

## PRELIMINARY REPORTING FRAMEWORK

Country: BRAZIL	Name of respondent: DANIELA AMÉRICA SUAREZ DE OLIVEIRA
Please indicate on whose behalf this is being completed:	<input type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point <input type="checkbox"/> Focal point for resource mobilization <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other. Please specify: <b>Director of Department of Biodiversity Conservation</b>
Title and Department of respondent:	<b>Department of Biodiversity Conservation, Secretariat of Biodiversity and Forests</b>
Organization of respondent:	<b>Ministry of Environment of Brazil</b>
Email address:	<a href="mailto:daniela.oliveira@mma.gov.br">daniela.oliveira@mma.gov.br</a>
Telephone contact:	<b>+55 61 2028-2028</b>
Date of completion and submission of completed framework:	<b>10<sup>th</sup> of September, 2012</b>

### *1. Information on international flows of financial resources*

This section of the Framework relates to the flows of financial resources from all sources to developing countries.

For ***developed countries*** (members of OECD-DAC): Please indicate the amount of resources provided in support of biodiversity in developing countries through ODA, other public funds, private/market mechanisms and through not-for profit organizations. For ***developing countries*** (countries, not members of OECD -DAC): Please indicate the amount of resources received from external sources through ODA, other public funds, private/market mechanisms and through not-for profit organizations.

Year: 2006 - 2010			Currency: million of US\$ - US\$ 1.00 = R\$ 1.76, ref. 2010					
Type of financial flows			Activity categories				Total	
			Directly related		Indirectly related			
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
1.1 Official Development Assistance	1.1.1 Bilateral	35.00	M			35.00	M	
	1.1.2 Multilateral	15.00	M	10.00	M	25.00	M	
1.2 Other public funds								
1.3 Private/ Market								
1.4 Not for profit organizations								
Comments:								
1.1.1 – Resources donated (approximate yearly amounts) to Brazil on the Period, mainly cooperation through programs like PPG7, ARPA, Ecological Corridors and others								
1.1.2 – Directly and indirectly related resources, approximate values presented as yearly amount perceived by Brazil through GEF Projects in this period.								

## 2. Information on the availability of financial resources in each country

This section of the Framework relates to the financial resources available to implement the Convention and its Strategic Plan in your country. It relates specifically to the end use of financial resources regardless of whether the source of the funds is domestic or external.

Year: 2006			Currency: million of US\$ - US\$ 1.00 = R\$ 1.76, ref. 2010					
Source			Activity categories				Total	
			Directly Related		Indirectly Related			
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	931.45	H	172.41	H	1,103.86	H	
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	209.86	M	839.45	M	1049.32	M	
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal	132.03	M	528.15	M	660.17	M	
2.2 Private/ Market		504.48	M	4,540.39	M	5044.88	M	
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)								
<p><b>Comments:</b> Central Government values were estimated considering official reports generated by financial and administrative systems (SIAFI and SIGPLAN) from the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Planning – for direct related activities general budget and personnel payment were considered. For Indirect related activities, only general budget was considered. State and Municipal government budgets were estimated considering global expenditures for all environmental activities – indirect values surpass federal expenditures due in part to urban equipment, pollution control and mitigation managed by these levels of government. Note that a (not yet estimated) part of these resources controlled by state and municipalities have an origin on the federal budget.</p> <p>Resources allocated from private/market were estimated using reports from The Economic Commission for Latin America – ECLA (2005) – the percentage of environmental expenditures would amount to approximately 1% of industrial GDP per year, during the period of 2000 and 2001. Biodiversity expenditures are expected to be approximately 10% of this 1% of industrial GDP for directly related activities, and the remaining resources accounted for indirectly related activities.</p> <p>Resources from other sources have not yet been estimated.</p> <p>THIS COMMENT APPLIES TO ALL SUBSEQUENT YEARS</p>								

Year: 2007			Currency: million of US\$ - US\$ 1.00 = R\$ 1.76, ref. 2010				
Source		Activity categories				Total	
		Directly Related		Indirectly Related			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	885.85	H	136,60	H	1,022.44	H
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	201.24	M	804.95	M	1,006.19	M
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal	167.97	M	671.91	M	839.89	M
2.2 Private/ Market		490.51	M	4,414.63	M	4,905.14	M
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)							

Year: 2008			Currency: million of US\$ - US\$ 1.00 = R\$ 1.76, ref. 2010					
Source			Activity categories				Total	
			Directly Related		Indirectly Related			
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	741.85	H	126.61	H	868.46	H	
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	238.91	M	955.64	M	1,194.55	M	
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal	212.24	M	848.95	M	1,061.19	M	
2.2 Private/ Market			493.44	M	4,440.93	M	4,934.36	M

2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Year: 2009			Currency: million of US\$ - US\$ 1.00 = R\$ 1.76, ref. 2010					
Source			Activity categories				Total	
			Directly Related		Indirectly Related			
			Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central		814.46	H	67.37	H	881.83	H
	2.1.2 State/Provincial		254.44	M	1017.75	M	1,272.19	M
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal		250.65	M	1102.61	M	1,253.27	M
2.2 Private/ Market			467.41	M	4,206.71	M	4,674.12	M
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)								

Year: 2010		Currency: million of US\$ - US\$ 1.00 = R\$ 1.76, ref. 2010					
Source		Activity categories				Total	
		Directly Related		Indirectly Related			
		Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence	Amount	Confidence
2.1: Government budgets	2.1.1 Central	905.77	H	117.96	H	1,023.74	H
	2.1.2 State/Provincial	270.97	M	1083.90	M	1,354.88	M
	2.1.3Local/ Municipal	296.02	M	1184.09	M	1,480.11	M
2.2 Private/ Market		514.69	M	4,632.20	M	5,146.89	M
2.3 Other (NGOs, foundation, and academia)							

### **3. Information on the steps being taken to implement the strategy for resource mobilization**

This section of the Framework addresses initiatives which are important in enabling access to financial resources for biodiversity activities. The information sought in this section does not require response in monetary units.

Steps		Year initiated/ completed	Description of support received for the step (if applicable)	Results achieved (if applicable)
3.1 Assessment of values of biodiversity	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2011/?	Brazil has started to make an assessment about gap analysis of studies in assessment values of biodiversity (financing source: domestic budget)	
3.2 Identification and reporting funding needs, funding gaps and funding priorities	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2012/2014	Brief assessment that identified how much is necessary to promote conservation, sustainable use and benefit sharing of Brazilian biodiversity for 2011 to 2020 (financing source: domestic budget)	
3.3 Development of national financial plans for biodiversity	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2012/2014	The Action Plan is being conducted by Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Planning, Budget and Management (financing source: domestic budget and resources from a recent approved GEF project "National Biodiversity Planning to Support the implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan in Brazil"- fast track)	
3.4 Integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in development plans and strategies	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2012/?	National Institute for Geography and Statistics in cooperation with MMA began reviewing the methods for calculating GDP	
3.5 Country integrated consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in national budgets	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>			
Comments:				

### **4. Information on specific issues related to resource availability**

This section of the Framework contains questions related to several specific issues including: technical cooperation; South-South cooperation; innovative financial mechanisms; and access and benefit-sharing.

#### ***4.1: Technical cooperation, capacity-building and South-South cooperation***

For ***developing countries*** (countries, not members of OECD -DAC): **please indicate if your country is participating in technical cooperation and capacity-building initiatives that support biodiversity from which you have received resources as well as if initiatives have been financed by your country.** You may also provide a description of the types of initiatives.

Type of initiative		Description (including the value of initiatives)
<b>4.1.3</b> North-South technical cooperation and capacity building received	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PPG7 + Norway donation for Climate Fund + Cooperation with GIZ for Mata Atlântica I and II – approximately US\$ 198 million
<b>4.1.4</b> South-South technical cooperation & capacity building received from other developing countries	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>4.1.5</b> South-South technical cooperation and capacity building - Provided	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brazil has engaged cooperation with African, Caribbean and South American countries, but we are unable to provide value estimates for these efforts.
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### ***4.2 Resources raised through reform of incentives and subsidies***

**Please indicate if your country has removed, phased out or reformed incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity and if positive incentives have been introduced.**

Incentives	Value	Description
<b>4.2.1</b> Removed, reformed or phased-out	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>4.2.2</b> Positive incentives introduced	No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Comments :</b>		

#### ***4.3 New and innovative financial mechanism***

**Please identify the new and innovative financial mechanisms that have been implemented by your country or in which your country has participated.**

Please indicate the type of initiative and the amount of financial resources generated (where known; order of magnitude estimates are better than none). Please also indicate whether and how the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity were considered and provide a brief description of the initiative, including the year of its establishment and operation.

Type of Initiative	Resources generated (If known)	Description (including how the intrinsic and all other values of biodiversity have been reflected)
VAT transfer (Brazilian ICMS Ecológico)	US\$ 822.13 million (2006-2010 lump sum)	The amount of resources transferred to municipalities from state governments varies from state to state and are proportional (different rules apply for each state, 1 to 5% of total tax revenue) to conservation efforts such as area covered by protected areas.
Environmental Compensation	US\$ 100 million (2006-2010, resource allocated to federal government)	The environmental compensation is a mechanism modernized by the Law of the National System of Protected Areas and is an type of offset scheme. It states that every project (infrastructure, urban equipments, power plants) that passes through licensing with Impact Assessment Studies must contribute to the implementation of Protected Areas – as much as 0.5% of the global investment for the implementation of each project.
<b>Comments:</b> Brazil has developed a series of ecosystem payment schemes, but they only became operational and effective resources started flowing on late 2011, thus they were not presented in this preliminary report. There is a national law under discussion in the national congress.		

***4.4 Access and benefit sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms consistent with the Convention***

**Please indicate the number of access and benefit-sharing of genetic resources initiatives and mechanisms your country has undertaken that enhance resource mobilization:**

Initiative	Description (including how resource mobilization is enhanced)
Comments:	