

Article 20 Financial resources

273. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this Article and the associated decisions by your country?

a) High		b) Medium	X	c) Low	
---------	--	-----------	---	--------	--

274. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?

a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	X	d) Severely limiting	
---------	--	-------------	--	-------------	---	----------------------	--

Further comments on relative priority and on availability of resources

Question 273.

Brazil has difficulties in contributing because it is a developing country. The financial resources applied are below what is required. The official financing source is the *Fundo Nacional do Meio Ambiente - FNMA* [National Environment Fund – FNMA] (www.mma.gov.br/fnma) and the *Projeto de Conservação e Utilização Sustentável de Diversidade Biológica Brasileira – PROBIO* [Project for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Brazilian Biological Diversity – PROBIO] (deriving from funds donated by GEF amounting to US\$10 million with Brazilian matching funds of US\$10 million). Since 1996, PROBIO has supported conservation priority-setting workshops for each of the major Brazilian biomes (five projects), and projects for research and information gathering, surveys, and the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within the following themes: The Causes and Consequences of Habitat Fragmentation (15 projects); Conservation of Gallery Forests; Restoration of *tabuleiro* Forests; Zoning of Upland Swamps and Bogs; Management of Threatened and Invasive Species; Support for Sustainable Activities in the Vicinities of Protected Areas; Creation of Protected Areas; Revision of Threatened Species Lists; Coral Reef Management; Proposal for the Management of Pollinators; Biodiversity Information Networks; Zoning of *Araucaria* Pine Forests; Landscape Analyses; Accruing the Value of Natural Resources (capacity building and two case studies) (available at www.mma.gov.br/port/sbf/chm/relpub.html#manual); Survey of Traditional Knowledge and Biodiversity; and Rapid Biodiversity Inventories in Poorly-known Areas in Brazilian Biomes (see: www.mma.gov.br). PROBIO acts in partnership with the *Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico – CNPq* [National Council for Scientific and Technological Development – CNPq] (see: www.cnpq.br) which, by 2001, had invested over R\$2 million in grants and scholarships resulting in the higher education qualifications of 238 students and the publication of 141 scientific articles.

The *Fundo Brasileiro para a Biodiversidade – FUNBIO* [Brazilian Biodiversity Fund – FUNBIO] is a private fund, deriving from a donation by the GEF, and plays a similar role to that of PROBIO, financing conservation projects and research throughout Brazil. See: www.funbio.org.br.

Question 274.

Fifty programmes from the Pluri-annual Plan PPA interface with the Articles of the Convention. Some of these programmes are cited in Annex III.

275. Has your country provided financial support and incentives in respect of those national activities which are intended to achieve the objectives of the Convention (20(1))?

a) no	
b) yes – incentives only	
c) yes – financial support only	
d) yes – financial support and incentives	X

Chapter 1

If a developed country Party - Does not apply

276. Has your country provided new and additional financial resources to enable developing country Parties to meet the agreed incremental costs to them of implementing measures which fulfil the obligations of the Convention, as agreed between you and the interim financial mechanism (20(2))?

a) no	
b) yes	

If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition –

277. Has your country received new and additional financial resources to enable you to meet the agreed full incremental costs of implementing measures which fulfil the obligations of the Convention (20(2))?

a) no	
b) yes	X

If a developed country Party - Does not apply

278. Has your country provided financial resources related to implementation of the Convention through bilateral, regional and other multilateral channels (20(3))?

If a developing country Party or Party with economy in transition -

279. Has your country used financial resources related to implementation of the Convention from bilateral, regional and other multilateral channels (20(3))?

a) no	
b) yes	X

Decision III/6. Additional financial resources

280. Is your country working to ensure that all funding institutions (including bilateral assistance agencies) are striving to make their activities more supportive of the Convention?

a) no	
b) yes – limited extent	X
c) yes – significant extent	

281. Is your country cooperating in any efforts to develop standardized information on financial support for the objectives of the Convention?

a) no	X
b) yes (please attach information)	

Decision V/11. Additional financial resources

282. Has your country established a process to monitor financial support to biodiversity?

a) no	
b) procedures being established	
c) yes (please provide details)	X

283. Are details available of your country's financial support to national biodiversity activities?

a) no	
b) not in a standardized format	X
c) yes (please provide details)	

284. Are details available of your country's financial support to biodiversity activities in other countries?	
a) not applicable	X
b) no	
c) not in a standardized format	
d) yes (please provide details)	
<i>Developed country Parties – Not applicable</i>	
285. Does your country promote support for the implementation of the objectives of the Convention in the funding policy of its bilateral funding institutions and those of regional and multilateral funding institutions?	
a) no	
b) yes	
<i>Developing country Parties -</i>	
286. Does your country discuss ways and means to support implementation of the objectives of the Convention in its dialogue with funding institutions?	
a) no	
b) yes	X
287. Has your country compiled information on the additional financial support provided by the private sector?	
a) no	
b) yes (please provide details)	X
288. Has your country considered tax exemptions in national taxation systems for biodiversity-related donations?	
a) no	X
b) not appropriate to national conditions	
c) exemptions under development	
d) exemptions in place	

Further comments on implementation of this Article

Question 275.

The *Instituto Sociedade, População e Natureza – ISPN* [Institute for Society, Population and Nature – ISPN] carried out a survey of 40 potential sources for financing for biodiversity research and conservation during the period 1985-1996. The Ecological ICMS (*Imposto Sobre Circulação de Mercadorias e Sobre Prestação de Serviços de Transporte Interestadual e Intermunicipal e de Comunicação - ICMS* [Tax on the Circulation of Commercial Goods and Transport Services Among States and Municipalities, and on Communications] (see also comments on Question 158) is mentioned as an incentive, besides credit loan agreements as a source of financing: the *Fundo Nacional do Meio Ambiente – FNMA* [National Environment Fund – FNMA], the *Programa Nacional do Meio Ambiente – PMNA* [National Environment Programme – PNMA] Phases I and II, and the Pantanal.

Question 280.

For some fostering agencies. Decree No. 4339, 22nd August, 2002, which establishes the principles and guidelines of the *Política Nacional da Biodiversidade* [National Biodiversity Policy], has a component for institutional-strengthening and the institutional arrangements required for the implementation of the Policy. See Chapter 2.

Questions 282 and 283.

The corresponding projects and funding agencies have prepared reports of their activities to demonstrate their financial execution.

Chapter 1

Question 284.

Not applicable; support is limited to social development projects in Angola and Mozambique, and agricultural and health programmes in Latin America and Africa.

Question 286.

The *Fundo Nacional do Meio Ambiente – FNMA* [National Environment Fund – FNMA], the official fund of the Brazilian government for compliance with the *Política Nacional da Biodiversidade* [National Biodiversity Policy], is financing projects in the 900 priority areas identified for the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity.

Question 287.

The *Conselho Empresarial Brasileiro para o Desenvolvimento Sustentável - CEBDS* [Brazilian Business Council for Sustainable Development – CEBDS] and the *Confederação Nacional da Indústria - CNI* (National Federation for Industry – CNI) are preparing documents for Rio+10, summarizing investments and business opportunities. See: www.cebds.com and www.cni.org.br. Additionally, the following book presents the CEBDS' activities: Almeida, Fernando. 2002. *O bom negócio da sustentabilidade*. Rio de Janeiro, Nova Fronteira. 192p.

Question 288.

There is no mechanism for tax exemption in the Brazilian national tax system for donations related to biodiversity, except for that allowed with creation of the *Reserva Particular do Patrimônio Natural – RPPN* [Private Natural Heritage Reserve – RPPN]. Consulted by the *Secretaria da Amazônia* [Amazon Secretariat], Paulo Haddad, reviewed the existing mechanisms and suggested procedures for modernization.

The RPPN is the only mechanism for tax exemption for rural properties. The RPPN Programme began to take off in 1994, and as of December 2002, there were about 600 in existence, 364 of which are federal (about 400,000 ha). The RPPN Program is one of the most significant alternatives for increasing the number of protected areas in the country, at a minimum cost and, importantly, with the recognition and participation of society. In addition to the ease and speed with which RPPNs can be created, it is worth noting that many threatened and restricted range species are benefiting from protection in these reserves, which have no lower size limit but in many cases result in the conservation of significant areas representing Brazil's major biomes. Certain activities are permitted in RPPNs, such as environmental education, ecotourism and scientific research, which can provide income for the owners. These activities increase and diversify employment and income opportunities for the local communities. RPPNs provide universities and governmental and non-governmental scientific organizations with opportunities for developing research. They also constitute potential gene banks for Brazilian fauna and flora. Botanical surveys in some have demonstrated high potential for germplasm projects for ornamental and medicinal plants and textile fibres. Others constitute important reserves for aquatic fauna and flora, such as, for example, the RPPNs located in Bonito, Mato Grosso do Sul, and in the mangroves of the Baía de Todos os Santos, in the state of Bahia. Significant populations of the endangered golden lion tamarin (*Leontopithecus rosalia*) have been established in forest fragments around the Poço das Antas Biological Reserve, Rio de Janeiro, through the reintroduction programme, and a number have been converted into RPPNs. The Miguel Abdalla RPPN, in Caratinga, Minas Gerais, protects the largest known population of the critically endangered northern muriqui (*Brachyteles hypoxanthus*).

In spite of the heroic efforts of the small team of the RPPN Programme, the present number of RPPNs in the country is still very small. There are RPPNs in only 10% of more than 5,000 municipalities in the country. Sixty-seven RPPNs were officially registered in 2001, a significant number, and the expectations were that many more would be created in 2002. However, they have not been met, due to discouraging changes in the programme, and 2002 was the worst year to date: only 11 RPPNs were registered. Many owners, facing undue difficulties, desisted from their attempts to create RPPNs on their properties. IBAMA has been ineffectual. No promotional events were organized and no informational materials were published and distributed. Undue delay in the registration process was one of the factors that most contributed to undermining the RPPN Program. The hope is that in 2003 the RPPN Programme will receive the recognition, institutionalisation and support it deserves, being as it is one of the most important protected area categories for biodiversity conservation, most especially in such as the Atlantic forest, where the large majority of the remaining habitat is so highly fragmented and in private hands. See: www.ibama.gov.br.