities, and other traditional knowledge providers. |

|  |
| --- |
| **GENDER** |
| Please add information on any progress, challenges, and outcomes with regards to any and all gender-responsive measures that were undertaken in the project’s activities during the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year. Also: Were indicators on gender equality and women’s empowerment incorporated in the project’s results framework? (Yes/No). If applicable, include the indicator with its baseline, target, and current value (2020-2021). |
| The project supports the access mechanisms, protection and sharing the benefits produced using genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge. Although the project's original design did not have gender-specific indicators, it incorporates the concern around promoting equal participation of men and women in the project activities, mainly the training processes.  As such, institutional capacity-building and other training initiatives (outputs 1.1, 1.3, 3.1) have been monitored, recording gender of participants in meeting minutes and attendance list of participants.  Up until now, of a total of 464 representatives from Academy, Government and Private Sector trained, 51% were men and 49% women.  For representatives of Traditional Communities and Indigenous People, out of 37 people trained, approximately 60% were men and 40% women.  The project will support and continue to monitor and promote equal participation of men and women for future training activities.  **Recommendations:**   * Continue monitoring that gender initiatives reach equally men and women, especially women representatives from indigenous peoples, traditional communities, and small rural producers. * Promote and encourage and increase the adhesion of these groups to the project's initiatives. * For new initiatives, include gender indicators for monitoring results. |

|  |
| --- |
| **KNOWLEDGE** |
| Please add information on knowledge activities and products developed in relation to the project (with GEF or non-GEF resources), with special emphasis on activities carried out during the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year. As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19. |
| Due to the nature of the project, components 1 and 3 are specifically focused on disseminating knowledge and information, as well as on training representatives of the various actors involved in the various stages of the thematic benefit-sharing arising from genetic heritage or associated traditional knowledge in Brazil.  As reported for the 2020 TCM cycle, several training cycles were carried out for the purpose of harmonizing and standardizing procedures for Project's target audiences, such as Academy, Productive Sector and Law Operators (Output indicators 1.1, 1.3, 3.1). A total of 464 people of this audiences were trained in training/events carried out by the Project so far, already exceeding the total target established. In 2020/2021, due to the State of Emergency in Public Health of National Importance (ESPN) by the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, and by determinations of the MMA, the planned in-person training activities related to the harmonization of sectors with the law ABS and the Nagoya Protocol were postponed until the situation improves.  For providers of traditional knowledge (PICTAFs), in 2020, due to the limitations of the pandemic, only 1 exclusive workshop for PICTAFs was carried out, with the participation of a total of 12 people being trained.  Considering the 25 PICTAFs trained in 2019/2020, a total 37 people were trained so far.  In addition, the project plans to prepare specific manuals for each stakeholder group (Output indicator 3.,3), to be included in the ABS Brazil Booklet, as presented as a new action by the MMA to compose the Work Plan for 2021/2022.  As for the ABS/Biodiversity Portal planned (Output 2.1), the Ministry informed that all data and information related to the ABS agenda in Brazil will be included on the Ministry of the Environment website, which is the Ministry's official channel for disseminating this information. The Ministry also informed that the website will contain the same information provided for the ABS Portal, adding to the CBD's Information Intermediation Center on Access and Benefit Sharing ("ABS Clearing House”). It also noted that it will be possible for the Ministry to count and register the number of accesses/consultations to genetic heritage information, for further report of this indicator.  **Recommendations:**  Ensure that the new activities and work plan to be agreed on are adequate and satisfactorily meet the goals related to the dissemination of knowledge to the most vulnerable stakeholders, especially representatives of different indigenous peoples and traditional communities. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROJECT MODIFICATIONS** | | | |
| Please report any significant modifications made to the project design since July 1st, 2020. (The basis for comparison is the Project Results Framework Matrix included in the original Request for CEO Endorsement Document.) This should be based on the Project Results Framework Matrix included in the original Request for CEO Endorsement Document. | | | |
| CATEGORY | YES/NO | APPROVED BY | DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE AND EXPLANATION |
| Objective | No |  |  |
| Outcome | No |  |  |
| Output/Activities | No |  |  |
| Other | No |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **extensionS or other modificationS** |
| Has the project been granted any extension or other modification covered by the OA-420 from July 1st, 2020 until June 30th, 2021? If yes, please explain below. As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19. |
| In process. In June 2021, after different draft Work Plan proposals were discussed, the Ministry presented a proposal for changes, later included in letter 2837/MMA/2021. This document presents a general justification and requests an 18-month period of extension for the proposed changes. The Ministry informed that a detailed Work Plan and justification within the Project objectives and goals were under preparation and would be sent by the end of July. |

|  |
| --- |
| **LESSONS LEARNED / BEST PRACTICES** |
| If the project generated any lessons learned or best practices during the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year, please provide a short description. As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19. |
| **The importance of project partners` actions, to deal with management changes:**   * Managerial changes in the government executing bodies are envisaged, with the impacts having been identified in the project documents. The new managerial groups which occupy the ministries and other government agencies have difficulties in continuing previous established projects for various reasons: new plans and approaches of new governments, parties or managers, questions of ideological consideration, the need to become familiar with the project, and changes in the bodies` priorities, among others. In order to minimize these difficulties, and guarantee good project continuity, early action by the execution and implementation teams is important, to show project coherence and the importance of its results. This action does not mean a guarantee of neutralizing the risks. The MTR identified extensive mobilization by the UNDP team, to work together with the new MMA management, which was successful in the first turnover. * The more coherent, objective, and connected that the responsible partners mobilized are, the more chances the project has of being understood and absorbed.   **Project coherence to overcome execution difficulties:**   * The clear link between the chain of activities and results expected is essential, so that the project is able to coordinate the various partners and beneficiaries. This interlock of activities put forward for the results is fundamental for the defense of the project with any changes in management, to incorporate new strategic partners and mobilize stakeholders. Project information should be clear and available, strengthening its action in the various areas of execution. In the case of the GEF/ABS project, the results matrix, with the exception of individual questions which have been identified, is extremely clear, which facilitates visualization of the project logic and ownership.   **Dissemination of project information:**   * In a specific case, project information was not widely disclosed among beneficiaries. Ownership of the project logic by the beneficiary groups is also a factor that defends its continuity and sustainability. The basic information, results, and lines of action should be disseminated among partners and beneficiaries, to clarify the role of the project and its impacts, increasing collaboration and engagement.   **Prioritizing the execution of longer processes and/or of greater complexity:**   * The activities which require various products (as in the case of version 2.0 of SisGen) and processes that involve learning and training, which are complex and mobilize various beneficiaries (Component 3 activities), need to be prioritized and executed at the start of activities. Thus, the risk of not being conducted for issues of a lack of adequate time to organize all of the related processes is reduced. |

1. For the GEF, this is equivalent to the project’s “Expected Completion Date”. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For the GEF, this is equivalent to the project’s “Expected Financial Closure Date”. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. These should include risks identified at CEO Endorsement AND any new risks identified during implementation. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)